Cl **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　*P* **1**　　　*L* **31**　　　# 30

Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　Ciena

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*

The Working Group Chair has now announced the assumed approval order for the next three amendments as:
IEEE P802.3bs - Amendment 10
IEEE P802.3cc - Amendment 11
IEEE P802.3cb - Amendment 12

SuggestedRemedy

Change the end of the list of amendments on Page 1 line 31 from:
"… IEEE Std 802.3bu-2016, and IEEE Std 802.3bv-2017." to:
"… IEEE Std 802.3bu-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bv-2017, IEEE Std 802.3-2015/Cor 1-2017, IEEE Std 802.3bs-201x, IEEE Std 802.3cc-201x, and IEEE Std 802.3cb-201x."

On page 13:
Add the summary for Corrigendum 1 to be immediately after the summary for 802.3bv
In the summary for 802.3bs, add Amendment 10-
Add the summary for 802.3cc as Amendment 11 after 802.3bs
Add the summary for 802.3cb as Amendment 12 after 802.3cc

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **000**　　*SC* **0**　　　　*P* **13**　　　*L* **19**　　　# 185

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket><late>*

Shouldn't IEEE Std 802.3-2015/Cor1-2017 be listed in the introduction of what we're amending?

SuggestedRemedy

Add IEEE Std 802.3-2015/Cor1-2017 to the list of ammendments preceding the cd ammendment.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: This comment was received after the Working Group ballot closed.]

See comment #30.

Cl **000**　　*SC* **69.1.2**　　　　*P* **80**　　　*L* **47**　　　# 20

Hajduczenia, Marek　　　　　　Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket><cc>*

"two-lane" or "2-lane" - it is not a big difference but the draft seems to use such terms inconsistently.

SuggestedRemedy

If you feel like doin a global find&replace, please at least align how you use these terms. I would opt for <number"-lane format, which is easier to read IMO

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: Changed clause from 69 to 000.]

802.3-2015 Section 6 uses only "four-lane" and not "4-lane".

P802.3bs is inconsistent, but the use of text form is significantly more prevalent than digit form.

Make the following changes thoughout the document with the exception of unchanged, imported text in amended clauses, if any.

Change all instances of "1-lane" to "one-lane".

Change all instances of "2-lane" to "two-lane".

Change all instances of "4-lane" to "four-lane".

Cl **030**　　*SC* **30.5.1.1.2**　　　　*P* **41**　　　*L* **25**　　　# 49

Graber, Steffen　　　　　　　Pepperl+Fuchs

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*

100GBASE-R on right side of table

SuggestedRemedy

Change 100GBASE-R to 200GBASE-R

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **030**
SC **30.5.1.1.2**

Page 1 of 14
2017-07-10 12:43:28 P

Cl **030** *SC* **30.5.1.1.2** *P* **41** *L* **25** # 61

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket>*

Should it be 200GBASE-R? same comment for line 27, and 29.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response comment #49

Cl **030** *SC* **30.5.1.1.2** *P* **41** *L* **27** # 50

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket>*

100GBASE-R on right side of table

SuggestedRemedy

Change 100GBASE-R to 200GBASE-R

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **030** *SC* **30.5.1.1.2** *P* **41** *L* **29** # 51

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket>*

100GBASE-R on right side of table

SuggestedRemedy

Change 100GBASE-R to 200GBASE-R

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **030** *SC* **30.5.1.1.15** *P* **42** *L* **35** # 178

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket><late>*

Clause 119 has been added to the aFECAbility list of clauses

SuggestedRemedy

Bring in the changes made by 802.3bs, which are: Add "Clause 119," after Clause 108. Delete the words "a FEC sublayer for"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: This comment was received after the Working Group ballot closed.]

Cl **030** *SC* **30.5.1.1.29** *P* **43** *L* **0** # 175

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket><late>*

aRSFECIndicationAbility has a Clause 91 reference, need to add Clause 134 as well.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the (see 91.5.3.3) from both 30.5.1.1.29 and 30.5.1.1.31

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: This comment was received after the Working Group ballot closed.]

