Cl **128** *SC* **7.1.6** *P* **109** *L* **41** # 1

McDermott, Thomas Fujitsu

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

The cluase deals with common mode output return loss, but references differential output retun loss in line 41, and the titel of figure 128-5 on page 110.

SuggestedRemedy

On page 109 line 41 - change 'differential mode' to 'common mode'.
Page 110 line 23 - change 'differenital mode' to 'common mode' in the figure title.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.6.1.1.5** *P* **30** *L* **38** # 2

Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

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

Editing instruction: suggest changing "in after" to "after".
Same for line 45

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.3** *P* **82** *L* **9** # 3

Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

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

Line 9: the "D" goto box is colliding with the text below it. Provide more separation.
Line 10: There is a dashed box colliding with the text "assert_lpidle * TX_OSET.indicate". Can you fix so that the lines do not overwrite the text? Also, should be consistent with the "D" transition next to it, both have dashed boxes or both do not.
Line 53: "NOTE—Transitions B and C are only required for the EEE capability." is colliding with the figure caption. Need more visual separation.
Line 5: align bottom of arrows, move right most arrow a little more right.
Line 15: arrow is entering state box, should just be touching.
Line 42: why is there a dashed box around the "B" entry state machine, but not a similar box around the "D" entry state machine? Make box use consistent.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.4** *P* **87** *L* **44** # 4

Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

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

Un-needed arrow head, remove.
For consideration: some of the state boxes look like unaligned separate lines, rather than a graphic box. Suggestion: make the corners look better aligned regardless of how drawn. Note this could be a FM -> PDF issue.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.4** *P* **88** *L* **7** # 5

Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

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

Many of the line "corners" are not graphically aligned in this figure that should be aligned better. Also, seeing lines running into state boxes that should be "move behind" or similar to neaten things up.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.10.4.1** *P* **115** *L* **53** # 6

Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

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

There are three occurences in this PICS section where the bottom horizontal line of a table is missing. The line needs to be there so we know that text hasn't fallen off the page also. Adjust whatever FM issue is causing this (never seen it before so can't recommend.)

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.10.4.2** *P* **150** *L* **53** # 7
Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

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

The bottom horizontal line of the table is missing. It needs to be there.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2.3** *P* **170** *L* **11** # 8
Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

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

The alignment of box corners, lines, and arrows could be improved. Arrow heads in the same diagram should most often be the same size. In many figures, text is uncomfortably close to lines, boxes, and the figure caption. Generally, I like to be specific for page and line, but after getting through the entire doc some over all neatening might be nice (yes, I know it might be considered time consuming....)

SuggestedRemedy

Suggested, as per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2.2** *P* **168** *L* **30** # 9
Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

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

What is "Termination", e.g., definition, requirements, etc.? Searching the draft, can only find this word in this and similar Cl 128A figures. So, what is the proper termination for the calibration and test setups?

SuggestedRemedy

Define termination as used in this draft.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
[Editor's note: need to define 'termination', and where the definition is to be placed]

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.2** *P* **204** *L* **10** # 10
Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

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

Line 10 and 25. Text is running into lines. Maintain slightly larger visual separation to avoid collision.

Almost same for Figure 130A–5 on Page 205.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.2.2** *P* **209** *L* **53** # 11
Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

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

Orphan subtitle. Keep with next few lines.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.2.2** *P* **211** *L* **13** # 12
Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

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

Right side of box is missing. Fix.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.4** *P* **214** *L* **10** # 13
Laubach, Mark Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Adjust column size to avoid breaking "s" of "Units" onto separate line.

SuggestedRemedy
As per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4.74aa** *P* **26** *L* **25** # 14
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
"IEEE Std 802.3bs™-201x" is not marked as Amendment 8

SuggestedRemedy
Add "Amendment 8—" ahead of "This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2015 and adds Clause 116 through Clause 124" statement

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.7a** *P* **35** *L* **15** # 15
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Rows in Table 45–124a modified (added) by this project are not marked in underline

SuggestedRemedy
Mark rows for bits 3.9.3 and 3.9.2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.7a.a** *P* **35** *L* **34** # 16
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
No editorial instructions for 45.2.3.7a.a and 45.2.3.7a.b

SuggestedRemedy
Insert editorial instructions before 45.2.3.7a.a

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
[Editor's note: please specify the editorial instructions]

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.9a** *P* **36** *L* **7** # 17
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Rows in Table 45–125a modified (added) by this project are not marked in underline

SuggestedRemedy
Mark rows for bits 3.21.8, 3.21.7, and 3.21.6:3 - they are being added

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.14.3** *P* **37** *L* **43** # 18
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Please make sure that "/" is not used for hyphenation

SuggestedRemedy
Alternatively, place a forced line break ahead of: "5/10/25/40/100GBASE-R" to make sure that designators are not broken across lines

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.7.12** *P* **38** *L* **38** # 19
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

Rows in Table 45–209 modified (added) by this project are not marked in underline

SuggestedRemedy

Mark rows for bits 7.48.15 and 7.48.14
Similar changed in Table 45–211aa and Table 45–211ab

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127B** *SC* **127B** *P* **158** *L* **30** # 20
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

The use of keywords such us "will" is clearly delineated in the Style Manual, see 10.2.2 Shall, should, may, and can

SuggestedRemedy

Please review the use of keywords such as MUST WILL and CAN in the draft and replace all of them with statements in Present Simple tense apart from usages where Style Manual is followed clearly.
In this particualr location, change "at the end of packet will be correctly converted as idles" to "at the end of packet are correctly converted as idles"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: please supply a list of specific substitutions.]

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.1** *P* **164** *L* **1** # 21
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

Table 128A-1 uses "max." and "max" - which is it supposed to be?

SuggestedRemedy

Please use "max." consistently. The same goes for "min."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2** *P* **167** *L* **24** # 22
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

no need to break the line in "See Equation (128A-2)" statement - extend the size of Value column and shrink the Parameter column to compensate. Also, extend the size of Units column to make sure "s" is not forced into line 2.
Also, add "-" in Units column where no units are present / needed

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment- there are multiple tables in the draft that need the associated change.
Please make sure all tables have "-" in Units column where no units are needed / defined.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.3** *P* **171** *L* **8** # 23
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

Is "per lane (range)" really intended to be crossed out?

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the cross-out
Similar issue on page 206, line 8

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: comment #63 and others recommends crossing out 'per lane' and keeping '(range)'. Which is preferred ?]

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.4.2.2** *P* **175** *L* **42** # 24
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

I do not think 802.3cb will be published in 2016.

SuggestedRemedy

Please change all references to "802.3cb-2016" to "802.3cb-201x"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.4.4** *P* **176** *L* **16** # 25
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

We do not use "E" based description for BER very often

SuggestedRemedy

Change "BER < 10E-12" to proper format as seen in 128A.1.1
Same for HI4, HI6, DI4, DI6
more of "E" based BER values in Table 128C–1
There are more instances in text and in PICS that need to be replaced.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128B** *SC* **128B.4.4.2** *P* **183** *L* **44** # 26
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

We do have a special symbol for ">=" please see the front matter and table of symbols

SuggestedRemedy

Please replace all instances of ">=" with appropriate symbol. The same goes for "<="
See IG3 for proper symbols

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128C** *SC* **128C.3** *P* **185** *L* **50** # 27
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

Missing space in "100 □± 10%." - make sure "±" symbol has always spaces around it

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128D** *SC* **128D.1.2** *P* **193** *L* **50** # 28
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

text in lines 50-54 is shown in italics, but it is not part of the equation.

SuggestedRemedy

Please apply proper text tyle
Simialr problem on page 196, lines 50-52; page 202, line 54

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128D** *SC* **128D.2.3** *P* **196** *L* **31** # 29
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

Tables are usually centered

SuggestedRemedy

Please center Table 128D-1

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **1** # 30
Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

Subclause reference column is empty

SuggestedRemedy

Please insert references in Subclause reference column

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: please supply references]

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1.1** *P* **206** *L* **37** # 31

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

Odd dash over "93" in 192.93 ps statement

SuggestedRemedy

Make sure dash is removed

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4.74aa** *P* **26** *L* **21** # 32

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The first two editing instructions in 1.4 do not conform to the usual style.
There is no need to say "in alphanumerical order" as the position is explicit.
There is no need to say "and renumber" as re-numbering is not required for the amendment.
The list of definitions is incorrect.
"5GSEI" should be after "5GBASE-T".

SuggestedRemedy

Change the first editing instruction to: "Insert the new definition for 2.5GBASE-KX, before 1.4.74a 2.5GBASE-T (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) as follows:"
Change the second editing instruction to: "Insert the five new definitions for 2.5GBASE-X, 2.5GPII, 2.5GSEI, 5GBASE-KR, and 5GBASE-R, after 1.4.74a 2.5GBASE-T (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) as follows:"
Add a new editing instruction before the definition for "5GSEI": "Insert the new definition for 5GSEI after 1.4.74b 5GBASE-T (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) as follows:"
Re-number "5GSEI" to be 1.4.74c

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **26** *L* **35** # 33

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Cross references to other parts of the 802.3 standard are not prefaced by "Clause", "subclause" or "Annex" unless they are to the first level heading.
Cross references to items in the P802.3cb draft should be live hyperlinks.
Cross references to other parts of the 802.3 standard that are not in the P802.3cb draft should be text with the character tag "External" applied.

SuggestedRemedy

Scrub the entire draft according to the principles outlined in the comment.
This means making at least the following changes:
Page 26 line 35, "Clause 127.2.4.1" should be "127.2.4.1" (Xref format "Section")
Page 34 line 7, "70.6.4" should be text with the character tag "External" applied
Page 34 line 37, "45.2.3.1" should be a hyperlink
Page 34 lines 38 to 41, "49.2", 55.3.6.3", "113.3.7.3", "126.3.7.3" should all be text with the character tag "External" applied
Page 53 lines 17, 18, and 19 "Clause 49", "Clause 49", and "Clause 82" should all be text with the character tag "External" applied
Page 57 line 10, "128A" and "130A" should be hyperlinks
Page 63 line 24 "Clause 36" should be text with the character tag "External" applied
Page 63 line 45, "clause 35" should be "Clause 35" and text with the character tag "External" applied
Page 66 line 28, "Clause 127.2.4.2" should be "127.2.4.2"
Page 69 line 30, "Clause 127.2.4.2" should be "127.2.4.2"
Page 78 line 14, "Clause 127.2.4.2" should be "127.2.4.2"
Page 125 line 20, "Clause 51.2" should be "51.2"
Page 125 line 47, "Clause 51.8" should be "51.8"
Page 126 line 14, "51.9" should be text with the character tag "External" applied
Page 128 line 11 "Clause 49" should be text with the character tag "External" applied
Page 135 line 48 "subclause 130.6.5" should be "130.6.5" and a cross-reference
Page 136 lines 21, 32 to 35, and 53, "Annex 31B", "Clause 45", "Table 130-2", "Table 130-3", and "Figure 130-1" should all be cross-references
Page 137 line 42, "Clause 78" should be a cross-reference
Page 140 lines 5, 22, and 23, "Table 130-4", "Equation (130-4)", and "Equation (130-5)" should all be cross-references
Page 143 lines 29, and 30, "Equation (130-5)", and "Equation (130-6)" should both be cross-references
Page 147 line 47, "130.7.2.1" should be a cross-reference
Page 149 lines 2 and 36, "Clause 130" should be a cross-reference in both places
Page 149 line 44, "Clause 21" should be text with the character tag "External" applied
Page 171 line 50, "92.8.3.7" should be text with the character tag "External" applied
Page 223 line 14, "Annex 128C.4.2" should be "128C.4.2"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.3.2.1.2** *P* **29** *L* **19** # 34

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The editing instructions in 30.3.2.1.2 and 30.3.2.1.3 need to state that the 2.5GBASE-T or 5GBASE-T entries were inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz.
Also, incorrect subclause number in the second editing instruction in 30.3.2.1.3

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing instructions in 30.3.2.1.2 to:
"Insert the following new entry in "APPROPRIATE SYNTAX" in 30.3.2.1.2 after the entry for 2.5GBASE-T (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x)".
"Insert the following new entry in "APPROPRIATE SYNTAX" in 30.3.2.1.2 after the entry for 5GBASE-T (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x)".
Change the editing instructions in 30.3.2.1.3 to:
"Insert the following new entry in "APPROPRIATE SYNTAX" in 30.3.2.1.3 after the entry for 2.5GBASE-T (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x)".
"Insert the following new entry in "APPROPRIATE SYNTAX" in 30.3.2.1.3 after the entry for 5GBASE-T (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x)".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.5.1.1.2** *P* **30** *L* **10** # 35

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The entry for 2.5GBASE-T was not modified by .3bz, it was inserted by .3bz.
The 5G entries should be placed below "5GBASE-T"

SuggestedRemedy

In the two editing instructions, change "as modified by" to "as inserted by".
In the second editing instruction, change "2.5GBASE-T" to "5GBASE-T"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.6.1.1.5** *P* **30** *L* **38** # 36

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The entries for 2.5GBASE-T and 5GBASE-T were not modified by .3bz, they were inserted by .3bz.
"in after the entry" doesn't make sense.

SuggestedRemedy

In the two editing instructions:
change "in after the" to "after the".
change "as modified by" to "as inserted by".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1** *P* **31** *L* **16** # 37

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

There are two register name changes

SuggestedRemedy

In the editing instruction change: "name of the register" to "names of the registers"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.1.5** *P* **31** *L* **31** # 38

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Editing instructions should be specific as to the location of the modification and should not try to capture the change in the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing instruction to: "Change the second sentence of 45.2.1.1.5 as follows:"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.6** *P* **31** *L* **48** # 39
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Most other entries in this table end "PMA/PMD", e.g. "10GBASE-KR PMA/PMD"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "5GBASE-KR" to "5GBASE-KR PMA/PMD"
Change "2.5GBASE-KX" to "2.5GBASE-KX PMA/PMD"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.7.4** *P* **32** *L* **6** # 40
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Reference to 802.3bz is garbled in 45.2.1.7.4, 45.2.1.7.5, and 45.2.1.8

SuggestedRemedy

In the editing instructions in 45.2.1.7.4, 45.2.1.7.5, and 45.2.1.8 change:
"IEEE802.3-201x Std 802.3bz" to:
"IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.14c** *P* **32** *L* **50** # 41
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The editing instruction needs to state where Table 45-17c can be found.
Given the underlining of the new rows in the table (which are only appropriate for a "change" editing instruction) it is simplest to make the editing instruction a simple "change".

