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

	P84	L 22	# 1	C/ 1	SC 1	.4.160a		P 23	L15	# <u>2</u>	
Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems					Ran, Adee Intel						
Type TR	Comment Status D			Comment	Туре	Е	Comment Stat	us D			
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.					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. <i>SuggestedRemedy</i>						
SuggestedRemedy					Change "between TP2 and TP3" to "between two PHYs".						
					Respons	se	Response Stat	us W			
					PROPOSED REJECT.						
PROPOSED 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,				This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ct D2.1 a D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the previous ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. The commenter is encouraged to resubmit this comment at Standards Association ballot.							
		ct_D2p1_comme	nts_final_unsatisfied_b	C/ 45 Ran, Adee		5.2.1.133			L 30	# 3	
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 rest 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."					Comment Type E Comment Status D "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 frequencies".						
	s a pile on to comm peration between e to describe the FEG le FEC frame (or a ard is perfectly reas ern and a reason for itation balloting. <i>dRemedy</i> le a reference to a p <i>Response</i> POSED REJECT. e comment acknow hent associated with ecirculated (Comme //www.ieee802.org/ odf). roposed change by ble sample of the S isfied comment - "V urrently published ir inced in the draft pr interleavers work, a	s a pile on to comment 2031. IEEE 802.3ct is is peration between equipment supplied by differ to describe the FEC in a way to allow third paile FEC frame (or a reference to a publicly availated is perfectly reasonable. The fact that one command a reason for the 802.3 working group in the areference to a publicly availation balloting. <i>dRemedy</i> le a reference to a publicly available sample States and the second states and the second states and the second states are second stat	s a pile on to comment 2031. IEEE 802.3ct is an open standard peration between equipment supplied by different vendors. It sh to describe the FEC in a way to allow third party compliance test le FEC frame (or a reference to a publicly available one) to be in ard is perfectly reasonable. The fact that one cannot be provide ern and a reason for the 802.3 working group not to allow progre- siation balloting. <i>dRemedy</i> le a reference to a publicly available sample SC-FEC frame. <i>Response Response Status</i> W POSED REJECT. e comment acknowledges, this comment is in support of an exis- nent associated with a Disapprove vote that has already been re- ecirculated (Comment #2031 //www.ieee802.org/3/ct/comments/D2P1/8023ct_D2p1_commen- bdf). roposed change by the commenter suggests providing a referen- ble sample of the SC-FEC frame. However, as noted in the init isfied comment - "While the rest vectors are known to exist for t urrently published in a place where they can be referenced. G.7 nccd in the draft provides significant detail on the structure of th interleavers work, and the permutation factor tables."	s a pile on to comment 2031. IEEE 802.3ct is an open standard allowing peration between equipment supplied by different vendors. It should provide sufficient to describe the FEC in a way to allow third party compliance testing. Requiring a le FEC frame (or a reference to a publicly available one) to be included in the ard is perfectly reasonable. The fact that one cannot be provided is a matter of ern and a reason for the 802.3 working group not to allow progress to standards siation balloting. <i>dRemedy</i> le a reference to a publicly available sample SC-FEC frame. <i>Response</i> Response Status W POSED REJECT. e comment acknowledges, this comment is in support of an existing unsatisfied nent associated with a Disapprove vote that has already been rejected, responded to, ecirculated (Comment #2031 //www.ieee802.org/3/ct/comments/D2P1/8023ct_D2p1_comments_final_unsatisfied_b odf). roposed change by the commenter suggests providing a reference to a publicly ble sample of the SC-FEC frame. However, as noted in the initial response to the isfied comment - "While the rest vectors are known to exist for the FEC code, none urrently published in a place where they can be referenced. G.709.2, which is need in the draft provides significant detail on the structure of the code, the way the	Sa pile on to comment 2031. IEEE 802.3ct is an open standard allowing TP2 ai se pile on to comment 2031. IEEE 802.3ct is an open standard allowing TP2 ai peration between equipment supplied by different vendors. It should provide sufficient A meth to describe the FEC in a way to allow third party compliance testing. Requiring a In add le FEC frame (or a reference to a publicly available one) to be included in the In add ard is perfectly reasonable. The fact that one cannot be provided is a matter of In add mm and a reason for the 802.3 working group not to allow progress to standards Suggested iation balloting. Chang dRemedy Proposed le a reference to a publicly available sample SC-FEC frame. Proposed Response Response Status W POSED REJECT. This c e comment acknowledges, this comment is in support of an existing unsatisfied The co period comment #2031 Cl 45 www.ieee802.org/3/ct/comments/D2P1/8023ct_D2p1_comments_final_unsatisfied_b Cl 45 podf). Ran, Adee roposed change by the commenter suggests providing a reference to a publicly Suggested ble sample of the SC-FEC frame. However, as noted in the initial response to the "suppor	s a pile on to comment 2031. IEEE 802.3ct is an open standard allowing peration between equipment supplied by different vendors. It should provide sufficient to describe the FEC in a way to allow third party compliance testing. Requiring a le FEC frame (or a reference to a publicly available one) to be included in the ard is perfectly reasonable. The fact that one cannot be provided is a matter of ern and a reason for the 802.3 working group not to allow progress to standards iation balloting. <i>dRemedy</i> le a reference to a publicly available sample SC-FEC frame. <i>Response Response Status</i> W POSED REJECT. a comment acknowledges, this comment is in support of an existing unsatisfied tent associated with a Disapprove vote that has already been rejected, responded to, ecirculated (Comment #2031 //www.ieee802.org/3/ct/comments/D2P1/8023ct_D2p1_comments_final_unsatisfied_bodf). roposed change by the commenter suggests providing a reference to a publicly ble sample of the SC-FEC frame. However, as noted in the initial response to the isfied comment - "While the rest vectors are known to exist for the FEC code, none urrently published in a place where they can be referenced. G.709.2, which is nced in the draft provides significant detail on the structure of the code, the way the interleavers work, and the permutation factor tables."	