Cl **045** *SC* **45.2.7** *P* **77** *L* **6** # 18

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket>*

Bottom line in Table 45-200 should be thick all around

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the line thickness

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **045**
SC **45.2.7**

Page 2 of 14
2017-07-10 12:43:28 P

Cl **045**　　*SC* **45.5**　　　　*P* **78**　　　*L* **1**　　　# 19
Hajduczenia, Marek　　　　　　　Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*
Since there are no PICS to be added, why is it in here and empty?

SuggestedRemedy
Remove 45.5 is no PICs are intended to be added

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

Remove Clause 45 PICS

Cl **045**　　*SC* **45.5**　　　　*P* **78**　　　*L* **1**　　　# 31
Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　Ciena

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*
The Clause 45 PICS has no changes in it.

SuggestedRemedy
Either add some changes to the Clause 45 PICS or remove this section from the draft.

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

Remove Clause 45 PICS

Cl **045**　　*SC* **45.5.3.3**　　　*P* **78**　　　*L* **11**　　　# 62
Cheng, Weiying　　　　　　　Coriant

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*
Is there any reason to have an empty table here? If there is no change, remove it.
Otherwise, add changes for the PICS.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Remove Clause 45 PICS

Cl **069**　　*SC* **69.1.2**　　　*P* **80**　　　*L* **53**　　　# 21
Hajduczenia, Marek　　　　　　　Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*
Missing "," before "repectively"

SuggestedRemedy
Add missing comma

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

Cl **069**　　*SC* **69.2.3**　　　*P* **81**　　　*L* **36**　　　# 32
Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　Ciena

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*
4-level should not split across two lines

SuggestedRemedy
change to a non-breaking hyphen (Esc - h)

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

Cl **073**　　*SC* **73.6.4**　　　*P* **85**　　　*L* **17**　　　# 23
Hajduczenia, Marek　　　　　　　Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*
Stray "."

SuggestedRemedy
Remove "."

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

Cl **073**　　*SC* **73.6.4**　　　*P* **85**　　　*L* **44**　　　# 24
Hajduczenia, Marek　　　　　　　Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*
It does not matter what the purpose of reservation its is, it is just reserved, nothing more.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "Reserved for future technology" to "Reserved"

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **073**
SC **73.6.4**

Page 3 of 14
2017-07-10 12:43:28 P

Cl **080**   *SC* **80.1.3**   *P* **93**   *L* **20**   # 54

Hanan, Leizerovich   MultiPhy

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

There is no 100GAUI-4 in Annex 83A, Annex83B, Annex83D, or Annex83E.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
Annex 83A, Annex 83B, Annex 83D, or Annex 83E.

to:
Annex 83A, Annex 83B, Annex 83D, Annex 83E, Annex135D, or Annex 135E .

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **080**   *SC* **80.1.3**   *P* **93**   *L* **44**   # 25

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

"100GBASE-KP4 all use a 4 lane data path." - in this case, "4 lane" is an adjective and should be hyphenated

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "4-lane"; make changes also in other pieces of text already in the draft for consistency. See also comment on "four-lane" versus "4-lane"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The instance of "4 lane" pointed out by the commenter is in imported, unchanged text (i.e., not new text). A maintenance request against 802.3-2015 is required to make the suggested change in this location.

However, there are other instances in new text which should be fixed.

In all instances of new text with "<number> lane" used as an adjective, add a hyphen as follows "<number>-lane".

See also comment #20.

Cl **080**   *SC* **80.7**   *P* **101**   *L* **0**   # 182

Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket><late>*

We added new 100G Clauses so list of related clauses needs to be updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Clause 135-138, Clause 140" to the list of clauses that are 100G related to the first paragraph of 80.7

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: This comment was received after the Working Group ballot closed.]