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing instruction to: "Change the row for 1.21.15:2 in Table 45-17c (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) as follows (unchanged rows not shown):

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.14c.a** *P* **33** *L* **12** # 42
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

"Std" and a space missing in the editing instruction.

SuggestedRemedy

change "by IEEE 802.3bz-201x)as" to "by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) as"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.88** *P* **33** *L* **32** # 43
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

"." missing from the end of the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.7a.a** *P* **35** *L* **34** # 44
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

There is no editing instruction for 45.2.3.7a.a or 45.2.3.7a.b.
For the moment, assume that P802.3bs is ahead of P802.3cb as per the editing instruction on page 34, line 52. If P802.3cb moves ahead of P802.3bs, this will need to change.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the editing instruction: "Insert 45.2.3.7a.a and 45.2.3.7a.b before 45.2.3.7a.1 (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bs-201x) as follows:"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.9a** *P* **36** *L* **3** # 45

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

The draft is inconsistent as to what is assumed concerning the order of approval of the P802.3bs and P802.3cb drafts.
In 45.2.3.7a it is assumed that the P802.3bs draft is first, here the changes due to P802.3bs are not shown.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the draft consistent as to whether P802.3bs is assumed to be before P802.3bs or after.
If it is assumed that P802.3bs is approved first, take account of the changes to Table 45-125a being made by the P802.3bs draft.
Also there is a space missing in "3.21.6:3in".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.7.2.1** *P* **38** *L* **28** # 46

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

"more than one of 1000BASE-KX, or 2.5GBASE-KX, or 10GBASE-KX4 PMAs" doesn't need two "or"s

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the first of the two "or"s

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.5** *P* **41** *L* **2** # 47

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The heading for 45.5 should include a copyright release footnote.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the footnote

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
[Editor's note: please supply the appropriate footnote text.]

Cl **45** *SC* **45.5.3.1** *P* **41** *L* **28** # 48

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

In item MM124, Status "2.5GKX:M 5GKX:M KX:M KX4:M KR:M", "5GKX:M" should be "5GKR:M"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "5GKX:M" to "5GKR:M"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.5.3.6** *P* **41** *L* **35** # 49

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

There are no editing instruction for items "*2.5GX" or "*5GR"

SuggestedRemedy

Add an editing instruction for items "*2.5GX" and "*5GR"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[Editor's note: add "Change the following PCS row by adding 2.5GX and 5GX as shown below (unchanged rows not shown):"

Cl **69** *SC* **69.1.1** *P* **43** *L* **16** # 50

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Space missing in "2.5Gb/s" and comma missing in base text after "25 Gb/s" on line 17

SuggestedRemedy

change to "2.5 Gb/s" and add comma after "25 Gb/s" on line 17

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **73** *SC* **73.3** *P* **47** *L* **46** # 51

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Since underline is used to show the changes, this has to be a "change" editing instruction.
Same issue for the second editing instruction in 73.6.4.
IEEE Std 802.3by-2016 is now published.
In the last editing instruction for 73.6.4, "paragraphs" should be "paragraph"

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing instruction for 73.3 to: "Change the third paragraph of 73.3 (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3by-2016) as follows:"
Change the second editing instruction for 73.6.4 to: "Change the third paragraph of 73.6.4 (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3by-2016) as follows:"
In the last editing instruction for 73.6.4, change "paragraphs" to "paragraph"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **73** *SC* **73.7.4.1** *P* **49** *L* **52** # 52

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Since underline is used to show the changes, this has to be a "change" editing instruction.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing instruction to: "Change 73.7.4.1 as follows:"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **73** *SC* **73.10.1** *P* **49** *L* **44** # 53

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Since the editing instruction says "Change the list of variables" the entire list has to be shown as per IEEE Std 802.3by-2016.

SuggestedRemedy

Either show the entire list or change this to an "insert" editing instruction (which does not use the underline font to show the insertion) and remove the other rows.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **78** *SC* **78.1.1** *P* **53** *L* **19** # 54

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The base text says "Additionally these PCS types generate the RX_LPI_ACTIVE signal …" Where "these PCS types" are the Clause 49 PCS, Clause 107 PCS, and Clause 82 PCS. Now the text has been changed to make the types specific, the Clause 107 PCS is missing from the list.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the Clause 107 PCS to the list.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **125** *SC* **125** *P* **55** *L* **8** # 55

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Clause 125 is not in IEEE Std 802.3-2015, so the reader needs some help to find it in the 9 amendments that precede 802.3cb.
However, there are 9 editing instructions in Clause 125 and it is cumbersome to add "(as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3by-2016)" to all of them.
This problem was encountered by the IEEE Std 802.3bm-2015 amendment of Clause 91 and the solution adopted during publication was to add: "Note that Clause 91 was introduced by IEEE Std 802.3bj-2014." before the first heading for Clause 91.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Note that Clause 125 was introduced by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x." above the Clause 125 heading.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **125** *SC* **125.2.2** *P* **57** *L* **33** # 56

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The editing instructions in 125.2.2 and 125.2.3 do not conform to the usual style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing instruction for 125.2.2 to: "Insert the following paragraph at the end of 125.2.2:"
Change the editing instruction for 125.2.3 to: "Insert the following paragraph at the end of 125.2.3:"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **125** *SC* **125.3** *P* **58** *L* **10** # 57

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The editing instruction does not match the changes made to the table (and it should not try to describe the changes in detail).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Change Table 125-3 as follows:"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127** *P* **59** *L* **1** # 58

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

There is no editing instruction for Clauses 127 to 130

SuggestedRemedy

Add a new editing instruction above the heading foe Clause 127: "Insert new Clauses 127 to 130 and corresponding new Annexes 127A to 130B as follows:"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.7** *P* **95** *L* **39** # 59

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The publication date for P802.3cb is unknown.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "2016" to "201x" in two places each in 127.7.3.2, 128.10.2.2, 129.7.2.2, 128A.4.2.2, 128B.4.2.2, 128D.3.2.2, 130A.4.2.2, 130B.4.2.2.
This should be done by changing the variable "PICS_year" in each file in the book.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31B** *SC* **31B.3.7** *P* **155** *L* **35** # 60

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Editing instructions need improvement

SuggestedRemedy

Change the first editing instruction to: "Change the fifth and sixth paragraphs of 31B.3.7 (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) as follows:"
Change the second editing instruction to: "Insert a new paragraph in 31B.3.7 immediately after the paragraph starting “2.5 Gb/s (using 2.5GBASE-T) ” (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) as follows:"
Change the third editing instruction to: "Insert a new paragraph in 31B.3.7 immediately after the paragraph starting “5 Gb/s (using 5GBASE-T) ” (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) as follows:"
Remove the underline from "5 Gb/s (not using 5GBASE-T) - max_overrun = 768+ frame_length" since the insert editing instruction does not use underline.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31B** *SC* **31B.4.3** *P* **156** *L* **7** # 61

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Inserting the two new rows as items *MIIcc and *MIIcd will result in the table no longer being in speed order as it is currently and also not showing the BASE-T variants after the others as currently.
Similarly for 31B.4.6

SuggestedRemedy

Change editing instruction in 31B.4.3 to: "Insert a new row for *MIIcaa before the row for *MIIca (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) and a new row for *MIIca1 before the row for *MIIcb (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) in the table in 31B.4.3 as follows (unchanged rows not shown):"
Renumber items accordingly.
Change editing instruction in 31B.4.6 to: "Insert a new row for TIM4aa before the row for TIM4a (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) and a new row for TIM4a1 before the row for TIM4b (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-201x) in the table in 31B.4.6 as follows (unchanged rows not shown):"
Renumber items accordingly.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31B** *SC* **31B.4.3** *P* **156** *L* **13** # 62

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Item TIM4c has "with PHY type other than 2.5GBASE-T" but item *MIIcc has "with PHY types of 2.5GBASE-KX".
These should be consistent with each other. The former seems preferable as a list of all other PHY types may become lengthy.

SuggestedRemedy

Change *MIIcc to "At operating speeds of 2.5 Gb/s with PHY types other than 2.5GBASE-T"
Change *MIIcd to "At operating speeds of 5 Gb/s with PHY types other than 5GBASE-T"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.3** *P* **171** *L* **8** # 63

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

"per lane (range)" is shown in strikethrough font which is inappropriate for a new annex.
Since this parameter is indeed a range (not a min or max value), "(range)" seems correct.

SuggestedRemedy

replace "per lane (range)" with "(range)" in normal font.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: duplicate of #23]

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.4.2.2** *P* **175** *L* **36** # 64

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

"Annex title" should be replaced by the annex title!

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Annex title" with "2.5Gb/s Storage Enclosure Interface (2.5GSEI)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.4.4** *P* **176** *L* **16** # 65

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The abbreviation "BER" stands for "bit error ratio", not "bit error rate"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Bit Error Rate" to "Bit error ratio" in 128A.4.4 and 130A.4.4

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.4.4** *P* **176** *L* **16** # 66

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

"10E-12" is equivalent to 1E-11 and also not in the format used in 802.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "10-12" where "-12" is a superscript.
Make the same change in 128A.4.4.2 (2 places), 128A.4.4.4 (2 places), 130A.4.4, 130A.4.4.2 (2 places), 130A.4.4.4 (2 places)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.4.4.2** *P* **177** *L* **4** # 67

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG_tools/editorial/requirements/words.html says that "The symbol 'bps' is not used, instead 'b/s' is used"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Gbps" to "Gb/s" in 128A.4.4.2 (2 places), 128A.4.4.4 (2 places), 130A.4.4.2 (2 places), 130A.4.4.4 (2 places)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** SC **130A.4.4.3** P **220** L **19** # 68
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The IEEE style manual says "A multiplication sign (×), not the letter “x”" should be used for a multiply sign.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the "x" with a multiply sign (Ctrl-q 0).
Check the draft for other instances.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** SC **128A.4.2.1** P **175** L **21** # 69
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Comment i-52 against P802.3bx D3.0 changed all instances of “enquiries” to "inquiries" in the base standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Change “enquiries” to "inquiries" here, in 128B.4.2.1, 128D.4.2.1, and 130A.4.2.1

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** SC **130A** P **201** L **6** # 70
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

"5Gb/s" should be "5 Gb/s" (there is always a space between a number and its unit.)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "5Gb/s" to "5 Gb/s" here and on page 218 lines 2 and 36

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128C** SC **128C.4.1** P **186** L **27** # 71
Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

802.3 does not use the format 2E-5 etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "2E-5" to 2 x 10-5" where "x" is a multiply sign (Ctrl-q 0) and "-5" is a superscript.
Change the numbers in the next three rows in an equivalent way.
Scrub the draft for other instances of this.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P **8** L **16** # 72
Gardner, Andrew Linear Technology

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

Name for Task Force Editor-in-Chief is "FirstName SecondName."

SuggestedRemedy

Insert correct name for Task Force Editor-in-Chief

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[Editor's note: Daniel F. Smith added as editor in chief]

Cl **128A** SC **128A.3.1** P **164** L **17** # 73
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

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

The return loss value is pointing to both an insertion loss and return loss equation.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the value to "See Equation (128A-2)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.1** *P* **164** *L* **7** # 74
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Units column is not wide enough for the title Units, so the "s" is on a second line.

SuggestedRemedy
Widen Units column so the whole word fits into one line.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2** *P* **167** *L* **17** # 75
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The second sentence is inconsistent with the other input characteristics sections.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the second sentence: "The test transmitter then transmits any valid PCS output (such as scrambled idle)."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2** *P* **167** *L* **27** # 76
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The interference tolerance Subclause reference is incorrect

SuggestedRemedy
Change 128A.3.2.1 to 128A.3.2.2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2** *P* **167** *L* **28** # 77
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The jitter tolerance Subclause reference is incorrect

SuggestedRemedy
Change 128A.3.2.1 to 128A.3.2.3

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2** *P* **167** *L* **23** # 78
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Units column is not wide enough for the title Units, so the "s" is on a second line.

SuggestedRemedy
Widen Units column so the whole word fits into one line.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2.2** *P* **167** *L* **40** # 79
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Figure 128A-9 reference is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy
Change 128A-9 to 128A-8.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2.3** *P* **168** *L* **52** # 80
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Figure 128A-10 reference is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy
Change 128A-10 to 128A-9.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.3** *P* **171** *L* **9** # 81
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Text is crossed out in the signaling rate parameter

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the "per lane (range)" text that is crossed out.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: duplicate of #23]

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.3** *P* **171** *L* **7** # 82
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Units column is not wide enough for the title Units, so the "s" is on a second line.

SuggestedRemedy
Widen Units column so the whole word fits into one line.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.3** *P* **171** *L* **28** # 83
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Signal-to-noise-and-distortion ratio (min) Subclause reference is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy
Change 128A.3.3.2 to 128A.3.3.3

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.3.2** *P* **171** *L* **43** # 84
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is an extra parenthesis around p(k)

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the extra parathesis. Change p(k)) to p(k).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.4** *P* **172** *L* **8** # 85
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Units column is not wide enough for the title Units, so the "s" is on a second line.

SuggestedRemedy
Widen Units column so the whole word fits into one line.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.4.3** *P* **173** *L* **35** # 86
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Figure 128A-10 reference is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy
Change 128A-10 to 128A-11.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.1** *P* **202** *L* **3** # 87
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Figure 130A-2 reference is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy
Change 130A-2 to 130A-3.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **9** # 88
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Text is crossed out in the signaling rate parameter

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the "per lane (range)" text that is crossed out.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: duplicate of #23.]

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **7** # 89
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Units column is not wide enough for the title Units, so the "s" is on a second line.