s a pile on to comment 2031. IEEE 802.3ct is an open standard allowing peration between equipment supplied by different vendors. It should provide sufficient to describe the FEC in a way to allow third party compliance testing. Requiring a le FEC frame (or a reference to a publicly available one) to be included in the ard is perfectly reasonable. The fact that one cannot be provided is a matter of ern and a reason for the 802.3 working group not to allow progress to standards iation balloting. <i>dRemedy</i> le a reference to a publicly available sample SC-FEC frame. <i>Response Response Status</i> W POSED REJECT. e comment acknowledges, this comment is in support of an existing unsatisfied nent associated with a Disapprove vote that has already been rejected, responded to, ccirculated (Comment #2031 //www.ieee802.org/3/ct/comments/D2P1/8023ct_D2p1_comments_final_unsatisfied_b odf). roposed change by the commenter suggests providing a reference to a publicly ble sample of the SC-FEC frame. However, as noted in the initial response to the isfied comment - "While the rest vectors are known to exist for the FEC code, none urrently published in a place where they can be referenced. G.709.2, which is nced in the draft provides significant detail on the structure of the code, the way the interleavers work, and the permutation factor tables."	 TP2 and TP3 are undefined terms that m A methodology should not be bound by s TP2 and TP3 are undefined terms that m A methodology should not be bound by s TP2 and TP3 are undefined terms that m A methodology should not be bound by s In addition, the endpoints are defined for and may not exist in any link. The transm <i>SuggestedRemedy</i> Change "between TP2 and TP3" to "betw <i>PROPOSED REJECT.</i> Proposed Response Status W POSED REJECT. Proposed change by the comments is nupport of an existing unsatisfied term statisfied negative comment soft. <i>Proposed Change by the commenter suggests providing a reference to a publicly value the rest vectors are known to exist for the FEC code, nore urrently published in a place where they can be referenced. G.709.2, which is inced in the draft provides significant detail on the structure of the code, the way the interleavers work, and the permutation factor tables."</i> nastisfied comment was circulated during the first and second recirculation ballots, 	 <i>TP2</i> and TP3 are undefined terms that make this defined terms that make this defined terms that make this defined between equipment supplied by different vendors. It should provide sufficient to describe the FEC in a way to allow third party compliance testing. Requiring a le FEC frame (or a reference to a publicly available one) to be included in the ard is perfectly reasonable. The fact that one cannot be provided is a matter of arm and a reason for the 802.3 working group not to allow progress to standards iation balloting. <i>dRemedy</i> le a reference to a publicly available sample SC-FEC frame. <i>Response Response Status</i> W POSED REJECT. a comment acknowledges, this comment is in support of an existing unsatisfied tent associated with a Disapprove vote that has already been rejected, responded to, acirculated (Comment #2031 //www.ieee802.org/3/ct/comments/D2P1/8023ct_D2p1_comments_final_unsatisfied_bdf). roposed change by the commenter suggests providing a reference to a publicly ble sample of the SC-FEC frame. However, as noted in the initial response to the isified comment - "While the rest vectors are known to exist for the FEC code, none interfeavers work, and the permutation factor tables." <i>Cl</i> 45 SC 45.2.1.133a.1 <i>P</i>29 Ran, Adee Intel <i>Comment Type</i> E <i>Comment Status</i> D "supported" is not the right word for the meaning of registers use "correspond" which is more appropriat status are significant detail on the structure of the code, the way the interleavers work, and the permutation factor tables." 	TP2 and TP3 are undefined terms that make this definition meaning peration between equipment supplied by different vendors. It should provide sufficient to describe the FEC in a way to allow third party compliance testing. Requiring a le FEC frame (or a reference to a publicly available one) to be included in the rand a reason for the 802.3 working group not to allow progress to standards iation balloting. TP2 and TP3 are undefined terms that make this definition meaning A methodology should not be bound by such specific names. <i>dRemedy</i> In addition, the endpoints are defined for measurement purposes at and may not exist in any link. The transmission is between PHYs. <i>dRemedy</i> In addition, the endpoints are defined for measurement purposes at and may not exist in any link. The transmission is between PHYs. <i>dRemedy</i> In addition, the endpoints are defined for measurement purposes at and may not exist in any link. The transmission is between PHYs. <i>dRemedy</i> In a reference to a publicly available sample SC-FEC frame. <i>Response Response Status P</i> OSED REJECT. <i>Proposed Response Status Q</i> /www.ieee802.org/3/ct/comments/D2P1/8023ct_D2p1_comments_final_unsatisfied bodf). The comment ris encouraged to resubmit this comment at Standard significant deail on the structure of the fee code, none urrently published in a place where they can be reference to a c. G. 709.2, which is inced in the artaft provides significant deail on the structure of the code, the way the interleavers work, and the permutation factor tables." need in the draft provides signinficant deatial on the structure of the code, the way	

