

Please configure project comments

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **12** L **18** # **7**
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **R**

It is unlikely bs, which is more complex and at the same stage as this standard will be approved prior to 802.3cb. Is this standard written to assume bs comes first? (other places leave out bs)

SuggestedRemedy

Please be consistent on which amendments are expected to precede this one. Consult 802.3 leadership on likely order and monitor the several standards in working group ballot.

Response Response Status **C**

REJECT.

This draft assumes 802.3bs project still gets finished before 802.3cb and/or in parallel, and being consistent.

The current text is consistent with the schedule of the two groups. We will continue to monitor the schedule of 802.3bs and make appropriate changes as needed.

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **13** L **23** # **101**
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The assumed order of amendments has been announced by the Working Group Chair up to Amendment 9

SuggestedRemedy

Change the "9" in "Amendment 9" to black.
 Change "Amendment 10" to "Amendment TBD"

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **13** L **25** # **42**
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

This is not the description in draft P802.3bv/D3.3 submitted for approval.

SuggestedRemedy

Amendment 9—This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2015 and adds Clause 115 and Annex 115A. This amendment adds point-to-point 1000 Mb/s Physical Layer (PHY) specifications and management parameters for operation on duplex plastic optical fiber (POF) targeting use in automotive, industrial, home-network, and other applications.

Response Response Status **W**

ACCEPT.

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **27** L **43** # **43**
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

Editor's Note is not current. About half of the listed projects are approved amendments, not parallel projects, there are a lot of other amendments that modify related text (e.g., aPHYType enumerations).

SuggestedRemedy

Preferred solution is to delete the parenthetical list, end with "other IEEE 802.3 amendment projects."

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

End with "any other IEEE 802.3 amendment projects or corrigendum running in parallel."

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **27** L **44** # **102**
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

In the note, "802.3bv" should be "P802.3bv"

SuggestedRemedy

Change, "802.3bv" to "P802.3bv"

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

But no action needed (text being deleted by Comment #43 resolution.)

Please configure project comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P 12 L 13 # 135
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Editors note -- "listed other eight amendments..." is not true (at least 10 now). No need to state specific # when amendments are listed below anyway.

SuggestedRemedy

delete "eight " from the editor's note

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1 P 28 L 4 # 8
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Editor's note (and subsequent editor's notes) list a large number of amendments, many of which are already published. If there is resolution of the clause to be done, it should be done already. Having already approved amendments hanging around in notes as though they are undecided muddies the issues and makes review more difficult. (THIS COMMENT APPLIES GLOBALLY, BUT THIS IS THE FIRST INSTANCE I FOUND)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete approved amendments or those in late stages of sponsor ballot from th list of amendments needing consideration on update. Perform any needed updates relevant to already approved amendments or amendments in later stages of sponsor ballot - it is clear these will be before cb.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete all approved amendments from the editors note here and all other instances in changed clauses (pages 28, 31, 33, 49, and 57). Editor's note on Pg 45 (CL69), Pg 163 (CL69A), Pg 51 (CL73) to be deleted (and not modified - comment 47, 54 & 48 resolutions). As of 01/12/2017, 802.3bv (amendment 9) is not yet approved by revcom. 802.3bu and prior are all approved.

So it should read:

"The editing instruction needs to be updated once the approval order of the various amendments and corrigenda (e.g. IEEE Std 802.3bv-20xx, IEEE Std 802.3bt-20xx, IEEE Std 802.3bs-20xx, and IEEE Std 802.3-2015-Cor_1) become settled."

Per the second part of the suggested remedy, "Perform any needed updates relevant to already approved amendments or amendments in later stages of sponsor ballot - it is clear these will be before cb.", we have already performed the needed synchronization with the existing drafts and approved amendments and continue to monitor.

Cl 1 SC 1 P 28 L 5 # 44
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The order is settled for most everything in the list. P802.3bu was approved during the December SASB meeting series. P802.3bv is a conditional submittal to RevCom for early consideration. I may have missed assignment of Amendment 10 to P802.3bt, but if Mr. Law has made that assignment, it too could probably be removed from the list.

SuggestedRemedy

I think P802.3bs, P802.3bt, will be working on D2.2 comments in January, P802.3cb on D2.1 comments, and P802.3cc on D2.0 initial WG ballot comments. I would expect only these are the amendment projects for which order is not yet settled. Also applies to similar Editor's Note on pages 21, 31 and 33.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #8 resolution.

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P 28 L 27 # 45
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Consider adding a reminder note that P802.3bs should be inserting terms in this area (200G terms would appropriately be inserted between 2.5G and 5G terms).

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Sufficient editors notes in appropriate places remind editors to update the editing instructions when amendment orders are settled.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.74c P 28 L 46 # 103
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status A

In the Editor's note, "5BSEI" should be "5GSEI" and "IEEE 802.3bz" should be "IEEE Std 802.3bz"

SuggestedRemedy

In the Editor's note, change "5BSEI" to "5GSEI" and change "IEEE 802.3bz" to "IEEE Std 802.3bz"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Please configure project comments

Cl 1 SC 1.4.107 P 29 L 8 # 46
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The duplicate clause lists in this definition is getting absurd. Delete the first list.

SuggestedRemedy

An 802.3 family of Physical Layer devices using 64B/66B encoding. (See ...

