

Cl 101 SC 101.3.4.3 P 77 L 45 # 1442
Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Add Editor's Note regarding status of technical decision on the upstream FEC. Hopefully to help motivate baseline text contribution for the next meeting. Adjust wording as desired.

SuggestedRemedy

Editor's note: There is sufficient Task Force decisions TD#81, TD#95 and TD#102 to permit baseline contribution for this section.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add note as follows:

"EDITORS NOTE (to be removed prior to publication); There are sufficient technical decisions TD#81, TD#95 and TD#102 to permit baseline contribution for this section, the authors are encouraged to proposed baseline text.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.5.1 P 81 L 23 # 1443
Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Add Editor's Note regarding status of technical decision on the upstream FEC. Hopefully to help motivate baseline text contribution for the next meeting. Adjust wording as desired.

SuggestedRemedy

Editor's note: There is sufficient Task Force decisions TD#81, TD#95 and TD#102 to permit baseline contribution for this section.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"EDITORS NOTE (to be removed prior to publication); There are sufficient technical decisions TD#81, TD#95 and TD#102 to permit baseline contribution for this section, the authors are encouraged to proposed baseline text.

Cl 902 SC 902.1 P 107 L 17 # 1429
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

A PLC frame should have several codewords in it, this text implies it has only one

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Clause was 902.1, Subclause was blank.

Change from:

"Each frame is composed of a fixed header, one or more PHY Instructions or PHY Responses, padding and FEC parity."

To:

"Each frame is composed of a fixed header, one or more PHY Instructions or PHY Responses, and padding; encoded in multiple FEC codewords."

Cl 902 SC 902.1.1 figure 902-1 P 108 L 5 # 1430
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The figure showa a single FEC codeword between Preambles. There should be 10 codewords between preambles with the FEC defined in figure 902-9 for PLC and the 128 symbols between preambles

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Clause was 902.1, Subclause was figure 902-1. Page number and line were blank.

See comment 1265 & remain_3bn_02_0114.pdf

Cl 902 SC 902.1.2.1 P 109 L 52 # 1431
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D

change convert to converted

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Clause was 902.1, Subclause was 100.2.6.3.

Cl 902 SC 902.1.4 P 112 L 5 # 1444
Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Figure 902-6 inadvertently picked up the incorrect 16-QAM constellation (from the DOCSIS 3.1 text). It should be as adopted by the Task Force in TD#103 in prodan_3bn_01_1113.pdf for EPoC constellation mappings.

SuggestedRemedy

Update the mapping to be (as per BZ Shen):

```
3 | 8 C 4 0
1 | 9 D 5 1
-1 | B F 7 3
-3 | A E 6 2
-----
-3 -1 1 3
```

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 902 SC 902.2.2 P 115 L 42 # 1435
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D

preamble may consist of 8 or 16 subcarriers depending on the symbol size

SuggestedRemedy

Move scrambler to the FEC encoder output and descrambler to the FEC decoder input

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
Clause was 902.2, Subclause was "F".

The suggested remedy does not appear to correlate with the comment.

Cl 902 SC 902.2.3 P 118 L 32 # 1432
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The interleaver is actually the write horizontally read vertically that is described above

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
Clause was 902.2, Subclause was blank.

No suggested remedy.

Cl 902 SC 902.2.4.1 P 118 L 43 # 1433
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D

TBD = 64 , the preamble is described above to have 8*8 or 64 bits

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Clause was 902.2, Subclause was blank.

Cl 902 SC 902.2.6 P 121 L 50 # 1434
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D

information bits - this is the usual term for the payload bits in the FEC word as opposed to parity bits.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Clause was 902.2, Subclause was blank.
Change:
"In this step, called the shortening step, one or more information bits (inforamtion bits of what??) are filled with 0 and the rest are filled with input bits."
To:
"In this step, called the shortening step, one or more FEC information bits are filled with 0 and the rest are filled with PHY-Link data bits."

Cl 902 SC 902.3.5 P 124 L 44 # 1436
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Why is this information required?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
Clause was 902.3, Subclause was blank.

Local time from the CNU is require because there is a random delay built into the response from the CNU so the CLT does not know when the PHY Discovery Response was launched.

Cl 902 SC 902.4 P 125 L 29 # 1437
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The PHY discovery response messages are long in order to enable good reception and avoid interference, backoff algorithm within a discovery window will require a very long window, this needs to be discussed by the group
Mayb better to backoff PHY discovery opportunities

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
Clause was 902.4, Subclause was blank.

No suggeseted change to the draft.

Cl 902 SC 902.4 P 125 L 32 # 1438
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"It should be noted" should be a requirement for the CLT : MUST? SHOULD? MAY?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
Clause was 902.4, Subclause was blank.

No suggested remedy.

Cl 902 SC 902.4 P 125 L 32 # 1439
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"multiple valid PHY Discovery Responses can be received by the CLT during a single discovery window. I" provided that they are not overlapping in time

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Clause was 902.4, Subclause was blank.

Change from:

"It should be noted that multiple valid PHY Discovery Responses can be received by the CLT during a single discovery window."

To:

"It should be noted that multiple valid PHY Discovery Responses that do not overlap in time can be received by the CLT during a single discovery window."

Cl 902 SC 902.4 P 125 L 4245 # 1440
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

This text is not clear to me. Why is this required? The CLT knows when data arrived. The CLT can let the CNU know by how much it needs to change its transmission start time (relative timing)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
Clause was 902.4, Subclause was blank. CommentType was blank

This is required by upper layers to properly calculate grants. Perhaps it can be left in the MPCP clause if this information is not required at the PHY.

Cl **902** *SC* **902.4** *P* **126** *L* **4** # **1441**
Kliger, Avi Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

The PHY discovery response signals need to be specified as it is a special signal.
The description of this signal has been adopted by the group

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Clause was 902.4, Subclause was blank.

No suggested remedy