Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # **2**
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

There are many instances of text in the draft that should be cross-references to other points in the draft, but aren't.
Many cross-reference hyperlinks don't work.

Examples are on page 15 (which is missing line numbers):
First NOTE "Table 56-1" and "Clause 64" should be hyperlinks but aren't
Second and third NOTEs "Table 56-1" should both be hyperlinks but aren't
None of the hyperlinks to clauses on this page work.

In Table 60-2, the two references to "Table 60-5" and the two references to "Table 60-8" should all be hyperlinks but aren't.

etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Go through the entire draft and make cross-references to other points in the draft into hyperlinks. This is particularly important for any text that is to be put into the standard (as opposed to unchanged base text).

Make the hyperlinks that are there work. A common reason for these not to work is that in Format, Document, PDF setup, on the Links tab, the "Create Named Destinations for All Paragraphs" is not checked.

Add line numbers to page 15

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # **3**
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

There are multiple instances of "pk to pk" in Tables which does not comply with the convention in: http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG_tools/editorial/requirements/words.html "pk-pk (in tables and subscripts)"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "pk to pk" to "pk-pk" in:
Table 60-5
Table 60-8
Table 60-8c
Table 60-8e
Table 75-6
Table 75-11

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **1**   *SC* **1**   *P* **15**   *L* **1**   # **4**
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

The references to 802.3 in 1.4.26, 1.4.42 and 1.4.43 are all in the form of a NOTE. This is different from the format used for almost all of the other 417 definitions in 1.4. Where thy contain a reference to IEEE Std 802.3, nearly all other definitions use the format "(See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause xx)" rather than a note.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the notes in 1.4.26, 1.4.42 and 1.4.43 to be the same format as all of the other definitions and use "(See IEEE Std 802.3, Table 56–1, ...)"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **1**
SC **1**

Page 1 of 7
19-03-2013 10:40:46

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4.27**   *P* **15**   *L* **11**   # 5

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

The definition in 1.4.27 is deleted by this draft. This will have the effect of changing the heading number of all subsequent definitions by one.
This means that all subsequent Amendments to 802.3-2012 must subtract one from the definition numbers of any definition above 1.4.26 that they need to change or insert. It also means that 1.4.42 and 1.4.43 shown below 1.4.27 on page 15 should be numbered 1.4.41 and 1.4.42

SuggestedRemedy

Either change the definition in 1.4.27 rather than deleting it,
or,
split the editing instruction into two halves, the first where it currently is:
"Change the text of 1.4.26 and delete 1.4.27, as follows:"
and the other after 1.4.27:
"Change 1.4.41 and 1.4.42 (renumbered from 1.4.42 and 1.4.43, respectively, by the deletion of 1.4.27) as follows:"
and re-number 1.4.42 and 1.4.43 to be 1.4.41 and 1.4.42

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Split the editing instruction into two halves, the first where it currently is:
"Change the text of 1.4.26 and delete 1.4.27, as follows:"
and the other after 1.4.27:
"Change 1.4.41 and 1.4.42 (renumbered from 1.4.42 and 1.4.43, respectively, by the deletion of 1.4.27) as follows:"
and re-number 1.4.42 and 1.4.43 to be 1.4.41 and 1.4.42

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.5.1.1.2**   *P* **18**   *L* **15**   # 20

Glen Kramer   Broadcom Corp.

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

1000BASE-PX10-D or 1000BASE-PX10D? We use both notations, with and without last hyphen, throughout the draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Use 1000BASE-PX10D consistently throughout the draft. Apply the same change to all other power budgets (PR, PRX, 20, 30, 40)

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

On p. 18, l. 15 to l. 29,

Change:
"1000BASE-PX10D" to "1000BASE-PX10-D",
"1000BASE-PX10U" to "1000BASE-PX10-U",
"1000BASE-PX20D" to "1000BASE-PX20-D",
"1000BASE-PX20U" to "1000BASE-PX20-U",
"1000BASE-PX30D" to "1000BASE-PX30-D",
"1000BASE-PX30U" to "1000BASE-PX30-U",
"1000BASE-PX40D" to "1000BASE-PX40-D",
"1000BASE-PX40U" to "1000BASE-PX40-U".

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.5.1.1.2**   *P* **18**   *L* **16**   # 21

Glen Kramer   Broadcom Corp.

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

Awkward text "...and the split of at least 1:16 split"

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the second occurrence of "split" (in 8 places)

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #6 for resolution

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: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **30**
SC **30.5.1.1.2**

Page 2 of 7
19-03-2013 10:40:47

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.5.1.1.2**   *P* **18**   *L* **16**   # 6

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

Eight instances of ", supporting the distance of at least xx km, and the split of at least 1:yy split" have been added. These additions do not need to contain the word "split" twice each, "a distance" reads better than "the distance", and "a split" reads better than "the split".

SuggestedRemedy

In all 8 instances delete the second "split" and change "the" to "a" twice.
So for 1000BASE-PX10D, the added text becomes: ", supporting a distance of at least 10 km, and a split of at least 1:16"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **60**   *SC* **60**   *P* **29**   *L* **1**   # 7

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

The changes to the title of Clause 60 are not shown correctly:
After "1000BASE-PX10" there is a comma and a space shown in both underline and strikethrough font. In front of "(long" there is an underlined space

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the comma after "1000BASE-PX10" - it was not there in the base document.
Remove the underline from the space before the "and" in strikethrough font.
Remove the underline from the space in front of "(long"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **60**   *SC* **60.1**   *P* **29**   *L* **16**   # 22

Glen Kramer   Broadcom Corp.

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

"The 1000BASE-PX10 PMD sublayers provide the a reach of at least 10 km whereas the 1000BASE-PX20, 1000BASE-PX30, and 1000BASE-PX40 PMD sublayers provide the reach of at least 20 km. The 1000BASE-PX10 and 1000BASE-PX20 PMD sublayers provide a typical split ratio of 1:16. The 1000BASE-PX30 PMD sublayers provide a typical split ratio of 1:32. The 1000BASE-PX40 PMD sublayers provide a typical split ratio of 1:64."

The reach and the split are provided by the fiber plant, not by the PMD sublayers. PMD sublayers support a given reach and a given split.

SuggestedRemedy

SuggestedRemedy: Use "support" instead of "provide"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **60**   *SC* **60.1**   *P* **30**   *L* **13**   # 19

Hajduczenia, Marek   ZTE Corporation

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

Footnotes in tables are removed, added or modified in this ammendment. The footnote hooks in tables are not always marked coorectly. For example, In Table 60-1, hook for footnote a (in Transmit direction) was inserted, and should be shown in underline. The underline is shown very low under the character.
In Table 60–5, foonotes a) and b), are removed, and hooks should be marked in strikethrough. They look more like underlined right now. Similar issue exists in Table 60–8 (footnotes a) and b)).
In Table 60–8a, hook for footnote c) should be marked in underline.

SuggestedRemedy

In the referenced locations, select the indicated footnote hook (letter) and then make sure that in the Character Designer (CTRL + D), the option of Superscript is selected (marked). Once applied, the format of the footnote hook will be corrected.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **60**   Page 3 of 7
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **60.1**   19-03-2013 10:40:47
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **60**   *SC* **60.10.1**   *P* **45**   *L* **37**   # 13

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

The PICS introduction section has a reference to the clause title in it:
"The supplier of a protocol implementation that is claimed to conform to
Clause 60 , ...". The text here should match the clause title as modified by the draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"type 1000BASE-PX10 and, 1000BASE-PX20, 1000BASE-PX30, and 1000BASE-PX40
(long" (where " and" is in strikethrough font) to:
"type 1000BASE-PX10 and 1000BASE-PX20 (long" where "10 and 1000BASE-PX20" is in
strikethrough font to match the modified clause title.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **60**   *SC* **60.10.4.2**   *P* **47**   *L* **6**   # 14

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

Items PX10D1 through PX10D5 and items PX10U1 through PX10U5 have incorrect
subclause references.
Note, the incorrect Table references are the subject of another comment.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the subclause references to
PX10D1 should be 60.3.1
PX10D2 should be 60.3.1
PX10D3 should be 60.3.2
PX10D4 should be 60.3.2
PX10D5 should be 60.3.2

PX10U1 should be 60.3.1
PX10U2 should be 60.3.1
PX10U3 should be 60.3.2
PX10U4 should be 60.3.2
PX10U5 should be 60.3.2

All references should be links.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **60**   *SC* **60.3.1**   *P* **31**   *L* **38**   # 8

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

There are multiple instances of references to "Table 60-8" which should not point to Table
60-8 and have a hyperlink to a different table.

SuggestedRemedy

On page 31, line 38 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-3" and the hyperlink incorrectly
points to Table 60-8a
On page 31, line 39 "Table 60-8" (in strikethrough font) should be "Table 60-3" and the
hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On page 33, line 50 "Table 60-8" (in strikethrough font) should be "Table 60-6" and the
hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On Page 47, line 7, item PX10D1 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-3" and the hyperlink
incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On Page 47, line 9, item PX10D2 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-3" and the hyperlink
incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On Page 47, line 12, item PX10D3 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink
incorrectly points to Table 60-8c
On Page 47, line 14, item PX10D4" Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink
incorrectly points to Table 60-8c
On Page 47, line 18, item PX10D5 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink
incorrectly points to Table 60-8c
On Page 47, line 27, item PX10U1 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-3" and the hyperlink
incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On Page 47, line 29, item PX10U2 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-3" and the hyperlink
incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On Page 47, line 32, item PX10U3 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink
incorrectly points to Table 60-8c
On Page 47, line 34, item PX10U4 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink
incorrectly points to Table 60-8c
On Page 47, line 38, item PX10U5 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink
incorrectly points to Table 60-8c

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **60**   Page 4 of 7
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **60.3.1**   19-03-2013 10:40:47
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **60**   *SC* **60.4**   *P* **33**   *L* **47**   # 1

Randy Rannow   APIC Corporation

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

In section 60.4, tables show two columns with specifications for receivers and transmitters. Rather than using different wording as I described below, I suggest the same for each

SuggestedRemedy

Is:
The 1000BASE-PX10-D and 1000BASE-PX10-U receiver shall meet shall meet the specifications ...
The 1000BASE-PX30-D and 1000BASE-PX30-U transmitter's specifications described in ...

Recommendation:
The 1000BASE-PX10-D and 1000BASE-PX10-U receivers (transmitters) shall meet shall meet the specifications ... described in Table xx
The same proposed solution applies to 60.4a.1 Transmitter optical specifications; 60.4a.2 Receiver optical specifications; 60.4b.1 Transmitter optical specifications; 60.4b.2 Receiver optical specifications

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Current text looks appropriate since the requirements for the transmitter and the receiver are different, and some more text is needed for the receiver specification with several exceptions. Therefore, they should not necessariliy look the same.

Cl **60**   *SC* **60.4a.1**   *P* **36**   *L* **29**   # 11

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

Table 60-8a, footnote a is "The nominal device type is not intended to be a requirement on the source type, and any device meeting the transmitter characteristics specified may be substituted for the nominal device type."

But the table does not have a "Device type", it has a "Nominal transmitter type"

SuggestedRemedy

Match the name in the table with the name in the footnote by changing the footnote to: "The nominal transmitter type is not intended to be a requirement on the source type, and any device meeting the transmitter characteristics specified may be substituted for the nominal transmitter type."

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Same change applies to Table 60-3 and Table 60-6.

Cl **60**   *SC* **60.4a.1**   *P* **36**   *L* **8**   # 9

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

Table 60-8a is a new table, so it should not have any underline or strikethrough font in it.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all text in underline to normal font and delete the text in strikethrough font.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **60**   Page 5 of 7
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **60.4a.1**   19-03-2013 10:40:47
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **60** *SC* **60.4a.1** *P* **36** *L* **8** # 10
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

In Table 60-8a, the SMSR and RMS spectral width specs are applied to both 1000BASE-PX30-D and 1000BASE-PX30-U.

But footnote c is applied only to the SMSR row - it should be applied to the RMS spectral width row too.

Footnote c only discusses the 1000BASE-PX30-U PMD - what about the 1000BASE-PX30-D PMD? as currently written both specs (SMSR and RMS spectral width) apply.

The RMS spectral width for both Tx types refers to Table 60-8b - but the table only defines 1000BASE-PX30-U transmitter spectral limits.

The text below Table 60-8a points to Table 60-8b for 1000BASE-PX30 (therefore both Tx types) but then only points to 1000BASE-PX30-U being shown in Figure 60-4a.

Since Table 60-8a has the RMS spectral width requirement for both Tx types in Table 60-8b, why does Figure 60-4a only show the curve for 1000BASE-PX30-U?

SuggestedRemedy

Either change the requirements for SMSR and RMS spectral width in Table 60-8a to be different from that currently shown, or:

Apply note c to "RMS spectral width (max)" as well as SMSR.
Change note c from:
"If 1000BASE-PX30-U PMD employs a DFB laser, ..." to:
"If the transmitter employs a DFB laser, ..."
Change the titles of Table 60-8b and Figure 60-4a to:
"1000BASE-PX30-D and 1000BASE-PX30-U transmitter spectral limits"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **60** *SC* **60-5** *P* **41** *L* **16** # 12
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

In Table 60-9, four new columns have been added with underline font. For three of the numbers, however, there is a trailing ".0" shown in both strikethrough and underline font. As these numbers are newly introduced, ".0" should not be shown at all.

SuggestedRemedy

delete the three instances of ".0" shown in both strikethrough and underline font.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **75** *SC* **75.5.1** *P* **61** *L* **40** # 15
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Table 75-9 is being replaced by the table shown. For a Replace editing instruction the replacement table should be in normal font not underline

SuggestedRemedy

Show the replacement Table 75-9 in normal font.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **75** *SC* **75.5.2** *P* **63** *L* **30** # 16
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

As Table 75-10 has been deleted, what was Table 75-11 in the base standard has now been re-numbered to be Table 75-10 (not Table 75-11 as shown)

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing instruction to:
"Change Table 75-10 (renumbered from Table 75-11 by the deletion of Table 75-10 above) as follows:"
and change the number of the changed table to Table 75-10

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **75**
SC **75.5.2**

Page 6 of 7
19-03-2013 10:40:47

Cl **75B**   *SC* **75B.2.2**   *P* **83**   *L* **12**   # 17

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

The first paragraph of 75B.2.2 contains five instances of wavelength ranges that are not in accordance with the IEEE style manual which includes:
"Ranges should repeat the unit (e.g., 115 V to 125 V). Dashes should never be used because they can be misconstrued as subtraction signs."

SuggestedRemedy

Change "1260–1360 nm" to "1260 nm to 1360 nm"
Change "1290–1330 nm" to "1290 nm to 1330 nm"
Change "1260–1280 nm" to "1260 nm to 1280 nm"
Change "1260–1360 nm" to "1260 nm to 1360 nm"
Change "1260–1280 nm" to "1260 nm to 1280 nm"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **75C**   *SC* **75C.1**   *P* **85**   *L* **29**   # 18

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

Comment #16 against D2.0 of P802.3bk (AIP) removed the trailing zeros from two instances of "0.20" in Table 75C-1, but this has not been implemented.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove trailing zeros from:
Table 75C-1 (0.20, 0.20)

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **75C**   Page 7 of 7
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **75C.1**   19-03-2013 10:40:47
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line