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change subclause to read:

"1.4.107 BASE-R: An IEEE 802.3 family of Physical Layer devices using the 64B/66B encoding. (See IEEE Std 802.3 Clause 49, Clause 82, or Clause 107, or Clause 129.)"

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P 32 L 9 # 9
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Doesn't 2.5GBASE-KX come before 2.5GBASE-T?

SuggestedRemedy

Split editing instructions (similar to 30.3.2.1.2) to show that 2.5GBASE-KX both come before the inserted BASE-T and 2.5GBASE-X comes after it.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P 32 L 16 # 10
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Doesn't 5GBASE-KX come before 5GBASE-T?

SuggestedRemedy

Change editing instruction to insert 5GBASE-KR and 5GBASE-R BEFORE 5GBASE-T

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 31B SC 31B P 161 L 2 # 52
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Editor's Note is overly broad. Of other amendments in WG ballot, only P802.3bs modifies this clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Prune list to other current amendment projects touching the clause that have not been assigned an amendment number.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.6 P 33 L 41 # 104
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Three incorrect references to amendments

SuggestedRemedy

Page 33, line 41, change "IEEE 802.3bs" to "IEEE Std 802.3bs"
 Page 34, line 22, change "IEEE802.3bz" to "IEEE Std 802.3bz"
 Page 34, line 36, change "IEEE802.3bz" to "IEEE Std 802.3bz"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Please configure project comments

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.89.6 P 36 L 15 # 11
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status A

Commenter realizes this is out of scope (somehow my comments and ballot on D2.0 got lost...) - Clarity - reads like PMD signal detect is only mandatory on 2.5GBASE-T if EEE is implemented. Should be always mandatory with EEE. I applaud the editor fixing the description in 45.2.1.89.6 to reflect that it is mandatory when EEE is implemented.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The PMD signal detect function is optional for 1000BASE-X PCS (see 70.6.4) and 2.5GBASE-X PCS (see 128.6.4), and mandatory if EEE is implemented." to "The PMD signal detect function is optional for both 1000BASE-X PCS (see 70.6.4) and 2.5GBASE-X PCS (see 128.6.4), if EEE is not implemented, and it is mandatory for both if EEE is implemented.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change:
 "The PMD signal detect function is optional for 1000BASE-X PCS (see 70.6.4) and 2.5GBASE-X PCS (see 128.6.4), and mandatory if EEE is implemented."

To:
 "The PMD signal detect function for both 1000BASE-X PCS (see 70.6.4) and 2.5GBASE-X PCS (see 128.6.4) is mandatory if EEE is implemented, and optional otherwise."

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.1.2 P 36 L 39 # 105
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Spurious text in red strikethrough font in the editing instruction here and on page 37, line 4

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "201x" in red strikethrough here.
 Delete ")" in red strikethrough on page 37 line 4.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.7a P 37 L 22 # 12
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Editing instruction suggests this draft will follow 802.3bs. Seems unlikely. Be consistent. If this precedes 802.3bs, it will have to insert Table 45-124a.

SuggestedRemedy

Consult with IEEE 802.3 leadership on ordering of amendments and be consistent.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change editing instruction to say:
 "Change Table 45-124a (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bs-20xx) as shown."

We need to be consistent -- and for now we assume this project is behind 802.3bs in amendment order.

Insert the following editors note (in a box, just below the 45.2.3.7a header):
 "Editors note (to be removed prior to publication): If this project is approved before IEEE P802.3bs, modify the editing instruction to insert Table 45-124a, and the subclause 45.2.3.7a PCS status 3 register (Register 3.9)."

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.7a P 37 L 23 # 106
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The editing instruction has been changed and now "Change two new rows" doesn't make sense.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing instruction to "Change Table 45-124a (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3bs-20xx) as shown."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: see comment 12 for revised wording - "inserted" rather than "modified".]

Please configure project comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.7a.a P 37 L 46 # 107
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The editing instruction added in response to comment #16 against D2.0 is incorrect. It should be as proposed by comment #44 against D2.0. Also, there is a typo in the second subclause number.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change " 45.2.3.9a.b after 45.2.3.7a.1" to "45.2.3.7a.b before 45.2.3.7a.1"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.9a P 38 L 9 # 108
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 "IEEE 802.3by" should be "IEEE Std 802.3by-2016"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "IEEE 802.3by" to "IEEE Std 802.3by-2016"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.14.1 P 39 L 31 # 109
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 IEEE Std 802.3bq-2016 made changes to the text shown in 45.2.3.14.1, 45.2.3.14.2, 45.2.3.14.3, and 45.2.3.14.4
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the base text in 45.2.3.14.1, 45.2.3.14.2, 45.2.3.14.3, and 45.2.3.14.4 to reflect the changes made by IEEE Std 802.3bq-2016 and also change the editing instructions to say "as modified by IEEE Std 802.3by-2016 and IEEE Std 802.3bq-2016"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 69 SC 69 P 45 L 2 # 47
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The note is not needed, no other current amendment projects are touching clause 69 (IEEE Std 802.3by is approved and published).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete note.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 69 SC 69.1.1 P 45 L 16 # 110
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The space in "2.5 Gb/s" should be underlined
 SuggestedRemedy
 Underline the space
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 69 SC 69.1.1 P 46 L 35 # 111
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 As Figure 69-2 is the last figure in Clause 69, the figure inserted after it should be Figure 69-3
 SuggestedRemedy
 Renumber Figure 69-2a to Figure 69-3
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Please configure project comments

Cl 69 SC 69.2.3 P 47 L 31 # 134
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 Table 69-2a, 2.5GBASE-KX row, Auto-Neg column, O for optional does not match equivalent spec in CL125

SuggestedRemedy
 Change O to an M (so CL73 Auto-Neg is Mandatory for 2.5GBASE-KX).

