| Cl 00 SC | $P$ | $L$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Booth, Brad | Intel | \# 201 |
| Comment Type | T | Comment Status D |

Comment Type T Comment Status D
This draft is being listed as an amendment to 802.3-2002 when it should be an amendment to 802.3REVam.I'm highlighting this as a technical comment because although the changes may be only editorial, the requirement for working group ballot is technical completeness. Incorrectly referencing 802.3-2002 might be by some as not being technically complete.

## Suggested Remedy

Update draft to be an amendment to 802.3REVam.
Response Response Status w

| Cl $00 \quad S C$ | P2 | $L$ | \# 202 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James, David | Intel |  |  |

Comment Type E Comment Status X
Several clause titles are too long and thus overflow the Table of Contents.
Suggested Remedy
Reduce these title lengths
Response Response Status 0

| Cl 00 | SC 49.1.4 | $P 10$ | $L$ | $\#$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Booth, Brad | Intel |  |  |  |

Comment Type E Comment Status D
Figure 49-1 contains a list of the various 10GBASE-R port types, but there is no editing instruction to modify this figure for 10GBASE-LRM.

Suggested Remedy
Add a note to "'Insert 10GBASE-LRM to the list of 10GBASE-R port types'"'.
Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

| Cl 44 SC | P6 | L1 | \# 204 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James, David | Intel |  |  |

Comment Type E Comment Status $\mathbf{X}$
Table cells should never be blank, as this seems to be an error and its meaning is unclear.
In some 802.3 documents, these were to be entries that should be straddled, but were not. Suggested Remedy

Put an em dask into each of the blank cells.
Response Response Status 0

| Cl 45 | SC 68.1.2 | P 8 | L 29 | \# 205 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James, David |  | Intel |  |  |
| Comm | pe E | Comment Status |  |  |

The terms R/W mean two different things, for heading and cells.
Suggested Remedy
Change the cell to be RW, appropriately defined as read/write in the table footnote.
Response Response Status 0

| CI 68 SC | $P$ | $L$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| James, David | Intel | \# 206 |

Page 13, 20, 21(I think), 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 40. Figure font should be 8-point Arial.
Suggested Remedy
change font size appropriately.
Response Response Status 0

| Cl $68 \quad$ SC | $P$ | $L$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| James, David | Intel |  |
| Comment Type | E | Comment Status x |

Page 27, 29, 31, 34, 35.
Suggested Remedy
Make this a short title, using text to describe in more detail..
Response Response Status O

| Cl 68 SC | P | L | \# 208 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James, David |  |  |  |
| Comment Type E | Comment Status | X |  |
| Page 39, 40, 41. <br> The equations should have numbers; text should then refer to the number. |  |  |  |
| Suggested Remedy give them numbers |  |  |  |
| Response | Response Status |  |  |


| Cl 68 | SC | P12 | $L$ | Intel |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |

Comment Type E Comment Status D
Don't start a sentence with a number: it parses poorly
Suggested Remedy
Rephrase sentence starting with 52.1.1
Response Response Status w

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

| Cl 68 | SC | $P 12$ | $L$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| James, David | Intel | $\# 210$ |  |

Comment Type E Comment Status D
The PCS block is poorly aligne with rectangle above and below.
Suggested Remedy
align this properly.
Response
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

| Cl 68 | $S C$ | P12 | L1 | \# 211 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Booth, Brad | Intel |  |  |  |

Comment Type E Comment Status X
Heading doesn't match what was typically used in 10G to describe PMDs.
Suggested Remedy
Change heading to read "'"Physical medium dependent (PMD) sublayer and baseband medium, type 10GBASE-LRM"'".
Response
Response Status W

| $C l 68$ | SC | $P 20$ | $L$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James, David | Intel | $\# 212$ |  |

Comment Type E Comment Status $\mathbf{X}$
Nonstandard line widths.
Suggested Remedy
very thin inside, thin on the boundaries.
Response Response Status

| CI 68 SC | $P 25$ | $L$ | $\# \mid 213$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| James, David | Intel |  |  |

Comment Type E Comment Status $\mathbf{X}$
Its nearly impossible to parse these equations correctly.
Suggested Remedy
Use no spaces or special characters in term names, then describe below if necessary.
Response Response Status 0


| Cl 68 SC |  | P 28 | $L$ | \# 215 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James, David |  | Intel |  |  |
| Comment Type | E | Comment Status |  |  |
| The use of the '*' symbol in 68-6 is confusing. |  |  |  |  |

Suggested Remedy
either use a math symbol ' $x$ ' or define the meaning of this symbol, with is all too often used to mean multiplication

Response Response Status
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Append to sentence page 28, line 13: ".. and the "*" symbol is used to denote convolution."

| Cl 68 | SC | $P 36$ | \# 216 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| James, David |  |  |  |


| Cl 68 SC |  | P39 | L | \# 220 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James, David |  |  |  |  |
| Comment Type | E | Comment Status X |  |  |

Use parenthesis to resolve precedence in T/2No: is this (T/2)No or $T /(2 N o)$ ?
Suggested Remedy
Use parenthesis to resolve precedence in T/2No: is this (T/2)No or $\mathrm{T} /(2 \mathrm{No})$ ?
Response
Response Status
0


| CI 68 | SC 49.1.4 | P18 | $L$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| James, David | Intel | \# 222 |  |

James, David
Comment Type E Comment Status $\mathbf{X}$

Nonstandard capitalization
Suggested Remedy
Waveform measurement and processing
Response Response Status O

| Cl 68 | SC | P39 | \# 219 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| James, David |  |  |  |

Comment Type E Comment Status X
The sentence starting with "The TP-2 penalty" looks too small.

## Suggested Remedy

Check the font size, changing if necessary
Response Response Status 0

Page 3 of 4
Cl $68 \quad$ SC 68.1.1

| Cl 68 SC 68.1.2 | P12 | L 29 | \# 224 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Booth, Brad |  |  |  |

Comment Type E Comment Status X
Terminology and conventions isn't required as those apply to the complete 802.3 document along with others.

## Suggested Remedy

Delete subclause
Response Response Status O

| Cl 68 | SC 68.5 | P16 | L 1 | \# 225 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Booth, Brad |  | Intel |  |  |

Comment Type E Comment Status $\mathbf{X}$
Table 68-2 contains references to modal bandwidths at 850 nm . This PMD is only specified for 1300 nm operation.

## Suggested Remedy

Remove the modal bandwidth at 850 nm information.
Response
Response Status W

See comment 142 In 802.3aq Task Force comment report for March 2005.

Page 4 of 4