Import from 802.3-2015 and amend the first paragraph of 80.7, adding clauses 135, 136, 137, 138, and 140 to the list of clauses.

Cl **090**   *SC* **90.1**   *P* **104**   *L* **6**   # 33

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

The paragraph being changed is the second paragraph of 90.1 not the first.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "second" to "first".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **091**   *SC* **91.3**   *P* **105**   *L* **0**   # 183

Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket><late>*

Need to add 135 reference

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the 2nd sentence of the 1st paragraph of 91.3 to read "Therefore, the RS-FEC sublayer may be a client of the PMA sublayer defined in Clause 83 or Clause 135 when the PMA service interface width, p, is set to 4."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: This comment was received after the Working Group ballot closed.]

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **091**   Page 4 of 14
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **91.3**   2017-07-10 12:43:28 P
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.4**   *P* **112**   *L* **8**   # 34
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*
Comment r01-56 against P802.3bs D3.1 has added a column for "Clause 118 200GMII Extender" in Table 116-3 as "O" for all PHY types.

SuggestedRemedy
Add a column for "Clause 118 200GMII Extender" in Table 116-2a as "O" for both PHY types.
Add a column for "Clause 118 200GMII Extender" in Table 116-3 as "O" for all PHY types.

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

Cl **120**   *SC* **120.5.7.2**   *P* **115**   *L* **31**   # 35
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*
The editor's note says it will be deleted in the next draft.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete the note

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

Cl **120**   *SC* **120.5.7.2**   *P* **115**   *L* **31**   # 179
Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket><late>*
Editors note has served it's purpose

SuggestedRemedy
Delete editors note

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

[Editor's note: This comment was received after the Working Group ballot closed.]

Cl **131**   *SC* **131.3.3**   *P* **123**   *L* **21**   # 86
Trowbridge, Steve   Nokia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*
The text "PMA:IS_SIGNAL.indication" has the line going through it in this one instance in Figure 131-2, where the similar text at all other inter-sublayer interfaces breaks the arrow above and below the text.

SuggestedRemedy
Break the arrow around the text as elsewhere in the same figure

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

Cl **131**   *SC* **131.4**   *P* **256**   *L* **9**   # 85
Stover, David   Analog Devices

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket><cc>*
Gap between digits in many locations throughout document. Looks like a thousands-place separator was replaced with a space. For example, Table 131–4 column "Maximum (bit time)" includes entries such as "2 048", "16 384", etc.

SuggestedRemedy
Search and repair all instances where thousands-place separator was replaced with a space; delete the space.

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

See response to comment #2.

Cl **131**   *SC* **131.5**   *P* **125**   *L* **24**   # 87
Trowbridge, Steve   Nokia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*
In the right hand stack, the top of the box for the 50GAUI-n (labeled wth SP1 and SP6 on the side) doesn't line up with the PMA(2:n) box above

SuggestedRemedy
Tidy up the figure

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **131**   Page 5 of 14
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **131.5**   2017-07-10 12:43:28 P
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **131** *SC* **131.5**   *P* **126** *L* **22**   # 186

Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket><late>

Tables 131-5 and 131-6 use - for not applicable, while both Clause 80 and 116 have used N/A.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the -'s to N/A in Tables 131-5 and 131-6

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: This comment was received after the Working Group ballot closed.]

Cl **132** *SC* **132.1**   *P* **129** *L* **23**   # 1

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>

"64-bit wide" or "64-bit-wide"? Given that these three words form a new adjective, the latter should be used

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The use of "64-bit-wide" is correct and would be consistent with 802.3-2015 80.2.1 and 802.3cd 131.2.1. Note however there are many instances without the hyphen in 802.3-2015 and P802.3bs.

For new text in draft (not imported for amendment), change all instances of "64-bit wide" to "64-bit-wide". Include 131.1.2 and 132.1.

