

Cl 01 SC 1 P1 L1 # 1 [REDACTED]  
Byrd, William PRIVACOM VENTUR

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **D**

My comments on the related document: 82-3-bf-D3-0.pdf apply to this document: too!

SuggestedRemedy

Same!

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment is a duplicate of comment #2 except for the document reference which is "802-3-bf-D3-0.pdf" in comment #2.

See Response to comment #2

Cl 01 SC 1 P1 L1 # 2 [REDACTED]  
Byrd, William PRIVACOM VENTUR

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **D**

My comments on the related document: 802-3-bf-D3-0.pdf apply to this document: too!

SuggestedRemedy

Same!

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

[Editor's note: Comment #1 against D3.0 of IEEE P802.3bf (from this commenter) was: "I voted Approval of this document. But, I do not support this type of format being submitted for ballot. The Standard had an incomplete Introduction, Scope, and general description. It jumped directly into the data, which was full of cross-outs and unexplained edits. The IEEE needs to limit any documents that do not have a full and complete justification for their existence. An average researcher would be hard pressed to make any sense of this document. This document should be able to stand on its own, and repeated references to other standards does not fulfill this obligation."]

The Proposed Change was:

"Add a complete Introduction, Scope and Justification to this document."]

The Introduction to the P802.3bg amendment to IEEE Std 802.3 is provided on pages 1 through 5 of D 3.0

The Scope, Purpose and Need of the project can be obtained from the IEEE Standards Association Web Site. Under "Manage myBallot Activity" clicking on the P802.3bg link on the left of the page will open the PAR for the P802.3bg project which contains this information. Duplicating it in the draft is therefore not necessary. Further information can be obtained from the 5 criteria responses for the P802.3bg project which can be found at: [http://www.ieee802.org/3/40GSMF/40GESMF\\_SG\\_5C\\_responses\\_0110.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/40GSMF/40GESMF_SG_5C_responses_0110.pdf)

The "cross-outs" are explained at the top of page 15 of the draft.

Cl 89 SC 89.10.1 P50 L12 # 3 [REDACTED]  
Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**

[Editor's note: Comment 1 against D 2.1 was agreed to be resubmitted by the Editor against D 3.0]

Table 89-14 "Optical fiber and cable characteristics ..." should state 1550nm as wavelength and not 1310nm. All parameters in the table should refer to the wavelength of 1550nm because this wavelength is defined now for the transmission.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In Table 89-14 change the Nominal fiber specification wavelength from 1310 nm to 1550 nm

Cl 99 SC 99 P4 L41 # 4 [REDACTED]  
Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation

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

IEEE Std 802.3az has now been published

SuggestedRemedy

Change 201x to 2010

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 5 [REDACTED]  
Turner, Michelle

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

This draft meets all editorial requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

No changes required due to this comment.

Cl 00 SC 0 P4 L 42 # 6  
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 802.3az has now been published  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change 201x to 2010  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC 99 P4 L 41 # 9  
 Booth, Brad Applied Micro (AMCC)  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 802.3az can be updated.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 201x to be 2010.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P4 L 48 # 7  
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Change 'add' to 'adds'  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 'add' to 'adds'  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 89 SC 89.5.6 P40 L 13 # 8  
 Frazier, Howard M Broadcom Corporation  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 This note seems to have been added to explain that the lane-by-lane transmit disable function does not apply to serial PMDs, but it singles out PMD Transmit Disable 0, possibly on the assumption that this is what an implementer might choose, but by remaining silent about the other lanes, it leaves open the possibility that transmit disable 1, 2, or 3 might be implemented.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace the note with: "The PMD lane-by-lane transmit disable function is not used for serial PMDs."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.