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 69A SC 69A P 163 L 2 # 54
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The note is not needed, no other current amendment projects are touching Annex 69A.

SuggestedRemedy
 Delete note.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 73 SC 73 P 51 L 2 # 48
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Editor's Note is overly broad. Of other amendments in WG ballot, none modify this clause. (IEEE Std 802.3bz is approved and published.)

SuggestedRemedy
 Delete note.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 73 SC 73.3 P 51 L 47 # 112
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The editing instruction has been changed and now "Change "2.5GBASE-KX, 5GBASE-KR," in" doesn't make sense.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the editing instruction to "Change the third paragraph of 73.3 (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3by-2016) as shown."

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 73 SC 73.4.6 P 52 L 9 # 113
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Space missing in "ChangeTable 73-4"

SuggestedRemedy
 Add the space

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 73 SC 73.4.6 P 52 L 22 # 114
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The editing instruction has been changed and now "Change "2.5GBASE-KX, 5GBASE-KR," in" doesn't make sense.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the editing instruction to "Change the third paragraph of 73.6.4 (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3by-2016) as shown."

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Please configure project comments

Cl 73 SC 73.4.6 P 52 L 29 # 115
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 "as the MDI and physical medium are different" was deleted by IEEE Std 802.3by-2016.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the text.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 73 SC 73.7.4.1 P 52 L 52 # 116
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Spurious "." at the beginning of the editing instruction
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the "."
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 78 SC 78 P 57 L 2 # 49
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Editor's Note is overly broad. Of other amendments in WG ballot, only P802.3bs and P802.3cc modify this clause.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Prune list to other current amendment projects touching the clause that have not been assigned an amendment number.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Only list 802.3bs. 802.3cc is not included because it follows 802.3cb.

Cl 125 SC 125 P 59 L 1 # 117
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Comment #55 against D2.0 was:
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add "Note that Clause 125 was introduced by IEEE Std 802.3bz-2016." above the Clause 125 heading.
 However, the text of the note has been changed, it is not above the heading, and it has been marked as "TO BE REMOVED PRIOR TO FINAL PUBLICATION"
 SuggestedRemedy

Follow the precedent set in IEEE Std 802.3bm-2015 page 64.
 Replace the current note with "Note that Clause 125 was introduced by IEEE Std 802.3bz-2016." above the Clause 125 heading in bold italic font.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 125 SC 125 P 61 L 10 # 50
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Not knowing if we will specify other 2.5G and 5G interfaces it might be better to maintain a speed ordering of the tables in this clause.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consistently group 2.5G rows and 5G rows rather than interspersing them in Tables 125-1, 125-2 and 125-3.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 125 SC 125 P 62 L 3 # 51
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status R
 This appears to be a note from P802.3bz.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete.
 Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 It is not from P802.3bz.

Please configure project comments

Cl 125 SC 125.1.3 P 60 L 40 # 2
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Editing instruction for table 125-1 appears to float randomly about the draft - beat on frame to tie it to where Table 125-1 ends up or it will cause confusion (yes, this is out of scope, but will prevent confusion later)

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 125 SC 125.1.4 P 61 L 18 # 118
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status A

"Clause 127[tilde]130" should be "Clause 127 to Clause 130"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Clause 127[tilde]130" to "Clause 127 to Clause 130"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 125 SC 125.1.4 P 61 L 23 # 1
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Vertical lines are overly thick in header section for clauses 127 through 130A

SuggestedRemedy

Apply appropriate very thin line style between clause 126 through 130A columns

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 125 SC 125.1.4 P 61 L 25 # 119
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The border width in the heading rows of Table 125-2 is incorrect

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the borders

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 125 SC 125.1.4 P 61 L 38 # 149
 Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type T Comment Status A

In Table 125-2 in clause 125.1.4, Clause 73 Auto-Negotiation for 2.5GBASE-KX was changed from Optional to Mandatory. However, in Table 128-1 in clause 128-1, it remains as optional. Besides, in clause 128.3, the text was changed from "shall" to "may optionally". In the PICS in 128.10.3, the item AN remains as Mandatory. They are inconsistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it consistent whether Clause 73 AN is mandatory or optional for 2.5GBASE-KX.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Adopted objectives at:

http://iee802.org/3/cb/8023cb_Objectives-Rev_0316a.pdf

Show that:

auto-negotiation is SUPPORTED,
 EEE is OPTIONALLY supported.

Make consistent change to MANDATORY auto-neg.
 Table 128-1, autonegotiation row becomes 'mandatory'.

Change 128.3 page 108, line 16 to read:

"The PCS associated with this PMD shall support the AN service interface primitive AN_LINK.indication as defined in 73.9."

Change page 138, line 6, AN1 line 'Status' column to "M". On 'Support' column, remove "No[]". Lines AN2 through AN4, change 'Status' column to "M" and remove "N/A[]" from 'Support' column.

