Cl **108** *SC* **108.2.2** *P* **104** *L* **25** # 1

Gorshe, Steve PMC-Sierra

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

Per ALU comment #20136, I find that the rate compensation method is inconsistant with the project objective: "Provide appropriate support for OTN"

SuggestedRemedy

Add CWMs to all 25Gbit/s Ethernet PHYs as proposed in trowbridge_3by_01_0915

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

[Editor changed Clause from 10805 to 108 and Subclause from 10805.2.2 to 108.2.2.]

The task force reviewed the cited presentation in consideration of D2.0 comments 136, 137, 138, 139, and 190 at the September 2015 task force meeting. Based on Motion #4 at the September 2015 Interim meeting there was no consensus to make the proposed changes.

See the September 2015 task force meeting minutes here:
http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Sept15/minutes_01_3by_0915_unapproved.pdf
[replace with link to approved minutes]

Cl **108** *SC* **108.2.4** *P* **106** *L* **1** # 2

Gorshe, Steve PMC-Sierra

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

Per ALU comment #20137, I find that having some PMDs use CWMs and others not use CWMs is inconsistant with the project objective: "Provide appropriate support for OTN"

SuggestedRemedy

Add CWMs to all 25Gbit/s Ethernet PHYs as proposed in trowbridge_3by_01_0915

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

[Editor changed Clause from 10805 to 108 and Subclause from 10805.2.4 to 108.2.4.]

See proposed response to comment #1.

Cl **108** *SC* **108.3.3** *P* **109** *L* **47** # 3

Gorshe, Steve PMC-Sierra

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

Per ALU comment #20138, I find that having some PMDs use CWMs and others not use CWMs is inconsistant with the project objective: "Provide appropriate support for OTN"

SuggestedRemedy

Add CWMs to all 25Gbit/s Ethernet PHYs as proposed in trowbridge_3by_01_0915

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

[Editor changed Clause from 10805 to 108 and Subclause from 10805.3.3 to 108.3.3.]

See proposed response to comment #1.

Cl **108** *SC* **108.3.6** *P* **110** *L* **27** # 4

Gorshe, Steve PMC-Sierra

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

Per ALU comment #20139, I find that the rate compensation method is inconsistant with the project objective: "Provide appropriate support for OTN"

SuggestedRemedy

Add CWMs to all 25Gbit/s Ethernet PHYs as proposed in trowbridge_3by_01_0915

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

[Editor changed Clause from 10805 to 108 and Subclause from 10805.3.6 to 108.3.6.]

See proposed response to comment #1.

Cl **110** *SC* **110.8.4.2.1** *P* **149** *L* **9** # 5

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

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

Figures 110-3 and 110-4 show "Additive host board loss" while text says "connecting path" - we should use the same name for something, every time. Do not see how loss is additive - the signal power is divided, the number of dBm is subtracted. Figure 83E-15, Example module stressed input test, calls it "Frequency-dependent attenuator". A pair of 3 dB SMA attenuators could be seen as "Additive loss", and the meaning of "host board" is unclear - but they would not have the desired effect.

SuggestedRemedy

Rename to "Frequency-dependent attenuator" or "Frequency-dependent attenuation", both figures and text. Explain in the text that this is intended to emulate the difference between the loss in a host and the MCB loss.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **110** *SC* **110.8.4.2.2** *P* **149** *L* **26** # 6

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

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

from the pattern generator to the cable assembly test fixture.

SuggestedRemedy

from PGC to the cable assembly test fixture.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **110** *SC* **110.10** *P* **151** *L* **53** # 7

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

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

I don't see a good reason for breaking the consensus of the last regular meeting.

SuggestedRemedy

Revisit the appropriateness of changing 2.75 m to 3 m in sponsor ballot.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **110** *SC* **110.1** *P* **138** *L* **42** # 8

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

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

D2.1 comment 92 would apply here also:
What do you mean, "supports operation"?

SuggestedRemedy

Change"supports operation" to "operates", twice.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **110** *SC* **110.1** *P* **138** *L* **44** # 9

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

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

The way this is written, a cable can't be both CA-25G-L and CA-25G-N:
"A 25GBASE-CR-S PHY supports operation over ... CA-25G-N and CA-25G-S, but not CA-25G-L.

SuggestedRemedy

If that's how we mean to describe things, we will have to write the list in 110.10 Cable assembly characteristics more carefully. That list is badly worded anyway - it says achievable cable length can't be less than 3 or 5 m, so shorter cables are not achievable.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **110** *SC* **110.8.4.2.1** *P* **149** *L* **9** # 10

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

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

Figures 110-3 and 110-4 show "Additive host board loss" while text says "connecting path" - we should use the same name for something, every time. Do not see how loss is additive - the signal power is divided, the number of dBm is subtracted. Figure 83E-15, Example module stressed input test, calls it "Frequency-dependent attenuator". A pair of wideband SMA 3 dB attenuators could be seen as "Additive loss", and the meaning of "host board" is unclear - but they would not have the desired effect.

SuggestedRemedy

Rename to "Frequency-dependent attenuator" or "Frequency-dependent attenuation", both figures and text. Explain in words that this loss is intended to emulate the difference between the MCB loss and the loss in a host.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **110** *SC* **110.8.4.2.2** *P* **149** *L* **26** # 11

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

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

from the pattern generator to the cable assembly test fixture.

SuggestedRemedy

from PGC to the cable assembly test fixture.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.