Cl **133** *SC* **133.2.1**   *P* **137** *L* **2**   # 2

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket><cc>

"20 479 66-bit blocks on each PCS lane, rather than after every 16 383 66-bit blocks" - in text, it would be much clearer for a reader to have "," as thousand separator rather than " "

SuggestedRemedy

Consider changing to "20,479 66-bit blocks on each PCS lane, rather than after every 16,383 66-bit blocks" or alternatively, use no separator at all - it is still simple to read without any specific separation
Consider scrubbing the rest of the draft.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

According the "2014 IEEE-SA Standards Style Manual", a space for thousand separators are required for numbers in tables. It gives no guidance for numbers outside of tables. https://development.standards.ieee.org/myproject/Public/mytools/draft/styleman.pdf

The "IEEE Editorial Style Manual" provides the following general (not specific to tables) guidance:
"7) Use thin spaces instead of commas between numbers in tens or hundreds of thousands (e.g., 62 000, 100 000, but 4000). "
https://www.ieee.org/documents/style_manual.pdf

P802.3cj (802.3 revision) includes a thousands-separator space in most cases for numbers 10 000 and greater.

Throughout the draft, for all numbers outside of tables less than 10000 remove the thousands-separator space.

Cl **133** *SC* **133.2.2**   *P* **137** *L* **26**   # 3

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>

In figure 133-3, individual 66b blocks are not properly left-aligned, as would be expected. Since the accompanying text does not speak of any misalignment, I assume block should be left aligned.

SuggestedRemedy

Make sure all 66b blocks and markers are left aligned across lanes - they are NOT right now

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **133**   Page 6 of 14
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **133.2.2**   2017-07-10 12:43:28 P
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **134**   *SC* **134.5.3.2**   *P* **151**   *L* **12**   # 89
Trowbridge, Steve   Nokia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*
"all FEC lanes" is appropriate when the number of FEC lanes could be in the range 4-16 as
for other interfaces, but reads funny when the number of lanes is exactly two

SuggestedRemedy
Change "After all FEC lanes are aligned ." to "After both FEC lanes are aligned ."

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

Cl **134**   *SC* **134.5.3.7**   *P* **152**   *L*   # 90
Trowbridge, Steve   Nokia

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*
Missing ">"

SuggestedRemedy
Change "amp_rx_3<63:58> = am_rxpayloads<1, 125:120" to "amp_rx_3<63:58> =
am_rxpayloads<1, 125:120>"

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

Cl **134**   *SC* **134.5.3.7**   *P* **152**   *L* **18**   # 6
Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*
missing space in "(see134.5.3.4)"

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

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

Cl **134**   *SC* **134.6.7**   *P* **157**   *L* **15**   # 81
Nicholl, Gary   Cisco Systems

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*
The first sentence is not strictly correct as there is no optional "fec bypass correction"
feature defined in Clause 134.

SuggestedRemedy
Change
 "An uncorrected FEC codeword is a codeword that contains errors (when the bypass
correction feature is supported and enabled) or contains errors that were not corrected
(when the bypass correction feature is not supported or not enabled)."
to
"An uncorrected FEC codeword is a codeword that contains errors that were not corrected."

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

Cl **134**   *SC* **134.7.4.1**   *P* **160**   *L* **40**   # 171
Wertheim, Oded   Mellanox Technologie

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*
The Alignment marker insertion feature indicates: First 256 message bits to be
transmitted from every 1024th codeword.
The AM length is 257 bits.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace 256 with 257.