Please configure project comments

Cl 125 SC 125.2.3 P 62 L 9 # 120
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 "clause number" should be "subclause number"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "clause number" to "subclause number"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 127 SC 127 P 63 L 3 # 121
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Comment #58 against D2.0 was:
 Add a new editing instruction above the heading for Clause 127: "Insert new Clauses 127 to 130 and corresponding new Annexes 127A to 130B as follows:"
 ACCEPT.
 However, the text has not been added as an editing instruction and it has been marked as
 "(to be removed prior to publication)"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Follow the precedent set in IEEE Std 802.3bm-2015 page 67.
 Replace the current Editor's note with "Insert new Clauses 127 to 130 and corresponding new Annexes 127A to 127C and 130A as follows:" just above the Clause 125 heading in bold italic font (as per an editing instruction).
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 127 SC 127.2.4.1 P 69 L 20 # 136
 McClellan, Brett Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 unnecessary line breaks
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove unnecessary line breaks
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 127 SC 127.2.4.1 P 69 L 28 # 137
 McClellan, Brett Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 grammer issue
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "The nominal rate of operation of the single 2.5GPll 312.5 Msymbols/s ± 100ppm."
 to "The nominal rate of operation of the 2.5GPll symbols is 312.5 Msymbols/s ± 100ppm."
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"The nominal rate of operation of 2.5GPll symbols is 312.5 Msymbols/s ± 100ppm."
 Cl 127 SC 127.2.4.2 P 71 L 16 # 138
 McClellan, Brett Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 'e' from 'Terminate' is left hanging.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Resize font, or hyphenate the word.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 127 SC 127.2.4.5 P 73 L 28 # 139
 McClellan, Brett Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 'te' from 'Terminate' is left hanging.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Resize font, or hyphenate the word.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Please configure project comments

CI 127 **SC 127.2.5.7** **P 76** **L 18** # **3**
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
 suppliedon - typo, missing space

SuggestedRemedy
 change to "supplied on"

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

 (Same as Comment #122)

CI 127 **SC 127.2.5.7** **P 76** **L 18** # **140**
 McClellan, Brett Marvell

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

SuggestedRemedy
 change "suppliedon" to "supplied on"

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

CI 127 **SC 127.2.5.7** **P 76** **L 18** # **122**
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
 Space missing in "suppliedon"

SuggestedRemedy
 Add the space

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

CI 127 **SC 127.2.6.1.2** **P 78** **L 13** # **4**
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **A**
 127.2.5.11 doesn't specify anything about "part 2" or "part 3" of the End_of_Packet
 delimiter - it delineates no "parts" - also applies to line 19.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "End_of_Packet delimiter part 2 or End_of_Packet delimiter part 3" to "the second
 or third code-group in an End_of_Packet delimiter" on line 13, and change "End_of_Packet
 delimiter part 1" to "the first code-group in an End_of_Packet delimiter" on line 19.

Response **Response Status** **W**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace definition with:
 "The code-group used for the second and, if present, the third code-group in an
 End_of_Packet delimiter as specified in 127.2.5.11."

 Also make the suggested change to the /T/ definition on line 19 as:
 "The code-group used for the first code group in the End_of_Packet delimiter as specified
 in 127.2.5.11."

CI 127 **SC 127.2.6.1.3** **P 78** **L 46** # **141**
 McClellan, Brett Marvell

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
 incorrect symbol change

SuggestedRemedy
 change to "(tpd<7:0>=0x9C)"

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

 (note to editor: replace (tpd<7:0>=0x9C)
 with (tpd<7:0> = 0x9C)

Please configure project comments

CI 128 SC 128.6.4 P 110 L 17 # 55
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type T Comment Status R

I believe we need to give the reader better guidance about the PMD signal detect definition than simply saying it is beyond the scope of the spec. (Sections 128.6.4 and 130.6.4)

SuggestedRemedy

Either provide a definition or point the reader to another document/reference where there is a definition

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

10GBASE-KX4 signal detect function, clause 71.6.4, uses same wording. To change this wording requires a proposal for signal detect definition.

CI 128 SC 128.6.6 P 110 L 51 # 56
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type T Comment Status A

I believe we need to give the reader better guidance about how to implement loopback mode than simply saying it is not defined. (Sections 128.6.6 and 130.6.6)

SuggestedRemedy

Either provide a method of implementation or point the reader to another document/reference where there is one

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the last sentence on page 110, line 50 to read:
 "The method of implementing loopback mode within the PMD is not defined by this standard."

CI 128 SC 128.7.1 P 112 L 26 # 58
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Units column needs a carriage return or line feed to align the first "UI" to Random jitter row

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a line as commented.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 128 SC 128.7.1 P 112 L 26 # 14
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Units column needs a carriage return or line feed to align the first "UI" to Random jitter row

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a line as commneted.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 128 SC 128.7.1 P 112 L 29 # 57
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Either the total jitter value of 0.35 is wrong, or the deterministic jitter value of 0.12 is wrong. I believe TJ should be 0.32. Was pointed out before, but editorial review missed it.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the value from 0.35 to 0.32 on the Total jitter row.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 128 SC 128.7.1 P 112 L 29 # 13
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Either the total jitter value of 0.35 is wrong, or the deterministic jitter value of 0.12 is wrong. It believe should be 0.32. Was pointed out by LM, but edit review missed it.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the value from 0.35 to 0.32 on the Total jitter row.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Please configure project comments

