Cl **00**   *SC*   *P*   *L*   # **4**
Lindsay, Tom   ClariPhy Communicati

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Readability and comprehension are challenged by the tight formatting. Currently, the reader is required to scan and jump several pages, in some cases, for table and figures that relate to document text.

Suggested Remedy

Structure the document so that all text, tables, and figures are contiguous within each subclause.   I realize this might put some gaps and white spaces into the document, but it would really help readability.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Editor will do his best.

Cl **00**   *SC*   *P*   *L*   # **5**
Law, David   3Com

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Strictly speaking the, as stated in the Editorial notes related to changed portions of the existing standard, the entire text of the editing instructions should be in bold italic font (see page 6, line 20 for an example where this doesn't seem to have been done).   Also the formatting that has generally be used in the past is to have the subclause title, then on a newline the editing instruction in bold italic, then the change text. It would also be helpful to provide more context for some of the editing instructions such as which paragraph of a subclause is being modified.   Taking the Clause 30 change as an example (of course I can't provide bold, italic or underline font so I'll use HTML markup) the text would read, with some additions to the editing instructions: <B>30.5.1.1.2 aMAUType</B>   <B><I>Insert the following new entry into 'APPROPRIATE SYNTAX' between the existing 10GBASE-LR and 10GBASE-LR entries:</I></B>   10GBASE-LRM R fibre over 1310nm optics as specified in Clause 68   Note that the insert instruction is really for where stand alone text is added, underscore and strikeout makings are not used in these case, only with the change instruction. I therefore believe in a number of places where insert is used, the change instruction would actually be correct. As an example I would suggest the subclause 44.1.4.4 changes, lines 30 through 41 on page 7, should read: <B>44.1.4.4 Physical Layer signaling systems</B>   <B><I>Change the 3rd paragraph of this subclause as follows:</I></B>   The term 10GBASE-R, specified in Clauses 49, 51, and 52, refers to a specific family of physical layer implementations based upon 64B/66B data coding method. The 10GBASE-R family of physical layer implementations is composed of 10GBASE-SR, 10GBASE-LR, and 10GBASE-ER<U> and 10GBASE-LRM</U>.   <B><I>Change the 7th paragraph of this subclause as follows:</I></B>   Specifications of <S>each</S> <U>these</U> physical layer devices are contained in Clause 52 through Clause 54 <S>inclusive</S><U>and Clause 68</U>.

Suggested Remedy

See comment.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC*   *P*   *L*   # **7**
Law, David   3Com

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

When self referencing please replace IEEE Std 802.3aq 200X with IEEE Std 802.3aq-200X (add the '-' between the aq and the 200X).

Suggested Remedy

See comment.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC*   *P* **12**   *L* **15**   # **8**
Parsons, Glenn

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

There is no need for this bolded title to introduce the new section.

Suggested Remedy

Remove text from this page or delete page

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC*   *P* **2**   *L* **12**   # **9**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Title is too long.

Suggested Remedy

Use a shorter summary.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment 106.

Cl **00**   *SC*   *P* **2**   *L* **37**   # **10**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Need space between number and title.

Suggested Remedy

Use good FrameMaker templates, available at:
http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/msc/WordProcessors.html

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC*   *P* **2**   *L* **54**   # **11**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
     Title is too long and overflows the table of contents.

Suggested Remedy
     Clause 68, physical ... ==> Clause 68

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
     PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
     See response to comment 106. PICS title follows Clause title.

Cl **00**   *SC*   *P* **3**   *L* **6**   # **12**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
     Title is too long and overflows the table of contents.

Suggested Remedy
     Clause 68, physical ... ==> Clause 68

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
     PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
     See response to comments 106 and 11.

Cl **00**   *SC*   *P* **4**   *L* **1**   # **13**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
     The style for the changed clauses is cumbersome and can be improved, both for
     readability and for closer resemblance to how the document will be published.

Suggested Remedy
     Insert an additional title page as the first page of the standard (as found in IEEE Std
     802.3ah-2002, appropriately edited for a draft). Include the appropriate Editorial Note on
     this page (the one about Change, Insert, Delete, and Replace).
     Delete lines 1-16 on pages 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 11
     Editor's choice whether to begin each changed clause on a new page, but I recommend
     not.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
     PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **01**   *SC*   *P* **4**   *L* **1**   # **14**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**
     Both in the editor's note and the heading it should be noted that this is a change to
     802.3REVam. Once REVam is complete, then you can state that it applies to 802.3-2005.

Suggested Remedy
     As per comment.   Also applies to Clause 30, Annex 30B, Clause 44, Clause 45 and
     Clause 49.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
     PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **01**   *SC*   *P* **4**   *L* **26**   # **15**
Dallesasse, John   Emcore Corporation

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
     Missing period at end of ITU-T reference.

Suggested Remedy
     Add period.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
     PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **4**   *L* **19**   # **16**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
     Insert subclause title

Suggested Remedy
     Insert: 1.3 Normative References

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
     PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **4**   *L* **20**   # **18**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
     Insufficient editing instruction, the insertion is alphabetical.

Suggested Remedy
     Recommend it read: ""Insert the following references into 1.3 in alphabetic order:""

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
     PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **4**   *L* **20**   **#** **17**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Subclause title should be entered, then editing instruction should follow.

Suggested Remedy
Change editing instruction to read: 1.3 Normative references   (italics)Insert the following entries:

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **4**   *L* **21**   **#** **19**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Add reference(s) for encircled flux. For info, ANSI/TIA/EIA-455-203-2001; Launched Power Distribution Measurement Procedure for Graded-Index Multimode Transmitters, is already in the list of references.

Suggested Remedy
Add entry for IEC 61280-1-4. Title is Fibre optic communication subsystem test procedures - Part 1-4: General communication subsystems - Collection and reduction of two-dimensional nearfield data for multimode fibre laser transmitters Publication date: 2003-01-23

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **4**   *L* **27**   **#** **20**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
I expect we will need a reference for IEC 60793-2-10.

Suggested Remedy
In usual format: IEC 60793-2-10 Optical fibres - Part 2-10: Product specifications - Sectional specification for category A1 multimode fibres Publication date 2004-11-04.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC*   *P*   *L*   **#** **24**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
To aid the publication editor and reduce the problems of parallel projects modifying the same portions of the standard add an Editor's Note.

Suggested Remedy
Insert an ""Editor's Note (to be removed prior to final publication).   The publication editor might want to change some of the editing instructions for this clause to be ""Change"" instructions rather than ""Insert"". Reviewers and the publication editor should note that editing instructions have been written to minimize the probability of changes being lost at publication. Other active amendment projects (e.g., P802.3an and P802.3ap) are likely to modify the same text, and the order of approval for the active amendments is uncertain.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC*   *P* **22**   *L* **5**   **#** **25**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Title is too long and overflows the line.

Suggested Remedy
Either: 1) Reduce the title length. 2) Break the line at a convenient location.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
If this applies to the title of Clause 30 as printed on page 5: It is included only to assist the publication editor in locating the point at which to insert the new text. The title itself is not subject to any changes.

Cl **30**   *SC*   *P* **3**   *L* **33**   **#** **26**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Mixed title and editing instruction. Split subclause title and editing instruction.

Suggested Remedy
30.5.1.1.2 aMAUType   Insert a new entry into the list of enumerations following the 10GBASE-LR entry:

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC*   *P* **5**   *L* **20**   # 27

Law, David   3Com

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The title of Clause 30 was updated by IEEE Std 802.3ah-2004. Please use this updated title.

Suggested Remedy

Suggest that '30. Mb/s, 100 Mb/s, 1000 Mb/s, MAC Control, and Link Aggregation Management' be changed to read '30. Management'.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC*   *P* **5**   *L* **22**   # 28

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

I don't think this is a 30 Mb/s link.

Suggested Remedy

30. Mb/s ==> 30. 10 Mb/s

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30**   *P* **5**   *L* **20**   # 29

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Title has been changed.

Suggested Remedy

Title should read: 30. Management

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30**   *P* **5**   *L* **20**   # 30

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Clause title is out of date

Suggested Remedy

Change title to 'Management'

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30**   *P* **6**   *L* **20**   # 31

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

REVam has a different title for clause 30.

Suggested Remedy

Change simply to ""Management""

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.5.1.1.2**   *P* **5**   *L* **23**   # 32

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Subclause title should be entered, then editing instruction should follow. I'd also recommend that the entry be put after SR so that numbering in 30B is sequential.

Suggested Remedy

Change to read: 30.5.1.1.2 aMAUType   (italics)Insert a new entry into the list following the 10GBASE-SR entry:

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30B**   *SC*   *P* **6**   *L* **1**   # 33

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

I think the proper order is changed clauses, changed annexes, then new clauses.

Suggested Remedy

Move to be last changed section.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30B**   *SC* **30B.2**   *P* **6**   *L* **18**   # 35

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Split the titles and uses appropriate level style.

