

Please configure project comments

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

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response Response Status **U**

ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 0 P 11 L 13 # 155

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

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 Corrigendum 1 description.

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use .bv as an example of where to place this and the needed content, based on 802.3cb's use of other drafts. It is also recommended that the particular draft used, be quoted with this information.]

[Also, can add an editor's note, in the draft, that states "This information may change for Sponsor Ballot."]

Please configure project comments

CI 128A SC 128A.3.1.7 P 172 L 33 # 7

Dudek, Mike Cavium

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

It seems unlikely that an SNDR value of only 5.6dB will provide a 1e-12 error rate. (SNDR is expected to be be un-equalizable noise and a 5.6dB SNR will not provide 1e-12 error rate). The effect of jitter and reflections from a worst case Rx (versus the good test load) will futher degrade the signal beyond this value.

SuggestedRemedy

Determine a reasonable value. Clause 92 uses 26dB which may be higher than necessary.

Make the change on page 175 line 8 as well, and change the SDNR for the drive interference in table 128A-8.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Suggested remedy for part one does not have enough specific information to implement. Documentation exists that explains the reason for this value.

Out of scope for this recirculation, this text has been unchanged since Draft 1.0.

2nd part of suggested remedy was implemented by changing SDNR to SNDR in the Table 128A-8. This is a duplicate of comment 3.