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

Cl **135**   *SC* **135.1.4**   *P* **165**   *L* **53**   # 8
Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*
More instanced of adjective forming inconsistencies: "2 lane" - other locations "2-lane" and
"two-lane"

SuggestedRemedy
Align to "<digit/number>-lane" format in the whole draft

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

See response to comment #20.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **135**   Page 7 of 14
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **135.1.4**   2017-07-10 12:43:28 P
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **135**　　*SC* **135.7.2.1**　　　　*P* **181**　　*L* **21**　　　# 36

Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　　Ciena

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*<bucket>*

Comment i-52 against P802.3bx D3.0 changed all instances of "enquiries" to "inquiries" in IEEE Std 802.3-2015.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "enquiries" to "inquiries" on Page 181, line 21 and Page 364, line 25

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **135F**　　*SC* **135F.3.2**　　　　*P* **357**　　*L* **25**　　　# 65

Hidaka, Yasuo　　　　　　　　　Fujitsu Lab. of Americ

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*<bucket>*

120D.3.3 does not exist.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 120D.3.3 to 120D.3.2.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **136**　　*SC* **136.7**　　　　*P* **194**　　*L* **19**　　　# 76

Healey, Adam　　　　　　　　　Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*<bucket>*

The editor's note states that it was supposed to self destruct after Draft 1.3.

SuggestedRemedy

The information in the note appears to be stale. Remove it.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See #27.

Cl **136**　　*SC* **136.7**　　　　*P* **194**　　*L* **19**　　　# 27

Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　Ciena

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*<bucket>*

The editor's note says it will be removed after D1.3

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the note

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **136**　　*SC* **136.7**　　　　*P* **194**　　*L* **19**　　　# 192

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*<bucket><late>*

Editors note has served it's purpose

SuggestedRemedy

Delete editors note

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: This comment was received after the Working Group ballot closed.]

See #27.

Cl **136**　　*SC* **136.8.11.2.1**　　*P* **203**　　*L* **38**　　　# 94

Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　　Cavium

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*<bucket>*

Wrong Reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 136.8.11.3.4 to 136.9.3.1.3

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **136**
SC **136.8.11.2.1**

Page 8 of 14
2017-07-10 12:43:29 P

Cl **136** *SC* **136.8.11.7.1** *P* **208** *L* **20** # 203

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket><late>*

coef_sts has more enumerations then are listed.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "equalization limit, coefficient at limit and equalization limit" to the list of valid values for this variable.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: This comment was received after the Working Group ballot closed.]

Cl **136** *SC* **136.8.11.7.5** *P* **212** *L* **18** # 84

Stover, David Analog Devices

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket>*

Timer execution keyword "start" is upper case in some states (TRAIN_LOCAL, LINK_READY), lower case in others (TIMEOUT); should be consistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Start" to "start" in states TRAIN_LOCAL, LINK_READY.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **136** *SC* **136.9.3** *P* **216** *L* **10** # 73

Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab. of Americ

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket>*

Some references to 120D are wrong. In 120D, the name of variable J4 was also changed to J4u.

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 136-11, change the reference of 120D.3.1.1 for the output jitter to 120D.3.1.8.
In Table 136-11, change the reference of 120D.3.1.2 for the Signal-to-noise-and-distortion ratio to 120D.3.1.6.
In PICS in 136.14.4.3, change the subclause of TC10 from 120D.3.1.2 to 120D.3.1.6.
In PICS in 136.14.4.3, change the subclause of TC12 from 120D.3.1.1 to 120D.3.1.8.
In Table 136-11, change "J4" to "J4u".
In 136.9.4.2.3, item e) on P221, change "J4" to "J4u" at 3 locations (on L1, L3, and L5).
Change "J4" to "J4u" in Equation (136-6) at 2 locations.
Change "J4" to "J4u" in Equation (136-7).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **136** *SC* **136.9.3.1.3** *P* **218** *L* **28** # 188

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket><late>*

136.9.3.1.3 states that when Figure 136-9 enters the OUT_OF_SYNC state the TxEq should be set according to Table 136-12 (Preset1 = NoEq). However, in Figure 136-9 there is no "load" of that Equalization value.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a call to "UPDATE_IC" into the OUT_OF_SYNC state before the ENCODE_STS call.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: This comment was received after the Working Group ballot closed.]

Update Figure 136-9 to implement the suggested remedy.

