Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4.160a**   *P* **23**   *L* **15**   # 2

Ran, Adee   Intel

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

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.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "between TP2 and TP3" to "between two PHYs".

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.133a.1**   *P* **29**   *L* **30**   # 3

Ran, Adee   Intel

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

"supported" is not the right word for the meaning of an index number. Descriptions of other registers use "correspond" which is more appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "indicates the optical frequencies that are supported" to "indicates the corresponding optical frequecnies".

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

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.133e**   *P* **33**   *L* **19**   # 4

Ran, Adee   Intel

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

It is odd that a bit name in the "Rx optical channel control register" starts with "Tx".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Tx Rx" to "Rx Tx", in Table 45.102o and in 45.2.1.133e.1

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.133e.2**   *P* **33**   *L* **39**   # 5

Ran, Adee   Intel

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

"supported" is not the right word for the meaning of an index number. Descriptions of other registers use "correspond" which is more appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "indicates the optical frequencies that are supported" to "indicates the corresponding optical frequecnies".

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

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.186ao**   *P* **48**   *L* **12**   # 6

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **R**

Register name says "corrected bits" as does the variable name in 153.2.5.4 but bit names say "uncorrected codewords".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "uncorrected codewords" to "corrected bits" (4 times".

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

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 **45**
SC **45.2.1.186ao**

Page 1 of 2
10/1/2020 8:26:12 AM

Cl **153**   *SC* **153.2.3.2.4**   *P* **84**   *L* **22**   # 1

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment 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 concern and a reason for the 802.3 working group not to allow progress to standards association balloting.

SuggestedRemedy

Provde a reference to a publicly available sample SC-FEC frame.

Response   *Response Status*   **U**

REJECT.

As the comment acknowledges, this comment is in support of an existing unsatisfied comment associated with a Disapprove vote that has already been rejected, responded to, and recirculated (Comment #2031 https://www.ieee802.org/3/ct/comments/D2P1/8023ct_D2p1_comments_final_unsatisfied_by_ID.pdf).

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 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.

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 **153**
SC **153.2.3.2.4**

Page 2 of 2
10/1/2020 8:26:12 AM