<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>With P802.3/D3.2 at RevCom, it is appropriate to update the cw draft for consistency with IEEE Std 802.3-2018. The draft is currently inconsistent, in some places recognizing that it will not be an amendment to the 2018 revision, and in many places assuming it will be an amendment to the 2018 revision.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>To someone not active on the project, content of Clauses 155 and 156 look like they may be based on other clauses.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Misuse of acronym PHY (see P802.3/D3.2, 1.5.</td>
<td>Delete &quot;(PHY)&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>This will be an amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 as stated on the cover page.</td>
<td>Replace &quot;2018&quot; with &quot;200x&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Capitalization of forward error correction in P802.3 was made consistent, this capitalization is not consistent with that used in P802.3/D3.2.</td>
<td>&quot;forward error correction&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grow, Robert
RMG Consulting

With editorial license.

With editorial license.
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Comment ID 11

Cl 45 SC 45.2 P23 L3 # 5
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
Base text error.

SuggestedRemedy
P802.3/D3.2 has this "MIDO Interface registers"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.

P802.3cw 45.2 is labeled "MDIO Interface Registers" which is consistent with P802.3/D3.2

Cl 155 SC 155.2.5.6 P47 L1 # 7
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
Use of the word "must" is deprecated.

SuggestedRemedy
Rewrite to "shall" or other choice of grammar. Also p. 73, l. 43; p. 75, l. 41, 42; p. 85, l. 34;
p. 91, l. 95; and p. 94, l. 26.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace "must" with "shall" throughout the document.

With editorial license.

Cl FM SC FM P3 L21 # 9
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
This isn't the current IEEE SA mandated front matter.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace the IEEE-SA front matter with that found in a current template.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Modify front matter to match front matter in Version 5.0 of the IEEE 802.3 Working Group FrameMaker template

Cl FM SC FM P2 L51 # 10
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
Some information in this copyright block has been updated.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace the IEEE-SA front matter with that found in a current template.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Modify copyright block to match copyright block in Version 5.0 of the IEEE 802.3 Working Group FrameMaker template

Cl FM SC FM P9 L15 # 11
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
This is not the current FM Introduction (e.g., first paragraph and Section Nine have been modified at a minimum.

SuggestedRemedy
Get current Introduction from P802.3/D3.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Modify introduction as required to match Version 5.0 of the IEEE 802.3 Working Group FrameMaker template

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>typo</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting</td>
<td>Replace &quot;04&quot; with &quot;104&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>not the</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting</td>
<td>Update with the current P802.3/D3.0 self description (D3.0 or later as appropriate.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>will cw</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting</td>
<td>Change &quot;Amendment 7&quot; to &quot;Amendment x&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.5.1.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment ID** 16

**Page 3 of 8**

**5/12/2022 3:05:54 PM**
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**Comment Type ER**

**Comment Status D**

Though I have some experience in 802.3, I do not have the knowledge of PHY type details to provide with confidence where this insert should be. The rules chosen in the resolution of P802.3/D3.0, comment #i-52 are:

1. Increasing speed.
2. Increasing reach (maximum supported distance over the medium).
3. Decreasing number of lanes
4. PHY "family designations, by convention, are assigned a reach of 0"
5. "Copper" PHYs precede "Fiber" PHYs (all else being equal)
6. Alphanumeric sort (all else being equal)

**SuggestedRemedy**

Using these rules, and consider the 6 400GBASE inserts being done by P802.3db to determine the correct insert point. (I don't think the insert points in P802.3db/D3.0 follow these rules.)

**Proposed Response **

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There is no discernable pattern for insertion point based on P802.3/D3.2 and P802.3db/D3.0. Change insertion point from "Insert new rows for 400GBASE-ZR in Table 78–1 (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cu-20xx and IEEE Std 802.3ct-20xx) after 400GBASE-LR4-6 as follows (unchanged rows not shown):" to "Insert new row for 400GBASE-ZR at end of Table 78–1:"

**Comment Type E**

**Comment Status D**

Page numbering for clause 116 is incorrect

**SuggestedRemedy**

Correct the page numbering in clause 116 to align with the rest of the document

**Proposed Response **

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
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### Comment 20

**Comment ID:** 20  
**CL:** 116  
**SC:** 116.1.4  
**P:** 28  
**L:** 3  
**Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Commenter:** Issenhuth, Tom  
**Company:** Huawei

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Comment:** Insertion point states as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cu-20xx. This document is an amendment to P802.3/D3.2 which includes all modifications from 802.3cu so this reference is no longer valid.

**Suggested Remedy:** Remove reference to P802.3cu. Review entire document and remove any references to amendments included in P802.3/D3.2 and update references as required for amendments to P802.3/D3.2.

**Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

### Comment 21

**Comment ID:** 21  
**CL:** 116  
**SC:** 116.1.4  
**P:** 28  
**L:** 6  
**Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Commenter:** Issenhuth, Tom  
**Company:** Huawei

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Comment:** Table 116-4 was changed to 116-5 in P802.3/D3.2. There may be other instances of Table or subclause numbering changing with P802.3/D3.2.

**Suggested Remedy:** Change Table 116-4 to Table 116-5. Review the entire document and change Table or subclause numbering to align with P802.3/D3.2.

**Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

### Comment 22

**Comment ID:** 22  
**CL:** 156  
**SC:** 156.9.1  
**P:** 86  
**L:** 35  
**Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

**Response Status:** PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

**Commenter:** Sluyski, Mike  
**Company:** Cisco Systems

**Comment Type:** T  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Comment:** In Table 156-6 Error Vector magnitude (max) is TBD

**Suggested Remedy:** Replace TBD with 12. Justification based on manillof_3Cw_01_220314 and Rahn_3cw-01a_220223. Further detail on EVM will be provided in a supporting presentation.

**Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

**Response Status:** LATE COMMENT

**Response:** For task force discussion.

---

**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**  
**Z/withdrawn**  

**SORT ORDER:** Comment ID  

**Comment ID:** 24  
**Page:** 5 of 8

**Date:** 5/12/2022 3:05:54 PM
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Sluyski, Mike Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D
Interferometric crosstalk at TP3 (max) in Table 156-8

Proposed Response
Remove parameter from table. Remove note (d). ADM applications can be considered Out-of-Scope for this specification.

SuggestedRemedy
For task force discussion.

Comment ID 25

Sluyski, Mike Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D
The I-Q phase error (max) is TBD

Proposed Response
Add definition: The I-Q phase error (max) is the largest proportional phase difference of the in-phase component I and quadrature component Q of the signal. Measured relative to LO

SuggestedRemedy
Change definition from "The I-Q phase error (max) is TBD" to "The I-Q phase error (max) is the largest proportional phase difference of the in-phase component I and quadrature component Q of the signal. Measured relative to local oscillator."

Comment ID 27

Sluyski, Mike Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D
The I-Q phase error (min) is TBD

Proposed Response
Add definition: The I-Q phase error (min) is the largest negative proportional phase difference of the in-phase component I and quadrature component Q of the signal. Measured relative to LO

SuggestedRemedy
Change definition from "The I-Q phase error (min) is TBD" to "The I-Q phase error (min) is the largest negative proportional phase difference of the in-phase component I and quadrature component Q of the signal. Measured relative to local oscillator."

Comment ID 28
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Cl 156 SC 156.9.16 P90 L46 # 29
Sluyski, Mike Cisco Systems

Comment Type T  Comment Status D  
The I-Q quadrature skew (max) is TBD

SuggestedRemedy
Add definition: The I-Q quadrature skew (max) is the maximum relative skew between the in-phase component I and quadrature component Q of the signal.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

LATE COMMENT
Change definition from "The I-Q quadrature skew is TBD" to "The I-Q quadrature skew (max) is the maximum relative skew between the in-phase component I and quadrature component Q of the signal."

Cl 156 SC 156.10.1.2.4 P94 L45 # 30
Sluyski, Mike Cisco Systems

Comment Type T  Comment Status D  
Receive filtering definitions include TBDs

SuggestedRemedy
Update as: "The signal is filtered using a 3rd-order super gaussian filter with RRC = 0.2"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

LATE COMMENT
Change definition from "The signal isfiltered using a TBD filter with TBD roll-off." to "The signal is filtered using a 3rd-order super gaussian filter with RRC = 0.2."

Cl 155 SC 155.4.2.1 P61 L50 # 32
Lewis, David Lumentum

Comment Type TR  Comment Status D  
Because the AM field is protected by C-FEC, the error rate in the AMP matching should be extremely low. A single match to the full 1920 bit field should be adequate to declare amp_valid.

SuggestedRemedy
Change the last sentence from: "The sequence is considered to be valid if at least TBD bits match the known bits of the pattern described in 155.2.4.4.1." to "The sequence is considered to be valid if all bits match the known bits of the pattern described in 155.2.4.4.1."

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

LATE COMMENT
Because the channel passband min & max characteristics are specified as black link characteristics in Table 156-8, it is not necessary to have a separate table specifying adjacent channel isolation.

Suggested Remedy
Remove the parameter from Table 156-8 and delete Table 156-9. Remove the test pattern line for adjacent channel isolation from Table 156-11. Remove the parameter definition at 156.9.29.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

LATE COMMENT
For task force discussion.