SuggestedRemedy
Widen Units column so the whole word fits into one line.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **9** # 90
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no subclause reference

SuggestedRemedy
Add 130A.3.1.1 to signaling rate Subclause reference

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **10** # 91
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no subclause reference

SuggestedRemedy
Add 130A.3.1.2 to DC CMV Subclause reference

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **12** # 92
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no subclause reference

SuggestedRemedy
Add 130A.3.1.2 to AC CMV Subclause reference

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **14** # 93
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no subclause reference

SuggestedRemedy
Add 130A.3.1.2 to pk-pk transmitter disabled Subclause reference

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **15** # 94
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no subclause reference

SuggestedRemedy
Add 130A.3.1.2 to pk-pk transmitter enabled Subclause reference

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **17** # 95
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no subclause reference

SuggestedRemedy
Add 130A.3.1.3 to return loss Subclause reference

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **20** # 96
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no subclause reference

SuggestedRemedy
Add 130A.3.1.4.2 to vf(max) Subclause reference

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **21** # 97
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no subclause reference

SuggestedRemedy
Add 130A.3.1.4.2 to vf(min) Subclause reference

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **21** # 98
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no subclause reference

SuggestedRemedy
Add 130A.3.1.4.2 linear fit pulse peak (min) Subclause reference

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **24** # 99
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no subclause reference

SuggestedRemedy
Add 130A.3.1.6 to all Jitter Subclause references

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **28** # 100
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no subclause reference

SuggestedRemedy
Add 130A.3.1.7 to txsndr Subclause reference

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **20** # 101
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The mV units are slightly off of the Values

SuggestedRemedy
Move the mV's down a bit

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1.4.2** *P* **209** *L* **1** # 102
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The is not a period after the 1st sentence.

SuggestedRemedy
Add a period after 130A.3.1.4.1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.2** *P* **209** *L* **40** # 103
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Units column is not wide enough for the title Units, so the "s" is on a second line.

SuggestedRemedy
Widen Units column so the whole word fits into one line.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.2.3** *P* **211** *L* **35** # 104
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The reference to Table 130A-10

SuggestedRemedy
Change Table 130A-10 to Figure 130A-10

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.3** *P* **213** *L* **30** # 105
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Subclause reference is incorrect

SuggestedRemedy
Change the txsndr reference to 130A.3.3.3

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.3** *P* **213** *L* **9** # 106
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Units column is not wide enough for the title Units, so the "s" is on a second line.

SuggestedRemedy
Widen Units column so the whole word fits into one line.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.3.2** *P* **213** *L* **46** # 107
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is an extra parenthesis around p(k)

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the extra parathesis. Change p(k)) to p(k).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.4** *P* **214** *L* **10** # 108
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The Units column is not wide enough for the title Units, so the "s" is on a second line.

SuggestedRemedy
Widen Units column so the whole word fits into one line.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128D** *SC* **128D** *P* **193** *L* **8** # 109
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Figure 128D-1 is mentioned twice.

SuggestedRemedy
Consider revising to "test fixtures illustrated in Figure 128D-1" or something similar.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
[Editor's note: please supply preferred text]

Cl **128D** *SC* **128D.2** *P* **194** *L* **49** # 110
Calbone, Anthony Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Title is incorrect

SuggestedRemedy
Change title to "Mated test fixtures"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127B** *SC* *P* **158** *L* **38** # 111
Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Typo: "1000BASEX PCS will interpret each /Q/ ordered_set as four /I/ ordered set." "set" should be plural not singular

SuggestedRemedy
Change to read: "1000BASEX PCS will interpret each /Q/ ordered_set as four /I/ ordered sets." i.e. change "set" to "sets"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127B** *SC* *P* **158** *L* **43** # 112
Larry, McMillan Western Digital

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
in the phrase "can detect false carrier, but these will be converted to receive error", "carrier" and "error" should be plural, not singular

SuggestedRemedy
Change to read: "can detect false carriers, but these will be converted to receive errors". i.e. change "carrier" to "carriers" and "error" to "errors"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127B** *SC* *P* **158** *L* **45** # 113

Larry, McMillan Western Digital

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

"It is permissible for a compliant 1000BASE-X PCS transmit process to truncated the first byte of preamble" is grammatically incorrect

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read: "It is permissible for a compliant 1000BASE-X PCS transmit process to truncate the first byte of a preamble" i.e. change "truncated" to "truncate" and add an "a" before "preamble"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.2** *P* **99** *L* **46** # 114

Bains, Amrik Cisco Systems

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

2.5GBASE-X uses 8B/10B 10 bit interface between PMA/PMD and not
"The PMD Service Interface supports the exchange of encoded and scrambled 64B/66B blocks between the
PMA and PMD entities."

SuggestedRemedy

The PMD Service Interface supports the exchange of encoded 8B/10B blocks between the PMA and PMD entities.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* *P* **101** *L* **42** # 115

Bains, Amrik Cisco Systems

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

1000BASE-KX shpuld be changes to 2.5GBAS-KXE

"The 1000BASE-KX PHY receiver should put unused functional blocks into a low power state to save energy."

SuggestedRemedy

Change Text to

The 2.5GBASE-KX PHY receiver should put unused functional blocks into a low power state to save energy.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127A** *SC* **127A** *P* **157** *L* **6** # 116

D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, Subsidiary

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

Annex127A consists of two sentences with a pointer to Annex36A. This does not help with ease of reading for the reader.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete Annex127A. Replace the last sentnece in second paragraph of 127.3.4. with - The patterns described in Annex 36A may be used
for 2.5GBASE-X except the nominal bit rate is 2.5 times faster and any references to the GMII applies to the XGMII."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **125** *SC* **125.1.4** *P* **57** *L* **23** # 117

D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, Subsidiary

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

Table 125-2 notes that autonegotiation is optional for 2.5GBASE-KX, however, in 73.3 it is stated that AN shall interact with PHYs. No note was found indicating that AN is optional to implement, but shall be implemented per Clause 73 if implemented.

SuggestedRemedy

Change entry in table for Row 2.5GBASE-KX to indicate that Clause 73 FEC is M

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128B** *SC* **128B** *P* **179** *L* **5** # 118

D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, Subsidiary

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

Annex 128B is primarily a duplication of Annex 69B. Such duplication should be avoided.

SuggestedRemedy

There are two options
1.delete annex 128B - modify annex 69B to add in specific requirements related to 2.5GBASE-KR
2. Delete redundant text in annex 128b, and replace in each instance with pointer to the original text in Annex 69B

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130B** *SC* **130B** *P* **221** *L* **5** # 119
D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, Subsidiary

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

Annex 130B is primarily a duplication of Annex 69B. Such duplication should be avoided.

SuggestedRemedy

There are two options
1.delete annex 130B - modify annex 69B to add in specific requirements related to 5GBASE-KR
2. Delete redundant text in annex 12830b, and replace in each instance with pointer to the original text in Annex 69B

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **FM** *SC* *P* **1** *L* **18** # 120
Maguire, Valerie Siemon

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

Extraneous "." at the end of the amendment title

SuggestedRemedy

Delete extraneous "."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.1.2** *P* **60** *L* **16** # 121
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

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

The left side of the PMD box is "off" in the figure - depending on magnification, it can appear that that box is narrower than the rest of the stack, or perhaps the line width at the left is narrower than that of the rest of the boxes in the stack

SuggestedRemedy

Adjust the width or the box or the line width to aligne the appearance with the rest of the stack

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **125** *SC* **125.1.3** *P* **55** *L* **47** # 122
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Unclear what the justification is for selecting different coding (10B or 66B) for 2.5G and 5G in this project. In the P802.3bz project, they are the same (66B equivalent, encoded as 65B omitting the redundant sync header bit since the alignment of blocks is determined by position in the LDPC parity frame). While it isn't likely, for example, that a 2.5G backplane interface targeted at storage networks would be interconnected with a 2.5GBASE-T interface across a transport network, this departs from the recent trend to have a consistent coding for each PHY rate and makes 2.5GBASE-X an "outlier" in the family of 2.5G and 5G PHYs using a unique line coding

SuggestedRemedy

Either use 66B coding for the 2.5G backplane interface, or provide a clear technical rationale for why this interface required a different line coding

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **78** *SC* **78** *P* **53** *L* **1** # 123
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

The discussion in the P802.3cd project concluded that EEE deep sleep mode was too complex and nobody uses it, so decided not to extend it to 50G or 200G operation

SuggestedRemedy

Consider whether deep sleep support can be omitted from EEE for P802.3cb

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 124
Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Limited

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

802.3by is an offiical standard

SuggestedRemedy

Change all the 802.3by-201x to 8023by-2016

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **78** *SC* **78.1.1** *P* **53** *L* **18** # 125
Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
The change from "these" to a list of Clauses didn't keep the entire list.

SuggestedRemedy
Add Clause 107 to the list of Clauses can generate RX_LPI_ACTIVE

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.1.4.1** *P* **166** *L* **33** # 126
Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
PRBS13Q is a PAM4 data pattern. If you want to use a NRZ PRBS13 pattern for Linear fit measurements you'll need to add that pattern to Clause 127

SuggestedRemedy
Add PRBS13 pattern definition, using the same polynomial that PRBS13Q uses to Clause 127 for use by 128A

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.2** *P* **107** *L* **34, 3** # 127
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**
ReturnLoss is not consistant with other usage.

SuggestedRemedy
change to: Return_Loss

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.5** *P* **108** *L* **31, 3** # 128
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**
ReturnLoss is not consistant with other usage.

SuggestedRemedy
change to: Return_Loss

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128C** *SC* **128C.4.4** *P* **188** *L* **41** # 129
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**
Missing parenthesis on the term: Af)

SuggestedRemedy
s/b: A(f)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1.1** *P* **206** *L* **37** # 130
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**
Overbar on the decimal 193.93

SuggestedRemedy
remove the overbar

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **73** *SC* **73.10.1** *P* **48** *L* **13** # 131
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
an_receive_idle

SuggestedRemedy
correct spelling for this term?

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **FM** SC P **4** L **10** # 132
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**
spelling of the word arabic

SuggestedRemedy
Arabic not arabic

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** SC **128.10.4.1** P **116** L **27** # 133
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**
Loopback function not effected

SuggestedRemedy
s/b: affected, not effected (it's a verb)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** SC **128.10.4.1** P **116** L **35** # 134
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**
Loopback affect on Transmitter

SuggestedRemedy
s/b: Loopback effect on Transmitter (effect is a noun, a result, not an action word)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** SC **127.2.6.2.3** P **85** L **2** # 135
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**
effecting hysteresis

SuggestedRemedy
s/b: affecting hysteresis (affect is a verb)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** SC **127.2.6.1.3** P **74** L **14** # 136
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**
capitalization in name

SuggestedRemedy
should read: PMD_SIGNAL.indication(SIGNAL_DETECT).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** SC **127.2.6.1.6** P **78** L **47** # 137
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**
capitalization in name

SuggestedRemedy
should read: PMD_SIGNAL.indication(SIGNAL_DETECT).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** SC **128.7.1.4** P **107** L **50** # 138
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
should read:
shall be less than or equal to 1200 mV.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.4** *P* **108** *L* **1** # 139
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
should read:
shall be less than or equal to 30 mV peak-to-peak,

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.4** *P* **108** *L* **19** # 140
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
should read:
shall be less than or equal to 30 mV within

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.10.4.3** *P* **117** *L* **19** # 141
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
Value/Comment column should read:
Less than or equal to 30 mV within 500 ns of tx_mode = QUIET

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.4** *P* **141** *L* **46** # 142
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
should read:
shall be less than or equal to 1200 mV,

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.4** *P* **141** *L* **47** # 143
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
should read:
shall be less than or equal to 30 mV peak-to-peak

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.4** *P* **142** *L* **17** # 144
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
should read:
shall be less than or equal to 30 mV

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.10.4.4** *P* **152** *L* **11** # 145
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
Value/Comment column should read:
Less than or equal to 1200 mV for a 1010 pattern

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.10.4.4** *P* **152** *L* **14** # 146
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
Value/Comment column should read:
Less than or equal to 30 mV

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.10.4.4** *P* **152** *L* **24** # 147
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
Value/Comment column should read:
Less than or equal to 30 mV within 500 ns of tx_quiet

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.1.1** *P* **161** *L* **29** # 148
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
Value/Comment column should read:
The bit error ratio (BER) shall be less than or equal to 10-12 with any errors...

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.1.1** *P* **203** *L* **29** # 149
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
change to be a "maximum"

SuggestedRemedy
Value/Comment column should read:
The bit error ratio (BER) shall be less than or equal to 10-12 with any errors...

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.7** *P* **110** *L* **28, 3** # 150
Smith, Daniel Seagate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
Rise/fall time ranges are ambiguous.

SuggestedRemedy
change wording to:
... transition time shall be from 30 ps to 100 ps, as measured at...

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.2.1** *P* **112** *L* **3** # 151
Smith, Daniel Seagate

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

plural missing

SuggestedRemedy

should read:
The receiver interference tolerance consists...

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **1** *L* **2** # 152
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

In publication, this is where the list of amendments and corrigenda comprising the base document being amended is listed. (See IEEE Std 802.3by page two or title page of P802.3bv/D3.0 for example.)

Based on current schedules, P802.3cb, could be be designated Amendment 10, 11 or 12. Questioning the schedule for P802.3cc when it is only at D1.0 argues against Amendment 12; and 802.3bs at the same initial WG ballot makes 10 or 11 a tossup, so the list or edits to the list certainly can be TBD. But, in addition, Corrigendum 1 will almost certainly be approved before this project is approved.

It is common to use 20xx as the year for yet to be approved projects. The SASB teleconference is 22 Sept, so if P802.3cb/D2.1 is not distributed before knowing the results, 802.3bn and 802.3bz might appropriately be 2016, but the corrigendum year and the year for 802.3bu and 802.3bv should be 20xx.

SuggestedRemedy

Could edit as in P802.3bv/D3.0 or indicate to be updated during publication preparation. If the list is added, delete the list at line 25.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **10** *L* **26** # 153
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

Draft uses both 201x and 20xx for yet to be approved standards and other year dates. While this project is unlikely to be subject to the uncertainty of the next decade, other projects getting started now face that possible uncertainty.

SuggestedRemedy

Use one form to simplify search by publication editor. I recommend 20xx as is used in IEEE boilerplate.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **8** *L* **18** # 154
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

The WG ballot group is now known. It is thoughtful to allow members to review the appearance of their names in case there is any error in the database.

SuggestedRemedy

Add list that the WG Chair can provide, (he will probably remind you not to duplicate officer names in the added list).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **11** *L* **13** # 155

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

Update with current document descriptions.

SuggestedRemedy

I personally prefer adding the document list with draft numbers that were used when creating the draft in an Editor's note above this list as this is the first location where base text is drawn from preceding amendments and corrigenda. The Editor's note list on p. 25 does not provide sufficient information for this purpose.