CI 128 SC 128.7.1.4 P 114 L 1 # 59
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The added text in 128.7.1.4, "The differential peak to peak output voltage when TX is disabled is defined in Table 128-4" is unnecessary, redundant, and confusing. It should be removed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the sentence as commented.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 128 SC 128.7.1.4 P 114 L 2 # 60
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 The sentence "... eight symbols of alternating polarity" is incomplete, as previously pointed out, but editorial review missed it. Whatever the resolution, do the same to 130.7.14 comment.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Complete the sentence as follows: "... eight symbols of alternating polarity, i.e. 0x1111111100000000...")
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 128 SC 128.7.1.4 P 114 L 2 # 15
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 The sentence "... eight symbols of alternating polarity" is incomplete, as previously pointed out by LM, but edit review missed it. Whatever the resolution, do the same to 130.7.14 comment.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Complete the sentence as follows: "... eight symbols of alternating polarity, i.e. 0x1111111100000000".)
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 128 SC 128.7.1.4 P 114 L 16 # 125
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The style manual says that "Within each subclause, notes should be numbered sequentially"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Number the notes
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 128 SC 128.7.1.9 P 116 L 45 # 61
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 At the beginning of the text of 128.7.1.9, the word "jitter" needs to be inserted after "The transmitter"
 SuggestedRemedy
 add "jitter" after "transmitter"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change to "transmit jitter".

CI 128 SC 128.7.2 P 117 L 14 # 62
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 As commented before, "suggest deletion of the "Receiver coupling" row to help eliminate double specification between this table 128-5 and 128.7.2.3 Whatever the resolution, do similarly to 130.7.2
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the "Receiver Coupling" row from Tables 128-5 and 130-5
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Please configure project comments

CI 128 SC 128.7.2 P 117 L 14 # 16
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 As commented by LM "suggest deletion of the "Receiver coupling" to help eliminate double specification with this table 128-5 and 128.7.2.3 Whatever the resolution, do the same to 130.7.2
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 128 SC 128.7.2.1 P 117 L 44 # 17
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 As commented by LM "these jitter numbers need some more review. Is the DCD here supposed to be part of the rest of the jitter as in Table 128-4? Or is it in addition to? Why is there no ISI component?" Whatever the resolution, do the same to 130.7.2.1 Table 130-6 (comment not replicated for CL130)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider & Clarify
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 128 SC 128.7.2.1 P 117 L 44 # 63
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 These jitter numbers need some more review. Is the DCD here supposed to be part of the rest of the jitter as in Table 128-4? Or is it in addition to? Why is there no ISI component? Whatever the resolution, do the same to 130.7.2.1 Table 130-6 (comment not replicated for CL130)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider & Clarify
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 For Table 128-6 and Table 130-6, remove the row, "Applied duty cycle distortion (min peak-to-peak)". DCD is observable but not controllable/programmable in the receiver tolerance test instrumentation, leading to complicated and unnecessary test requirements.
 For Table 130-6, change "Applied random jitter (min peak-to-peak)" to 0.15 in order to match Table 130-4.
 ISI is taken into account by the channel definition which is used for testing defined in 69A.2.2.

CI 128 SC 128.7.2.5 P 118 L 24 # 126
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Space missing in "ofTable"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the space
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 128 SC 128.7.2.5 P 118 L 24 # 145
 McClellan, Brett Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 typo
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "oftable" to "of Table"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Please configure project comments

Cl 128 **SC 128.10.3** **P 121** **L 8** # **64**
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **R**
 "2.5GBASE-X" needs to change to "2.5GBASE-KX" in 128.10.3
SuggestedRemedy
 change "2.5GBASE-X" to "2.5GBASE-KX"
Response **Response Status** **C**
 REJECT.

 PCS reference is supposed to be -X.

Cl 128 **SC 128.10.4.3** **P 124** **L 18** # **65**
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **A**
 Is this supposed to be 0.35 or 0.32?
SuggestedRemedy
 Change the value from 0.35 to 0.32.
Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT.

Cl 128 **SC 128.10.4.3** **P 124** **L 18** # **18**
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **D**
 As commented by LM "Is this supposed to be 0.35 or 0.32?".
SuggestedRemedy
 Change the value from 0.35 to 0.32.
Proposed Response **Response Status** **Z**
 REJECT.

 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 128A **SC 128A.3.4.2** **P 182** **L 32** # **146**
 McClellan, Brett Marvell
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
 unnecessary capitalization
SuggestedRemedy
 change "Noise" to "noise"
Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT.

Cl 128A **SC 128A.3.4.2** **P 182** **L 40** # **147**
 McClellan, Brett Marvell
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
 missing "GBd"
SuggestedRemedy
 change "3.125" to "3.125GBd"
Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

 Change to:
 "3.125 GBd"

Cl 128B **SC 128B.4.3.2** **P 193** **L 4** # **148**
 McClellan, Brett Marvell
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **A**
 Equation (128B-8) defines a limit, not a region
SuggestedRemedy
 change
 "within the high confidence region defined by Equation (128B-8)"
 to
 "be limited by Equation (128B-8)"
Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT.

Please configure project comments

Cl 129 SC 129 P 127 L 2 # 66
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

5GBASE-R is used throughout Clause 129; shouldn't it be 5GBASE-KR instead? Also noted at least two instances of a reference to 10GBASE in the PICS

SuggestedRemedy

Replace incorrect references to 5GBASE-R, 10GBASE-R, and 10GBASE-KR in Clause 129 with references to 5GBASE-KR

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Per suggested remedy:
 PCS reference is -R.

