

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3cs D2.0 SuperPON Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P**11** L**51** # **29**
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**
 There is noo decription of IEEE Std 802.3cs™-20xx
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please add a brief description of this amendment
 Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #62

Cl **1** SC **1.3** P**20** L**8** # **93**
 Anslow, Pete Independent
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A**
 G.698.2 is being added to 1.3 by P802.3ct, which is expected to be approved ahead of .3cs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the entry for G.698.2 from 1.3
 Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT.

Cl **1** SC **1.4** P**20** L**15** # **43**
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A**
 Missing editing instruction.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert the following new definition after 1.4.232
 Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #94

Cl **1** SC **1.4** P**20** L**18** # **44**
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A**
 Missing editing instruction. EQT is already defined in IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020. The instruction probably should be a Change (with appropriate change marks to the base text), but because there are no change marks, perhaps a Replace is intended.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 1.4.245c (inserted by IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020) with the following:
 Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #94

Cl **1** SC **1.4** P**20** L**24** # **46**
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A**
 Missing editing instruction.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert the following new definition after 1.4.275
 Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #94

Cl **1** SC **1.5** P**20** L**30** # **26**
 Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**
 The use of the abbreviation "PON" for Passive Optical Network is used 392 times in the current draft. However, the term is not listed as a abbreviation in Clause 1.5. Given the pervasive use of "PON", add it as an abbreviation.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "PON: Passive Optical Network" to Clause 1.5.
 Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3cs D2.0 SuperPON Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1 P23 L19 # 52

Nicholl, Shawn

Xilinx

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**

Table 45-3 row "1.1003" is missing an entry in the Subclause column

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to add "45.2.1.134b" in the Subclause column for the row corresponding to register address 1.1003

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.23a.2 P23 L39 # 51

Grow, Robert

RMG Consulting

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A**

If a change, this subclause should not reuse a subclause number in IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020.

SuggestedRemedy

Re-number to 45.2.1.23a.1a.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.23a.2 P23 L40 # 96

Anslow, Pete

Independent

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A**

Clause 45 level 5 headings about bit functions always contain the bit numbers.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the heading from:
 "Super-PON PMA/PMD transmit channel" to:
 "Super-PON PMA/PMD transmit channel (1.29.9:6)"

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.23a.2 P23 L40 # 53

Nicholl, Shawn

Xilinx

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**

Missing the bit references in 45.2.1.23a.2 heading.

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to change "45.2.1.23a.2 Super-PON PMA/PMD transmit channel" to "45.2.1.23a.2 Super-PON PMA/PMD transmit channel (1.29.9:6)"

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.23a.2 P23 L42 # 18

Zimmerman, George

CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**

"The Super-PON PMA/PMD operating transmit channel (see 164.2.2) is selected using bits 9 to 6." says nothing about how the transmit channel is encoded, and 164.2.2 only gives hints from Table 164-1. From these, and 45.2.1.134b.5 that this is a 4 bit number, 0 to 15.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert new second sentence (after "9 to 6."), "The Super-PON operating transmit number is a four-bit number, 0 to 15, represented by bits 9 to 6, as an unsigned integer with bit 9 the most significant bit."

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.41 P29 L19 # 33

Marris, Arthur

Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**

The entries in Table45-213 are blank

SuggestedRemedy

Either delete the table body so just the changes to the table title are shown or fill the table in

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #69

Cl 164 SC 164.2.2 P41 L 39 # 27

Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The table 164-1 Super-PON PMD naming convention has a note (b) associated with parameter "g", the PMD FSR set. The table says that the allowed values are [1,2] while the note says "This amendment defines the use of FSR set 1. FSR set 2 is reserved for a future amendment". And table Table 164-4 on page 47, line 6 has values for FSR set 2. Therefore, the note (b) contradicts the document.

SuggestedRemedy

Either update the note (b) for Table 164-1 or remove the FSR set 2 content from the document.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove footnote b)

Cl 164 SC 164.2.4.2 P44 L 45 # 35

Gorshe, Steve Microchip Technology

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The term "black link" is used in several places in the draft. It is nominally introduced in section 164.2.4.2 (pp. 44, line 45), but not defined. This is an ITU-T term and it's meaning may not be familiar to readers of IEEE 802.3.

SuggestedRemedy

It would be a good idea to explain the concept here, including that "black link" comes conceptually from "black box." The ITU-T definition can be found in clause 5.1 of ITU-T Recommendation G.698.1 or G.698.2, and an appropriate paraphrase of that definition should be added here.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #92