IEEE P802.3cw D1.1 400 Gb/s over DWDM systems 2nd Task Force review comments

D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, US Subsidiary of Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
Given the potential different stack configurations, this annex should be used to illustrate different examples with the different PCS / PMA
SuggestedRemedy
Presentation illustrating different concepts will be provided
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Note, comment refers to annex 120A.

Huber, Tom Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D
Multiple definitions are being added, so the editing instruction should use plural forms.
SuggestedRemedy
Change "definition" to "definitions"
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "Insert the following new definition" to "Insert the following two new definitions"

Huber, Tom Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D
Multiple definitions are being added, so the editing instruction should use plural forms.
SuggestedRemedy
Change "abbreviation" to "abbreviations"
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

FEC is being used as both a noun and an adjective in the sentence describing CFEC. While the usage throughout 802.3 is not entirely consistent, within a single sentence we probably should be consistent.
SuggestedRemedy
Change "The transmit data is encoded with a concatenated forward error correction (CFEC) consisting of an inner SC-FEC code and an outer Hamming code SD-FEC." to "The transmit data is encoded with a concatenated forward error correction (CFEC) code consisting of an inner SC-FEC code and an outer Hamming SD-FEC code."
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Comment Type: E   Comment Status: D   bucket

The description of the test pattern is grammatically awkward. The first sentence of the paragraph has already established that a test pattern is transmitted when the transmit channel is in test pattern mode. The second sentence is intended to indicate what the test pattern is.

Suggested Remedy
Change the second sentence: "The PCS shall provide transmit test-pattern mode for the scrambled idle pattern (see 119.2.4.9)."

to
"The transmitted test pattern shall be the scrambled idle pattern (see 119.2.4.9)."

Proposed Response: Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E   Comment Status: D   bucket

Multiplication should be indicated with a multiplication symbol rather than an x.

Suggested Remedy
Replace 510 x 512 with 510 × 512

Proposed Response: Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E   Comment Status: D   bucket

It would be more clear to describe demapping the MII explicitly rather than using vice versa.

Suggested Remedy
Change "The PCS maps the 400GMII signal into 66 bit blocks, and vice versa using a 64B/66B coding scheme." to
"The PCS maps the 400GMII signal in 66b blocks, and demaps the 400GMII signal from 66b blocks, using a 64B/66B coding scheme.

Proposed Response: Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
The AMs are used to locate the row that is the start of the frame, not the row number. There is also a stray comma before the parenthetical phrase.

**Proposed Response**

The computation is fully specified in the referenced OIF document. Delete the second sentence of the second paragraph and the entire third paragraph and bullet list, so the text reads:

A 32-bit cyclic redundancy code is calculated over 244,664 input bits as described in the OIF-400ZR-01.0, March 10, 2020, subclause 9.2. The 32 bits of the CRC value are.....

**Proposed Response**

The 32 bits of the CRC value are placed with.
The last two paragraphs would be better combined, with the clause in the first sentence of the final paragraph concerning the location of the MBAS field removed (that information is already provided in the first sentence of the next-to-last paragraph).

**Suggested Remedy**
Replace the last two paragraphs with:

Following the CRC-32 a 6-bit MBAS is added. The MBAS is used by the SC-FEC encoder and decoder to synchronize the state of the error de-correlator controllers between the receiver and the transmitter. The staircase FEC implementation uses a 7-bit MBAS which provides a 128-block sequence. The six most significant bits of the 7-bit MBAS are transferred between source and sink in the 6-bit MBAS overhead. The numerical value represented in the six MBAS overhead bits is incremented every two SC-FEC blocks and provides a 128-block multi-block.

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status** W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment**

Huber, Tom
Nokia

**Comment Type** E
**Comment Status** D

**MBAS description**

Capital B is used as the abbreviation for 'bit' in the rest of the document.

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace the x here and in the first paragraph of 155.2.4.8 with multiplication symbols.

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status** W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment**

Huber, Tom
Nokia

**Comment Type** E
**Comment Status** D

**Multiplication**

Missing a 'd' in 'illustrated'

**Suggested Remedy**

Change: ".which are added to the 400GBASE-ZR SC-FEC frame as illustrate in Figure 155-5." to "which are added to the 400GBASE-ZR SC-FEC frame as illustrated in Figure 155-5."

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status** W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
IEEE P802.3cw D1.1 400 Gb/s over DWDM systems 2nd Task Force review comments

**Comment by:** Huber, Tom Nokia

**Comment:** Bits should be spelled out, and no need to describe the size of the padding again here since it is already clearly described in 155.2.4.7

**Suggested Remedy:**
Change the first sentence from:
"The scrambled output from the SC-encoder plus 6x119b padding is organized as 10 976 rows of 119b."
to:
"The scrambled output from the SC-encoder plus padding is organized as 10 976 rows of 119 bits."

**Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment by:** Huber, Tom Nokia

**Comment:** Multiplication should be indicated with a multiplication symbol rather than an x.

**Suggested Remedy:** Replace the x's here and elsewhere on the page, including the end of 155.2.5.6 on the next page, with multiplication symbols.

**Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment by:** Maniloff, Eric Ciena

**Comment:** PHY shows 400GBASE-R PCS instead of 400GBASE-ZR PCS

**Suggested Remedy:** Replace 400GBASE-E with 400GBASE-ZR

**Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
IEEE P802.3cw D1.1 400 Gb/s over DWDM systems 2nd Task Force review comments

**Comment and Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P63</th>
<th>L21</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>D’Ambrosia, John  Futurewei, US Subsidiary of Huawei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>L21</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type TR Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.1.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400GBASE-R PCS (119) and 400GBASE-R PMA (120) are not noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

update table to include clauses 119 and 120 as optional

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P64</th>
<th>L39</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Mani1off, Eric  Ciena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P64</td>
<td>L39</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.1.1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 155 should not be an external cross references for PCS for 400GBASE-ZR and PMA for 400GBASE-ZR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Correct the clause 155 cross references

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED REJECT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED REJECT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED REJECT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P65</th>
<th>L23</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Huber, Tom  Nokia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type T Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the value of SIGNAL_DETECT is fixed to OK, and therefore not dependent on the amount of light being received, the NOTE needs to be revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

Change

NOTE—SIGNAL_DETECT = OK does not guarantee that the rx_symbol parameters are known to be good. It is possible for a poor quality link to provide sufficient light for a SIGNAL_DETECT = OK indication and still not meet the BER defined in 156.1.1.
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Cl 156 SC 156.7.1 P71 L 48 # 40
Issenhuth, Tom Huawei
Comment Type E Comment Status D
Sentence does not contain location of definitions.
SuggestedRemedy
Add location of definitions.
Proposed Response None
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 156 SC 156.7.2 P73 L 3 # 41
Issenhuth, Tom Huawei
Comment Type E Comment Status D
Sentence does not contain location of definitions.
SuggestedRemedy
Add location of definitions.
Proposed Response None
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 156 SC 156.7.2 P73 L 13 # 30
D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, US Subsidiary of Huawei
Comment Type ER Comment Status D
Agreed upon language from 802.3ct, which is a ratified standard should be used in appropriate situations.
SuggestedRemedy
Under Value in Table 156-7, change:
The frequency in Table 156-4 corresponding to the variable Rx_optical_channel_index to
The frequency in Table 156-4 where the channel index number equals the variable Rx_optical_channel_index
Proposed Response None
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
### Comment 156

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Proposed Response:**  
**Response Status:** W  
**Suggested Remedy:**  

> Figure 156-4 is an imported pdf and appears fuzzy.

#### Proposed Response

**Proposed Acceptance:**

#### Comment 156A

**Comment Type:** TR  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Proposed Response:**  
**Response Status:** W  
**Suggested Remedy:**  

> The stated average receive power (min) is incorrectly stated as -16 dBm, when it should be -12 dBm -

#### Proposed Response

**Proposed Acceptance in Principle:**

For task force discussion.

---

**Comment 156A2**

**Comment Type:** TR  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Proposed Response:**  
**Response Status:** W  
**Suggested Remedy:**  

> The operating ranges in Figure 156A-3 can be roughly divided into 2 areas, one where the OSNR is between TBD dB (12.5 GHz) and TBD dB (12.5 GHz) together with an average optical power at TP3 between 0 dBm and -16 dBm

#### Proposed Response

**Proposed Acceptance in Principle:**

---

**Comment 156A3**

**Comment Type:** TR  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Proposed Response:**  
**Response Status:** W  
**Suggested Remedy:**  

> Stated channel output power range is incorrect

#### Proposed Response

**Proposed Acceptance:**

---

**Comment 156A4**

**Comment Type:** TR  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Proposed Response:**  
**Response Status:** W  
**Suggested Remedy:**  

> EVM definition in incomplete.

#### Proposed Response

**Proposed Acceptance:**

---

**Comment 156A5**

**Comment Type:** TR  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Proposed Response:**  
**Response Status:** W  
**Suggested Remedy:**  

> As noted in Table 156A-1, the range is -12 dBm to 0 dBm

#### Proposed Response

**Proposed Acceptance:**

---

**Comment 156A6**

**Comment Type:** TR  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Proposed Response:**  
**Response Status:** W  
**Suggested Remedy:**  

> modify noted -16 dBm to -12 dBm also modify -16 dBm to -12 dBm throughout the rest of the subclause as appropriate

#### Proposed Response

**Proposed Acceptance:**

---

**Comment 156A7**

**Comment Type:** TR  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Proposed Response:**  
**Response Status:** W  
**Suggested Remedy:**  

> For task force discussion.