Cl **136** *SC* **136.11.7** *P* **224** *L* **31** # 9

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket>*

"Channel Operating Margin" acronym is defined here for the first time, but used extensively before

SuggestedRemedy

Move the definition of acronym to its first use

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The acronym is defined on its first use, in 136.9.4.2, which refers to this subclause.

The definition is repeated here for convenience of readers that may get to this subclause without going through 136.9.4.2.

Cl **136** *SC* **136.11.7** *P* **225** *L* **8** # 101

Dudek, Mike Cavium

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *<bucket>*

Formatting of the table has gone wrong.

SuggestedRemedy

It should be 30mm for the test 2 Zp, and 1.1e-4 for Cp

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See #74.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **136**
SC **136.11.7**

Page 9 of 14
2017-07-10 12:43:29 P

Cl **136**   *SC* **136.11.7**   *P* **225**   *L* **8**   # 74

Healey, Adam   Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

In "Value" column in the first row, missing line break between "30" and "1.1 x 10^(-4)".

SuggestedRemedy

Insert line break. There is a similar problem in Table 137-5 (page 243, line 22). There is also some inconsistent justification of value fields (some left, some center). Re-format to be consistent.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **136**   *SC* **136.11.7**   *P* **225**   *L* **8**   # 69

Hidaka, Yasuo   Fujitsu Lab. of Americ

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

New lines between the values for z_p = 30mm, C_p = 1.1 x 10^-4 nF, Z_c = 90 ohm in Table 136-15 are lost.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert new lines to separate values.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See #74.

Cl **136**   *SC* **136.14.4.4**   *P* **233**   *L* **26**   # 103

Dudek, Mike   Cavium

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

The Requirement in 136.9.4.1 is for a FEC symbol error rate not BER.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "PMD BER better than 10-4" to "Meets FEC symbol error rate requirement"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **136A**   *SC* **1**   *P*   *L*   # 95

Dudek, Mike   Cavium

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

It is better to make a direct reference rather than refering to 92A which then refers to the equation in 92.10.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference to equation 92-27.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Change P371 L4 reference 92A.6. to equation 92-27

Cl **136B**   *SC* **136B.1.1.6**   *P* **373**   *L* **30**   # 106

Dudek, Mike   Cavium

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

The specification for the multi-lane mated test fixture needs to include more than QSFP.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The QSFP28" to "The multi-lane". Change the title of table 136-2 replacing QSFP28 with "multi-lane. The PICS also need to be amended to include the additional test fixtures.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **136C**   *SC* **136C.1**   *P* **377**   *L* **22**   # 96

Dudek, Mike   Cavium

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

It would read better if the "enabling a 3m length" were not split by the parenthsis (2 places).

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The 50GBASE-CR is a single-lane cable assembly (and can also be implemented as a multiple version using a four-lane or eight-lane plug for high density applications), enabling a 3 m length" to
"The 50GBASE-CR is a single-lane cable assembly enabling a 3 m length(and can also be implemented as a multiple version using a four-lane or eight-lane plug for high density applications). "

Make the similar change in the next sentence.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **136C**   Page 10 of 14
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **136C.1**   2017-07-10 12:43:29 P
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **136C**   *SC* **136C.3.3**   *P* **380**   *L* **9**   # 189
Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom Limited

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket><late>
Figure 136C-3 is a example of a 1 to 4 plug

SuggestedRemedy
Change "two-plug" to "four-plug"

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

[Editor's note: This comment was received after the Working Group ballot closed.]

Cl **136D**   *SC* **136D.3**   *P* **389**   *L* **1**   # 29
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>
Annex 136D PICS is blank

SuggestedRemedy
Fill out the PICS proforma.

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

See comment #169.

Cl **136D**   *SC* **136D.3.3**   *P* **390**   *L* **4**   # 63
Cheng, Weiying   Coriant

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>
Is there any reason to have an empty table here? If there is no change, remove it. Otherwise, add changes for the PICS.

SuggestedRemedy

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

See comment #169.