Suggested Remedy

Annex 30B   30B.2 ASN.1 module for CSMA/CD managed objects

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause   Page 4 of 38
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Cl **30B**   *SC* **30B.2**

Cl **30B**   *SC* **30B.2**   *P* **6**   *L* **18**   # **36**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Annex title and subclause headings are merged.

Suggested Remedy

Change to be what is in .3REVam.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30B**   *SC* **30B.2**   *P* **6**   *L* **26**   # **37**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Numbering is out of order.

Suggested Remedy

Place 10GBASE-LRM after 10GBASE-SR.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30B**   *SC* **30B2**   *P* **6**   *L* **22**   # **38**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Inconsistent style for the inserts, surrounding context is not required to understand.

Suggested Remedy

Delete all lines except for the new 10GBASE-LRM line.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Propose to reduce the quantity of surrouding context.

Cl **44**   *SC*   *P* **7**   *L*   # **39**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The subclause and instructions should be split in all cases.

Suggested Remedy

Split and put the subclause with title on its own line, and one or more instructions with modified text following that subclause title.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.1**   *P* **7**   *L* **20**   # **40**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Subclause title should be entered, then editing instruction should follow.   This applies to Clauses 44, 45 and 49.

Suggested Remedy

Use the .3REVam subclause headings. Insert the editing instructions after the subclause headings all in bold italic text.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.3**   *P* **7**   *L* **26**   # **41**

Dallesasse, John   Emcore Corporation

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

""l"" in ""10GBASE-lRM"" in the text that describes the editorial change should be capitalized.

Suggested Remedy

Change ""l"" to ""L""

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.3**   *P* **7**   *L* **28**   # **42**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Put in the complete bullet d).

Suggested Remedy

As per comment.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **35**   # **43**

Law, David   3Com

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Typo, redundant 'and'.

Suggested Remedy

'.. LR, and 10GBASE-ER and 10GBASE-LRM.' shoudl read '.. LR, 10GBASE-ER and 10GBASE-LRM.'

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause   Page 5 of 38
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4**

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **30**   # **44**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
Hard to find the insert, identify paragraph.

Suggested Remedy
Change instruciton to read: Insert 10GBASE-LRM into family of 10GBASE-R physical layer implementations in the third paragraph, as follows:

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **33**   # **45**
Thaler, Pat   Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Since Clause 52 is included, ""Clause 68"" should be added to the list of clauses that define 10GBASE-R.

Suggested Remedy

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **33**   # **46**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
Missing Clause 68 in the list of 10GBASE-R clauses.

Suggested Remedy
Change the text to read: The term 10GBASE-R, specified in Clauses 49, 51, 52 and 68, refers to...

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **35**   # **47**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Missing strikethrough.

Suggested Remedy
Strikethrough ""and""

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **35**   # **50**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Extra and not required.

Suggested Remedy
Change end of sentence to read: ... is composed of 10GBASE-SR, 10GBASE-LR, 10GBASE-ER, and 10GBASE-LRM.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **35**   # **49**
Jaeger, John   Big Bear Networks

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
There is an extra 'and' in the 2nd sentence of the statement to be inserted into 44.1.4.4

Suggested Remedy
Delete the first 'and' and have the 2nd sentence read: The 10GBASE-R family of physical layer implementations is composed of 10GBASE-SR, 10GBASE-LR, 10GBASE-ER and 10GBASE-LRM.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **35**   # **48**
Bradshaw, Peter   Intersil

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
The repeated 'and' in the ammended line is not desirable.

Suggested Remedy
Either:-   1. change the insertion to "", 10GBASE-LRM"" and place it after ""10GBASE-LR""   or   2. remove the ""and "" after ""10GBASE-ER""

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **37**   # **51**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Hard to find the edit.

Suggested Remedy
Add ""last paragraph"" to the editing instruction.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **39**   # **52**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

This sentence was changed pretty dramatically and one of the edits is not shown. Return the sentence to its original state and add Clause 68.

Suggested Remedy

Change to read: Specifications of each physical layer device are contained in Clauses 52, 53, 54 and 68.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Original sentence is not strictly correct (or may be just not gramatical). Propose change to: Specifications of these physical layer devices are contained in Clauses 52, 53, 54 and 68.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **39**   # **53**
Bradshaw, Peter   Intersil

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The change is incorrectly marked. The ""s"" at the end of ""devices"" is an addition.

Suggested Remedy

Underline the ""s"" in ""devices""

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **42**   # **54**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Misleading editorial instruction.

Suggested Remedy

Insert the column for Clause 68 and the row for 10GBASE-LRM into Table 44–1, as shown below:

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **48**   # **55**
Bradshaw, Peter   Intersil

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

The addition to Table 44-2 would seem to need an ""or"" rather than an ""and"" here. The two references are, as far as I can see, identical except for subclause number. The instruction to ""see"" either of them seems unnecessary, since, apart from repeating part of the material of this subclause, the main effect of both 52.2 and 68.2 is to refer the reader BACK to 44.3.   Which is where Table 44-2 appears, NOT in 44.1.4.4 as it is now listed.

Suggested Remedy

First, insert the CORRECT subclause number before this entry: the Table to be altered is in subclause 44.3, NOT 44.1.4.4.   Second: either delete the "" See 52.2"" altogether, or change ""or"" to ""and"". The former is prefereable, since this near-useless reference, if extended, will probably cause a line wrap in the table, probably forcing more of the next table onto the next page.... Too much for such a near-circular reference.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Will delete the reference altogether.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.4.4**   *P* **8**   *L* **10**   # **56**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The blank cells are confusing. Sometimes these are used to represent straddled cells, or TBDs, which are not (I believe) the intent.

Suggested Remedy

Fill each blank cell with an em dash.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The suggestion is to change the style of a table in Clause 44.
We should not modify the style for this particular table.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.1.44**   *P* **7**   *L* **35**   # **57**
Arthur, Marris   Cadence

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Delete "",and""

Suggested Remedy

Delete "",and""

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.4**   *P* **8**   *L* **13**   # **58**

Bradshaw, Peter   Intersil

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

The Table 44-1 incorporated in the draft is not that of the current RevAM draft. In particular, it does NOT include the line referring to 10GBASE-CX4

Suggested Remedy

Add the new line for 10GBASE-LRM to the CORRECT table.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.5**   *P* **8**   *L* **21**   # **59**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Missing subclause title

Suggested Remedy

Add ""44.5 Relation of 10 Gigabit Ethernet to other standards""

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **44.5**   *P* **8**   *L* **22**   # **60**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

This can be a change instruction, 802.3an is not modifying this table.

Suggested Remedy

Change Table 44–4, as follows:

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **44**   *SC* **Table 44-1**   *P* **8**   *L* **1**   # **62**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

There is no editing instruction for the insertion of LRM into Table 44-1.

Suggested Remedy

Add editing instruction.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The editing instruct is not located close enough to the table. This will be corrected.

Cl **44**   *SC* **Table 44-2**   *P* **7**   *L* **45**   # **64**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Table numbering is incorrect. Table should also be provided as a reference.

Suggested Remedy

Change edit instruction to point to Table 44-2, not Table-44.2. Add Table 44-2 and show the edit in the table.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC*   *P* **9**   *L* **20**   # **65**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The subclause and instructions should be split in all cases.

Suggested Remedy

Split and put the subclause with title on its own line, and one or more instructions with modified text following that subclause title.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.8**   *P* **10**   *L* **8**   # **66**

Cravens, George

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Bit(s) entry reads 1.11.15:3 , there is no bit 2.

Suggested Remedy

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Change Bit(s) entry to 1.11.15:2.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45**   *P* **9**   *L* **17**   # **67**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Incorrect title, differs from REVam.

Suggested Remedy

45. Management Data Input/Output (MDIO) Interface

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause   Page 8 of 38
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Cl **45**   *SC* **45**

Cl **45**   *SC* **45**   *P* **9**   *L* **18**   # **68**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Clause title is wrong

Suggested Remedy
    Change to: Management Data Input/Output (MDIO) Interface

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.10**   *P* **10**   *L* **1**   # **69**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Unwanted italics?

Suggested Remedy
    Put ':' in upright font.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.10**   *P* **10**   *L* **1**   # **70**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Table 45-11 lacks a subclause heading.