From my most recent review updates to the list are appropriate:
p. 12, l. 42 hopefully publication editors will correct the grammar, other projects have deleted "for" to do that in their drafts;
p.11, l.26 the published standard includes Annex 109C in the description;
p.11, l.51 Physical Layer is the capitalization in P802.3bn/D3.2;
p.12, l.14 P802.3bu/D3.1 adds to the last line of the description; IEEE 802.3 single twisted-pair interfaces;
p.12, l.15 as you probably know, P802.3bv has been assigned Amendment 9 relocate description;
p.12, l.24 The P802.3bv/D3.0 description has been significantly changed. Update to: This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2015 and add 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.
p.12, l.35 Consider adding Corregigendum 1 description.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **12** *L* **24** # 156

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

Update with current document descriptions.

SuggestedRemedy

I personally prefer adding the document list with draft numbers that were used when creating the draft in an Editor's note above this list as this is the first location where base text is drawn from preceding amendments and corrigenda. The Editor's note list on p. 32 does not provide good information for this purpose.

From my most recent review updates to the list are appropriate:
p. 12, l. 42 hopefully publication editors will correct the grammar, other projects have deleted "for" to do that in their drafts;
p. 13, l. 8 add Amendment 8 802.3bu and Amendment 9 802.3bv. Also consider adding Corrigendum 1 as it is likely to preceed approval of this project.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: duplicate of #155]

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **1** *L* **2** # 157

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

This is typically where the list of amendments and corrigenda comprising the base document is listed. (See IEEE Std 802.3by page two or title page of P802.3bv/D3.0 for example.)

SuggestedRemedy

Copy list from P802.3bv, adding IEEE Std 802.3bv-20xx. Delete the list from line 25. Years should be of the form 20xx for projects not yet approved. The SASB teleconference is 22 Sept, so if D3.1 is not distributed before knowing the results, 802.3bn and 802.3bz might appropriately be 2016. Based on current schedules, this amendment is likely to be designated Amendment 10, so no other amendments need be considered for addition to the list at this time.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **3** *L* **1** # 158
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

Incomplete first sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the full stop and words: This amendment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **3** *L* **5** # 159
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

It isn't common to add just speed to keywords.

SuggestedRemedy

Either delete speed keywords or expand to 2.5 Gigabit Ethernet, etc.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **8** *L* **19** # 160
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

The WG ballot group is now known. It is thoughtful to allow members to review the appearance of their names in case there is any error in the database.

SuggestedRemedy

Add list that the WG Chair can provide, (he will probably remind you not to duplicate officer names in the added list).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: duplicate of #154]

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **10** *L* **3** # 161
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

This box is published as part of the standard, so the self reference should be to the undated year of the standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Change P802.3cb to IEEE Std 802.3cb-20xx.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **11** *L* **26** # 162
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

Update with current document descriptions.

SuggestedRemedy

I personally prefer adding the document list with draft numbers that were used when creating the draft in the Editor's note above as this is the first location where base text is drawn from preceding amendments and corrigenda. The Editor's note list on p. 25 does not include draft information.

From my most recent review updates to the list are appropriate:
p. 11, l. 26, add Annex 109C
p. 11, l. 46 hopefully publication editors will correct the grammar;
p. 11, l. 49 though almost certain to be approved in 2016, it is customary to list as 20xx until approval;
p. 12, l.4 though almost certain to be approved in 2016, it is customary to list as 20xx until approval;
p. 12, l. 24 description of 802.3bv has changed and it has been designated Amendment 9;
p. 12, l. 28 Corrigendum 1 is more likely to be on the list than 802.3bs, consider adding.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: duplicate of #155]

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **26** *L* **4** # 163
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

The amendment numbers for most of the listed documents have been established.

SuggestedRemedy

Update note to delete amendments assigned numbers. In the case of P802.3cb, P802.3bs and possibly P802.3cc are the only other amends likely to compete for Amendment #10.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1** *SC* **1.3** *P* **26** *L* **15** # 164
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

The source for the document is possbily unknown for many readers.

SuggestedRemedy

Please add a footnote pointing to where to get the document.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: please supply footnote text.]

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4** *P* **16** *L* **19** # 165
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

I doubt anyone could write the sort rules for 1.4. As the 802.3 dictionary that soon will have about 500 entries, the sort rules should be consistent, unfortunately, we broke that with 802.3u abandoning IEEE sort order and instead of adding 100 Mb/s before 10 Mb/s, we added it after starting us on a path to almost arbitrary and somewhat unpredictable order.

1BASE-T and 2BASE-TL were originally inserted in IEEE sort order. With 2.5G, we now have a unique challenge in resolving this because IEEE rules ignore spaces and non-alphanumeric characters. That means that 2.5G and 25G are treated the same (the decimal point ignored) so that terms beginning with 2.5G and 25G would be intermixed based on the following characters.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 166
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

The inserts as specified by P802.3bz make worse the sort order mess that is currently the state of 1.4. 40GBASE terms in 2015 did not follow either the speed ordered port type list at the beginning of 1.4, nor insert after 2BASE-TL for at least the first digit being in sort order. 25GBASE terms were inserted by P802.3by before 40GBASE terms so at least the first digit of the port types somewhat sort. P802.3bz inserts start a third area for insert of port types in the area of 1BASE-TL, unfortunately, there is no predictable sort order in P802.3bz as the 5GBASE terms should follow 2BASE-TL to approximate IEEE sort order.

SuggestedRemedy

Unless another revision is completed prior to this amendmement (which would require significant editorial changes to the draft), it is probably best to follow P802.3bz. Please watch to see if order and numbering is changed when P802.3bz is published.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
[Editor's note: not enough information provided to process this comment. Where is this applicable ?]

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4.74a6** *P* **26** *L* **46** # 167
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

5GSEI should follow 5GBASE-T inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bz-20xx.

SuggestedRemedy

Add editing instruction referencing IEEE Std 802.3bz-20xx and renumber 5GSEI to 1.4.74c.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4.107** *P* **26** *L* **49** # 168
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

P802.3bs is also modifying this definition, if timelines hold true, this instruction and base text is correct.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an Editor's note to remind that 802.3bs is also modifying this definition and base text and editing instruction reference will have to be updated if 802.3bs is assigned a lower amendment number than 802.3cb.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: please supply editors note text.]

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.6** *P* **31** *L* **38** # 169

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

P802.3bs is defining bit 6 to expand the number space. It currently has these two values (with a leading 0) listed as reserved.

SuggestedRemedy

Might want to add an editors note specific to this one indicating that this fact and that amendment order will not only require changes to the editing instruction, but also to the base text if P802.3bs is assigned a lower amendment number. If this project is assigned a lower amendment number, then the reserced rows in P802.3bs will have to carry these values to prevent them being accidently removed.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **78** *SC* **78.1.4** *P* **53** *L* **51** # 170

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

Please note that P802.3bz/D3.3 as submitted to RevCom properly inserts content into Table 1 considering the insert of P802.3bp, but failed to update the editing instructions for Tables 78.2 and 78-4 similarly. P802.3bv is also inserting three port types into all three tables. Unless IEEE Std 802.3bz corrects this problem, during publication preparation, the 2.5G and 5G values in Tables 2 and 4 will be inserted in the midst of 1000BASE-terms.

SuggestedRemedy

While insert relative to is fine, you need to encourage publication editors to correct the order problem in P802.3/D3.3 or this project will compound the problem.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.3.4** *P* **94** *L* **18** # 171

Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

"Random jitter test patterns" are not specified in Annex 127A or Annex 36A which is referred from Annex 127A, although Annex 36A specifies "Jitter test patterns".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Random jitter test patters" with "Jitter test patterns".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.6** *P* **94** *L* **43** # 172

Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

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

Clause 71.8 is interconnect characteristics. Clause 71.9 is environment specifications.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference to 71.8 with a reference to 71.9.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.3** *P* **102** *L* **20** # 173

Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Table 125-2 in clause 125.1.4, page 57 specifies clause 73 AN is optional for 2.5GBASE-KX, but here it is written as the PCS shall support the AN.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "shall support" with "optionally support", or change clause 73 AN in Table 125-2 from "O" to "M".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.88** *P* **33** *L* **28** # 174

Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Here, MDIO register names for 1.160 and 1.160 are changed. Those register names also appear in Table 70-2 and Table 70-3 in clause 70.5, but editing instructions are missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide editing instructions to change register names in Table 70-2 and Table 70-3 in clause 70.5 so that the PMA/PMD register names are consistent.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1** *P* **106** *L* **28** # 175

Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

"Duty Cycle Distortion (DCD)" is not an adequate term to represent a type of jitter, because it is not clear whether the DCD is on the signal itself or on the clock that genarets the signal. Use of this term is now discouraged. We should call it Even-Odd Jitter that is defined in 92.8.3.8.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Duty Cycle Distortion" with "Even-Odd Jitter" from the entire document.
It is used in the following locations:
128.7.1, P106, L28, L30
128.7.1.8, P110, L40
128.7.1.9, P110, L47, L48
128.7.2.1, P112, L22
130.7.1, P140, L28, L31
130.7.1.8, P144, L42
130.7.1.9, P144, L48, L49
130.7.2.1, P147, L22
130.10.4.4, P152, L47
128A.3.1, P164, L26
128A.3.1.6, P167, L1, L2
128A.3.3, P171, L25
128B.2.1, P180, L19, L21
130A.3.1, P206, L26
130A.3.1.6, P209, L18, L19
130A.3.3, P213, L28
130B.2.1, P222, L17, L19

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.2** *P* **107** *L* **28** # 176

Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

This clause specifies not only impedance of test fixture, but also return loss of test fixture.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the title of clause from "Test fixture impedance" to "Test fixture characteristics".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.2** *P* **107** *L* **30** # 177

Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

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

"f" is not italic face.

SuggestedRemedy

Make "f" italic face.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.4** *P* **108** *L* **17** # 178

Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Here, it is said that the common-mode voltage shall be between -0.2 and 1.9V, whereas Table 128-4 specifies it between 0 and 1.9V.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "-0.2" with "0".

Or, make a correction to the table.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.5** *P* **109** *L* **21** # 179

Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Equation 128-3 specifies the return loss from 100MHz, whereas Figure 128-4 specifies the return loss from 10MHz.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Figure 128-4 frequency to start from 100MHz.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.7** *P* **110** *L* **29** # 180
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

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

Here, a reference to 128B.1 is made, but there is not high-frequency test pattern in 128B.1. The high-frequency test pattern is defined in 36A.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference to 128B.1 with a reference to 36A.1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.8** *P* **110** *L* **39** # 181
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Test pattern 2 and 3 in 52.9.1.1 are defined for 10GBASE-R which uses 64B66B encoding. They are too much stressful for 8B10B links due to large DC wonder that do not exist after 8B10B encoding, and not recommended.

SuggestedRemedy

Use jitter tolerance test pattern defined in 48A.5 and use jtransmitter jitter test requirements in 71.7.1.9.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.2.1** *P* **112** *L* **5** # 182
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Clause 59.9.1.1 does not exist.
If this is intended to be test patterns 2 or 3 in 52.9.1.1, they are not recommended, because they are defined for 10GBASE-R which uses 64B66B encoding. They are oto much stressful for 8B10B links due to large DC wonder that do not exist after 8B10B encoding.

SuggestedRemedy

Use continuous jitter test pattern as defined in Annex 48A.5. See 71.7.2.1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.2.5** *P* **113** *L* **3** # 183
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

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

"f" is not italic face.

SuggestedRemedy

Make "f" italic face.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.10.3** *P* **115** *L* **9** # 184
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

PCS is mandatory.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "No []" in the support column for PCS.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.10.3** *P* **115** *L* **28** # 185
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

EEE is referred, but not defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a row to define EEE.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.10.3** *P* **115** *L* **28** # 186
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

TD is mandatory if EEE is supported.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "No []" with "N/A []" in the support column for TD.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **129** *SC* **129.1.3** *P* **120** *L* **15** # 187
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

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

5GBASE-X PCS in Figure 129-1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "5GBASE-X PCS" with "5GBASE-R PCS".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.6.4** *P* **138** *L* **5** # 188
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

It is too rough to say that the definition of the PMD signal detect function is beyond the scope of this specification.

SuggestedRemedy

Give a brief definition of the PMD signal detect function regarding to the functionality. It may be OK to say the detail implementation is beyond the scope of this specification.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.2** *P* **141** *L* **23** # 189
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

This clause specifies not only impedance of test fixture, but also return loss of test fixture.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the title of clause from "Test fixture impedance" to "Test fixture characteristics".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.2** *P* **141** *L* **34** # 190
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Equation 130-1 and 130-2 are not continuous at 2579 MHz.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the right hand side of Equation 130-2 as follows:

24 - 13.275 log_10 (f / 1289 MHz)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.8** *P* **144** *L* **35** # 191
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Methodology of jitter measurement in Annex 48B.3 is old and not good.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the methodology of jitter measurement described in 92.8.3.8 which uses PRBS9.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.11** *P* **145** *L* **53** # 192
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

v1 is defined as the average voltage in the interval t1 to t1-2T, but t1 is in the middle of the rising edge.

SuggestedRemedy

Define v1 as the average voltage in the interval t1+2T to t2-T.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.11** *P* **146** *L* **2** # 193
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

v3 is defined as the average voltage in the interval t2 to t3-T, but t2 is in the middle of falling edge.

SuggestedRemedy

Define v3 as the average voltage in the interval t2+2T to t3-T.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.1** *P* **160** *L* **8** # 194
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

The definitions of the compliance points, the host compliance board, and the drive compliance board are not clearly shown in the figures. For instance, the output of PMD transmit function is labeled as TP0_D-H in Figure 128A-1, but labeled as TP1_D-H in Figure 128A-2. In Figure 128A-2, the loss from TP1_D-H to the connector input is 0.9dB in the top figure but 1.375dB in the middle figure.

SuggestedRemedy

Define the compliance points clear.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.1.4.1** *P* **166** *L* **32** # 195
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

The linear pulse fitting procedure in 94.3.12.5.2 is for PAM4 signal, and PRBS13Q is a PAM4 test pattern.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the linear pulse fitting procedure for NRZ that is described in 92.8.3.5.1 and use PRBS9 test pattern.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.3.1** *P* **171** *L* **36** # 196
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

The linear pulse fitting procedure in 94.3.12.5.2 is for PAM4 signal, and PRBS13Q is a PAM4 test pattern.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the linear pulse fitting procedure for NRZ that is described in 92.8.3.5.1 and use PRBS9 test pattern.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1.4.1** *P* **208** *L* **48** # 197
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

The linear pulse fitting procedure in 94.3.12.5.2 is for PAM4 signal, and PRBS13Q is a PAM4 test pattern.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the linear pulse fitting procedure for NRZ that is described in 92.8.3.5.1 and use PRBS9 test pattern.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.3.1** *P* **213** *L* **39** # 198
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

The linear pulse fitting procedure in 94.3.12.5.2 is for PAM4 signal, and PRBS13Q is a PAM4 test pattern.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the linear pulse fitting procedure for NRZ that is described in 92.8.3.5.1 and use PRBS9 test pattern.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2.2** *P* **167** *L* **38** # 199
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

It is not clear how the crosstalik is applied in the receiver interference tolerance test. In Figure 128A-9, the crosstalk is applied only during the calibration. Also, Figure 128A-8 and 128A-9 seem identical.

