## IEEE P802.3ct D2.2 100 Gb/s over DWDM systems 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

-											
C/ 153	SC 153.2.3.2.4	P <b>84</b>	L <b>22</b>	# 1	C/ 1	SC 1.4.160a	l	P <b>23</b>	L15	# 2	
Marris, Ai	Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems					Ran, Adee Intel					
Comment	t Type <b>TR</b>	Comment Status R			Commen	tType E	Comment S	Status R			
This is a pile on to comment 2031. IEEE 802.3ct is an open standard allowing interoperation between equipment supplied by different vendors. It should provide sufficient detail to describe the FEC in a way to allow third party compliance testing. Requiring a sample FEC frame (or a reference to a publicly available one) to be included in the standard is perfectly reasonable. The fact that one cannot be provided is a matter of					TP2 and TP3 are undefined terms that make this definition meaningless out of its context. A methodology should not be bound by such specific names. In addition, the endpoints are defined for measurement purposes at the end of patch cords and may not exist in any link. The transmission is between PHYs.						
conce	concern and a reason for the 802.3 working group not to allow progress to standards association balloting.				Suggeste	dRemedy					
Suggeste	dRemedy				Chan	ge "between TP2	and TP3" to "t	between two P	HYS".		
Provde a reference to a publicly available sample SC-FEC frame.			Response		Response S	Status C					
Response	9	Response Status U			REJE	CT.					
REJECT.					This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.						
		edges, this comment is in			C/ 45	SC 45.2.1.13	33a.1	P <b>29</b>	L <b>30</b>	# 3	
	comment associated with a Disapprove vote that has already been rejected, responded to, and recirculated (Comment #2031				Ran, Ade	e		Intel			
https: y_ID.	://www.ieee802.org/3 pdf).	Comment Type E Comment Status R "supported" is not the right word for the meaning of an index number. Descriptions of othe registers use "correspond" which is more appropriate.									
The proposed change by the commenter suggests providing a reference to a publicly available sample of the SC-FEC frame. However, as noted in the initial response to the						dRemedy					

available sample of the SC-FEC frame. However, as noted in the initial response to the unsatisfied comment - "While the test vectors are known to exist for the FEC code, none are currently published in a place where they can be referenced. G.709.2, which is referenced in the draft provides significant detail on the structure of the code, the way the block interleavers work, and the permutation factor tables."

The unsatisfied comment was circulated during the first and second recirculation ballots, and no other additional comments in support of the unsatisfied comment were made.

Change "supported for each channel index number" to "corresponding to each channel index number".

Change "indicates the optical frequencies that are supported" to "indicates the

Response Response Status C

corresponding optical frequecnies".

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Comment ID 3

## IEEE P802.3ct D2.2 100 Gb/s over DWDM systems 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

C/ <b>45</b>	SC 45.2.1.133e	e P3	3 <i>L</i> 19	# 4	
Ran, Adee		Intel			
Comment Ty It is odd		<i>Comment Status</i> n the "Rx optical ch	<b>R</b> nannel control regist	er" starts with "Tx	".
SuggestedR Change		x", in Table 45.102	o and in 45.2.1.133	e.1	
Response REJEC <sup>-</sup>	Г.	Response Status	С		
This cor	nment was WITH	IDRAWN by the co	mmenter.		
CI <b>45</b>	SC 45.2.1.133	e.2 P3	3 L39	# <u>5</u>	
Ran, Adee		Intel			
	ted" is not the rigl	<i>Comment Status</i> ht word for the mea d" which is more ap	ning of an index nu	mber. Description	s of other
SuggestedR	Remedy				
	"indicates the op onding optical fre		at are supported" to	o "indicates the	
Change index nu		ach channel index i	number" to "corresp	onding to each ch	annel
Response REJEC <sup>-</sup>	г.	Response Status	с		
This cor	nment was WITH	IDRAWN by the co	mmenter.		
CI <b>45</b>	SC 45.2.1.186a	ao P4	8 L12	# 6	
Ran, Adee		Intel			
Comment Ty	vpe <b>T</b>	Comment Status	R		
	r name says "con corrected codewo		s the variable name	in 153.2.5.4 but b	it names
SuggestedR Change	•	dewords" to "correc	ted bits" (4 times".		
- 		Response Status	C		
Response REJEC <sup>-</sup>	г.				

Comment ID 6