In PICS:
 table 129.7.2.2,
 table 129.7.3 - item PCS,
 table 129.7.6.5 item - AN1 & AN2

change 10GBASE- to 5GBASE-

Cl 129 SC 129.2.1 P 129 L 38 # 40
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syst

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Clause 49 has:

hi_ber
 Boolean variable which is asserted true when the ber_cnt exceeds 16 indicating a bit error ratio >10⁻⁴

Clause 129 has:

The 5GBASE-R PCS shall have all the functionality of the 10GBASE-R PCS specified in Clause 49 with the changes noted below.

The BER monitor state diagram shown in Figure 49-15 applies but it shall test ber_cnt for a value of 32 rather than 16 in the exit conditions from state BER_BAD_SH as listed below.

- a) The definition of "ber_cnt" in 49.2.13.2.4 is replaced with "Count up to a maximum of 32 of the number of invalid sync headers within the current 125 us period."
- b) The definition of "hi_ber" in 49.2.13.2.2 is replaced with "Boolean variable which is asserted true when the ber_cnt exceeds 32 indicating a bit error ratio >10⁻⁴."

Boolean variable which is asserted true when the ber_cnt exceeds 16 indicating a bit error ratio >10⁻⁴

Seeing as the clock speed is halved this implies a four times increase in BER which is wrong as 802.3cb has the same 10-12 overall BER requirement.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"The 5GBASE-R PCS shall have all the functionality of the 10GBASE-R PCS specified in Clause 49 with the changes noted below.

The BER monitor state diagram shown in Figure 49-15 applies but it shall test ber_cnt for a value of 32 rather than 16 in the exit conditions from state BER_BAD_SH as listed below."

To:

"The 5GBASE-R PCS shall have all the functionality of the 10GBASE-R PCS specified in Clause 49 except that the 125us timer becomes a 250us timer.

The BER monitor state diagram shown in Figure 49-15 applies but the definition of "ber_cnt" in 49.2.13.2.4 is replaced with "Count up to a maximum of 16 of the number of invalid sync headers within the current 250 us period." and the ber_cnt definition in 49.2.14.2 is similarly modified."

Delete paragraphs a) and b) on lines 40 to 44.

Please configure project comments

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change:

"The 5GBASE-R PCS shall have all the functionality of the 10GBASE-R PCS specified in Clause 49 with the changes noted below.

The BER monitor state diagram shown in Figure 49–15 applies but it shall test ber_cnt for a value of 32 rather than 16 in the exit conditions from state BER_BAD_SH as listed below."

To:

"The 5GBASE-R PCS shall have all the functionality of the 10GBASE-R PCS specified in Clause 49.

The BER monitor state diagram shown in Figure 49–15 applies but the definition of "ber_cnt" in 49.2.13.2.4 is replaced with "Count up to a maximum of 16 of the number of invalid sync headers within the current 250 us period." and the ber_cnt definition in 49.2.14.2 is simialrly modified."

Delete paragraphs a) and b) on lines 40 to 44.

Cl **129** *SC* **129.3.1** *P* **132** *L* **26** # **127**

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Space missing in "in51.2"

SuggestedRemedy

Add the space

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **129** *SC* **129.7.6.2** *P* **137** *L* **36** # **128**

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

"of Clause 51.8" should be "of 51.8"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "of Clause 51.8" to "of 51.8"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.1** *P* **139** *L* **14** # **67**

Larry, McMillan Western Digital

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

Why does this say 10GBASE-KR? Shouldn't it be 5GBASE-KR instead?

SuggestedRemedy

Change Table column heading of "10GBASE-KR" to "5GBASE-KR"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.1** *P* **139** *L* **14** # **19**

Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

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

As commented by LM "Why does this say 10GBASE-KR? Shouldn't it be 5GBASE-KR instead?"

SuggestedRemedy

Change Table column heading of "10GBASE-KR" to "5GBASE-KR"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Please configure project comments

Cl 130 SC 130.1 P 139 L 18 # 129
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The format of Table 130-1 has been changed from the one used in a very large number of PMD clauses in 802.3

SuggestedRemedy

Revert Table 130-1 back to the version in D2.0 with the exception that "73", "78", and "129" are cross-references with a format "Section" to bring it back to the format used in Clauses 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 110, 111, 112, 121, 122, 123, 124, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: add back the words behind the clause numbers, as shown in Clause 85 in 802.3-2015_SECTION6.pdf.

Should read:

- 73 - Auto Negotiation for Backplane
- 78 - EEE
- 129 - PCS and PMA for 64B/66B

Cl 130 SC 130.6.4 P 144 L 8 # 68
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type T Comment Status R

I believe we need to give the reader better guidance about the PMD signal detect definition than simply saying it is beyond the scope of the spec. (Sections 128.6.4 and 130.6.4)

SuggestedRemedy

Either provide a definition or point the reader to another document/reference where there is a definition

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

10GBASE-KX4 signal detect function, clause 71.6.4, uses same wording. To change this wording requires a proposal for signal detect definition.

Cl 130 SC 130.6.6 P 144 L 51 # 69
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type T Comment Status A

I believe we need to give the reader better guidance about how to implement loopback mode than simply saying it is not defined. (Sections 128.6.6 and 130.6.6)

SuggestedRemedy

Either provide a method of implementation or point the reader to another document/reference where there is one

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the last sentence on page 144, line 51 to read:

"The method of implementing loopback mode within the PMD is not defined by this standard."