Suggested Remedy
    Insert '45.2.1.10 10G PMA/PMD extended ability register (Register 1.11)'. Put the
    reference to table 45-11 (currently '45-12') in this subclause.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.10**   *P* **10**   *L* **1**   # **72**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Wrong table number

Suggested Remedy
    Change 'Table 45-12' to 'Table 45-11'.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.10**   *P* **10**   *L* **1**   # **71**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Missing subclause number/title. Improve editing instruction

Suggested Remedy
    45.2.1.10 10G PMA/PMD extended ability register (Register 1.11)   Insert row into Table 45-
    11 to define reserved bit 1.11.1 for 10GBASE_LRM, as follows: Editor's Note (to be
    removed prior to publication): Other projects are defining bits in this register (e.g.,
    P802.3an and P802.3ap). Depending on order of publication, the number of rows in the
    table my need to be adjusted at time of publication. Bit 1.11.2 is proposed for use by
    10GBASE-T, bits 1.11.3, and bits 1.11.4 are proposed for use by 10GBASE-KR4 and
    10GBASE-KR respectively. Reserved bits will also need to be adjusted based on order of
    publication.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.10**   *P* **10**   *L* **8**   # **73**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Table omits bit 1.11.15.2.

Suggested Remedy
    Change '1.11.15:3' to '1.11.15:2'. (Leave 10GBASE-T to declare 1.11.15:2)

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.6**   *P*   *L*   # **74**
Bradshaw, Peter   Intersil

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
    Table 45-7. Although my attempts to ""rationalize"" the assignemnts in this table during the
    CX4 task force were resoundingly rejected, it wouls still seem more rational to use '1000'
    for 10GBASE-T (closer to '0000' for the other electrical cable standard, CX4) and '1001' for
    10GBASE-LRM

Suggested Remedy
    Swap the two lines for 10GBASE-T and 10GBASE-LRM.   Obviously, this would need to
    be co-ordinated with the 10GBASE-T task force.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.6**   *P* **9**   *L* **33**   # **75**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
   Table 45-7 lacks a subclause heading.

Suggested Remedy
   Insert (in numerical order): '45.2.1.6 10G PMA/PMD control 2 register (Register 1.7)'. Put
   the reference to table 45-7 in this subclause.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.6**   *P* **9**   *L* **34**   # **76**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**
   Table 45-7 is incorrectly numbered and should be located under the correct subclause
   heading.

Suggested Remedy
   Insert subclause heading for 45.2.1.6 and then place the editing instructions for the table in
   that subclause. More importantly, change the table to be Table 45-8.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.6**   *P* **9**   *L* **45**   # **78**
Claseman, George   Micrel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
   n table 45-7, code point 1001 indicates 10GBASE-T PMA/PMD type. No such standard
   exists yet.

Suggested Remedy
   Change to ""Reserved"".

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.6**   *P* **9**   *L* **46**   # **79**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**
   Incomplete change

Suggested Remedy
   Change to read ""10GBASE-LRM PMA/PMD type

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.7.4**   *P* **7**   *L* **22**   # **80**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**
   The changes shown are hard to understand considering none of the relevant data in
   included.   This also applies to 45.1.7.5 and 45.2.1.8.

Suggested Remedy
   Insert the full paragraph showing the change made to the paragraph.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.7.4**   *P* **9**   *L* **18**   # **81**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
   Unwanted period after 'fault'

Suggested Remedy
   Remove. Also in 45.2.1.7.5, and at end of line that starts 'Table 45-7'.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.7.4**   *P* **9**   *L* **22**   # **82**
Bradshaw, Peter   Intersil

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**
   Although the texts of 52.4.8 and 68.4.8 appear close to identical, it would seem more user-
   friendly to give the user soem quide as to what is ""appropriate"".

Suggested Remedy
   Instead of the addition at the end of the sentence, use the following: ""The description of
   the transmit fault function for 10GBASE-LRM serial PMDs is given in 68.4.8, and for other
   serial PMDs in 52.4.8.""

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.7.5**   *P* **9**   *L* **26**   # **83**
Bradshaw, Peter   Intersil

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Although the texts of 52.4.9 and 68.4.9 appear close to identical, it would seem more user-friendly to give the user soem quide as to what is ""appropriate"".

Suggested Remedy
    Instead of the addition at the end of the sentence, use the following: ""The description of the receive fault function for 10GBASE-LRM serial PMDs is given in 68.4.9, and for other serial PMDs in 52.4.9.""

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.7.5**   *P* **9**   *L* **26**   # **84**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Unwanted word

Suggested Remedy
    Remove 'Clause'.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.7.8**   *P* **9**   *L* **31**   # **85**
Bradshaw, Peter   Intersil

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Although the texts of 52.4.7 and 68.4.7 appear close to identical, it would seem more user-friendly to give the user soem quide as to what is ""appropriate"".

Suggested Remedy
    Instead of the addition at the end of the sentence, use the following: ""The transmit disable function for 10GBASE-LRM serial PMDs is described in 68.4.7, and for other serial PMDs in 52.4.7.""

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.8**   *P* **10**   *L* **11**   # **86**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Listings of values normally start from 0.

Suggested Remedy
    Switch the 0-value and 1-value description.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.8**   *P* **10**   *L* **16**   # **87**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Misleading capitalization

Suggested Remedy
    Read Only

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED REJECT.
    This concerns the style already used in Clause 45.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.8**   *P* **9**   *L* **55**   # **89**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Misleading capitalization

Suggested Remedy
    Read/Write ==> read/write

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED REJECT.
    This concerns the style already used in Clause 45.

Cl **45**   *SC* **Table 45-12**   *P* **10**   *L* **4**   # **92**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Table heading incorrect.

Suggested Remedy
    Change to be Table 45-12.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **Table 45-12**   *P* **10**   *L* **8**   # **93**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Bit numbering is incorrect.

Suggested Remedy

Change 1.11.15:3 to be 1.11.15:2.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **Table 45-7**   *P* **9**   *L* **45**   # **95**

Law, David   3Com

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Why is the text PMA/PMD not added so that the 10GBASE-LRM entry is the same as all other entries.

Suggested Remedy

Change the text '10GBASE-LRM' to read '10GBASE-LRM PMA/PMD type'.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **Table 45-7**   *P* **9**   *L* **45**   # **96**

Law, David   3Com

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

The 10GBASE-T PMA/PMD appears here as existing text however in Table 45-11 on the next page there is no mention of the 10GBASE-T PMA/PMD.

Suggested Remedy

Either show the 10GBASE-T related bits as existing text or not, would seem a good idea to not as IEEE P802.3aq is expected to be approved prior to IEEE P802.3an.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **49**   *SC* **49**   *P* **11**   *L* **19**   # **98**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**

The subclause and instructions should be split in all cases.

Suggested Remedy

Split and put the subclause with title on its own line, and one or more instructions with modified text following that subclause title.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **49**   *SC* **49**   *P* **11**   *L* **19**   # **97**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

All of these modifications can and should be written as Changes. 10GBASE-KR will not be modifying clause 49, any exceptions will be covered in clause 69.

Suggested Remedy

Rewrite each modification as a Change.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **49**   *SC* **49.1.2**   *P* **11**   *L* **20**   # **99**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Grammar?

Suggested Remedy

Change 'item d in to the list' to 'item d of the list'.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **49**   *SC* **49.1.2**   *P* **11**   *L* **22**   # **100**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Show the bullet d).

Suggested Remedy

As per comment.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **49**   *SC* **49.11**   *P* **11**   *L*   # **101**

Law, David   3Com

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Shouldn't 10GBASE-LRM be added to the list of PHYs in the scope subclause for Clause 49, type 10GBASE-R.

Suggested Remedy

See comment.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
This PCS can connect directly to one of the 10GBASE-R
Physical Layers: 10GBASE-SR, 10GBASE-LR, 10GBASE-ER and 10GBASE-LRM.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause   Page 12 of 38
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Cl **49**   *SC* **49.11**

Cl **68** *SC* *P* **11** *L* **15** **#** **103**

Claseman, George Micrel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Title page. This information is conveyed on the next page.

Suggested Remedy

Remove title page.

Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68** *SC* *P* **12** *L* **#** **104**

Thaler, Pat Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

I don't understand the purpose of this page. Do you intend it to be part of the standard? It appears to be unnecessary.

Suggested Remedy

Delete the page or if you want to start Clause 68 on an odd page, replace with the traditional ""this page intentionally left almost blank"" page.

Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
The extra (title) page was included to overcome pdf bookmark difficulties. I presume that these can be resolved without including it.

Cl **68** *SC* *P* **12** *L* **1** **#** **105**

Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

This page is not required.

Suggested Remedy

Delete.

Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68** *SC* *P* **13** *L* **1** **#** **106**

Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

Heading for this clause is missing some information and contains unnecessary information.

Suggested Remedy

Change heading to read: Physical medium dependent (PMD) sublayer and baseband medium, type 10GBASE-LRM   If this comment is accepted, a change will be required to the heading of 68.10 and to the text in 68.10.1, 68.10.2.2 and 68.10.3.

Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68** *SC* **68** *P* **13** *L* **1** **#** **118**

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Delete the parenthetical information from the title.

Suggested Remedy

Delete here and in other subclause titles (e.g., in the PICS).

Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68** *SC* **68.1** *P* **13** *L* **0** **#** **119**

Thompson, Geoff

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Figure does not have crosshatching, as promised, in the PMD portion of Figure 68-1 as far as I can tell.

