Cl **108**   *SC* **108.5.2.2**   *P* **106**   *L* **25**   # 136

Trowbridge, Steve   Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *OTN, BTI*

Doing rate compensation below the PCS precludes developing an OTN mapping for 25GbE which is PCS codeword transparent.

SuggestedRemedy

See trowbridge_3by_01_0915.pdf for proposed remedy. The problem can be solved if all of the PMDs have CWMs, none of the PMDs have CWMs, or if no rate compensation is done to insert CWMs (i.e., overclock to insert CWM). Propose to move the rate compensation to the PCS. Rate compensation should similarly be removed from Figure 108-2.

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The task force reviewed the cited presentation.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes. See Motion #4.

See comments 137, 138, 139 and 190.

Cl **108**   *SC* **108.5.2.4**   *P* **108**   *L* **1**   # 137

Trowbridge, Steve   Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *OTN, BTI*

Some PMDs having CWMs and others not prevents creating a PCS codeword transparent mapping for 25GbE into OTN which can interconnect any pair of 25GbE PMDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to move CWM insertion to the PCS. See trowbridge_3by_01_0915.pdf for details. If CWM insertion is moved to the PCS, Figure 108-3 needs to transcode the CWM from four 66B blocks to the 257B format.

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The task force reviewed the cited presentation.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes. See Motion #4.

See comments 136, 138, 139, and 190.

Cl **108**   *SC* **108.5.3.3**   *P* **111**   *L* **47**   # 138

Trowbridge, Steve   Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *OTN, BTI*

Some PMDs having CWMs and others not prevents developing a PCS codeword transparent mapping into OTN which can interconnect any pair of 25GbE PMDs.

SuggestedRemedy

See trowbridge_3by_01_0915.pdf for details. Move CWM removal to the PCS, and replace this text with how to transcode CWM from the 257B format back to four 66B blocks.

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The task force reviewed the cited presentation.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes. See Motion #4.

See comments 136, 137, 139 and 190.

Cl **108**   *SC* **108.5.3.6**   *P* **112**   *L* **15**   # 139

Trowbridge, Steve   Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *OTN, BTI*

Having rate compensation below the PCS prevents creating a PCS codeword transparent mapping into OTN which can interconnect any pair of 25GbE PMDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Move this rate compensation to the PCS and add CWM to all PMDs. See trowbridge_3by_01_0915.pdf.

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The task force reviewed the cited presentation.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes. See Motion #4.

See comments 136, 137, 138, and 190.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **139**   Page 1 of 2
2015-10-21 4:45:08 PM

Cl **000**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 190
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *OTN, BTI*

The current draft contains two different variants of 25 Gb/s Ethernet where idle insertion/deletion has to be performed in order to convert from one type to the other (at the OTN will have to do) due to one containing CWMs and the other not.
While the exact requirements of the objective: "Provide appropriate support for OTN" are somewhat vague, I do not consider that this has been met.

SuggestedRemedy

Add CWMs to all 25 Gb/s Ethernet PHYs as per the proposal in http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Sep15/trowbridge_3by_01_0915.pdf

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The task force reviewed the cited presentation.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes. See Motion #4.

See comments 136, 137, 138, and 139.

Cl **112**   *SC* **112.9**   *P* **191**   *L* **34**   # 236
Geoff Thompson   GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**

The term "channel" used to specify the media is an undefined term within the 802.3 standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Please rewrite using the term "link segment" which is precisely defined within 802.3 for precisely this use. (also all other uses within the draft)

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

'Channel' is the term used in the equivalent sections for previous clauses (95, 88, 87, 86, 52).

Consistent with the previously listed clauses, 112.9 says "the term channel is used here for consistency with generic cabling standards".

Changing a previously used term for a single clause might be confusing.

Cl **112**   *SC* **112.10.3**   *P* **193**   *L* **5**   # 237
Geoff Thompson   GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**

This sub-clause purports to define the MDI but does not do that. It defines the MDI device or MDI connector but not the INTERFACE. It is the interface, not the interface connector which is the MDI.

SuggestedRemedy

Change either the title of the sub-clause or the contents so that the title and contents match.

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The nomenclature and text is consistent with equivalent sections in many other clauses including 95, 88, 87, 86, and 52.

Changing a single clause as suggested might be confusing.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **237**   Page 2 of 2
2015-10-21 4:45:08 PM