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ct D2.1 and D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the previous ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

The commenter is encouraged to resubmit this comment at Standards Association ballot.

and no other additional comments in support of the unsatisfied comment were made.

Comment ID 3

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

CI 45	SC 45.2.1.13	3e <i>P</i> 3	3 L19	# 4		C/ 45	SC 45.2.1.18	6ao	P 48	L 12	# 6
Ran, Adee	9	Intel		L		Ran, Adee		l	ntel		
Comment	Type E	Comment Status	D			Comment 7	Гуре Т	Comment St	atus D		
It is o	dd that a bit name	in the "Rx optical c	hannel control registe	er" starts with "T	x".	Registe	er name says "c	orrected bits" as	does the va	ariable name in 15	3.2.5.4 but bit names
Suggested	Remedy					say "ur	corrected code	words".			
	•	Tx", in Table 45,102	o and in 45.2.1.133e	.1		Suggestedl	Remedy				
-	Response	Response Status				Change	e "uncorrected o	odewords" to "c	orrected bits	s" (4 times".	
•	POSED REJECT.	Response Status	vv			Proposed F PROP(Response DSED REJECT.	Response Sta	atus W		
the sc	ope of the recircu	llation ballot. ouraged to resubmit	from the previous batthis comment at Star			D2.2 or the sco	the unsatisfied	negative commulation ballot.	ents from th	e previous ballots	EEE P802.3ct D2.1 and . Hence it is not within ds Association ballot.
Ran, Adee		Intel	5 255	# 5							
Comment		Comment Status	n n								
"suppo	orted" is not the ri		aning of an index nur	nber. Descriptio	ns of other						
Suggested	dRemedy										
Chang	-		hat are supported" to	"indicates the							
	ge "supported for number".	each channel index	number" to "correspo	onding to each c	hannel						
Proposed	Response	Response Status	w								
PROF	OSED REJECT.										
D2.2 c the sc	or the unsatisfied ope of the recircu	negative comments lation ballot.	ntive changes betwe from the previous ba	llots. Hence it is	s not within						

The commenter is encouraged to resubmit this comment at Standards Association ballot.

Comment ID 6