Suggested Remedy

Crosshatch at the precise density previously determined by 802.3 project editors to show on both screen and printout.

Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The Frame document does show cross hatching. This figure came from Clause 52, where it appears with cross hatching in the pdf version. Editor will try to resolve by showing the cross hatching in the pdf document.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **10**   # **120**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

""other"" is not strong enough.

Suggested Remedy

Replace with ""functionally equivilent"".

Response   *Response Status* **W**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **12**   # **121**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

hatched is not usually the term used.

Suggested Remedy

Change to be shaded.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See proposed response to comment 119.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **6**   # **122**

Law, David   3Com

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

Typo.

Suggested Remedy

Shouldn't '10GBASE' read '10GBASE-LRM'.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See reponse to 123

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **7**   # **123**

Booth, Brad   Intel

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

Paragraph is unclear and is missing information. There is also no ""other means"" defined for management functions, so that should be deleted.

Suggested Remedy

Change to read: This clause specifies the 10GBASE-LRM PMD and the baseband medium for multimode optical fiber. In order to form a complete physical layer, the PMD is combined with the appropriate sublayers in Table 52-2 and optionally with the management functions that may be accessible through the management interface defined in Clause 45.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace paragraph with:
This clause specifies the 10GBASE-LRM PMD and the associated multimode fiber media. In order to form a complete physical layer, the PMD is combined with the sublayers appropriate for 10GBASE-R, as specified in Table 52-2, and optionally with the management functions that may be accessible through the management interface defined in Clause 45.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **7**   # **124**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

Text needs to be improved.

Suggested Remedy

This clause specifies the PMD and multimode fiber media for a serial PHY. The PMD uses the 10GBASE-R PMA of Clause 51, and the same MDI used by other 10GBASE-R PMDs as specified in Clause 52.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See response to 123.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Page 14 of 38

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.1**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.1.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **47**   # **126**

Thaler, Pat   Agilent Technologies

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

This subclause is unnecessary and sets a bad precedent. Our Clauses are part of a document and don't need to state that. None of the other Clauses have such a section but the definitions and such in Clause 1 apply equally to them.   Because this Clause is not contiguous with the other 10 Gig clauses, a reference to that for the overview of 10 Gig is useful.

Suggested Remedy

Delete this Clause. Add to 68.1 at the end of the paragraph beginning ""Figure 68-1 depicts.... ""See Clause 44 for an introduction to 10 Gigabit Ethernet and the relationship of the 10GBASE-LRM PMD to other sublayers.""

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10**   *P* **36**   *L* **2**   # **127**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Editorial:The title is too long and overflows the TOC, requiring manual editor intervention.

Suggested Remedy

Clause 68, phy... ==> Clause 68

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment 106.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.1**   *P* **36**   *L* **12**   # **128**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Missing the word ""Clause"" before the clause number.

Suggested Remedy

As per comment.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.1**   *P* **36**   *L* **13**   # **129**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Its unclear what is the meaning of can be found in 21.

Suggested Remedy

If this is a clause, then state Clause 21.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
.. , can be found in Clause 21.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.1**   *P* **36**   *L* **9**   # **130**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Wrong capitalization. The title starts with a capital.

Suggested Remedy

physical medium dependent ==> Physical medium dependent

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.2.1**   *P* **36**   *L* **17**   # **131**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Extra dot

Suggested Remedy

Remove

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.2.3**   *P* **37**   *L* **7**   # **132**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Consistent centering

Suggested Remedy
Center the following columns, here and througout. Item Clause/Subclause Status Support

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Following the precedent of Clause 52:
Item: Left justified;
Clause/subclause: left justified;
Status: centre justified;
Support: centre justified.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.3**   *P* **37**   *L* **23**   # **133**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Editorial:The title is too long and overflows the TOC, requiring manual editor intervention.

Suggested Remedy
for physical medium dependent... ==> for Clause 68

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment 106.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.3.1**   *P* **37**   *L* **29**   # **134**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
No space to fill in form

Suggested Remedy
Insert space(s) between [and], quite a few times.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.3.1**   *P* **37**   *L* **41**   # **135**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
font size

Suggested Remedy
'Table 68-1' should be in 9 point.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.3.2**   *P* **38**   *L* **8**   # **136**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Move the subclauses from the Value/Comment field into the subclause. Multiple subclauses can be referenced. Also, the ""c"" in the Value/Comment heading is lowercase while all the other are uppercase.

Suggested Remedy
Move subclause values and change ""c"" to uppercase.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.3.3**   *P* **38**   *L* **33**   # **137**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Table 68-3 and Table 68-3? Should there be something else mentioned?

Suggested Remedy
Check - if nothing found, delete 'and Table 68-3'

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Just one table.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.3.4**   *P* **39**   *L* **6**   # **138**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
""Per definition."" is not required in the Value/Comment field as it is assumed.

Suggested Remedy
Remove all the ""Per definition."" statements.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.3.4**   *P* **39**   *L* **6**   # **139**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Most of the table entries don't have a full stop

Suggested Remedy
At discretion

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.3.5**   *P* **39**   *L* **36**   # **140**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Take the subclauses out of the Value/Comment field and put it in the Subclause field. It is okay to list multiple subclauses in this field.

Suggested Remedy
As per comment.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.3.5**   *P* **39**   *L* **40**   # **141**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Grammar?

Suggested Remedy
Delete 'the' before 'IEC 60825-1'?

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.10.3.6**   *P* **40**   *L* **11**   # **142**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Wrong subclause?

Suggested Remedy
Change '68.5.1' to '68.9.3'?

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.4.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **38**   # **146**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy
Use 8-point Arial.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
Figure taken from Clause 52.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.4.3**   *P* **15**   *L* **11**   # **148**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
In these functional primitives, '.indicate' is now deprecated and '.indication' preferred.

Suggested Remedy
Change '.indicate' to '.indication', three times.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.4.4**   *P* **15**   *L* **17**   # **149**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
If PMD_SIGNAL.indicate (SIGNAL_DETECT) is a function of a variable there wouldn't be a space before the (. See 52.1.1 for other examples.

Suggested Remedy
Either explain what parts of speech these things are, or remove the space.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.4.4**   *P* **15**   *L* **31**   # **151**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Gratuitous capital in header row of table 68-1

Suggested Remedy
Change 'Conditions' to 'conditions'.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause   Page 17 of 38
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.4.4**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.4.4**   *P* **15**   *L* **44**   # `152`
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Bad use of 'etc.': there is no list to define what the others are, not formal enough (should be spelt out if used at all).

Suggested Remedy
Change to 'and so on' or 'and so forth'.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete this informative paragraph altogether. The optical power at which SIGNAL DETECT is OK is given in the table. As with all other parameters, implementation margin will be required.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.4.7**   *P* **15**   *L* **19**   # `153`
Claseman, George   Micrel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**
""PMD Transmit Disable 0 is not used for serial PMDs."" Neither are Disables 1-3.

Suggested Remedy
Include Disables 1-3.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.4.7**   *P* **16**   *L* **19**   # `155`
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Gratuitous capitals

Suggested Remedy
Change 'Transmit Disable' to 'transmit disable'.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.4.7**   *P* **16**   *L* **19**   # `154`
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Wrong font.

Suggested Remedy
Pleas apply the correct paragraph style.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.4.7**   *P* **16**   *L* **9**   # `156`
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Gratuitous capital

Suggested Remedy
Change 'Transmitter' to 'transmitter'.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5**   *P* **16**   *L* **44**   # `157`
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
'which' or 'that'? See style guide or a good dictionary; in formal writing, use 'that' with a restrictive clause. Also precedent of clauses 38 52 ('that'), 58 59 60 ('which').

Suggested Remedy
Change 'which' to 'that'.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5**   *P* **17**   *L* **15**   # `161`
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Missing space

Suggested Remedy
Change '1.5dB' to '1.5 dB'.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5**   *P* **17**   *L* **5**   # `164`
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**
This is a 1300 nm PMD, and the 850nm modal bandwidth is not relevant. There is only one modal bandwidth on 62.5 um fiber and two on 50 um fiber.

Suggested Remedy
Remove the 850 nm modal bandwidth numbers and condense the table to show only the 3 different modal bandwidths and operating ranges for 1300 nm.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
The bandwidth pairs, for the two wavelengths, are used together as the fiber type identifier.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause   Page 18 of 38
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.1**   *P* **18**   *L* **11**   # **168**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
It's the width that needs the footnote, not the spectral.

Suggested Remedy
Move the 'a' to after 'width'.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.1**   *P* **18**   *L* **13**   # **169**
Kolesar, Paul   Systimax

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Clarify and simplify spectral width specification in Table 68-3.

Suggested Remedy
Combine the second and third lines into one line that states: ""RMS spectral width from 1300 nm to 1355 nm"".