Cl **136D**   *SC* **136D.3.3**   *P* **390**   *L* **6**   # 75
Healey, Adam   Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>
The major capabilities/options and PICS proforma tables are blank.

SuggestedRemedy
Complete the tables.

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

See comment #169.

Cl **136D**   *SC* **136D.3.3**   *P* **390**   *L* **6**   # 169
Kolesar, Paul   CommScope

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>
There are no PICS stated, yet there are "shall" statements in the clause at page 382 lines 42, 43, 47; page 384 line 1;

SuggestedRemedy
Create PICS for each shall statement.

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

[Editor's note: Change subclause from 3.3 to 136D.3.3.]

Editor to implement appropriate PICS for Annex 136D.

Cl **136D**   *SC* **136D.3.4**   *P* **390**   *L* **18**   # 64
Cheng, Weiying   Coriant

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>
Is there any reason to have an empty table here? If there is no change, remove it. Otherwise, add changes for the PICS.

SuggestedRemedy

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

See comment#169.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **136D**   Page 11 of 14
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **136D.3.4**   2017-07-10 12:43:29 P
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **137**　　*SC* **137.10.**　　　　*P* **243**　　　*L* **21**　　　　# 68

Hidaka, Yasuo　　　　　　　Fujitsu Lab. of Americ

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*

New lines between the values for z_p = 30mm, C_p = 1.1 x 10^-4 nF, Z_c = 90 ohm in Table 137-5 are lost.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert new lines to separate values.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See #74.

Cl **138**　　*SC* **138.7.1**　　　　*P* **262**　　　*L* **19**　　　　# 155

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　Mellanox

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*

Table 121-6 and 124-6 say Extinction ratio, each lane (min), while tables 122-9, 122-10, 138-8, 139-6 and 140-6 say Extinction ratio (min).

SuggestedRemedy

Consistency would be good. As adding the extinction ratios of the lanes together makes no sense, it seems that extinction ratio could go without "each lane", like modulation format, SMSR, spectral width, and some others. If so, nothing to do in P802.3cd.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

For consistency with previous multi-lane clauses, change 'Extinction ratio' to 'Extinction ratio, each lane (min)'

Cl **138**　　*SC* **138.7.1**　　　　*P* **262**　　　*L* **26**　　　　# 10

Hajduczenia, Marek　　　　　Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*

Footnote c is separated visually from a) and b) for some reason

SuggestedRemedy

Please apply proper format so that a), b), and c) have the same line spacing

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **138**　　*SC* **138.8.5.1**　　　*P* **265**　　　*L* **50**　　　　# 11

Hajduczenia, Marek　　　　　Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*

"5 tap" is a compound adjective

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "5-tap"
Same with "T/2 spaced" to "T/2-spaced"

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Throughout 802.3-2015 and P802.3bs, the prevalent phrase is "<number> tap" without hyphen.

Cl **138**　　*SC* **138.8.5.1**　　　*P* **265**　　　*L* **51**　　　　# 39

Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　Ciena

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*

Comment r01-3 against P802.3bs D3.1 has added "The sum of the equalizer tap coefficients is equal to 1." at the end of the first paragraph of 121.8.5.4 and 122.8.5.4.

SuggestedRemedy

Keep the two drafts in sync by adding "The sum of the equalizer tap coefficients is equal to 1." at the end of the first paragraph of 138.8.5.1 and 139.7.5.4

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **138**　　*SC* **138.9.2**　　　　*P* **267**　　　*L* **10**　　　　# 52

Graber, Steffen　　　　　　Pepperl+Fuchs

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*<bucket>*

Hazard Level1M

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: Hazard Level 1M (add space)

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **138**
SC **138.9.2**

Page 12 of 14
2017-07-10 12:43:29 P

Cl **138**   *SC* **138.9.2**   *P* **267**   *L* **10**   *#* 13

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>

missing space in "Hazard Level1M"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Hazard Level 1M"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **138**   *SC* **138.10.1**   *P* **268**   *L* **41**   *#* 14

