

Draft 3.0 Comments

IEEE P802.3bg 40 Gb/s SMF PMD comments

Sponsor Ballot

CI 01 SC 1 P1 L1 # 1

Byrd, William PRIVACOM VENTUR

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **X**

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

SuggestedRemedy
Same!

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 01 SC 1 P1 L1 # 2

Byrd, William PRIVACOM VENTUR

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **X**

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

SuggestedRemedy
Same!

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 89 SC 89.10.1 P50 L12 # 3

Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**

[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 **O**

CI 99 SC 99 P4 L41 # 4

Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation

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

IEEE Std 802.3az has now been published

SuggestedRemedy
Change 201x to 2010

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 5

Turner, Michelle

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

This draft meets all editorial requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 00 SC 0 P4 L42 # 6

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

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

802.3az has now been published

SuggestedRemedy
change 201x to 2010

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 00 SC 0 P4 L48 # 7

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

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

Change 'add' to 'adds'

SuggestedRemedy
Change 'add' to 'adds'

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **89** SC **89.5.6** P**40** L**13** # **8**
Frazier, Howard M Broadcom Corporation

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**

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 **O**

CI **99** SC **99** P**4** L**41** # **9**
Booth, Brad Applied Micro (AMCC)

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

802.3az can be updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 201x to be 2010.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**