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment 382.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.1**   *P* **18**   *L* **28**   # **172**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
Footnotes c and d are unnecessary and misleading. Basically, all the parameters in these tables are defined in 68.6 Definitions of optical parameters and measurement methods. The reader knows that because 68.5.1 says '... specifications given in Table 68-3 ... per definitions in 68.6.' Following footnotes c and d, the lack of a footnote to 'Uncorrelated jitter (rms)' implies that this parameter is not defined or explained in 68.6, but that is not the case.

Suggested Remedy
Delete footnotes c and d.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.1**   *P* **18**   *L* **46**   # **176**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
In table 68-3, mode conditioning patch cord doesn't have units of %.

Suggested Remedy
Delete % in the 'Unit' column, twice.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.1**   *P* **18**   *L* **46**   # **175**
Kolesar, Paul   Systimax

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
State launch condition specifications more clearly and uniformly in Table 68-3.

Suggested Remedy
The first column for each of the three launch condition rows can be formatted as follows: Optical launch specification^e for <fiber type>: (^e refers to footnote e) Default Alternative The encircled flux specifications in the third column for all three fiber types can be clarified by stating them as follows: 30% encircled flux within 5um radius 86% encircled flux within 11um radius Delete all ""%"" in the fourth column, as redundant with information in column three. In column one, reference footnote f for each launch that has an encircled flux specification by placing superscript f after either ""alternative"" or ""default"" as appropriate. Modify footnote f to read: ""This encircled flux specification defines the native launch directly into a patch cord of the same fiber type as that of the supported cable plant when measured per IEC 61280-1-4 or ANSI/TIA/EIA-455-203.""

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
As suggested remedy, except for detailed wording of footnote f:
'This encircled flux specification defines the launch at the MDI directly into a patch cord of the same fiber type as that of the supported cable plant when measured per IEC 61280-1-4 or ANSI/TIA/EIA-455-203.'

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.1**   *P* **19**   *L* **2**   # **178**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Missing space

Suggested Remedy
Change to 'launches. The'

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.1**   *P* **19**   *L* **7**   # **180**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Why doesn't figure 68-3 come between table 68-3 and table 68-4? Is it a Frame thing or a tag in the wrong place?

Suggested Remedy
If the latter, fix.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.2**   *P* **16**   *L* **20**   # **181**
Claseman, George   Micrel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
""Also, for information, channels responses...""

Suggested Remedy
""Also, for information, channel responses...""

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.2**   *P* **16**   *L* **4**   # **182**
Claseman, George   Micrel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Table 68-2 refers to 850nm, but clause 68 covers 1300 only.

Suggested Remedy
Remove 850nm references?

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
Page 17, line 4.
The pairs of bandwidths, for the two different wavelengths, are used together as the identifier for the different fiber types.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.2**   *P* **17**   *L* **20**   # **183**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
Shouldn't this paragraph be a NOTE since it is just for information. If it is really specifying something, the language should be corrected.

Suggested Remedy
Change to a NOTE.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.2**   *P* **17**   *L* **21**   # **184**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
'channels responses'?

Suggested Remedy
Change to 'channel responses'.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.2**   *P* **17**   *L* **7**   # **185**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
The outside lines look too thick.

Suggested Remedy
Should be thin.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Editor agrees. The line does look a bit too thick. Will investigate.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **18**   # **186**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
Footnotes a and e are unnecessary. The reader knows to look in 68.6 because 68.5.1 says '... specifications given in Table 68-4, per definitions in 68.6.'

Suggested Remedy
Delete footnotes a and e.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.5.2**　　　　　　*P* **19**　　　*L* **21**　　　# 188
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

Comment Type　**ER**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

'Received power in OMA' could be better named - it's not specific at present.

Suggested Remedy

Change to 'Lowest received power in OMA'. Consider removing 'min'.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See proposed response to comment 209.

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.5.2**　　　　　　*P* **19**　　　*L* **26**　　　# 190
Booth, Brad　　　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

Line weight too heavy for sub-parameters.

Suggested Remedy

Decrease line weight.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.5.2**　　　　　　*P* **19**　　　*L* **28**　　　# 194
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

Comment Type　**ER**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

Table 69-4 footnote d (to Qsq) duplicates material in 68.6.7 and 68.6.9. The only thing that it really does is substitute for a name in words by Qsq so that the reader can navigate to the appropriate parts of 68.6.

Suggested Remedy

If we stay with Qsq, insert 'Test transmitter signal to noise ratio' before 'Qsq'. Change footnote d to 'Transmitter signal to noise ratio is defined in 68.6.7 but its use here is qualified by 68.6.9.3.'

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.5.2**　　　　　　*P* **19**　　　*L* **30**　　　# 195
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

Comment Type　**ER**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

We can give this item a shorter, clearer, more familiar name. See another comment for some of the reasoning.

Suggested Remedy

Change 'Spacing, Delta_t, of pulses defining ISI generator response' to 'Transversal filter tap spacing, Delta_t'

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Presently, the draft defines the ISI signal characteristics mathematically with dT as one parameter and avoids explicitly suggesting the implementation (there is no mention of transversal filter or tap spacing elsewhere in the draft). The present comment should only be accepted if we do want to explicitly suggest an implementation.
But see also comment 338.

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.5.2**　　　　　　*P* **19**　　　*L* **31**　　　# 197
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

Comment Type　**ER**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

These 'ISI parameters' could do with a better name - they aren't directly parameters of ISI.

Suggested Remedy

Change 'ISI parameters' to 'tap weights' (three times in this table).

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Similar to comment 195, these ARE parameters of the ISI impaired signal as it is presently mathematically defined in 68.6.9.2. We would only make this change if we changed that section accordingly to refer to this as a transversal filter with spacings and tap weights.
But see also comment 338.

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.5.2**　　　　　　*P* **19**　　　*L* **39**　　　# 203
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

There's only one simple stressed receiver test.

Suggested Remedy

Change 'tests' to 'test'.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **41**   # **207**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Three cells seem to be bottom aligned while the rest are centered vertically.

Suggested Remedy
Reconcile.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.5.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **41**   # **204**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**
It would help the reader to add a footnote letting him know that this is the filtered risetime, and giving the other risetime. The difference is not large but it is significant. See style guide for different types of notes to tables: we want an informative one so that in case of disagreement, it is clear which definition of risetime has precedence. We could also give the equivalent bandwidth of the filter, but I think the consensus is that it isn't necessary.

Suggested Remedy
Add table note or table footnote: 'NOTE - These times are as seen through a standard 7.5 GHz Bessel-Thomson response. The unfiltered time is X ps.' Substitute a real number for X; it may be about 3 ps less than the filtered risetime.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6**   *P* **20**   *L* **16**   # **223**
Ghiasi, Ali   Broadcom

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Pattern should be square wave and not ""Square""

Suggested Remedy

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
"Square" to mean square wave in test pattern table has pecedence in Clause 52.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.1**   *P* **20**   *L* **30**   # **228**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Footnote a should be attached to the first occurrence of PRBS9.

Suggested Remedy
Move the superscript a to the first occurrence of PRBS9 in table 68-5 (around line 23).

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.1**   *P* **20**   *L* **35**   # **230**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**
As we are using this table as a table of contents for the definitions and methods section, it's worth including all the tests or specs, even ones where the choice of pattern is a don't-care.

Suggested Remedy
Between TWDP and wavelength, add a row: Encircled flux   N/A   See IEC 61280-1-4
Add rows for any other parameters or tests that we have overlooked. (RIN and optical return loss tolerance are already covered - part of transmitter signal to noise ratio.)

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.10**   *P* **30**   *L* **51**   # **236**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Finish sentence with full stop

Suggested Remedy
.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.10**   *P* **30**   *L* **51**   # **237**
Dallesasse, John   Emcore Corporation

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Missing a period in the sentance ending ""stressed receiver test of 68.6.9""

Suggested Remedy
Add a period.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.10**   *P* **31**   *L* **1**   # **239**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Cleaning up the graphic

Suggested Remedy
Remove unused trailing zeros (both axes). Add graticule. Normalise to DC gain of 1 (stressors due to change anyway). Make the diagram the right size in Excel and don't resize it in Frame and the letter spacing should come out OK.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.10**   *P* **31**   *L* **14**   # **240**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy
Use 8-point Arial.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will make text font consistent with other figures.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.10**   *P* **31**   *L* **24**   # **241**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
arbitrary time values? You know exactly what the offset is/are!

Suggested Remedy
Change 'arbitrary time values)' to '6 UI' (if it is so). If it's not so simple, change 'offset from one another by arbitrary time values' to 'offset in time' or 'offset in time from one another' or similar.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.10**   *P* **31**   *L* **32**   # **242**
James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy
Use 8-point Arial.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
Figure derived from similar one in Clause 52.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.10**   *P* **31**   *L* **41**   # **243**
Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
The word ""informative"" should be at the end of Figure 68-13's title.

Suggested Remedy
Move ""informative"" to be inside parantheses at the end of the title, ""(informative)"".