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1 P 146 L 34 # 70
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Total jitter should be 0.27

SuggestedRemedy

Change the value from 0.30 to 0.27 on the Total jitter row

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1 P 146 L 34 # 20
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

As commented by LM "Total jitter should be 0.27"

SuggestedRemedy

Change the value from 0.30 to 0.27 on the Total jitter row

Proposed Response Response Status Z

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Please configure project comments

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.4 P 148 L 1 # 71
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The third sentence in 130.7.1.4 ("The transmitter output voltage shall be as specified in Table 130-4") is unnecessary, redundant, and confusing. It should be removed

SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the sentence as commented.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.4 P 148 L 2 # 21
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 The sentence "... eight symbols of alternating polarity." is incomplete, as previously pointed out by LM, but edit review missed it. Whatever the resolution, do the same to 128.7.14 comment.

SuggestedRemedy
 Complete the sentence as follows: "... eight symbols of alternating polarity, i.e. 0x1111111100000000".)

Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.4 P 148 L 2 # 72
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 The sentence "... eight symbols of alternating polarity." is incomplete. Whatever the resolution, do the same to 128.7.14 comment.

SuggestedRemedy
 Complete the sentence as follows: "... eight symbols of alternating polarity, i.e. 0x1111111100000000...".)

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.4 P 148 L 11 # 130
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The style manual says that "Within each subclause, notes should be numbered sequentially"

SuggestedRemedy
 Number the notes

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.5 P 148 L 26 # 73
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 Fix by adding a space after "of" in "...the requirements ofTable 103-4".

SuggestedRemedy
 Do so.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.5 P 148 L 26 # 22
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 Fix by adding a space after "of" in "...the requirements ofTable 103-4".

SuggestedRemedy
 Do so.

Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Please configure project comments

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.5 P 148 L 26 # 131
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Space missing in "ofTable"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the space
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.5 P 149 L 24 # 132
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 There is no Figure 130-4
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix the auto-numbering in Clause 130
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.6 P 149 L 29 # 74
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 Fix by adding a space after "of" in "...the requirements ofTable 103-4".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Do so.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.6 P 149 L 29 # 133
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Space missing in "ofTable"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the space
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.6 P 149 L 29 # 23
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 Fix by adding a space after "of" in "...the requirements ofTable 103-4".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Do so.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.7 P 150 L 31 # 75
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 shouldn't this say "...a run of at least eight consecutive ones followed by at least eight consecutive zeroes."? -- the sentence seems incomplete.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "...at least eight consecutive ones." to "...at least eight consecutive ones followed by at least eight consecutive zeros"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.11 P 151 L 22 # 24
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 As commented by LM, "shouldn't this say "...a run of at least eight consecutive ones followed by at least eight consecutive zeroes."" -- the sentence seems incomplete.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "...at least eight consecutive ones." to "...at least eight consecutive ones followed by at least eight consecutive zeros"
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Please configure project comments

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.11 P 151 L 22 # 76
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 shouldn't this say "...a run of at least eight consecutive ones followed by at least eight consecutive zeroes."? -- the sentence seems incomplete.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "...at least eight consecutive ones." to "...at least eight consecutive ones followed by at least eight consecutive zeros"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.11 P 151 L 50 # 150
 Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 The definition of v1 refers to an undefined variable t.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "t - 2T" to "t_2 - 2T".
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Definition for v1 should read:
 "...in the interval t1 + 2T to t2 - 2T"

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.11 P 151 L 50 # 77
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 For v1, "t1 + 2T to t - 2T" should be "t1 + 2T to t2 - 2T"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change per comment
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.11 P 151 L 52 # 151
 Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 v3 is negative steady-state voltage.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "positive" to "negative".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.11 P 151 L 52 # 78
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 For v3, "positive steady-state voltage..." should be "negative steady-state voltage..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 change per comment
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.1.11 P 151 L 53 # 153
 Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 v_4 is defined as maximum voltage.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "maximum" to "minimum".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Please configure project comments

CI 130 SC 130.7.1.11 P 151 L 53 # 152
 Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 A new line is missing between "t_3 - 2T" and "v_4".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change line after "t_3 - 2T".
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add a new line after t3 - 2T

CI 130 SC 130.7.1.11 P 151 L 53 # 79
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 For v4, "maximum voltage measured..." should be "minimum voltage measured..." There also needs to be a carriage return before "v4" to move it down one line
 SuggestedRemedy
 change per comment
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Also add a space between "interval" and "t2".

CI 130 SC 130.7.2 P 152 L 25 # 80
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 suggest deletion of the "Receiver coupling" row to help eliminate double specification between this table 130-5 and 130.7.2.3 Whatever the resolution, do the same to 128.7.2
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the "Receiver Coupling" row from Tables 128-5 and 130-5
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 130 SC 130.7.2 P 152 L 25 # 25
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 As commented by LM "suggest deletion of the "Receiver coupling" to help eliminate double specification with this table 130-5 and 130.7.2.3 Whatever the resolution, do the same to 128.7.2
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 130 SC 130.7.2.2 P 153 L 21 # 26
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 As commented by LM, consider changing "A 5GBASE-KR receiver..." to "The signaling speed of a 5GBASE-KR receiver..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 130 SC 130.7.2.2 P 153 L 21 # 81
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 consider changing "A 5GBASE-KR receiver..." to "The signaling speed of a 5GBASE-KR receiver..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change the sentence to read:
 "The signaling speed of a 5GBASE-KR receiver shall comply with the requirements of Table 130-5."