SuggestedRemedy

Apply crosstalk during test.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2.3** *P* **168** *L* **52** # 200
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

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

Table 128A-10 is applied peak-to-peak sinusoidal jitter.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference to Figure 128A-10.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.2.3** *P* **169** *L* **1** # 201
Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab of America

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

the host interference tolerance test

SuggestedRemedy

the host jitter tolerance test

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.7a** *P* **35** *L* **21** # 202
Lusted, Kent Intel

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

table 45-125a entries for bits 3.21.8 and 3.21.7 are not underlined (per IEEE style guide) to indicate insertions per editing instructions

SuggestedRemedy

Underline as necessary

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.4** *P* **107** *L* **54** # 203
Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

The minimum peak-to-peak transmitter amplitude is not specified in the specification. It is inferred to be >720mV in the "EEE capability" paragraph on page 108, linke 19. However, it is this reader's interpretation of that EEE paragraph that the >720 requirement only applies to PHYs that support the optional EEE.

SuggestedRemedy

Sufficiently define the minimum peak-to-peak amplitude for the transmitter.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.10** *P* **111** *L* **7** # 204
Lusted, Kent Intel

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

Figure 128-6 has a shadowing feature enabled that reduces readability.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove shadowing.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.10** *P* **111** *L* **26** # 205
Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

For v1 and v2, the average voltage in the interval t1 to t2 includes the shoulder rise/fall times of the waveform. this artificially reduces the measured voltage from the true amplitude of the waveform at the midpoint.

SuggestedRemedy

consider defining a window in the flat portion of the waveform, away from the rise and falling edges, as the steady state voltage. see figure 72-12 for inspiration.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.11** *P* **145** *L* **29** # 206
Lusted, Kent Intel

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

Figure 130-7 has a shadowing feature enabled that reduces readability.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove shadowing.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.11** *P* **146** *L* **8** # 207
Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

value for Rpre is not defined in specification.
the min and max value of Rpre is not defined in the specification.

SuggestedRemedy

Set a value for Rpre.
Define the min and max value of Rpre

Add relevant PICS entry.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.11** *P* **145** *L* **52** # 208
Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

For v1 and v3, the average voltage in the interval t1 to t2-T includes the shoulder rise time of the waveform. this artificially reduces the measured voltage from the true amplitude of the waveform at the midpoint.

SuggestedRemedy

consider defining a window in the flat portion of the waveform, away from the rise and falling edges, as the steady state voltage. see figure 72-12 for inspiration.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.7** *P* **144** *L* **30** # 209
Lusted, Kent Intel

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

The rising and falling transition times requirement references v1 and v4. v4 is the pre-emphasis point. v3 is the negative waveform level.

SuggestedRemedy

change "v4" to "v3"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4** *P* **26** *L* **27** # 210
Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

there are definitions listed in the editorial note do not match that of the entries below.

SuggestedRemedy

list all entries in editing instructions or remove explicit reference to terms in editing instructions.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4** *P* **26** *L* **40** # 211
Lusted, Kent Intel

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

the definition for 5GBASE-R incorrectly references 10GBASE-R.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider changing "10GBASE-R" to "5GBASE-R" in 1.4.74a4

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4** *P* **26** *L* **50** # 212
Lusted, Kent Intel

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

The P802.3bs project is modifying the definition of BASE-R also.

The P802.3by-20xx project is P802.3-2016.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to editor note the dependency on P802.3bs changes to the definition of BASE-R.

Update reference to 802.3by with the published year.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: please supply dependency text.]

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.7a** *P* **35** *L* **21** # 213
Lusted, Kent Intel

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

table 45-124a entries for bits 3.9.2 and 3.9.3 are not underlined (per IEEE style guide) to indicate insertions per editing instructions

SuggestedRemedy

Underline as necessary

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **73** *SC* **73.11.4** *P* **51** *L* **5** # 214
Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

PICS is missing change to Std 802.3-2015 Clause 73.11.4.4 PICS entry RF5 for 2.5GBASE-KX parallel detection

SuggestedRemedy

Change PICS entry for RF5 to include 2.5GBASE-KX

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **73** *SC* **73.3** *P* **47** *L* **46** # 215
Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syst

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

Editorial instruction should be change rather than insert

SuggestedRemedy

Add text "Change third paragreaph as follows" or something similar.

Also fix in 73.6.4 and 73.7.4.1

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.4** *P* **66** *L* **41** # 216
McClellan, Brett Marvell

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

"However any 2.5GPII symbol may be deleted. Usually this will either be a 2.5GPII idle or LPI symbols, though in pathological error conditions (i.e. unterminated packet followed immediately with sequence ordered-set) some other symbol may be deleted."
is there no requirement for a minimum IPG following a frame?
XGMII requires 5 octect IPG

SuggestedRemedy

Consider adding a minimum 5 octect IPG requirement.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.1.5** *P* **31** *L* **31** # 217
McClellan, Brett Marvell

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

per 129.3.3 5GBASE-R has an option PMA loopback enabled by 1.0.0

SuggestedRemedy

page 31 line 31 and 33 change "2.5GBASE-KX" to "2.5GBASE-KX, 5GBASE-R"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.2** *P* **65** *L* **5** # 218
McClellan, Brett Marvell

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

need to show that wencode_state in the last column is the next value of wencode_state

SuggestedRemedy

change wencode_state in column 5 to wencode_state<n>
change wencode_state in the last column to wencode_state<n+1>
or
do not change wencode_state in column 5
change wencode_state in the last column to wencode_state_next

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.2** *P* **65** *L* **1** # 219
McClellan, Brett Marvell

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

in table 127-1 the abbreviation for Normal Interframe is shown as "IDLE", not "Idle" as used in table 127-3 in the 2.5GPII Columns

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Idle" to "IDLE" in the 2.5GPII Columns

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.2** *P* **65** *L* **29** # 220
McClellan, Brett Marvell

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

following the notation of Clause 48, a sequence ordered set is noted as ||Q||, not |Q|.
also line 30 missing comma after Seq
also line 54, should |W| be /W/ instead?

SuggestedRemedy

line 29 change |Q| to ||Q||
line 30 change "Seq, Data S0, Seq Data S1," to "Seq, Data S0, Seq, Data S1,"
line 54 change |W| to /W/.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.2** *P* **65** *L* **29** # 221
McClellan, Brett Marvell

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

/W/ is used prior to definition

SuggestedRemedy

add a reference to the definition

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: please supply reference.]

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.4** *P* **66** *L* **28** # 222
McClellan, Brett Marvell

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

following the notation of Clause 48, a sequence ordered set is noted as ||Q||, not |Q|, a Signal ordered set is noted as ||Fsig||, not |Fsig|

SuggestedRemedy

Change |Q| to ||Q|| and |Fsig| to ||Fsig||

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.5** *P* **67** *L* **12** # 223
McClellan, Brett Marvell

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

in table 127-2 the abbreviation for Normal Interframe is shown as "IDLE", not "Idle" as used in table 127-4 in the 2.5GPII Columns

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Idle" to "IDLE" in the 2.5GPII Columns

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.5** *P* **67** *L* **16** # 224
McClellan, Brett Marvell

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Should wencode_state be replaced by wdecode_state in the 5th and last columns?
Also need to show that wdecode_state in the last column is the next value of wdecode_state

SuggestedRemedy

change wdecode_state in column 5 to wdecode_state<n>
change wdecode_state in the last column to wdecode_state<n+1>
or
do not change wdecode_state in column 5
change wdecode_state in the last column to wdecode_state_next

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.5** *P* **67** *L* **20** # 225
McClellan, Brett Marvell

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Data* condition is not defined, needs a definition
SOP is not defined for XGMII, it should be "Start"

SuggestedRemedy

Provide definition or note for Data* and change SOP to Start.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.5** *P* **67** *L* **30** # 226
McClellan, Brett Marvell

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

transition from DATA to LPI should not be allowed, should pass through ERR first

SuggestedRemedy

line 30 and line 33 change X in 5th column to !DATA

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.5** *P* **67** *L* **35** # 227
McClellan, Brett Marvell

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

transition from DATA to Sequence should not be allowed, should pass through ERR first

SuggestedRemedy

line 35 and line 37 change X in 5th column to !DATA

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.5.6** *P* **69** *L* **41** # 228
McClellan, Brett Marvell

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

move "/" after the line break

SuggestedRemedy

page 69 line 41 move "/" after the line break
also page 71 line 5 move '/' after the line break

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.2** *P* **72** *L* **18** # 229
McClellan, Brett Marvell

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

/PL_LIMIT/ is a number not a set

SuggestedRemedy

change to PL_LIMIT

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.3** *P* **72** *L* **37** # 230
McClellan, Brett Marvell

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

is the element symbol defined anywhere in 802.3? Does it need definition?

SuggestedRemedy

add a defnition if needed.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
[Editor's note: please supply definition]

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.3** *P* **76** *L* **15** # 231
McClellan, Brett Marvell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

idle_d definition uses akward language

SuggestedRemedy

change
"SUDI(![/D21.5/] * ![/D2.2/])
that uses an alternate form to support the EEE capability:
SUDI(![/D21.5/] * ![/D2.2/] * ![/D6.5/] * ![/D26.4/])"
to
"SUDI(![/D21.5/] * ![/D2.2/]) when EEE is not supported or
SUDI(![/D21.5/] * ![/D2.2/] * ![/D6.5/] * ![/D26.4/]) when EEE is supported"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.4** *P* **77** *L* **6** # 232
McClellan, Brett Marvell

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

"NEXTSEQ()" is a function with no input. Why is "()" included?
This function appears similar to the check_end function. Perhaps the name format should be similar.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "NEXTSEQ()" to "check_SEQ"
similarly change "WALIGN()" to "WALIGN"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.4** *P* **77** *L* **18** # 233
McClellan, Brett Marvell

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

"Signal_detectCHANGE" is not capitalized.

SuggestedRemedy

change "Signal_detectCHANGE" to "signal_detectCHANGE"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **9** # 234
Ewen, John GlobalFoundries

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

Table 130A-1 is missing subclause references

SuggestedRemedy

Insert appropriate references

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: please specify the references]

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.1.4.1** *P* **166** *L* **33** # 235
Ewen, John GlobalFoundries

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Is Np=100 correct? This seems an order of magnitude larger than other clauses.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to Np=3 to be consistent with SNDR definition in 128A.3.1.7

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.1.4.1** *P* **166** *L* **33** # 236
Ewen, John GlobalFoundries

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Why is a PAM4 pattern used for the linear fit pulse response when normal operation uses NRZ? Also the reference to 120.5.10.2.3 appears incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Use a PRBS9 test pattern for the linear pulse fit as specified in 120.5.11.1.2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.3.1** *P* **171** *L* **38** # 237
Ewen, John GlobalFoundries

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Is Np=100 correct? This seems an order of magnitude larger than other clauses.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to Np=3 to be consistent with SNDR definition in 128A.3.3.3

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.3.1** *P* **171** *L* **38** # 238
Ewen, John GlobalFoundries

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Why is a PAM4 pattern used for the linear fit pulse response when normal operation uses NRZ? Also the reference to 120.5.10.2.3 appears incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Use a PRBS9 test pattern for the linear pulse fit as specified in 120.5.11.1.2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1.4.1** *P* **208** *L* **50** # 239
Ewen, John GlobalFoundries

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Why is a PAM4 pattern used for the linear fit pulse response when normal operation uses NRZ? Also the reference to 120.5.10.2.3 appears incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Use a PRBS9 test pattern for the linear pulse fit as specified in 120.5.11.1.2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.3.1** *P* **213** *L* **41** # 240
Ewen, John GlobalFoundries

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Why is a PAM4 pattern used for the linear fit pulse response when normal operation uses NRZ? Also the reference to 120.5.10.2.3 appears incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Use a PRBS9 test pattern for the linear pulse fit as specified in 120.5.11.1.2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.11** *P* **145** *L* **23** # 241
Ewen, John GlobalFoundries

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Subclause 130.7.1.11 appears incomplete. Voltages v1-v4 and ratio Rpre are defined but no values are specified for the PMD in Clause 130. PICS item TC21 however defines this as a mandatory feature which seems inconsistent.

SuggestedRemedy

I'm not sure of the original intent of this subclause. Perhaps the entire subclause should be moved to Annex 130A where the value for Rpre is defined.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.3.1** *P* **213** *L* **24** # 242
Ewen, John GlobalFoundries

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Table 130A-6 The subclause reference for Pre-cursor ratio is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Refer to 130.7.1.11 or update 130A.3.3.1 to define pre-cursor ratio.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1** *SC* **1.5** *P* **27** *L* **6** # 243
Baden, Eric Broadcom Limited

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

2.5GSEI line is missing period (".") at the end of sentence. Also 5GSEI

SuggestedRemedy

Fix them

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.7.a** *P* **35** *L* **49** # 244
Baden, Eric Broadcom Limited

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

Two issues -- first issue: formatting - 45.2.3.7a refers to Table 45-124a, but Table 45-123 is placed between the edit instruction and the referred table.

SuggestedRemedy

1) move Table 45-123 before 45.2.3.7a

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.7.a** *P* **36** *L* **23** # 245
Baden, Eric Broadcom Limited

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

Second issue: Edit instruction says "insert" but the Table 45-124a shows five rows, four without any revision marks. BTW revision marks are not allowed for "insert" instruction.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the edit instruction to "modify", and note inserted lines 3.9.3 and 3.9.2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.5.6** *P* **69** *L* **40** # 246
Baden, Eric Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Link status (remote fault) signalling indication that are native to XGMII but not GMII should be made optional, and stated as such.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "A sequence ordered_set is used to convey various link status such as local fault or remote fault." to "... convey various optional link status..." And "The 24 bit data of the sequence ordered_set on the XGMII are mapped to S0, S1, S2, S3 (see 127.2.4.2), and /W0/, /
W1/, /W2/, /W3/ are the 8B/10B mapped version." to ...ordered_set on the XGMII, when implemented, are mapped to S0, ..."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.7.4** *P* **96** *L* **12** # 247
Baden, Eric Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

If my comment on 127.2.5.6 on link status signalling to be made optional is accepted, PICS entry needs to be added

SuggestedRemedy

Add a line for LNKS; Implementation of PCS Link Status Signalling; Subclause 127.2.5.6; O; Yes [ ] No []

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.1** *P* **99** *L* **9** # 248
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

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

Clause 45 is not an external cross-reference since it is amended in this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Make this a live cross-reference to Clause 45 and change the font color to black.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.10** *P* **111** *L* **4** # 249
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

A procedure for the measurement for v1 and v2 is provided but no requirements on the values of v1 and v2 are given.

SuggestedRemedy

Include requirements for v1 and v2 or, if there are no requirements, remove the subclause.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.8** *P* **113** *L* **10** # 250
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

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

The interconnect requirements are defined in Annex 128C.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the reference.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.1** *P* **133** *L* **9** # 251
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

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

Clause 45 is not an external cross-reference since it is amended in this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Make this a live cross-reference to Clause 45 and change the font color to black.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.11** *P* **145** *L* **25** # 252
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

A procedure for the measurement of v1, v2, v3, and v4 (and Rpre) is provided but no requirements on the values of v1, v2, v3, and v4 (and Rpre) are given.

SuggestedRemedy

Include the requirements or, if there are no requirements, remove the subclause.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127A** *SC* **127A** *P* **157** *L* **6** # 253
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

The only 2.5GBASE-X PMD is the one defined by Clause 128 and that clause explicitly defines the test pattern to be used for each parameter. Further, Clause 128 does not appear to cite and Annex 36A test patterns. Therefore, this annex seems to have no purpose.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Annex.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127B** *SC* **127B** *P* **158** *L* **6** # 254
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

A 1000BASE-X PCS/PMA operating at 2.5 times its specified signaling rate is beyond the scope of IEEE Std 802.3. As a result, it is unclear why the standard should address compatibility with this non-standard application.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Annex.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A** *P* **159** *L* **13** # 255

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Since this is an Annex to Clause 128, it seems reasonable to assume that transmitters and receivers that satisfy the Clause 128 requirements are suitable for this application. If this is the case, then it seems TP0D-H and TP0H-D should be equivalent to TP1 in Clause 128, and TP5D-H and TP5H-D should be equivalent to to TP4 in Clause 128. If so, then it seems that channel between TP0D-H and TP5H-D (or TP0H-D and TP5D-H) is simply a specific partitioning of the generic channel described in Annex 128C. If all of this is correct, then it seems that the text and/or test point definitions should be modified to make this clear. If it is not correct, then the relationship between this interface and clause it is associated with is unclear. Is this Annex defining a completely different PMD?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify the relationship between a 2.5GBASE-KX PMD and the 2.5GSEI.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.1** *P* **160** *L* **8** # 256

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

In Figure 128A-1, the test point adjacent to the PMD transmit function is TP0 but here it appears to be TP1. Which is correct?

SuggestedRemedy

Include the TX PCB before TP1 or change the test point to TP0.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.1** *P* **160** *L* **27** # 257

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Why is the loss from TP1D-H to the connector 0.9 dB in one part of the figure and 1.375 dB in another part of the figure. What has changed? Similarly for the TP1 to TP5 insertion loss.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify the difference between the diagrams in Figure 128A-2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.1.4.1** *P* **166** *L* **33** # 258

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

PRBS13Q is a PAM4 test pattern and seems to be inappropriate for this interface. Furthermore, 94.3.12.5.2 pertains to the measurement of PAM4 signals. Note the similar issue with 128A.3.3.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference to 92.8.3.5 or a similar NRZ-based measurement procedure. Note that 92.8.3.5 specified the use of PRBS9 so no expection for the test pattern would likely be required in this case.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.1.4.2** *P* **166** *L* **40** # 259

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

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

Table 128A.3.1 already states that "A 2.5GSEI host output shall meet the specifications defined in Table 128A–1 if measured at TP4H-D" and Table 128A-1 includes the parameters defined in this subclause. It is not necessary to state the requirements again.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the last two sentences from this subclause. Note similar issues in 128A.3.1.6, 128A.3.1.7, 128A.3.3.2, and 128A.3.3.3.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.1.6** *P* **166** *L* **54** # 260

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

If the maximum permitted deterministic jitter is 0.12 UI and the maximum permitted random jitter is 0.2 UI, how could a compliant implementation exhibit jitter in excess of 0.32 UI? The specification seems to set the maximum jitter to 0.35 UI despite this.

SuggestedRemedy

Check the jitter math. Note that DCD is considered a component of deterministic jitter as stated in 128A.3.1.6.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.1** *P* **201** *L* **13** # 261

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Since this is an Annex to Clause 130, it seems reasonable to assume that transmitter and receivers that satisfy the Clause 130 requirements are suitable for this application. If this is the case, then it seems TP0D-H and TP0H-D should be equivalent to TP1 in Clause 128, and TP5D-H and TP5H-D should be equivalent to to TP4 in Clause 130. If so, then it seems that channel between TP0D-H and TP5H-D (or TP0H-D and TP5D-H) is simply a specific partitioning of the generic channel described in Annex 128C. If all of this is correct, then it seems that the text and/or test point definitions should be modified to make this clear. If it is not correct, then the relationship between this interface and clause it is associated with is unclear. Is this Annex defining a completely different PMD?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify the relationship between a 5GBASE-KR PMD and the 5GSEI.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.1** *P* **202** *L* **7** # 262

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

In Figure 130A-1, the test point adjacent to the PMD transmit function is TP0 but here it appears to be TP1. Which is correct?

SuggestedRemedy

Include the TX PCB before TP0 or change the test point to TP1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.1** *P* **202** *L* **14** # 263

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Why is the loss from TP1D-H to the connector 1.2 dB in one part of the figure and 2 dB in another part of the figure. What has changed? Similarly for the TP1 to TP5 insertion loss.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify the difference between the diagrams in Figure 130A-2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.2** *P* **163** *L* **17** # 264

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

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

In the second part of the figure, it seems the test point at the PMD receiver function should be TP5H-D. the test point at the connection interface should be TP4H-D, the "Tx PCB" should be "Rx PCB", and the AC coupling capacitors shown between the TP4 and TP5.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the figure per the comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.2** *P* **205** *L* **20** # 265

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

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

In the second part of the figure, it seems the test point at the PMD receiver function should be TP5H-D. the test point at the connection interface should be TP4H-D, the "Tx PCB" should be "Rx PCB", and the AC coupling capacitors shown between the TP4 and TP5.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the figure per the comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **9** # 266

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

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

The "Subclause reference" column of Table 130A-1 is blank. In the parameter column, the phrase "per lane (range)" in the signaling rate row is struck out for no apparent reason.

SuggestedRemedy

Fill in the missing column and correct the formatting error.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: please supply the reference.]
[Editor's note: see also comment #23.]

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1.4.1** *P* **208** *L* **48** # 267

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

PRBS13Q is a PAM4 test pattern and seems to be inappropriate for this interface. Furthermore, 94.3.12.5.2 pertains to the measurement of PAM4 signals. Note the similar issue with 130A.3.3.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference to 92.8.3.5 or a similar NRZ-based measurement procedure. Note that 92.8.3.5 specified the use of PRBS9 so not expection for the test pattern would likely be required in this case.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1.4.2** *P* **209** *L* **2** # 268

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

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

130A.3.1 already states that "A 5GSEI host input shall meet the specifications defined in Table 130A–1 if measured at the appropriate test point." and Table 130A-1 includes the parameters defined in this subclause. It is not necessary to state the requirements again.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the last two sentences from this subclause. Note similar issues in 130A.3.1.6, 130A.3.1.7, 130A.3.3.2, and 130A.3.3.3.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128D** *SC* **128D** *P* **193** *L* **6** # 269

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

The title of this annex is "Test Fixtures for 2.5 Gb/s and 5 Gb/s Backplanes" but it only seems to define the test fixtures for the SEIs. Test fixtures are also defined in 128.7.1.1 and 130.7.1.1 which are presumably also backplane interfaces.

SuggestedRemedy

Rename the Annex to "Test Fixtures for Storage Enclosure Interfaces" or perhaps consolidate the Clause 128 and Clause 130 test fixture definitions into this annex.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.8** *P* **110** *L* **38** # 270

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

The subclause states that "The data pattern for jitter measurements shall be the test patterns 2 or 3 as defined in 52.9.1.1." Test pattern 2 emulates 64B/66B encoding and test pattern 3 is PRBS31. Are these appropriate test patterns for an 8B/10B encoded link?

SuggestedRemedy

Reevaluate the choice of jitter test patterns for 2.5GBASE-KX.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130** *SC* **130.8** *P* **148** *L* **10** # 271

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

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

The interconnect characterstics are not defined in Annex 130B.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference to Annex 128C.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128C** *SC* **128C.4.3** *P* **188** *L* **2** # 272

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Using Equation (128C-7), it appears the maximum insertion loss for 5GBASE-KR is allowed to be about 33.6 dB at 2.578125 GHz. This does not agree with a fitted attenuation limit of 13.4 dB at 2.578125 GHz and an insertion loss deviation limit of +/-2.8 dB at 2.578125 GHz. This implies the insertion loss should not exceed 16.2 dB at that frequency.

SuggestedRemedy

Revisit the insertion loss equation for 5GBASE-KR.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128C** *SC* **128C.4.3** *P* **188** *L* **13** # 273
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Equation (128C-7) states the range of the limit to be fmax, and in Table 128C-1, fmax is assigned a value of 7 GHz. However, Figure 128C-3 only plots the limit to about 2.25 GHz and it is unclear how the curve applies to 2.5GBASE-KX and 5GBASE-KR (compare to Figure 128C-2).

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the plot with one that illustrates the limit over the specified frequency range and annotate the plot so show how it applies to 2.5GBASE-KX and 5GBASE-KR respectively (including the "high confidence" regions").

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128C** *SC* **128C.4.4** *P* **188** *L* **46** # 274
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

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

Equations (128C-9) and (128C-10) are incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "0.7^(-9)" to "0.7x10^(-9)" in both cases.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1.6** *P* **209** *L* **16** # 275
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

If the maximum permitted deterministic jitter is 0.12 UI and the maximum permitted random jitter is 0.15 UI, how could a compliant implementation exhibit jitter in excess of 0.27 UI? The specification seems to set the maximum jitter to 0.30 UI despite this.

SuggestedRemedy

Check the jitter math. Note that DCD is considered a component of deterministic jitter as stated in 128A.3.1.6.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4** *P* **26** *L* **53** # 276
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"...Clause 49 or Clause 82, Clause 107, or Clause 129."

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the first "or" and add a "," so the sentence reads "...Clause 49, Clause 82, Clause 107, or Clause 129."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **125** *SC* **125.3** *P* **58** *L* **11** # 277
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

The insert instruction and added rows in Table 125-3 have errors, and the instructions weren't followed.

SuggestedRemedy

1) Change the instruction to read "Change Table 125-3 by inserting four rows, one each for 2.5GBASE-X PCS/PMA, 2.5GBASE-KX PMD, 5GBASE-R PCS/PMA, 5GBASE-KR PMD, as shown, and change the associated notes a and b as shown."

2) Change the value in the third row of the Sublayer column to "2.5GBASE-KX PMD". Add a row above "2.5GBASE-KX PMD", in the Sublayer column use "2.5GBASE-X PCS/PMA". Fill remaining columns with appropriate values.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.1.1** *P* **59** *L* **10** # 278
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"2.5Gb/s

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "2.5 Gb/s"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.1.1** *P* **59** *L* **15** # 279
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"(may include MDI)". This language seems odd, would you ever not include the MDI? Clause 36 (1000BASE-X PCS) is very similar to this paragraph but says "(including MDI)".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "(may include MDI)" to "(including MDI)".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.1.3.1** *P* **60** *L* **43** # 280
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

This sentence has some typos.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove extra "." and make "Encoding" lowercase. Should read "... PHY implementations. The 2.5GBASE-X PCS provides all services required by the XGMII including encoding (decoding) of the XGMII ..."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.1** *P* **63** *L* **38** # 281
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

Subclause title is "2.5Gb/s PCS Internal Interface (2.5GPII)". Should be a space in "2.5Gb/s".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "2.5 Gb/s PCS Internal Interface (2.5GPII)".

Also, "2.5Gb/s" in first sentence of the following paragraph, change that as well.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.2** *P* **65** *L* **31** # 282
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

In this paragraph there are 2 instances of "Sequence" (capital "S") when it should be "sequence" (lowercase "s"). Changing these to lowercase would also make them consistant with other instances in this subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Page 65, line 31 & Page 65, line 32: Change "Sequence" to "sequence".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.2** *P* **65** *L* **35** # 283
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"24 bit" should be "24-bit".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "24-bit".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.4** *P* **66** *L* **31** # 284
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"2.5GMII" should be "2.5GPII".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "2.5GPII".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.5** *P* **66** *L* **53** # 285
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"24 bit" should be "24-bit".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "24-bit".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.5.6** *P* **69** *L* **39** # 286
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"24 bit" should be "24-bit".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "24-bit".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.4** *P* **77** *L* **45** # 287
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

This paragraph uses "X" to indicate a number of 2.5GPII symbols, however the title is just "WALIGN()" (no input variable X). I'm not an expert in Function definitions but I think it should be "WALIGN(X)". Also, other functions use lowercase "x" or "y", probably should be the same here.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "WALIGN()" to "WALIGN(x)". Change instances of "X" to "x".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127B** *SC* *P* **158** *L* **46** # 288
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"2.5Gb/s"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "2.5 Gb/s"

Two instances:

Page 158, Line 46
Page 158, Line 49
Page 159, Line 6

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.2** *P* **99** *L* **43** # 289
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

There seems to be an inconsistantcy between "2.5GBASE-X PMD" and "2.5GBASE-KX PMD", previously in the draft I only saw "2.5GBASE-KX PMD". Should be consistant throughout the draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances of "2.5GBASE-X PMD" to "2.5GBASE-KX PMD". I see "2.5GBASE-X PMD" in the following places.

Page 99, Line 43
Page 100, Line 24
Page 157, Line 8

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.2** *P* **99** *L* **46** # 290
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

"64B/66B". Shouldn't this be "8B/10B" for BASE-X?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "8B/10B".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.2.4.3** *P* **101** *L* **42** # 291
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"1000BASE-KX PHY". Should be "2.5GBASE-KX PHY".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "2.5GBASE-KX PHY".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.6.10** *P* **105** *L* **26** # 292
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"Auto-negotiation". Should be "Auto-Negotiation" (capital "N").

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Auto-Negotiation".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.2** *P* **107** *L* **31** # 293
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"The differential The differential return loss,"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The differential return loss,"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.4** *P* **108** *L* **6** # 294
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

In Figure 128-3, it says "SL<p> - SLn<n>".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "SL<p> - SL<n>".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.6** *P* **109** *L* **42** # 295
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"The minimum differential return loss is shown in Figure 128-5". Should be "The minimum common-mode output return loss is shown in Figure 128-5". Also the title to Figure 128-5 is wrong.

SuggestedRemedy

1) Change "The minimum differential return loss is shown in Figure 128-5" to "The minimum common-mode output return loss is shown in Figure 128-5".

2) Change the title of Figure 128-5 to "Trasnmitter common-mode return loss".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.9** *P* **110** *L* **46** # 296
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Typos. "C" in "Component" and "peak-to-peaks".

SuggestedRemedy

Change sentence to "... deterministic component of 0.15 UI peak-to-peak and a ..."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128** *SC* **128.7.1.10** *P* **111** *L* **2** # 297
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

128.7.1.10 Transmitter output waveform defines symbol periods and voltages for a square test pattern that is used for the "transmitter output waveform test". However, there aren't any electrical requirements involving these times and voltages. Does Clause 128 even need a transmitted output waveform test? It does not include equalization so is it necessary? CL70 1000BASE-KX also does not define an equalizer and is missing a subclause equivalent to 128.7.1.10.

SuggestedRemedy

Either

a) Remove 128.7.1.10 including associated text and diagrams.

or

b) Add electrical requirements involving the test pattern voltages, similar to those found in 72.7.1.11.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.1.2** *P* **165** *L* **6** # 298
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

In Figure 128A-6 there are two instances of "SL<p>". One of them should be "SL<n>". Same things appears in Figure 120A-6 in 130A.3.1.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Change one of the "SL<p>" to "SL<n>" in Figure 128A-6 and 130A-6.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.1.5** *P* **166** *L* **49** # 299
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"5"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "five".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128A** *SC* **128A.3.3.2** *P* **171** *L* **8** # 300
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

Remove the striked out text "per lane (range)".

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: duplicate of #23]

Cl **128B** *SC* **128B.2.4** *P* **181** *L* **25** # 301
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Since Clause 128 doesn't define equalization is this transmitter control necessary? It's only used to change equalizor values during the receiver interference tolerance test.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove 128B.2.4

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **128B** *SC* **128B.3** *P* **181** *L* **40** # 302
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

Looks like this sentence is missing a subclause reference, "in for 2.5GBASE-KX".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "in 128.7.2.1 for 2.5GBASE-KX."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128C** *SC* **128C.3** *P* **185** *L* **50** # 303
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"100 (Ohm)+/- 10%".

SuggestedRemedy

Add space so the text reads "100 (Ohm) +/- 10%".

Note: Use Ohm symbol.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128C** *SC* **128C.4.1** *P* **186** *L* **24** # 304
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

Top two rows of Table 128C-1 list parameters "F max" and "F min". Should be "f_max" and "f_min" where "_" represents subscript text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "f_max" and "f_min".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128C** *SC* **128C.4.6.1** *P* **190** *L* **34** # 305
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

Missing "(" in "PSNEXT)".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "(PSNEXT)".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128D** *SC* **128D.2.3.1** *P* **196** *L* **39** # 306
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

Title is identical to 128D.2.3.2 and not correct. Should be "Mated test fixture multiple disturber near-end crosstalk (MDNEXT) loss". Also, MDNEXT has been defined and used in other Clauses as "Multiple Disturber Near End Crosstalk" but here its spelt out as "single disturber near-end crosstalk".

SuggestedRemedy

1) Change the subclause title to "Mated test fixture multiple disturber near-end crosstalk (MDNEXT) loss".

2) Change "Single Disturber Near-End Crosstalk" to "Multiple Disturber Near-End Crosstalk".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **128D** *SC* **128D.2.3.2** *P* **197** *L* **19** # 307
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

This subclause is either missing parameters (mostly far-end) or has some additional unnecessary parameters defined. For example Equations 128D-6 and 218D-7 are nearly identical, the difference is the use of Ant vs Aft but both equations are labelled as Wnt. Since Aft is not defined my guess is that there shouldn't be any far-end parameters in this section.

SuggestedRemedy

Either

a) Remove Equation 128D-7 and any references to that equation.

or

b) Add in far-end parameters to these definitions and rename Wnt in Eq. 128D-7 to Wft.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **129** *SC* **129.1.3** *P* **120** *L* **16** # 308
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"5GBASE-X PCS". Should be "5GBASE-R PCS".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "5GBASE-R PCS"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **129** *SC* **129.1.4** *P* **121** *L* **17** # 309
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

There seems to be an inconsistantcy between "5GBASE-R PMD" and "5GBASE-KR PMD", previously in the draft I only saw "5GBASE-KR PMD". Should be consistant throughout the draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances of "5GBASE-R PMD" to "5GBASE-KR PMD". I see "5GBASE-R PMD" in the following places.

Page 121, Line 17
Page 125, Line 5
Page 134, Line 24

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **129** *SC* **129.3.2.2** *P* **125** *L* **39** # 310
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

This paragraph has 3 instances of "sixteen". The IEEE style manual stats the numbers less than 10 should be spelt out. To be consistant with other text in this draft and the 802.3 std, change "sixteen" to "16".

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances of "sixteen" to "16".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **129** *SC* **129.5** *P* **126** *L* **10** # 311
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"BT" is used in this paragraph to abbreviate "bit-times". But this is the on;y instance of "BT" I found in the draft. Should be consistant throughout draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "BT" to "bit-times"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **129** *SC* **129.7.3** *P* **128** *L* **14** # 312
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"PCS" is used in the Value column of rows 3 and 4. Two major capabilities should not use the same name.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the "PCS" in row 4 to "BER".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **129** *SC* **129.7.6.3** *P* **130** *L* **40** # 313
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

The PICS table in 129.7.6.2 and 29.7.6.3 are identical.

SuggestedRemedy

Populate the PICS table in 129.7.6.3 with the appropriate text.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.6.4** *P* **138** *L* **3** # 314
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"Global PMD signal detect function" should be "Global_PMD_signal_detect function"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Global_PMD_signal_detect function".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.4** *P* **142** *L* **5** # 315
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

In Figure 130-3, "SL<p> - SLn<n>".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "SL<p> - SL<n>".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.7** *P* **144** *L* **31** # 316
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

The enabling/disabling of equalization in this paragraph is confusing. First it says "with no equalization and a run of at least eight consecutive ones." then says "equalization may be disabled completely during this testing." Should be clear and consistant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the last sentence of this paragraph. This will make it clear that equalization needs to be disabled to accurately measure the transition time, and it would be consistant with 10GBASE-KR as well.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.7.1.10** *P* **145** *L* **1** # 317
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

130.7.1.10 Transmitter output waveform defines symbol periods and voltages for a square test pattern that is used for the "transmitter output waveform test". However, there aren't any electrical requirements involving these times and voltages.

SuggestedRemedy

Add electrical requirements involving the test pattern voltages, similar to those found in 72.7.1.11.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **130A** *SC* *P* **201** *L* **6** # 318
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

Annex title is "5Gb/s Storage Enclosure Interface".

"5Gb/s" in 130A.4 title too.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "5Gb/s" to 5 Gb/s" in both titles.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130A** *SC* **130A.3.1** *P* **206** *L* **9** # 319
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

Remove the striked out text "per lane (range)".

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: duplicate of #23.]

Cl **130B** *SC* **130B.1** *P* **221** *L* **17** # 320
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
"Channel".

SuggestedRemedy
Change to "channel" (lowercase). Also in 128B.1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130B** *SC* **130B.2.2** *P* **222** *L* **35** # 321
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
"ILTC" should be "IL_TC" where "_" represents subscript text.

Also in 128B.2.2.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "ILTC" to IL_TC" in both locations.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130B** *SC* **130B.3** *P* **223** *L* **38** # 322
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
"2.5GBASE-KX" should be "5GBASE-KR".

SuggestedRemedy
Change to "5GBASE-KR"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **130B** *SC* **130B.3** *P* **223** *L* **43** # 323
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Looks like this sentence is missing a subclause reference, "in for 5GBASE-KR".

SuggestedRemedy
Change to "in 130.7.2.1 for 5GBASE-KR."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.5.1.1.2** *P* **30** *L* **14** # 324
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
"over undefined PMD". After reviewing other aMAUTypes, I can't find other instances of this langauge.

Also seen on page 30 line 20.

SuggestedRemedy
Fix this to match other aMAUType descriptions

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **31B** *SC* **31B.4.6** *P* **156** *L* **28** # 325
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Rows are missing divider.

SuggestedRemedy
Add divider between rows.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.7.14aa** *P* **39** *L* **25** # 326
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

In the description column of the third row in Table 45-211aa, "2.5GBASE-KR". This should be "2.5GBASE-KX".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "2.5GBASE-KX".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.5.3.1** *P* **41** *L* **28** # 327
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

In the status column, one of the values is "5GKX:M". This should be "5GKR:M".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "5GKR:M".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **69** *SC* **69.1.1** *P* **43** *L* **16** # 328
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

"...1000 Mb/s, 2.5Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, 10 Gb/s,..." There should be a space in "2.5Gb/s".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "2.5 Gb/s".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **73** *SC* **73.2** *P* **47** *L* **33** # 329
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

In Figure 73-1, just under the MEDIUM symbol it says "1 Gb/s, 2.5Gb/s, 5Gb/s, 10 Gb/s, 25Gb/s, 40 Gb/s or 100 Gb/s". Should read "1 Gb/s, 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, 40 Gb/s or 100 Gb/s".

SuggestedRemedy

Add spaces so it reads "1 Gb/s, 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, 40 Gb/s or 100 Gb/s".

Note: The "25Gb/s" was added to this diagram by P802.3by but in that draft it is properly inserted as "25 Gb/s".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** *SC* **Abstract** *P* **3** *L* **1** # 330
Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

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

The first sentence of the abstract is strange. "This amendment to the IEEE Std 802.3-2015". Either it needs improvement or should be removed (I don't see similar text from other amendments).

SuggestedRemedy

Change or remove.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Editor's note: duplicate of #158]

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **8** *L* **7** # 331
Law, David HPE

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Please add Working Group voter list supplied in IEEE_P802d3cb_WG_names_DL_290816.fm

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.2** *P* **62** *L* **48** # 332

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Subclause 127.2.2 'Functions within the PCS' states that 'The Word Encode process continuously generates four 2.5GPII symbols based upon the TXD <31:0> and TXC <3:0> signals on the XGMII, sending them to the Word-to-Octets process.' however according to Figure 127–2 'Functional block diagram' and the TX_XGMII state of Figure 127–4 'PCS Word Encode and Word-to-Octets state diagram' the Word Encode process generates four 2.5GPII symbols along with an associated 4 bits of transmit enable and 4 bits of transmit error.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that 'The Word Encode process continuously generates four 2.5GPII symbols based upon the TXD <31:0> and TXC <3:0> signals on the XGMII, sending them to the Word-to-Octets process.' should be changed to read 'The Word Encode process continuously generates four 2.5GPII symbols (tpd<3:0><7:0>), and associated 4 bits of transmit enable (tp_en<3:0>) and 4 bits of transmit error (tp_er<3:0>), based upon the TXD <31:0> and TXC <3:0> signals on the XGMII, sending them to the Word-to-Octets process.'.

Additionally suggest that the text 'The Word-to-Octets process takes the four 2.5GPII symbols and outputs them one 2.5GPII symbol at a time to the PCS Transmit Process.' be changed to read 'The Word-to-Octets process takes the four 2.5GPII symbols, and associated transmit enable and transmit error, and transmits one 2.5GPII symbol and its associated transmit enable and transmit error at a time to the PCS Transmit Process across the 2.5GPII.'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.1** *P* **63** *L* **53** # 333

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

There are two instances in subclause 127.2.4.1 '2.5Gb/s PCS Internal Interface (2.5GPII)' where a it is stated that 'The nominal rate of operation is ..' however a time, not a rate, is specified.

In addition in response to comment i-77 of on the initial sponsor ballot of IEEE P802.3bz/D3.0 the clock precision for the XGMII clock defined in subclause 46.3.1.1 was changed from +/-0.01% to +/- 100ppm. While 0.01% and 100 ppm are equivalent I believe that the use of ppm is more common when defining clock precision in IEEE 802.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that on page 63, line 53 the text ' The nominal rate of operation is 12.8ns +/- 0.01%.' should be changed to read 'The nominal rate of operation is 78.125 Msymbols/s +/- 100pm.' and that 'The nominal rate of operation of the single 2.5GPII symbol is 3.2ns +/- 0.01%.' be changed to read ' The nominal rate of operation of the 2.5GPII is 312.5 Msymbols/s +/- 100ppm.'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4.1** *P* **64** *L* **5** # 334

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Table 127-1 and 127-2 both list 'Data X' as an 'abbreviation' for the permissible encoding 1, 0, 0x00 to 0xFF. The only other uses of 'Data X' I can find are in Table 127–3 'Word Encode mapping' Table 127–4 'Word Decode mapping' where it is used in relation to the XGMII but I don';t think they are related. As an aside, I think an abbreviation is usual a shorter form of a word or phrase, therefore not sure that 'Data X' is an abbreviation of the word 'Data'.

SuggestedRemedy

Since it seems it is not used, suggest that the 'abbreviation' 'Data X' be removed from Table 127-1 and 127-2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.3** *P* **74** *L* **19** # 335

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

The definition for the sync_status states that it is 'A parameter set by the PCS Synchronization process ...'. The term parameter is normally used for information conveyed in a primitive related to a service interface, for example see subclause 127.3.1.1.1 'Semantics of the service primitive'. I don't think this is the case for sync_status. Further I don't see sync_status generated by the PCS Synchronization process, instead it is derived from code_sync_status (which is generated by the PCS Synchronization process) and rx_lpi_active varibles.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the text 'A parameter set by the PCS Synchronization process to reflect the status of the link as viewed by the receiver. The values of the parameter are defined for code_sync_status. The equation for this parameter is' be replaced with 'Alias used by the PCS receive state diagram, consisting of the following terms:'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.3** *P* **74** *L* **19** # 336

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Since tx_even is generated by Figure 127–6 'PCS transmit code-group state diagram', part of the TRANSMIT function in Figure 127-2, and is used by Figure 127–4 'PCS Word Encode and Word-to-Octets state diagram', the WORD-TO-OCTET function in Figure 127-2, tx_even seesms to cross the 2.5GPII and therefore appears to be part of the interface.

SuggestedRemedy

Add sync_status to Figure 127-2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.3** *P* **74** *L* **24** # 337

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Subclause 127.2.6.1.3 'Variables' states that 'The equation for this parameter is sync_status = code_sync_status + rx_lpi_active.' While rx_lpi_active is a Boolean (see page 76, line 18), code_sync_status is not, instead the values for the code_sync_status parameter are 'FAIL' and 'OK' (see page 76, line 10). Further it is stated that The values of the parameter are defined for code_sync_status.'.

As a result the above the output of this equation is defined as parameter with the value of either 'FAIL' or 'OK' based on a OR of a Boolean and a parameter with the value of either 'FAIL' or 'OK'. It however isn't clearly defined how the parameter values 'FAIL' and 'OK' should be mapped to Boolean values for input to, and output from, the OR operation.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that text 'Where the parameter value 'OK' maps to the Boolean value 'TRUE' and 'FAIL' maps to the Boolean value 'FALSE'.' be added after the equation.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.3** *P* **74** *L* **34** # 338

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Figure 127–2 'Functional block diagram' shows the input to the 'WORD-TO-OCTETS' as tpd<3:0><7:0>, tp_en<3:0> and tp_er<3:0>, and the output as tpd<7:0>, tp_en, tp_er. Similarly Figure 127–4 'PCS Word Encode and Word-to-Octets state diagram' shows assignments such as tp_en <= tp_en<0>, tp_er <= tp_er<0> and tpd<7:0> <= tpd<0><7:0>.

It is confusing to use the same variable names as both the input and output of the 'WORD-TO-OCTETS' function with the only differentiation being that the input is an array, for example tp_en<3:0>, and the output is a bit, for example tp_en. This also looks odd within the stats diagram as you end up with assignments such as tp_en <= tp_en<0>. In particular this is because in other instances the name of the array is used to mean the entire array. As an example tx_code-group<9:0> is defined on page 75, line 7, yet in the state SPECIAL_GO (page 83, 10) there is the assignment tx_code-group <= tx_o_set without reference to the array width.

In addition the definition for tpd<x><7:0> states that 'x= 0, 1, 2, 3 for the four sets of 2.5GPII.'. That doesn't seem to match the use of tpd as an input to the 'WORD-TO-OCTETS' function in Figure 127–2, nor to the definition of the WENCODE function (page 78, line 6), where x has the value '3:0'.

I'm also not sure the definition for the input variables to the 'WORD-TO-OCTETS' function are correct. Take as an example tp_en<x> (page 74, line 38). The definition states '2.5GPII transmit data valid to the Word-to-Octets process. x= 0, 1, 2, 3 for the four sets of 2.5GPII.'

According to Figure 127–2 'Functional block diagram' the 2.5GPII is between the 'WORD-TO-OCTETS' block and the PMA. This isn't where this variable is used, instead it is used between the 'WORD ENCODE' block and the 'WORD-TO-OCTETS' block, and therefore this isn't '2.5GPII transmit data valid', it's the input to the Word-to-Octets process that 2.5GPII transmit data valid is derived from.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that since the connection between the 'WORD ENCODE' block and the 'WORD-TO-OCTETS' isn't defined as an interface, and is instead internal to the PCS Word Encode and Word-to-Octets state diagram, that:

[1] tp_en<3:0> be changed to be we_tp_en<3:0>
[2] tp_er<3:0> be changed to be we_tp_er<3:0>
[3] tpd<3:0><7:0> be changed to we_tpd<31:0>

[4] The assignments in state TX_XGMII be changed to:

{we_tp_en<3:0>,we_tp_er<3:0>,we_tpd<31:0>,wencode_state} <=
WENCODE(TXC<3:0>,TXD<31:0>,wencode_state)

[5] The assignments in state TX_2.5GPII_0 be changed to:

tp_en <= we_tp_en<0>
tp_er <= we_tp_er<0>
tpd<7:0> <= we_tpd<7:0>

[6] The assignments in state TX_2.5GPII_1 be changed to:

tp_en <= we_tp_en<1>
tp_er <= we_tp_er<1>
tpd<7:0> <= we_tpd<15:8>

[7] The assignments in state TX_2.5GPII_2 be changed to:

tp_en <= we_tp_en<2>
tp_er <= we_tp_er<2>
tpd<7:0> <= we_tpd<23:16>

[8] The assignments in state TX_2.5GPII_3 be changed to:

tp_en <= we_tp_en<3>
tp_er <= we_tp_er<3>
tpd<7:0> <= we_tpd<31:24>

[9] The definition for tpd<x><7:0> be changed to read:

we_tpd<31:0>
Transmit data output of the WORD ENCODE process.

[10] The definition of tp_en<x> be changed to read:

tp_en<3:0>
Transmit data valid output of the WORD ENCODE process.

[11] The definition of tp_er<x> be changed to read:

tp_er<3:0>
Transmit error output of the WORD ENCODE process.

[12] Figure 127–2 'Functional block diagram be updated as follows:

tpd<3:0><7:0> be changed to we_tpd<31:0>
tp_en<3:0> be changed to be we_tp_en<3:0>
tp_er<3:0> be changed to be we_tp_er<3:0>

[13] 127.2.4.3 'Word-to-Octets' is changed to read:

The Word-to-Octets process takes the output of the Word Encoder (we_tp_en<3:0>, we_tp_er<3:0>, we_tpd<31:0>) and presents it one symbol at a time (tp_en, tp_er, tpd<7:0>) to the PCS transmit process. we_tpd<7:0> is presented first and we_tpd<31:24>

is presented last.

The Word-to-Octets process shall be synchronized to the PCS transmit process such that we_tpd<7:0> and we_tpd<23:16> are presented to the PCS transmit process which will result in the corresponding ordered set to be output to the PMA when the variable tx_even is TRUE and we_tpd<15:8> and we_tpd<31:24> when the variable tx_even is FALSE.

[14] A similar set of changes should be made to the receive path.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.3** *P* **75** *L* **16** # 339

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

I believe that running disparity is described in subclause 36.2.4.4 'Running disparity rules' of IEEE Std 802.3-2015, not subclause 36.2.4.3 which I believe is 'Valid and invalid code-groups.'.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that 'Running disparity is described in 36.2.4.3.' be changed to read 'Running disparity is described in 36.2.4.4.'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.1.7** *P* **79** *L* **42** # 340

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Subclause 46.3.1.1 'TX_CLK (transmit clock)' of IEEE Std 802.3-2015, as modified by IEEE P802.3bz/D3.3, states that 'TX_CLK provides the timing reference for the transfer of the TXC<3:0> and TXD<31:0> signals from the RS to the PHY. The values of TXC<3:0> and TXD<31:0> shall be sampled by the PHY on both the rising edge and falling edge of TX_CLK.'.

Figure 127–4 'PCS Word Encode and Word-to-Octets state diagram' uses cg_timer_done to exit the RESET state in to the TX_XGMII state, where TXC<3:0> and TXD<31:0> are sampled by the WENCODE function. From that point on a further four occurrences of cg_timer_done cause entry in to the TX_XGMII state, and for TXC<3:0> and TXD<31:0> to be sampled again by the WENCODE function. Based this doesn't the cg_timer timer have to be phase locked to TX_CLK. If not drift between cg_timer and TX_CLK could result in loss or duplication of data.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the text 'The cg_timer shall expire synchronously with both the rising edge and falling edge of TX_CLK (see tolerance required for TX_CLK in 46.3.1.1) on entry to the TX_XGMII state in the PCS Word Encode and Word-to-Octets state diagram (see Figure 127-4).' be added to the definition of the cg_timer timer.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.1** *P* **80** *L* **25** # 341

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Subclause 127.2.2 'Functions within the PCS', and its subclauses 127.2.4.2 'Word Encode' 127.2.4.3 'Word-to-Octets', give a reasonably detailed description of the operation of these functions, and therefore, the associated state diagrams. Subclause 127.2.6 'Detailed functions and state diagrams', despite its title, however in subclause 127.2.6.2.1 'Word Encode and Word-to-Octets' gives only a higher level description.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that instead of duplicating at a high level, a cross reference be provided to the earlier detailed text, and that subclause 127.2.6.2.1 'Word Encode and Word-to-Octets' be changed to read:

The Word Encode function (see 127.2.4.3) and Word-to-Octets function (see 127.2.4.3) are described in the state diagram depicted in Figure 127–4, including compliance with the associated state variables as specified in 127.2.6.1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.1** *P* **81** *L* **11** # 342

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Since tx_even is generated by Figure 127–6 'PCS transmit code-group state diagram', part of the TRANSMIT function in Figure 127-2, and is used by Figure 127–4 'PCS Word Encode and Word-to-Octets state diagram', the WORD-TO-OCTET function in Figure 127-2, tx_even cross the 2.5GPII and therfore appears to be part of the interface.

SuggestedRemedy

Add tx_even to Figure 127-2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.1** *P* **81** *L* **43** # 343

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

In Figure 127–4 'PCS Word Encode and Word-to-Octets state diagram' suggest that 'tx_even_FALSE' should read 'tx_even=FALSE' on the exit from state TX_2.5GPII_3.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.2** *P* **82** *L* **2** # 344

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

In Figure 127–5 'PCS transmit ordered set state diagram' suggest that 'tx_en=0 * tx_er=0' should read 'tp_en=0 * tp_er=0' on the transition from the state TX_TEST_XMIT to XMIT_DATA.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.2** *P* **82** *L* **4** # 345

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

In Figure 127–5 'PCS transmit ordered set state diagram' suggest that 'tx_en=1 * tx_er=1' should read 'tp_en=1 * tp_er=1' on the transition from the state XMIT_DATA to ALIGN_ERR_START.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.2** *P* **83** *L* **26** # 346

Law, David HPE

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

The 'else' in the states should be uppercase, see the last entry in IEEE Std 802.3-2015 Table 21–1. Suggest that the 'If' and 'then' should also be UPPERCASE. See IEEE Std 802.3-215 Figure 48–7 for example of this formatting.

Suggest similar formatting for state diagram function definition pseudo code that uses the same construct on page 77, line 28.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.3** *P* **85** *L* **5** # 347

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

It is states that 'For EEE capability the relationship between sync_status and code_sync_status is given by Figure 127–8c;
otherwise sync_status is identical to code_sync_status.'. I don't see the relationship between sync_status and code_sync_status given in Figure 127–8c, in fact I don't see sync_status used in Figure 127–8c, only code_sync_status is used.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that 'For EEE capability the relationship between sync_status and code_sync_status is given by Figure 127–8c; otherwise sync_status is identical to code_sync_status.' be changed to read 'For EEE capability the relationship between sync_status and code_sync_status is given by the definition of the sync_status variable in 127.2.6.1.3; otherwise sync_status is identical to code_sync_status.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.4** *P* **86** *L* **5** # 348

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

In Figure 127–8a 'PCS receive state diagram, part a' suggest that 'rx lpi active <= FALSE;' should read 'rx_lpi_active <= FALSE' in the LINK_FAILED state.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.4** *P* **86** *L* **5** # 349

Law, David HPE

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

In Figure 127–8a 'PCS receive state diagram, part a' suggest that in the state 'LINK_FAILED' the spurious ';' at the end of the first two assignments, and the spurious '.' at the end of the third, be deleted.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.4** *P* **86** *L* **11** # 350

Law, David HPE

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

In Figure 127–8a 'PCS receive state diagram, part a' suggest that in the state 'WAIT_FOR_K' the spurious ';' at the end of the first assignments and the spurious '.' at the end of the second, be deleted.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.4** *P* **86** *L* **19** # 351

Law, David HPE

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

In Figure 127–8a 'PCS receive state diagram, part a' suggest that 'rp-dv <= 0;' should read 'rp_dv <= 0' in the RX_K state.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.4** *P* **86** *L* **29** # 352

Law, David HPE

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

In Figure 127–8a 'PCS receive state diagram, part a' suggest that 'rp-dv <= 0;' should read 'rp_dv <= 0' in the IDLE_D state.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.6.2.4** *P* **86** *L* **47** # 353

Law, David HPE

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

In Figure 127–8a 'PCS receive state diagram, part a' suggest that a note similar to NOTE 2 found on Figure 127–8b 'PCS receive state diagram, part b' be added for the edit from the CARRIER_DETECT states.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that 'NOTE 2 - The transitions from the CARRIER_DETECT state is a test against the codegroup obtained from the SUDI that caused the transition to CARRIER_DETECT state.' be added to Figure 127–8a 'PCS receive state diagram, part a'. The existing note will need to be designated NOTE 1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **127** *SC* **127.7.5.4** *P* **97** *L* **48** # 354

Law, David HPE

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

In item PMA1 suggest that '… of tx_code_group' should read '… of tx_code-group' .

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **129** *SC* **129.7.6.6** *P* **131** *L* **25** # 355

Law, David HPE

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

Suggest we don't use dashes in PICS item designation.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the item designations LP-0X be changed to read 'LPX'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **127** *SC* **127.2.4** *P* **63** *L* # 356

Kim, Yong Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

XGMII is the adopted interface for 2.5G, and the baseline for the 2.5G Backplane signalling is compatible with 1000BASE-KX (and possibly propriatary SGMII in broad use) running at 2.5X speed-up. It is highly desireable to make features that were not present at 1G, but present at 2.5G due to adoption of XGMII (10G) runing at 1/4 speed, to be optional.

SuggestedRemedy

A bit broad reaching changes. Requres ordered set transmit for link status to be optional. 127.2.5.6 Sequence /Q/ clause need to indicate optional implementation; 127.2.6.2.2 Transmit needs to say "if the optional link status signalling is enabled..." And Annex 127B should be expanded to make this clear. Please refer to the presentation WRT to this comment, to be submited for Sept 2016 Interim.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**