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.10**   *P* **31**   *L* **50**   # **244**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Unusual space between paragraphs?

Suggested Remedy
per comment

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.11**   *P* **32**   *L* **3**   # **248**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Capitals inside words

Suggested Remedy
Change '-Cursor' to '-cursor', twice

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Page 23 of 38

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.11**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.11**   *P* **32**   *L* **7**   # **249**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Bad table lines.

Suggested Remedy

Use very-thin in the interior. Use thin on the boundary.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
(Editor has been having difficulty making these lines come out as required!)

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.11**   *P* **33**   *L* **14**   # **206**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy

Use 8-point Arial.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
This figure is derived from one in Clause 52.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.2**   *P* **17**   *L* **42**   # **253**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

OMS is actually defined in 1.4.242, does 52.9.5 redefine it? Or do you mean something other than defined.

Suggested Remedy

Either change reference or language.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The definoition given in Clause 1.4 describes the concept of OMA. The precise definition - the measurement method - is given in Clause 52.
Change to: For the purposes of Clause 68, OMA is defined by the measurement method given in 52.9.5, and as illustrated in Figure 68–4.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.2**   *P* **17**   *L* **43**   # **254**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Should be no space before % (unlike other units - see style guide for example).

Suggested Remedy

Remove one space in 68.6.2, six in table 68-3, two in table 68-4, and two in 68.6.9.2.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.3**   *P* **18**   *L* **14**   # **259**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Pseudo-row notation is confusing.

Suggested Remedy

Put this information in separate rows.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Editor's opinion is that grouping the specral width specs makes for easier reading. See also comment 382.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.3**   *P* **18**   *L* **36**   # **260**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Pseudo-row notation is confusing

Suggested Remedy

Put distinct data is separate rows.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Editor's opinion is that grouping the launch spec, for each fiber type, makes for easier reading.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.3**   *P* **18**   *L* **43**   **#** **261**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Pseudo-row notation is confusing.

Suggested Remedy

Put distinct data is separate rows

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Editor's opinion is that grouping the launch spec, for each fiber type, makes for easier reading.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.3**   *P* **18**   *L* **45**   **#** **262**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Pseudo-row notation is confusing

Suggested Remedy

Put distinct data in separate rows.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Editor's opinion is that grouping the launch spec, for each fiber type, makes for easier reading.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.3**   *P* **18**   *L* **48**   **#** **263**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The units column has '%' where a comment exist

Suggested Remedy

Delete these typos.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.3**   *P* **18**   *L* **7**   **#** **264**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Use standard line widths.

Suggested Remedy

Thin lines on boundary, not thick.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Editor will verify that line widths are as required.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.3**   *P* **19**   *L* **45**   **#** **265**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The 'Conditions of receiver jitter tolerance test' row is confusing.

Suggested Remedy

Straddle the columns, or describe better is that is not what was intended.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.4**   *P* **21**   *L* **15**   **#** **266**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy

Use 8-point Arial.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Figure derived from one in Clause 59.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.4**   *P* **21**   *L* **34**   **#** **269**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy

Use 8-point Arial.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Page 25 of 38

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.4**

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.6.5**　　　　　*P* **22**　　*L* **53**　　　# **274**

Booth, Brad　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

The note is very long.

Suggested Remedy

Move note into its own subclause (68.6.5.1).

Response　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.6.5**　　　　　*P* **22**　　*L* **7**　　　# **275**

James, David　　　　　　　　　JGG

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

The abbreviation is unnecessary.

Suggested Remedy

min ==> minimum

Response　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.6.5**　　　　　*P* **23**　　*L* **35**　　　# **277**

James, David　　　　　　　　　JGG

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**X**

The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy

Use 8-point Arial.

Response　　　　　*Response Status*　**O**

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.6.6**　　　　　*P* **24**　　*L* **6**　　　# **282**

James, David　　　　　　　　　JGG

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

Excess capitalization

Suggested Remedy

System Under Test ==> System under test

Response　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.6.6**　　　　　*P* **24**　　*L* **7**　　　# **283**

James, David　　　　　　　　　JGG

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**X**

The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy

Use 8-point Arial.

Response　　　　　*Response Status*　**O**

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.6.6.1**　　　　*P* **24**　　*L* **18**　　　# **286**

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

Confusion around 'stored' and 'recorded'. If a waveform is held in RAM then thrown away when the TWDP has been calculated, is it 'stored'? Confusion with sentences like 'Record the serial number of the oscilloscope', 'record the test pattern used'.

Suggested Remedy

Line 18, delete 'and stored'.　Line 20, change 'recorded' to 'captured' (twice). Line 22, change 'stored' to 'captured'.

Response　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　*SC* **68.6.6.1**　　　　*P* **24**　　*L* **25**　　　# **288**

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

Distracting sentence 'The reference equalizer is equivalent to an infinite length decision feedback equalizer.' Trying to decide what 'equivalent to an infinite length' means is a diversion. Remember the applied mathematicians' 'light inextensible string', 'smooth inclined plane' and so on - they don't say 'infinitely light/smooth/...'. I agree with the authors that there are enough taps that the number doesn't matter.

Suggested Remedy

Change to 'The reference equalizer is a long decision feedback equalizer with many taps.' Can anyone come up with smoother phrasing?

Response　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause   Page 26 of 38
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Cl **68**　　　*SC* **68.6.6.1**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **24**   *L* **28**   # **290**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

 Need to find out if we will need a copyright release statemnet for the code and whether we want to put it on the web (by iteslf). See 40.6.1.2.4 for precedent.

Suggested Remedy

 Find out.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **24**   *L* **30**   # **292**

Lindsay, Tom   ClariPhy Communicati

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

 The MATLAB TWDP code was initially written for folks to test and become familiar with it. It should now be adapted to better fit the standard. This comment addresses formatting, eliminates reference to an improper data sequence, eliminates reference to a specific waveform, corrects some variable names, and gives better guidance to the user.   This is essentially a resubmission of comment 96 from the previous ballot (except for a few items that were addressed in Atlanta). I considering breaking this into pieces, but since it's already prepared this way, has been out long enough for folks to review, is tested, and is editorial (does not affect technical results in any way), I decided to submit it as a block this one time.

Suggested Remedy

 See separate document ""TWDPforD2_0.txt"". This is readily viewed in Notepad - I used an 8 point Courier font to view.   Editor - please use a fixed pitch font in the standard, as it will greatly improve readability. You may have to work with tabs to maintain the structured appearance.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **24**   *L* **30**   # **291**

Bradshaw, Peter   Intersil

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

 I cannot find any examples of MATLAB code in the other portions of the 802.3 spec. Also, I cannot find any reference to a Toeplitz matrix in the current spec, and I have not seen any in my local supermarket. The description of the algorithm in the main body of Clause 68 seems too samll, at least some outline should be presented there.

Suggested Remedy

 Move the MATLAB code to annex 68A, or a new annex (68B?), and put at least a short description of the algorithm in place of this section.   And insert a definition of a ""Toeplitz matrix"", or a reference to a readily accessible source.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **24**   *L* **32**   # **294**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

 The comments in this code need updating at several points; I expect Tom will provide comments.

Suggested Remedy

 Edit and revise the comments to keep in step with the rest of the draft.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **24**   *L* **38**   # **295**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

 Need to show that the input pattern is an example, and make the example the preferred choice. The PRBS9 is on the web at http://ieee802.org/3/aq/public/tools/TWDP/prbs9_950.txt (the 950 is shorthand for its polynomial). In the following, some quotes are mine, others are part of the draft.

Suggested Remedy

 Change ''TxData.txt';' to ''prbs9_950.txt';   % This is an example'. Similarly, comment MeasuredWaveformFile MeasuredOMA SteadyZeroPower and (I think - see other comments) OverSampleRate, to show they are examples. Change 'G05.txt' to an example that's compatible with prbs9_950.txt.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **24**   *L* **40**   # **296**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
Terminology: 'bit period', 'bit time', 'unit interval' (see 1.4 Definitions).

Suggested Remedy
Change 'bit period' to 'unit interval', here and several times in 68A.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **24**   *L* **52**   # **299**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
It's a nuisance that the test cases are arranged in columns here while they are in rows in
table 68-4.

Suggested Remedy
FiberResp = [...
0.000000 0.072727 0.145455 0.218182
a b c d
e f g h
I j k l];
Delays = FiberResp(1,:); need to check if that should be FiberResp(1,:)';
(in STEP 1)
Pcoefs = FiberResp(i+1,:); need to check if that should be FiberResp(i+1,:)';

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **25**   *L* **23**   # **301**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
This construct Hsys(find(Fgrid==0)) was new to me; other programming languages may not
have an equivalent, and we are trying to make our algorithm portable to other languages.

