

IEEE P802.3cn D2.1 50G/200G/400G over >10km SMF 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

CI 122	SC 122.7	P 43	L 50	# 1
--------	----------	------	------	-----

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, Aquantia, APL Gp, BMW, Cisco

Comment Type	E	Comment Status	D
--------------	---	----------------	---

Now that the new text all quotes particular sections, it is no longer clear for the base standard text to say "provided the channel requirements of 400GBASE-FR8 are met." It would be better to reference 122.11, as all the new references added to this paragraph do.

Same comment applies to similar paragraph in 139.6 (P75 L3)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "channel requirements of 400GBASE-FR8" to "channel requirements for 400GBASE-FR8 specified in 122.11"
make similar change in 139.6 for 50GBASE-FR (specified in 139.9).

Proposed Response	Response Status	Z
-------------------	-----------------	---

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 122	SC 122.11a	P 58	L 40	# 2
--------	------------	------	------	-----

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, Aquantia, APL Gp, BMW, Cisco

Comment Type	T	Comment Status	D
--------------	---	----------------	---

"(over an engineered link)" has no meaning. This section spells out the requirements for interoperability. Is anything else required? If so, specify it. I think "over an engineered link" means that some adjustment may be required, which is already in the text at the end of the paragraph (Attenuators may be required...)

Same comment applies to 122.11b and 122.11c

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "(over an engineered link)", in first sentence of 122.11a, 122.11b, and 122.11c

Proposed Response	Response Status	Z
-------------------	-----------------	---

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 122	SC 122.11a	P 58	L 42	# 3
--------	------------	------	------	-----

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, Aquantia, APL Gp, BMW, Cisco

Comment Type	E	Comment Status	D
--------------	---	----------------	---

The sentence for the requirements reads confusingly (I had to read it twice). In the suggested remedy I have provided what I THINK you mean. Personally, I would have written this as a "shall" requirement, but that does not seem to be the style for clause 122.

Same comment applies to 122.11b and 122.11c.

Similar comment applies to 139.10a and 139.10b (Page 84 & 85) except that the references are 139.9 and Table 139-15

SuggestedRemedy

Change "provided that the fiber optic cabling (channel) characteristics for 200GBASE-LR4 given in 122.10 are met, with the exception of the maximum and minimum channel insertion loss values, which are given in Table 122-20 for the two link directions separately."
to: "provided that the fiber optic cabling (channel) channel characteristics given in 122.10 are met, with the exception that the maximum and minimum insertion loss values for the specified direction of transmission be in the range given by Table 122-20."
Similarly modify 122.11b, and 122.11c.

Proposed Response	Response Status	Z
-------------------	-----------------	---

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 00	SC 0	P 13	L 3	# 4
-------	------	------	-----	-----

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys

Comment Type	E	Comment Status	D
--------------	---	----------------	---

Prefix of "Amendment 5 -" missing in start of paragraph like given for Amendments 1-4 given in Page 12

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "Amendment 5-" at the beginning of the paragraph

Proposed Response	Response Status	W
-------------------	-----------------	---

PROPOSED REJECT.

Amendment numbers are only added to the draft frontmatter when the assumed amendment order is announced by the IEEE 802.3 Working Group Chair. As P802.3cg is the only 802.3 amendment currently in Standards Association ballot, this has only been announced as far as Amendment 4.

IEEE P802.3cn D2.1 50G/200G/400G over >10km SMF 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

CI 00 SC 0 P13 L 8 # 5

Kabra, Lokesh

Synopsys

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Prefix of "Amendment 6 -" missing in start of paragraph

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "Amendment 6-" at the beginning of the paragraph

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Amendment numbers are only added to the draft frontmatter when the assumed amendment order is announced by the IEEE 802.3 Working Group Chair. As P802.3cg is the only 802.3 amendment currently in Standards Association ballot, this has only been announced as far as Amendment 4.

CI 00 SC 0 P13 L 15 # 6

Kabra, Lokesh

Synopsys

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Prefix of "Amendment 7 -" missing in start of paragraph

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "Amendment 7-" at the beginning of the paragraph

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Amendment numbers are only added to the draft frontmatter when the assumed amendment order is announced by the IEEE 802.3 Working Group Chair. As P802.3cg is the only 802.3 amendment currently in Standards Association ballot, this has only been announced as far as Amendment 4.

CI 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P21 L 18 # 7

Kabra, Lokesh

Synopsys

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"**GBASE-ER*" description in this section of 802.3-2018 uses the term "extended reach" in the description

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "reach" with "extended reach"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

There are no descriptions in 30.5.1.1.2 that include "with extended reach up to at least 40 km".

The existing descriptions are either "with extended reach" or "with reach up to at least 40 km". As the former description is much less helpful than the latter, the descriptions in the P802.3cn draft all use "with reach up to at least 40 km".

CI 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P21 L 27 # 8

Kabra, Lokesh

Synopsys

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"**GBASE-ER*" description in this section of 802.3-2018 uses the term "extended reach" in the description

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "reach" with "extended reach"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

There are no descriptions in 30.5.1.1.2 that include "with extended reach up to at least 40 km".

The existing descriptions are either "with extended reach" or "with reach up to at least 40 km". As the former description is much less helpful than the latter, the descriptions in the P802.3cn draft all use "with reach up to at least 40 km".

CI 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P21 L 36 # 9

Kabra, Lokesh

Synopsys

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"**GBASE-ER*" description in this section of 802.3-2018 uses the term "extended reach" in the description

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "reach" with "extended reach"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

There are no descriptions in 30.5.1.1.2 that include "with extended reach up to at least 40 km".

The existing descriptions are either "with extended reach" or "with reach up to at least 40 km". As the former description is much less helpful than the latter, the descriptions in the P802.3cn draft all use "with reach up to at least 40 km".

CI 00 SC 0 P 12 L 53 # 10

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D

802.3cg is specified for operation over a single balanced pair of conductors.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace, "operation on a single balanced pair copper cable" with "operation over a single balanced pair of conductors".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change the summary text for IEEE Std 802.3cg-20xx in the front matter to be consistent with the latest version in P802.3cg D3.1.