Please configure project comments

Cl 130 SC 130.7.2.4 P 153 L 38 # 27
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 As commented by LM, and paraphrased by me, delete "1200 mV" and change "of" to "in" the second sentence

SuggestedRemedy
 Change from "This may be larger than the 1200 mV differential maximum of 130.7.1.4" to "This may be larger than the differential maximum in 130.7.1.4"

Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.2.4 P 153 L 38 # 82
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 delete "1200 mV" and change "of" to "in" the second sentence

SuggestedRemedy
 Change from "This may be larger than the 1200 mV differential maximum of 130.7.1.4" to "This may be larger than the differential maximum in 130.7.1.4"

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.2.5 P 153 L 47 # 28
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 As commented by LM, delete equation references 130-3 and 130-4 and replace them by a reference to the table 130-5

SuggestedRemedy
 Change from "...greater than or equal to Equation (130-3) and Equation (130-4)." to "...as specified in Table 130-5."

Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 130 SC 130.7.2.5 P 153 L 47 # 83
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 delete equation references 130-3 and 130-4 and replace them by a reference to the table 130-5

SuggestedRemedy
 The entire text of 130.7.2.5 should be limited to only: "For frequencies from 100 MHz to 3750 MHz, the differential return loss, in dB with f in MHz, of the receiver shall be as specified in Table 130-5. This return loss requirement applies at all valid input levels."

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.3 P 156 L 8 # 84
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 "5GBASE-R" needs to change to "5GBASE-KR" in 130.10.3

SuggestedRemedy
 change "5GBASE-R" to "5GBASE-KR"

Response Response Status C
 REJECT.

This is correct as is.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4 P 156 L 26 # 85
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 In 130.10.4, "10GBASE-KR" should be "5GBASE-KR"

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "10GBASE-KR" to "5GBASE-KR"

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Please configure project comments

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.2 P 156 L 43 # 86
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 fix "2.GBASE-KX" on FS1 line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from "2.GBASE-KX" to "5GBASE-KR"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.2 P 156 L 43 # 29
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 As commented by LM, fix "2.GBASE-KX" on FS1 line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from "2.GBASE-KX" to "5GBASE-KR"
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.2 P 156 L 51 # 87
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 fix "2.5GBASE-KX" on FS3 line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from "2.5GBASE-KX" to "5GBASE-KR"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.2 P 156 L 51 # 30
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 As commented by LM, fix "2.5GBASE-KX" on FS3 line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from "2.5GBASE-KX" to "5GBASE-KR"
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.2 P 157 L 27 # 88
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 change "effected" to "affected" and insert a space " " after "by" on FS16 line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to read "Loopback not affected
 by Global_PMD_transmit_disable"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.2 P 157 L 27 # 31
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 As commented by LM, change "effected" to "affected" and insert a space " " after "by" on
 FS16 line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to read "Loopback not affected
 by Global_PMD_transmit_disable"
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Please configure project comments

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.4 P 158 L 29 # 35
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**
 As commented by LM, add "within" after "output" and fix capitalization on TC11 line

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "output ..." with "Output within ..."

Proposed Response Response Status **Z**
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.4 P 158 L 29 # 92
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**
 add "within" after "output" and fix capitalization on TC11 line

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "output ..." with "Output within ..."

Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to:
 "Output within ± 150 mV of the pre-LPI value"

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.4 P 158 L 38 # 36
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**
 As commented by LM, TC15 values are not updated to match the draft

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Between 30 ps and 100 ps..." with "Between 20 ps and 60 ps..."

Proposed Response Response Status **Z**
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.4 P 158 L 38 # 93
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**
 TC15 values are not updated to match the draft

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Between 30 ps and 100 ps..." with "Between 20 ps and 60 ps..."

Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.4 P 158 L 42 # 37
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**
 As commented by LM, TC16 values are not updated to match the draft

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Between 30 ps and 100 ps..." with "Between 20 ps and 60 ps..."

Proposed Response Response Status **Z**
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.4 P 158 L 42 # 94
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**
 TC16 values are not updated to match the draft

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Between 30 ps and 100 ps..." with "Between 20 ps and 60 ps..."

Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT.

Please configure project comments

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.4 P 159 L 3 # 95
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 TC17 values are not updated to match the draft
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "0.30 UI" with "0.27 UI"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.5 P 159 L 22 # 38
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 As commente dby LM, RC1 value was not updated to match the draft
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "1200" with "1600"
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.5 P 159 L 22 # 96
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 RC1 value was not updated to match the draft
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "1200" with "1600"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.5 P 159 L 25 # 39
 Kim, Yong Broadcom LTD
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 As commente dby LM, RC2 refereces weren not updated to match the draft
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "...in Annex 130B with parameters in Table 130-5" with "1600" with "...in Annex 69A with parameters in Table 130-6"
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.5 P 159 L 25 # 97
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 RC2 references were not updated to match the draft
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "...in Annex 130B with parameters in Table 130-5" with "...in Annex 69A with parameters in Table 130-6"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 130 SC 130.10.4.5 P 159 L 30 # 98
 Larry, McMillan Western Digital
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 RC4 reference was not updated to match the draft
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "...in Annex 130B" with "...in Annex 69A"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.