Suggested Remedy
Change abs(Hsys(find(Fgrid==0))) to sum(PCoefs)

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **25**   *L* **41**   # **304**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
E not defined

Suggested Remedy
Tell us what E is.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **25**   *L* **41**   # **305**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
|| not defined

Suggested Remedy
Tell us what || means.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **25**   *L* **42**   # **306**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
Mention of 'the expectation operator' but no instance of it in the clause.

Suggested Remedy
Tell us where we are supposed to see this expectation operator. e.g. if it is E, say so.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.6.2**   *P* **25**   *L* **43**   # **307**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
Description of step 5 and comments describing smaller steps have become merged.
Comment not near its subject.

Suggested Remedy
Start a new line after 'Z.' (the end of the description of step 5). Move the line '%% Constuct
a Toeplitz autocorrelation matrix.' to just before 'C = toeplitz(Corr(1:EqNf));'.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**　　　*SC* **68.6.6.2**　　　　　　*P* **25**　　　*L* **44**　　　　*#* **308**
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**D**
　Spelling

Suggested Remedy
　Change 'Constuct' to 'Construct'.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**
　PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　　*SC* **68.6.6.2**　　　　　　*P* **26**　　　*L* **25**　　　　*#* **309**
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**X**
　Save a line (sorry, should have thought of it last time!)

Suggested Remedy
　Join two lines, giving:TWDP = max(TrialTWDP)　% End of program

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**O**

Cl **68**　　　*SC* **68.6.7**　　　　　　*P* **26**　　　*L* **31**　　　　*#* **311**
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**D**
　Format

Suggested Remedy
　In RINxOMA, make the x a subscript.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**
　PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　　*SC* **68.6.7**　　　　　　*P* **26**　　　*L* **31**　　　　*#* **310**
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**D**
　Readers may not associate RINxOMA with RIN12OMA.

Suggested Remedy
　insert extra words: '...specification given in Table 68-3 as RIN12OMA, when measured...'.
　12 is subscript.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**
　PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　　*SC* **68.6.7**　　　　　　*P* **26**　　　*L* **48**　　　　*#* **317**
James, David　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　JGG

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**D**
　The equation is confusing

Suggested Remedy
　1) Replace English fragment with a real variable. 2) Define the variable after the equation.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**
　PROPOSED REJECT.
　Editor's opinion is that the use of English helps to keep the equation easy to understand.

Cl **68**　　　*SC* **68.6.7**　　　　　　*P* **26**　　　*L* **54**　　　　*#* **319**
Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Picolight

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**D**
　The correct units for RIN is dB/Hz

Suggested Remedy
　Change dB to dB/Hz

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**
　PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　　*SC* **68.6.7**　　　　　　*P* **26**　　　*L* **55**　　　　*#* **320**
James, David　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　JGG

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**D**
　Wrong symbol.

Suggested Remedy
　Replace the multiply dot with an x, as per Style Manual preferences.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**
　PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**　　　*SC* **68.6.7**　　　　　　*P* **27**　　　*L* **7**　　　　*#* **324**
James, David　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　JGG

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**X**
　The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy
　Use 8-point Arial.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.8**   *P* **27**   *L* **37**   # **327**

Thaler, Pat   Agilent Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

The text says average power level but the figure labels it mean power level. Okay, this is a terribly picky point but why use two different words for the same thing?

Suggested Remedy

Replace ""average"" with ""mean""

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.8**   *P* **27**   *L* **45**   # **329**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy

Use 8-point Arial.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.8.3**   *P* **29**   *L* **16**   # **330**

Thaler, Pat   Agilent Technologies

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**

The reference to Figure 68-12 seems misplaced here. It should be given in 68.6.8.2 (about line 34 of page 29 seems best) where the pulses are originally defined. As it is, it isn't clear that these are the same pulses.

Suggested Remedy

Delete the paragraph beginning ""Figure 68-12 shows ..."" and add to 68.6.8.2 ""Figure 68-12 illustrates the three signal shapes.""

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The pulse responses of the figure are due to the channel emulation components together with the response of the measurement instrument. Subcluase 68.6.8.2 deals only with the channel emulation components. The response of the measurement instrument is introduced only in sunclause 68.6.9.3.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.9**   *P* **28**   *L* **5**   # **331**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Distracting bad English in '68.6.9.1 through 68.6.9.4'

Suggested Remedy

Change 'through' to 'to'.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.9.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **23**   # **340**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Consistency of terminology

Suggested Remedy

Use hyphen between mode and conditioning, here, in figure 68-10, in 68.6.10, in figure 68-13, in 68.6.11, and in figure 68-14.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.9.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **25**   # **342**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Label for the fiber is incorrect.

Suggested Remedy

Change to read: 62.5/125 um fiber

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.9.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **25**   # **341**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Editorials

Suggested Remedy

Correct font size of 'or 59.9.5', remove second space between 125 and um. Should it be 62.5 rather than 62?

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.9.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **41**   # **347**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy

Use 8-point Arial.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.9.1**   *P* **29**   *L* **6**   # **351**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy

Use 8-point Arial.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.9.2**   *P* **29**   *L* **22**   # **352**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

The ""Where..."" statement doesn't appear to be the correct format.

Suggested Remedy

Change to the correct format.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.9.2**   *P* **29**   *L* **27**   # **354**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

The 'further' is confusing, as in the current diagram, the signal is impaired by noise first and filtering after.

Suggested Remedy

Delete 'further'

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "further" to "also".

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.9.2**   *P* **29**   *L* **43**   # **357**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

redundant word

Suggested Remedy

delete 'the' before Qsq

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.9.2**   *P* **29**   *L* **43**   # **356**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

using ... using

Suggested Remedy

Change first one to 'by'

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The test signal is calibrated as follows, using an optical reference receiver …

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.6.9.3**   *P* **30**   *L* **7**   # **360**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Wrong symbol.

Suggested Remedy

Replace the multiply dot with an x, as per Style Manual preferences.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.8**   *P* **33**   *L* **48**   # **362**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Reference only one cabling model.

Suggested Remedy

My personal preference would be to reference the cabling model in Figure 52-14 as that is a 10G cabling model, but the draft contains more references to Figure 38-7. Pick one and be consistent on its use.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
The fiber optic cabling model is shown in Figure 52-14.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause   Page 31 of 38
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.8**

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.8**   *P* **34**   *L* **25**   **#** **365**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
number and unit split apart

Suggested Remedy
Use nonbreaking space between 50 and um. Redo the 'shrink to fit/fixed table width' anyway.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **68.9.2.2**   *P* **35**   *L* **5**   **#** **374**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Extra commas, consistency

Suggested Remedy
Remove four commas

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **Figure 68-1**   *P* **13**   *L* **33**   **#** **379**
Law, David   3Com

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
Typo.

Suggested Remedy
Shouldn't '10GBASE-R' read '10GBASE-LRM'.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **Figure 68-10**   *P* **28**   *L* **51**   **#** **380**
Lindsay, Tom   ClariPhy Communicati

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
Purpose for using scope is used for calibration. Cal may include acquisition as one of it's steps, but we should focus on the overall purpose.

Suggested Remedy
Change end of scope block from ""... for waveform acquisition"" to ""... for waveform calibration"".

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **Figure 68-8**   *P* **27**   *L* **10**   **#** **383**
Lindsay, Tom   ClariPhy Communicati

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
The word acquisition may be confusing here.

Suggested Remedy
Remove last line of scope block ""for waveform aquisition"".

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **general**   *P* **13**   *L*   **#** **385**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
After review, I don't understand why the Task Force would choose to write a new clause rather than making it a modification of existing clauses.

Suggested Remedy
Reconsider. Figure 68-1 should simply be a reference to Figure 52-1 as this is just another 10GBASE-R PHY. Many paragraph in the early material are either virtually identical or the differences are too subtle for me to understand why they need to be repeated in this clause. Subclause 68.5 could be 52.8.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68**   *SC* **Table 68-2**   *P* **17**   *L* **4**   **#** **388**
Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
The period charcter is used instead of dot (MHz.km).

Suggested Remedy
Replace with a symbol font dot.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68**   *SC* **Table 68-3**   *P* **18**   *L* **33**   # **395**

Lindsay, Tom   ClariPhy Communicati

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

If 62.5 and 50 micron OM2 alternative launch specs are the same, so they can be reduced to one section and save some space.

Suggested Remedy

1. Change line 33 under Description to ""Optical launch specifications for 62.5 micron fiber and OM2 50 micron fiber:""   2. Delete rows 39-42 from the table.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Also, retain only one reference for offset patchcords: 38.11.4. Additional, informative, footnote with 59.9.5 reference.

Cl **68**   *SC* **Table 68-4**   *P* **19**   *L* **39**   # **403**

Lindsay, Tom   ClariPhy Communicati

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

The simple Rx test has only one parameter and we can save some space.

Suggested Remedy

1. Change line 39 to ""Simple stressed receiver test signal rise and fall times (20-80%)"". Move value into same row.   2. Delete current line 41.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **68A**   *SC*   *P* **41**   *L* **12**   # **407**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

""the 802.3aq standard."" is an incorrect reference.