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>

Different ways to define a term inline: in some locations, it is italicized, in some sorrounded with "", in others - no special markup exists

SuggestedRemedy

Please consider using consistent approach, at least within this draft. Suggested ""

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove italics for "channel" in 138.10.1

Cl **138**   *SC* **138.11.4.4**   *P* **275**   *L* **12**   *#* 55

Shariff, Masood   CommScope

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>

The terms OM3, OM4, and OM5 are used in several place in the standard to designated Optical Multimode cables as defined by ISO/IEC/JTC 1/SC 25/WG 3. It is confusing to use the same designations for other purposes in this document.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the designations of the Optical Masurement Method to OMM instead of OM

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The designations are consistent with many other optical clauses, including 52, 53, 68, 86, 95, 121, 122, 123, 139, 140.

Cl **138**   *SC* **138.11.4.5**   *P* **298**   *L* **14**   *#* 56

Shariff, Masood   CommScope

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>

The terms OM3, OM4, and OM5 are used in several place in the standard to designated Optical Multimode cables as defined by ISO/IEC/JTC 1/SC 25/WG 3. It is confusing to use the same designations for other purposes in this document.

SuggestedRemedy

hange the designations of the Optical Masurement Method to OMM instead of OM

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The designations are consistent with many other optical clauses, including 52, 53, 68, 86, 95, 121, 122, 123, 139, 140.

Cl **139**   *SC* **139.5.1**   *P* **281**   *L* **1**   *#* 15

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>

Different ways to designate Test Points - in Figure 139-2, these are deisgnators in large circles, in other locations, there are just labels, or slanted trapezoids.

SuggestedRemedy

Please use consistent symbols for test points, at least within this draft - not asking for any global alignment .

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The draft is not broken with respect to indications of test points.
Trapezoids are generally used to indicate optical multiplexers and demultiplexers which are absent in Clause 139 and 140.
The draft is not broken with respect to indications of test points

---

Cl **139**   *SC* **139.6.1**   *P* **284**   *L* **1**   *#* 16

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   <bucket>

Footnotes to Table 139-6 got separated from the pain table

SuggestedRemedy

Please glue the footnotes to table, unless it is physically impossible to make them stay with the table.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **139**   Page 13 of 14
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **139.6.1**   2017-07-10 12:43:29 P
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **139**	*SC* **139.7.5.2**	*P* **288**	*L* **40**	# 17

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

DGD used without definition

SuggestedRemedy

First definition is on page 293 under Table 139-12. Need to be moved in here since it is the first use in text

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

DGD is listed in list of abbreviations.
Same style as in-force Clause 87, 88 and 95

Cl **139**	*SC* **139.10.3**	*P* **294**	*L* **27**	# 58

Brown, Matt   MACOM

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

"400GBASE-LR" should be "50GBASE-LR"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "400GBASE-LR" to "50GBASE-LR"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **140**	*SC* **140.7.4**	*P* **309**	*L* **14**	# 132

Dawe, Piers   Mellanox

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

140-6.The

SuggestedRemedy

missing space

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **140**	*SC* **140.7.4**	*P* **309**	*L* **14**	# 28

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

Space missing in "Table 140-6.The"

SuggestedRemedy

Add the space.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **140**	*SC* **140.11.4**	*P* **318**	*L* **1**	# 57

Shariff, Masood   CommScope

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *<bucket>*

The terms OM3, OM4, and OM5 are used in several place in the standard to designated Optical Multimode cables as defined by ISO/IEC/JTC 1/SC 25/WG 3. It is confusing to use the same designations for other purposes in this document.

SuggestedRemedy

hange the designations of the Optical Masurement Method to OMM instead of OM

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The use of OM3, OM4 and OM5 in the PICS has been established in many in force clauses, 52, 53, 58, 59, 60, etc.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **140**
SC **140.11.4**

Page 14 of 14
2017-07-10 12:43:29 P