Suggested Remedy

Change to read: ""Clause 68.""

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **4**   *P* **14**   *L* **42**   # **411**

Ghiasi, Ali   Broadcom

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**

Please add patchcords to the Fig 68-2 so it resembles the application or create a new Fig to show the cable plant.

Suggested Remedy

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **41**   *L* **10**   # **416**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

Consistent terminology

Suggested Remedy

Change 'TP2' to 'TWDP' - but see another comment. At line 48, change 'The TP2 penalty' to 'TWDP'.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **41**   *L* **10**   # **415**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

No-value sentence, now the text is in the draft.

Suggested Remedy

Delete 'An upper limit on penalty thus measured is compared against a limit specified by the 802.3aq standard.'

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **41**   *L* **11**   # **418**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

Somewhere near the beginning of 68A we ought to refer to 68.6.6.

Suggested Remedy

Insert second sentence 'The normative TWDP procedure and algorithm is specified in 68.6.6.'

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial   COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   SORT ORDER: Clause, Page, Line, Subclause   Page 33 of 38
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**

Cl **68A** *SC* **68A** *P* **41** *L* **28** # **420**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
Please number the equations

Suggested Remedy
Please number the equations

Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A** *SC* **68A** *P* **41** *L* **28** # **419**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
OMA_RCV appears to be a function (like Q), but it's a variable

Suggested Remedy
Use multiply dot or cross after RCV in first and third equations

Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A** *SC* **68A** *P* **41** *L* **38** # **421**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**
Don't use 'e' notation. In the remedy, /sup/ means toggle to or from superscript.

Suggested Remedy
10/sup/-12/sup/

Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A** *SC* **68A** *P* **41** *L* **50** # **422**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
transmitter system under test?

Suggested Remedy
Change to 'transmitting system under test'.

Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A** *SC* **68A** *P* **41** *L* **52** # **423**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
This isn't true with the part-pattern technique in the draft: 'capture at least one complete cycle of the data pattern'

Suggested Remedy
Change to 'capture the signal with at least seven...'.

Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A** *SC* **68A** *P* **41** *L* **53** # **424**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
3-dB

Suggested Remedy
3 dB (I think)

Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A** *SC* **68A** *P* **41** *L* **54** # **425**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
The scope effectively doesn't filter the captured waveform, but vice versa.

Suggested Remedy
Change to 'filter the waveform before capture.'

Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A** *SC* **68A** *P* **41** *L* **6** # **426**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
It's TWDP not TOWDP

Suggested Remedy
Delete 'optical'.

Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **42**   *L* **16**   # **427**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
   May not be a complete 'cycle'.

Suggested Remedy
   Change 'corresponding to one complete cycle of the data sequence.' to 'of length and position specified - e.g. one complete cycle of PRBS9.' Add new sentence: ' The end and beginning of the captured sequence should match.'

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **42**   *L* **17**   # **429**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
   Is it compulsory that the re-sampled waveform have 16 samples per bit period?

Suggested Remedy
   Decide and make clear

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **42**   *L* **17**   # **428**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
   Need to change the list of inputs when we have worked out how to make the algorithm measure a signal strength.

Suggested Remedy
   per comment

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **42**   *L* **20**   # **431**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
   This is confusing through over-use of 'sequence': 'The data sequence used to generate the transmitted sequence.' There's no other occurrence of 'transmitted sequence'.

Suggested Remedy
   Change 'transmitted sequence' to 'transmitted waveform'.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **42**   *L* **20**   # **430**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
   Need to change description of alignment when we have worked out how it's done.

Suggested Remedy
   per comment

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **42**   *L* **23**   # **432**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
   Empty line?

Suggested Remedy
   Remove

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **42**   *L* **31**   # **433**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
   Need to change description of anti-aliasing filter to follow changes in 68.6.6.

Suggested Remedy
   per comment

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **42**   *L* **34**   # **434**
Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
   re 'a standard fractionally-spaced MMSE-DFE receiver'; what standard? Without a reference, this is empty.

Suggested Remedy
   Delete 'standard'.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **42**   *L* **39**   **#** **435**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**

Out of place?   Does this sentence really mean channel input: 'The channel input is a periodic data sequence ... where N is the length of one period (e.g. 511 for PRBS9).'?

Suggested Remedy

If it's the captured waveform, move it to line 17, and say 'The captured waveform x(k)' on line 25. If it's the data sequence, move it to line 20 and say 'The data sequence x(k) used'. If it's the FFE input, to line 33. Avoid the term 'channel input', correct the terminology, put a label {x} or x(k) by the thing it is, to give the reader a clue. It would help to write x(k) = {x(0),x(1)... (if that is the case) to tie these vectors back to figure 68A-1.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **42**   *L* **43**   **#** **436**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

Repetition, and too much discourse in the middle of a recipe list of actions.

Suggested Remedy

Delete 'The measured waveform is assumed ... then sampled at rate 2/T.'.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **43**   *L* **14**   **#** **438**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

This sentence in brackets looks a lot like repetition, and neither it or its twin seem to be in the right place.

Suggested Remedy

Put a more generic statement of method around p42 line 24, just before the recipe list of actions.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A**   *P* **43**   *L* **20**   **#** **439**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

Repetition

Suggested Remedy

Shrink to 'For each bit in the data sequence, the equalized input to the slicer is calculated and the probability of error calculated ...'

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A.1**   *P* **41**   *L* **27**   **#** **440**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

Equation numbers are missing.

Suggested Remedy

Insert equation numbers.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A.1**   *P* **41**   *L* **36**   **#** **441**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

Wrong symbol.

Suggested Remedy

Replace the multiply dot with an x, as per Style Manual preferences.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68A**   *SC* **68A.2**   *P* **41**   *L* **48**   **#** **442**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

Paragraph seems to have a line return at the end of the first sentence.

Suggested Remedy

Fix.

Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **68A**	*SC* **68A.2**	*P* **41**	*L* **49**	# **443**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

SUT needs to be added to 1.5 Abbreviations.

Suggested Remedy

Add SUT to 1.5 Abbreviations.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**	*SC* **68A.2**	*P* **41**	*L* **50**	# **444**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

10.5 point font should be

Suggested Remedy

10 point

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**	*SC* **68A.2**	*P* **42**	*L* **23**	# **445**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

Extra carriage return between paragraphs.

Suggested Remedy

Delete.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**	*SC* **68A.2**	*P* **42**	*L* **28**	# **446**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

This list is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy

First indent should be 'a)', 'b)', etc. Second level indent should be '1)', '2)', etc.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**	*SC* **68A.2**	*P* **42**	*L* **7**	# **447**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

The figure font is nonstandard.

Suggested Remedy

Use 8-point Arial.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**	*SC* **68A.2**	*P* **43**	*L* **16**	# **448**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

Line spacing seems to be off. Readability is hampered.

Suggested Remedy

Fix.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **68A**	*SC* **68A.2**	*P* **43**	*L* **33**	# **449**

James, David   JGG

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

Bad capitalization.

Suggested Remedy

i.e. ==> I.e.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99**	*SC*	*P* **1**	*L* **24**	# **450**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Awkward break in amendment title

Suggested Remedy

Put ""Type 10GBASE-LRM"" on a new line.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC*   *P* **1**   *L* **32**   # **451**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

 Text is a bit verbose and expiration date shouldn't be past the next revision of the draft.

Suggested Remedy

 Change to read: This document specifies the 10GBASE-LRM PMD for serial 10 Gb/s operation using installed, FDDI-grade multimode fiber. The formal expiration of this draft is June 16, 2005.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC*   *P* **1**   *L* **4**   # **452**

Booth, Brad   Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

 Font size of TM

Suggested Remedy

 Reduce size.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC*   *P* **12**   *L*   # **453**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

 Current publication style does not include a separator title page.

Suggested Remedy

 Delete it.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC*   *P* **2**   *L* **1**   # **454**

Grow, Robert   Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

 Front matter will be required for Sponsor Ballot. (Front matter is not part of the standard.)

Suggested Remedy

 Add more complete front matter (to be supplied by WG Chair) prior to Sponsor Ballot. It would be nice if this was done for at least one WG recirculation.

Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **contents**   *P* **2**   *L* **1**   # **456**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

 Need a heading. Could also have subheadings 'Changes to existing clauses', 'New clause and annex' but not really worth it.

Suggested Remedy

 Insert heading: 'Contents'

Response   *Response Status* **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **contents**   *P* **2**   *L* **1**   # **455**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

 12 point font should be

Suggested Remedy

 10 point

Response   *Response Status* **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **contents**   *P* **2**   *L* **14**   # **457**

Dawe, Piers   Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

 Third level entries lack a space or tab between number and title. Also in one case between title and page number.

Suggested Remedy

 Fix the template

Response   *Response Status* **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT.