Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **1**   *L* **10**   # 216

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

The introduction identifies the amendment as #4.

SuggestedRemedy

Amendment 4:

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Use correct numbering

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **1**   *L* **23**   # 218

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

The latest revision draft when you resolve comments and recirculate P802.3db will likely be P802.3/D3.0

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Update as needed

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **1**   *L* **27**   # 6

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

802.3ct and 802.3cp have been added to D2.1 of 802.3dc

SuggestedRemedy

Include 802.3ct-2021 and 802.3cp in this list

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make this change

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **1**   *L* **27**   # 217

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

Now that P802 D2.1 is out, this can be updated to add IEEE Std 802.3ct-2021 and IEEE Std 802.3cp-2021.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Update to be consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **1**   *L* **35**   # 73

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

It seems unlikely you will go to SA ballot after 802.3cw. 802.3cw is still at d1p2.

SuggestedRemedy

Check with WG leadership for order of amendments and align this, and amendment descriptions on page s 10 & 11

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make changes according to appropriate amendment order after consulting with Working Group leadership.

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **1**   *L* **37**   # 7

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Should say Working Group instead of Task Force. Do we need to say ballot instead of review

SuggestedRemedy

Correct

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Correct front matter in future drafts for Working Group Review

See also comment #74

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 **FM**
SC **FM**

Page 1 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **FM**	*SC* **FM**	*P* **1**	*L* **37**	# 74

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

prepared for Task Force Review… this is for working group ballot

SuggestedRemedy

Change Task Force Review to Working Group Ballot.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this in future drafts.

See also comment #7

Cl **FM**	*SC* **FM**	*P* **3**	*L* **6**	# 220

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

Forward Error Correction should not be capitalized, see Keywords and 1.5 of P802.3.

SuggestedRemedy

forward error correction

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Uncapitalize forward error correction.

Cl **FM**	*SC* **FM**	*P* **9**	*L* **17**	# 8

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

D2.1 of 802.3dc moved sentence starting with "The title was changed…" to the end of
paragraph and added "and the ability to use
an Ethertype to specify the MAC client protocol were "

SuggestedRemedy

Update this paragraph to match latest draft of 802.3dc

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**	*SC* **FM**	*P* **10**	*L* **29**	# 103

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

The paragraph starting on line 29 should be part of the previous paragraph (Section Eight).

Also, on line 130, a space is missing after "Clause 125".

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the paragraph break, insert space between "Clause 125" and "includes".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Correct this paragraph to match latest draft of 802.3dc

Cl **FM**	*SC* **FM**	*P* **10**	*L* **36**	# 9

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Changes were made in D2.1 of 802.3dc

SuggestedRemedy

Update this paragraph to match latest draft of 802.3dc

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**	*SC* **FM**	*P* **11**	*L* **10**	# 219

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **TR**	*Comment Status* **D**	*Bucket*

PHY is not an acronym for Physical Layer in IEEE Std 802.3. No acronymn is defined for
Physical Layer.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "(PHY)"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "(PHY)"

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 **FM**
SC **FM**

Page 2 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **12**   *L* **1**   # 45

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

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

blank page

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the blank page.
Also remove blank pages 19, 26,

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **12**   *L* **1**   # 10

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Extra blank page

SuggestedRemedy

remove

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove extra page

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 49

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

SuggestedRemedy

1 1 1 1 1 x x = reserved

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #78.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **2**   # 35

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum/Marvell

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Hyperlink to from sidebar table of content not working

SuggestedRemedy

Please sidebar hyperlink

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Hyperlinks do appear to work in D2.0.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **12**   *L* **1**   # 104

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

There are several blank pages in the draft (apparently at the end of clauses).

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the empty pages.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **13**   *L* **2**   # 34

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum/Marvell

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Page hyperlink is not working

SuggestedRemedy

Please fix the hyperlink to page#

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 3 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **14**   *L* **14**   # 37

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum/Marvell

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Incorrect title for 167, Physical Medium Dependent (PMD) sublayer and medium, type 100GBASE-VR1, 200GBASE-VR2, 23 400GBASE-VR4, 100GBASE-SR1, 200GBASE-SR2, and 400GBASE-SR441

SuggestedRemedy

Please repalce 441 with 4

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Framemaker issue.
SR441 is actually SR4……41 where 41 is page number. Will be fixed in the next draft.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **18**   *L* **14**   # 106

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

Many editorial instructions in this draft appear as bookmarks in the bookmark pane, making navigation inconvenient.

SuggestedRemedy

Apply paragraph formatting for all editorial instructions to avoid them being treated as bookmarks.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **25**   *L* **20**   # 113

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

Several cross-references to content that is not included in this draft are formatted in green, bu unlike other amendments, they are active (and broken) links.

Additionally, many cross-references to content in amended clauses that are included in this draft (e.g. clauses 82 and 91) are also formatted in green (and some are broken links).

SuggestedRemedy

Make all external cross-references plain text in green, and all internal cross-references active links in black.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix these cross references

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **41**   *L* **51**   # 118

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Per 1.1.6 Word usage, "must" cannot be used when stating mandatory requirements.

Multiple instances of the word "must" appear in text inherited from earlier clauses, on pages 41, 43, 45 (twice), 48, 55, and 56. These earlier clauses have been edited in 802.3dc D2.1 to eliminate usage of this word.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentences that include "must" based on similar text in 802.3dc D2.1.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **18**   *L* **4**   # 105

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

Nothing is inserted in this subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the subclause and editorial instruction, unless the next draft add some content.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Subclause 1.3 will be deleted. Editorial instruction regarding future changes to subclause numbers 1.4.x for the new PMDs will remain to monitor new drafts of 802.3dc.

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 **1**
SC **1.3**

Page 4 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4**   *P* **18**   *L* **12**   # 221

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

With the merge of IEEE Std 802.3ct and IEEE Std 802.3cp into P802.3/D2.1, indeed subclause numbering has changed in P802.3/D2.1, but additionally, base text has also changed from that in this draft. With the expected (conditional) approval to advance the revision project to SA ballot, stability of both subclause numbers and base text should be significantly improved with P802.3/D2.1 and future drafts.

SuggestedRemedy

Review changed clauses against the then current draft of the P802.3 revision project. (I have also submitted individual comments for some specific noted differences found in review of P802.3/D2.1 changes.)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Following are the assignments:

```
1.4.38a   100GBASE-SR1       100GBASE-R encoding
1.4.41a   100GBASE-VR1       100GBASE-R encoding
1.4.108a  200GBASE-SR2       200GBASE-R encoding
1.4.109a  200GBASE-VR2       200GBASE-R encoding
1.4.142a  400GBASE-SR4       400GBASE-R encoding
1.4.144a  400GBASE-VR4       400GBASE-R encoding
```

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4**   *P* **18**   *L* **27**   # 206

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Systems

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

Missing space in "1.4.103a200GBASE-SR2:"

SuggestedRemedy

Add space and in the next three sub headings

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4**   *P* **18**   *L* **28**   # 182

Huber, Tom   Nokia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

200GBASE-SR2 should be described as using 200GBASE-R encoding

SuggestedRemedy

Change "… using 100GBASE-R encoding …" to "… using 200GBASE-R encoding …"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #221.

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4**   *P* **18**   *L* **34**   # 183

Huber, Tom   Nokia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

200GBASE-VR2 should be described as using 200GBASE-R encoding

SuggestedRemedy

Change "… using 100GBASE-R encoding …" to "… using 200GBASE-R encoding …"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #221.

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4**   *P* **18**   *L* **40**   # 184

Huber, Tom   Nokia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

400GBASE-VR4 should be described as using 400GBASE-R encoding

SuggestedRemedy

Change "… using 100GBASE-R encoding …" to "… using 400GBASE-R encoding …"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #221.

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 **1**
SC **1.4**

Page 5 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4.39a**   *P* **18**   *L* **15**   # 75

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

There is no "100GBASE-SR10 encoding" - it is just "100GBASE-SR10", AND, I think 100GBASE-SR1 should go before 100GBASE-SR10, which would be after "1.4.38 100GBASE-R encoding".

SuggestedRemedy

Change editing instruction to Insert the following new definition after 1.4.38 100GBASE-R encoding.
Renumber 1.4.39a to 1.4.38a

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #221.

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4.39a**   *P* **18**   *L* **26**   # 222

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

Subclause numbers have changed with the merge of 802.3ct and 802.3cp.

SuggestedRemedy

Editing instructions and text subclause numbers can be updated. In P802.3/D2.1:
100GBASE-SR10 is 1.4.40, 100GBASE-SR4 is 1.4.41, 200GBASE-R is 1.4.108, 200GBASE-SR4 is now 1.4.109, 400GBASE-SR16 is now 142, 400GBASE-SR8 is now 144. Change inserted clauses to correspond.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #221.

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4.103a**   *P* **18**   *L* **28**   # 154

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

200GBASE-SR2 should use 200GBASE-R encoding

SuggestedRemedy

Change 100GBASE_R to 200GBase R.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change to 200GBASE-R encoding.
See response to comment #221.

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4.103a**   *P* **18**   *L* **34**   # 155

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

200GBASE-VR2 should use 200GBASE-R encoding

SuggestedRemedy

Change 100GBASE_R to 200GBase R.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change to 200GBASE-R encoding.
See response to comment #221.

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4.103a**   *P* **18**   *L* **40**   # 156

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

400GBASE-SR2 should use 400GBASE-R encoding

SuggestedRemedy

Change 100GBASE_R to 400GBase R.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change to 400GBASE-R encoding.
See response to comment #221.

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4.103a**   *P* **18**   *L* **46**   # 157

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

400GBASE-VR2 should use 400GBASE-R encoding

SuggestedRemedy

Change 100GBASE_R to 400GBase R.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change to 400GBASE-R encoding.
See response to comment #221.

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 **1**
SC **1.4.103a**

Page 6 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **1**　　*SC* **1.4.104a**　　　*P* **18**　　*L* **32**　　# 76

Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

Editing instruction says "new definitions" - I only see one.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "new definitions" to "new definition" in the editing instruction

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1**　　*SC* **1.4.136a**　　　*P* **19**　　*L* **1**　　# 11

Parsons, Earl　　　　　　CommScope

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

Extra blank page

SuggestedRemedy

remove

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove extra page

Cl **16**　　*SC* **16.7.1**　　　*P* **51**　　*L* **24**　　# 39

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum/Marvell

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket*

Still having problem to display symbols using Apple Preview

SuggestedRemedy

Please correct when there is a fix from Adobe

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **16**　　*SC* **16.7.2**　　　*P* **52**　　*L* **25**　　# 41

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum/Marvell

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket*

Still having problem to display symbols using Apple Preview

SuggestedRemedy

Please correct when there is a fix from Adobe

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **30**　　*SC* **30.5.1.1.2**　　　*P* **20**　　*L* **11**　　# 77

Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket*

"ATTRIBUTE" is missing on line before APPROPRIATE SYNTAX:. Also, ATTRIBUTE should be at the indent occupied by APPROPRIATE SYNTAX, which would cause APPROPRIATE SYNTAX to line up with the indent of the added MAU types.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert ATTRIBUTE on new line before APPROPRIATE SYNTAX, with style and alignment as described.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add "ATTRIBUTE" and indent "APPROPRIAT SYNTAX" correctly.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45**　　　*P* **21**　　*L* **1**　　# 223

Grow, Bob　　　　　　RMG Consulting

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

P802.3/D2.1, Clause 45 is still a mess for capitalization, from the Clause title using too many capitals to the erratic capitalization of "Register" in text throughout.

SuggestedRemedy

This draft seems to be internally consistent (only capitalize "Register" when followed by a name or the first word of a title/sentence), so no change is requested, this comment is just to note that future P802.3 drafts might try to fix some of this, changing base text used in this draft, and P802.3db should follow how this is resolved for P802.3/D2.1 comment resolutions.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
No change to capitalization of "Register".

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**

Page 7 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.6**   *P* **21**   *L* **10**   # 78

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

"Change the indicated reserved rows" - there are no rows indicated to be changed. Further,
Table 45-7 has 3 reserved rows. I suspect the one to be changed is the top-most, but it looks
like the change needs to be more complicated.   The reserved rows are:
1 1 1 x x x x = reserved
1 1 0 1 x x x = reserved
1 1 0 0 1 x x = reserved
but the added rows are indicated purely as inserts, creating double-definitions:
...
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 = reserved (with values 1111110 through 1111000 defined)

Also, I cannot find any reference to 50GBASE-BR40-U in the draft, or in another
amendment - so I'm guessing this is an error or in an amendment coming later.

SuggestedRemedy

Change editing instruction to "Change the description of bits 1.7.6:0 in Table 45-7, as shown
(unchanged rows not shown):
show in description, as below, <UL> indicates start of underline, <END UL> end of underline,
<SO> and <END SO> start and end of strikeout, and text outside of that is just plain to show
where the new text lies in the draft

"6 5 4 3 2 1 0
<UL> 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 = reserved
1 1 1 1 1 1 0 = 400GBASE-SR4 PMA/PMD
1 1 1 1 1 0 1 = 400GBASE-VR4 PMA/PMD
1 1 1 1 1 0 0 = 200GBASE-SR4 PMA/PMD
1 1 1 1 0 1 1 = 200GBASE-VR4 PMA/PMD
1 1 1 1 0 1 0 = 100GBASE-SR4 PMA/PMD
1 1 1 1 0 0 1 = 100GBASE-VR4 PMA/PMD <END UL>
<SO> 1 1 1 x x x x = reserved <END SO>
<UL> 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 = reserved
1 1 1 0 x x x = reserved <end UL>
1 1 0 1 x x x = reserved
...."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the description of bits 1.7.6:0 in Table 45-7 as shown (unchanged rows not shown):
"6 5 4 3 2 1 0
<UL> 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 = reserved
1 1 1 1 1 1 0 = 400GBASE-SR4 PMA/PMD
1 1 1 1 1 0 1 = 400GBASE-VR4 PMA/PMD
1 1 1 1 1 0 0 = 200GBASE-SR4 PMA/PMD
1 1 1 1 0 1 1 = 200GBASE-VR4 PMA/PMD
1 1 1 1 0 1 0 = 100GBASE-SR4 PMA/PMD

---

1 1 1 1 0 0 1 = 100GBASE-VR4 PMA/PMD <END UL>
<SO> 1 1 1 1 1 x x = reserved
1 1 1 1 0 1 x = reserved
1 1 1 1 0 0 1 = reserved <END SO>
1 1 1 1 0 0 0 = 50GBASE-BR40-U
...."
<UL> stands for underline and <SO> for strikeout.
50GBASE-BR40-U comes from 802.3cp and was added in 802.3dc D2.1.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.6**   *P* **21**   *L* **10**   # 207

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Systems

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

Show "1 1 1 x x x x = reserved" as struck through
Change "1 1 1 1 0 0 0 = 50GBASE-BR40-U" to "1 1 1 1 0 0 0 = reserved"
add "1 1 1 0 X X X = reserved"

SuggestedRemedy

See comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #78.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.6**   *P* **21**   *L* **10**   # 224

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

No changes are shown in the table, only inserts.

SuggestedRemedy

The last line of the table shows an unchanged row in contradiction to the instruction, (perhaps
change instruction to say most unchanged rows not shown). Reserved row existing text
should be taken from P802.3/D2.1 rather than what is shown (deleted rows in P802.3/D2.1
should be shown in strikethrough.)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #78.

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 **45.2.1.6**

Page 8 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.6**　　　　*P* **21**　　*L* **23**　　# 50

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　General Motors

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

deleted text has to be shown in strikethrough

SuggestedRemedy

Add in strikethrough "1 1 1 1 1 x x = reserved"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #78.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.6**　　　　*P* **21**　　*L* **25**　　# 48

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　General Motors

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

deleted text has to be shown in strikethrough

SuggestedRemedy

Add in strikethrough "1 1 1 1 0 1 x = reserved"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #78.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.6**　　　　*P* **21**　　*L* **26**　　# 107

Ran, Adee　　　　　Cisco

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

The line for 50GBASE-BR40-U appears in the base document (802.3dc D2.1) so should not be underlined.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the underline.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.6**　　　　*P* **21**　　*L* **26**　　# 47

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　General Motors

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

deleted text has to be shown in strikethrough

SuggestedRemedy

Add "reserved" in strikethrough
1 1 1 1 0 0 1 = "reserved" 100GBASE-VR1 PMA/PMD

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #78.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.6**　　　　*P* **21**　　*L* **27**　　# 46

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　General Motors

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

an unchanged row is shown as new

SuggestedRemedy

Delete from this draft: 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 = 50GBASE-BR40-U

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #78.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.7.4**　　　*P* **21**　　*L* **43**　　# 208

Marris, Arthur　　　　　Cadence Design Systems

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

Make 167.5.10 a cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Make 167.5.10 a cross reference and similarly make the next two tables include cross references

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **45.2.1.7.4**

Page 9 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.7.4**   *P* **21**   *L* **43**   # 79

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

167.5.10 should be an active cross reference, same comment for 167.5.11 in Table 45-10 and 167.5.7 in Table 45-12.

SuggestedRemedy

make locations in Tables 45-9, 45-10 and 45-12 active cross references

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.21**   *P* **22**   *L* **37**   # 209

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

1.23.7 and 1.23.8 are being used by 802.3ck

SuggestedRemedy

Move thes bits to 1.23.9 and 1.23.10 and add reserved row for 1.23.8:7

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #239.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.21**   *P* **22**   *L* **37**   # 239

Anslow, Pete   Independent

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Bits 1.23.7 and 1.23.8 are already allocated in P802.3ck D2.2 as:
1.23.8   200GBASE-CR2 ability
1.23.7   200GBASE-KR2 ability

SuggestedRemedy

Revert the allocations in register 1.23 to what they were in D1.2:
1.23.10   200GBASE-SR2 ability
1.23.9   200GBASE-VR2 ability

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.21**   *P* **22**   *L* **37**   # 108

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Bits 7 and 8 of register 1.23 have been assigned by 802.3ck (since D1.0, December 2019) and are not available.

SuggestedRemedy

Keep bits 8:7 reserved, and assign bits 10:9 instead (or others based on availability).

Change 45.2.1.21.9 and 45.2.1.21.10 accordingly.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comments #225 and #239.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.21**   *P* **22**   *L* **37**   # 100

Lusted, Kent   Intel Corporation

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

The 200G PMA/PMD extended ability bits 1.23.7 and 1.23.8 collide with P802.3ck

SuggestedRemedy

Move the bits to another location in the register

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment #239.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.21.9**   *P* **22**   *L* **47**   # 225

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

The insert point and subclause number are incorrect. Bit subclauses are written most significant bit to least significant bit (order of the two new subclauses is correct, but insert poir is wrong.

SuggestedRemedy

Inserted clauses should be inserted after 45.2.1.21.1, with bit 1.3.8 being inserted as 45.2.1.21.1a, and bit 1.3.7 being inserted as 45.2.1.21.1b.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

45.2.1.21.1a 1.23.10
45.2.1.21.1b 1.23.9

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 **45.2.1.21.9**

Page 10 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.22**   *P* **23**   *L* **9**   # 109

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

This draft is an amendment of 802.3dc-202x, so modifications by 802.3cn-2019 are already included.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the editorial instruction.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.22**   *P* **23**   *L* **9**   # 110

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

In D2.1 of 802.3dc (as in 802.3cn-2019) bits 14:11 are reserved, not just 14:12, so the new assignments should be bits 12:11, to avoid a single bit gap.

SuggestedRemedy

Assign bits 12:11.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment #227.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.22**   *P* **23**   *L* **9**   # 80

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

"(as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cn-2019)" - if this is an amendment to the revision (802.3-2022), then modification by 802.3cn-2019 is not relevant or necessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "(as modified by IEEE Std 8092.3cn-2019)" in editing instruction

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.22**   *P* **23**   *L* **9**   # 226

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

With this draft now writen to amend 802.3-202x, the parenthetical pointing at 802.3cn can be deleted.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.22**   *P* **23**   *L* **19**   # 227

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

The bit values do not agree between table and instruction. Unless other reserved bits are being defined in amendments 1-3, the bits defined should probably be 11 and 12, with Reserved becoming 14:13.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

1.24.13 400GBASE-SR4
1.24.12 400GBASE-VR4

See comment #81 for the remaining reserved bits.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.22**   *P* **23**   *L* **19**   # 200

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

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

14:14

SuggestedRemedy

Delete :14

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #81.

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 **45.2.1.22**

Page 11 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.22**　　　*P* **23**　　*L* **19**　　# `210`

Marris, Arthur　　　　　　　Cadence Design Systems

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

Clean up reserved rows in Table 45–25

SuggestedRemedy

On line 19 make it a single reserved bit 1.24.14 and show ":11" crossed out
Add another underlined reserved row for 1.24.11. (This bit will be used by 802.3cw for 400GBASE-ZR.)

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #81.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.22**　　　*P* **23**　　*L* **19**　　# `81`

Zimmerman, George　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

There is only one reserved bit - no need for a range

SuggestedRemedy

Change edit just to strike out ":12" (deleting the inserted 14, and striking out the colon as well)

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.22.11**　　*P* **23**　　*L* **31**　　# `228`

Grow, Bob　　　　　　　　RMG Consulting

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

Insert point and subclauses are incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

insert point woud be after 45.2.1.22.1 and bit numbers in the following subclauses should be consistent with resolution of comment on the bit numbers in the table bits 12 and 11 if that comment is accepted).

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

45.2.1.22.1a 1.24.13
45.2.1.22.1b 1.24.12

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.24**　　　*P* **23**　　*L* **12**　　# `199`

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　Nvidia

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

In the tables in Clause 45, the bits are presented in reverse order.
In 802.3dc, Table 45-27, 40G/100G PMA/PMD extended ability 2 register bit definitions, bits 3 to 9 are allocated, bits 0 and

SuggestedRemedy

Move the row beginning "1:26:2:X0X Reserved" to above 1.26.1 100GBASE-SR1 ability.
Delete the last row "...".
So that the reader can understand the context of the amendment and check issues like this, include the adjacent unchanged row from the base document, beginning "1.26.3 100GBASE-DR ability" and change "unchanged rows not shown" to "some unchanged rows not shown".

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #240.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.24**　　　*P* **23**　　*L* **45**　　# `240`

Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　Independent

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket*

Bits 1.26.0 and 1.26.1 are already allocated in P802.3ck D2.2 as:
1.26.1　100GBASE-CR1 ability
1.26.0　100GBASE-KR1 ability

SuggestedRemedy

Revert the allocations in register 1.26 to what they were in D1.2:
1.26.10　100GBASE-VR1 ability
1.26.2　100GBASE-SR1 ability
Note that in D1.2, these were shown in the wrong order in the table (the row for 1.26.10 100GBASE-VR1 should be above the row for 1.26.2 100GBASE-SR1)

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **45.2.1.24**

Page 12 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.24**   *P* **23**   *L* **47**   # 111

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *Bucket*

Bits 0 and 1 of register 1.26 have been assigned by 802.3ck (since D1.0, December 2019) and are not available.

SuggestedRemedy

Keep bits 1:0 reserved, and assign bits 11:10 instead (or others based on availability).

Change 45.2.1.24.7 and 45.2.1.24.8 accordingly.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comments #230 and #240.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.24**   *P* **23**   *L* **49**   # 82

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

"insert the following new subclauses (Table 45.2.1.24.7 and Table 45.2.1.24.8) after 45.2.1.24.4" - these are subclauses, not tables, use correct cross-reference formatting so it just says (45.2.1.24.7 and 45.2.1.24.8) - also, put editing instruction AFTER Table 45-27.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment #230.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.24**   *P* **23**   *L* **49**   # 230

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *Bucket*

The editing instructon is wrong. The words "Table" should not be in the parenthetical. Also a three subclause numbers are wrong.

SuggestedRemedy

There is already a 45.2.1.24.7 in P802.3/D2.1 so the final subclause numbers should be 8 an 9 here and on the inserted subclauses on page 24.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

45.2.1.24.1a 1.26.10
45.2.1.24.7a 1.26.2

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.24**   *P* **24**   *L* **7**   # 101

Lusted, Kent   Intel Corporation

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *Bucket*

The 40G/100G PMA/PMD extended ability register 2 bit 1.26.0 and 1.26.1 collide with P802.3ck

SuggestedRemedy

Move the bits to another location in the register

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment #240.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.24**   *P* **24**   *L* **7**   # 211

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *Bucket*

1.26.0 and 1.26.1 are being used by 802.3ck

SuggestedRemedy

Move these ability bits somewhere else

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #239.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.24**   *P* **24**   *L* **12**   # 229

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

Bit order in table is wrong. Did youreally intend to leave 1.26.2 as the reserved bit instead of bit 0 being left reserved?

SuggestedRemedy

Bit 2 should appear above bit 1. Adjust bit numbers if you want the reserved bit to be the LSE of the register.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

1.26.10 100GBASE-VR1
1.26.2   100GBASE-SR1

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 **45.2.1.24**

Page 13 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **78**   *SC* **78.1.4**   *P* **25**   *L* **6**   # 212

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

I do not see EEE listed in the P802.3db objectives

SuggestedRemedy

Consider deleting Clause 78 from the 802.3db draft.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Cl **78**   *SC* **78.1.4**   *P* **25**   *L* **8**   # 112

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

802.3cw is not expected to be published before 802.3db, so its modifications should not be included here.

I do not see anything in the table that does not match 802.3dc, so this seems to be only an error in the editorial instruction.

Also applies to two instances in 116.1.3 (P35 L40 and P38 L27).

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the editorial instructions.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove 802.3cw from editing instructions

Cl **78**   *SC* **78.1.4**   *P* **25**   *L* **20**   # 241

Anslow, Pete   Independent

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

Comment #65 against P802.3cj D2.0 defined the order of items in Table 78-1. See:
http://www.ieee802.org/3/cj/comments/P8023-D2p0-Comments-Final-byID.pdf#page=14
According to this, 100GBASE-VR1 should be inserted after 100GBASE-CR10

SuggestedRemedy

Insert the row for 100GBASE-VR1 after the row for 100GBASE-CR10.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Reorder rows in this table as appropriate

Cl **78**   *SC* **78.1.4**   *P* **25**   *L* **51**   # 12

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Footnote shouldn't be underlined

SuggestedRemedy

remove underline

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Un-underline this footnote

Cl **78**   *SC* **78.1.4**   *P* **26**   *L* **1**   # 13

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Extra blank page

SuggestedRemedy

remove

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove this extra page

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **1**   # 84

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

80.1.1 Should be 80.1.5

SuggestedRemedy

Change 80.1.1 to 80.1.5

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this numbering

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 **80**
SC **80.1.1**

Page 14 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:30 AM

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **1**   # 185

Huber, Tom   Nokia

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

The heading number for the subclause titled "Physical Layer signaling systems" is 80.1.5

SuggestedRemedy

Change 80.1.1 to 80.1.5

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix subclause numbering

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **8**   # 186

Huber, Tom   Nokia

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

The heading for the new columns in Table 80--5 is "Clause 167", while all other columns in the table only have the clause number as a heading.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the heading from "Clause 167" to "167"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference without breaking others.

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **10**   # 201

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

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

Clause 167

SuggestedRemedy

167

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **10**   # 14

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Fix cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

change "Clause 167" to "167"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix without breaking other cross references

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **10**   # 246

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communications

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

Clause number should be used - should be "167" and not "Clause 167"
The same problem is present in Table 116-4 and Table 116-5

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Clause 167" in Table 80-5 to "167". Make sure the link is live.
The same problem is present in Table 116-4 and Table 116-5

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix these cross references without breaking others

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **11**   # 172

Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

100GAUI-1 is missing from Table 80-5, but is present in Table 167-1

SuggestedRemedy

Add 120F and 120G to Table 80-5 with the same editors note that is after Table 167-1.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove references to 802.3ck

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **80**   Page 15 of 47
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **80.1.1**   11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **11**   # 213

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Change "Clause 167" to "167"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Clause 167" to "167"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **13**   # 85

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

"Clause 167" column header is different than the others which just have numbers

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Clause 167" to "167" (as active xref)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference without breaking the others

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.3**   *P* **27**   *L* **9**   # 83

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

It appears "Clause 140" an external reference is somehow an active cross reference. No idea where it points…

SuggestedRemedy

See comment, make it not active.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Deactivate this cross reference

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.4**   *P* **27**   *L* **15**   # 138

Brown, Matt   Huawei

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

Since the table is shown with insertion mark-up with surrounding unchanged text the correct instruction is "change" not "insert" and no further details are required.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the instruction to: "Change Table 80-1 as follows (some unchanged rows not shown)'

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make this change to editing instructions

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.2.3**   *P* **28**   *L* **36**   # 231

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

Forward Error Correction should not be capitalized, see Keywords and 1.5 of P802.3. Updating changed clause base text to P802.3/D2.1 or later should fix this. (The noted changes are in titles, which might be missed in a base text update.)

SuggestedRemedy

Forward error correction (FEC) sublayers, in line 38 forward error correction. Base text also changed for Clause 91, page 30, line 1 (forward error correction), page 23, line 2 (forward error correction) and p. 33., l.1 (forward error correction) and should be fixed

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make these changes

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.4**   *P* **28**   *L* **14**   # 140

Brown, Matt   Huawei

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

Bottom row has think border at top.

SuggestedRemedy

Change top border to "very thin".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Correct table borders

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 **80**
SC **80.4**

Page 16 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **80**　　　*SC* **80.4**　　　　　　*P* **28**　　　*L* **47**　　　# **139**

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

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

Since the table is shown with insertion mark-up with surrounding unchanged text the correct instruction is "change" not "insert" and no further details are required.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the instruction to: "Change Table 80-6 as follows (some unchanged rows not shown)'

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make this change to editing instructions

Cl **80**　　　*SC* **80.4**　　　　　　*P* **29**　　　*L* **1**　　　# **202**

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

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

Table 80-6--Sublayer delay constraints

SuggestedRemedy

Table 80-7--Sublayer delay constraints

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Correct table numbering

Cl **91**　　　*SC* **91.5.3.3**　　　　*P* **30**　　　*L* **12**　　　# **98**

Marris, Arthur　　　　　　　　　　Cadence Design Systems

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

Change "100GBASE-DR PHY" to "100GBASE-DR" and the word "is" is missing on line 33

SuggestedRemedy

Change "100GBASE-DR PHY" to "100GBASE-DR" on lines 12, 22 and 34
Also change "When the RS-FEC sublayer used" to "When the RS-FEC sublayer is used"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make these changes

Cl **91**　　　*SC* **91.5.3.3**　　　　*P* **30**　　　*L* **18**　　　# **114**

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

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

The amended text of this paragraphs is unclear. The normative requirement of the paragraph is missing.

The current content is insufficient for readers without going to the base document to see what the "shall" is about.

SuggestedRemedy

Include the third paragraph in its entirety.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Include entire paragraph and not just this sentence.

Cl **91**　　　*SC* **91.6.3**　　　　　*P* **31**　　　*L* **4**　　　# **158**

Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　　　　Marvell

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

This may be a problem with 802.3dc but "PMDs." should not be after DR

SuggestedRemedy

Delete PMDs on row 4

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove extra "PMDs"

Cl **91**　　　*SC* **91.6.3**　　　　　*P* **31**　　　*L* **4**　　　# **99**

Marris, Arthur　　　　　　　　　　Cadence Design Systems

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

Change "100GBASE-DR PMDs" to "100GBASE-DR"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "100GBASE-DR PMDs" to "100GBASE-DR"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "PMDs" in this instance

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 **91**
SC **91.6.3**

Page 17 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **91**　　　*SC* **91.7.3**　　　　　*P* **32**　　　*L* **5**　　　# 141

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

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

Since the changes are clearly shown with insert mark-up the instruction is unecessarily verbose.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the instruction to: "Change the table in 91.7.3 as follows (some unchanged rows not shown)"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Simplify editing instructions

Cl **91**　　　*SC* **91.7.3**　　　　　*P* **32**　　　*L* **27**　　　# 15

Parsons, Earl　　　　　　　　　　CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to external cross reference to Clause 91.5.3.3.1

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

Cl **91**　　　*SC* **91.7.4.1**　　　　　*P* **33**　　　*L* **4**　　　# 142

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

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

Since the changes are clearly shown with insert mark-up the instruction is unecessarily verbose.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the instruction to: "Change the table in 91.7.4.1 as follows (some unchanged rows no shown)". Same for the table in 91.7.4.2.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Simplify editing instructions

Cl **91**　　　*SC* **91.7.4.1**　　　　　*P* **33**　　　*L* **12**　　　# 16

Parsons, Earl　　　　　　　　　　CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to external cross reference to Clause 91.5.2.7

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

Cl **91**　　　*SC* **91.7.4.2**　　　　　*P* **33**　　　*L* **32**　　　# 17

Parsons, Earl　　　　　　　　　　CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to external cross reference to Clause 91.5.3.3

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

Cl **91**　　　*SC* **91.7.4.2**　　　　　*P* **33**　　　*L* **43**　　　# 18

Parsons, Earl　　　　　　　　　　CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to external cross reference to Clause 91.5.3.3

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

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 **91**
SC **91.7.4.2**

Page 18 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.7.4.2**   *P* **34**   *L* **5**   # 19

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to external cross reference to Clause 91.5.3.3

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

Cl **116**   *SC* **116**   *P* **36**   *L* **32**   # 20

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Fix cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

change "Clause 167" to "167"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.2**   *P* **35**   *L* **16**   # 159

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

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

With only 2 items "all" isn't appropriate "both" is better

SuggestedRemedy

Change "all" to "both"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace "all" with "each"

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.3**   *P* **35**   *L* **21**   # 143

Brown, Matt   Huawei

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

Why not stick with the convention you've used in other tables and use change mark-up and surrounding unchanged text?

SuggestedRemedy

Change the instruction to: "Change Table 116-1 as follows (some unchanged rows not shown)". Underline text in new rows and add preceding and succeeding unchanged rows. Apply to other amended tables (including Table 161-7) with similar editing instructions.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Maintain consistency with other tables.

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.3**   *P* **35**   *L* **33**   # 203

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

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

Use the standard order of MAC rate (slow to fast), reach (short to long), lane count (high to low), as in Table 80-1 and Table 116-2. So, 200GBASE-VR2 comes after 200GBASE-CR4 and before 200GBASE-SR4, and 200GBASE-SR2 comes after 200GBASE-SR4 and before 200GBASE-DR4. Also show the context to make it easier to review the document.

SuggestedRemedy

Show the 200GBASE-CR4 row from the base document,
then the 200GBASE-VR2 row as in the draft,
then the 200GBASE-SR4 row from the base document,
then the 200GBASE-SR2 row as in the draft,
then the 200GBASE-DR4 row from the base document.
Revise the instructions to editor accordingly.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Reorder this table to be consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc.

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 **116**
SC **116.1.3**

Page 19 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.3**   *P* **35**   *L* **41**   # 144

Brown, Matt   Huawei

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

Since the table is shown with insertion mark-up with surrounding unchanged text the correct instruction is "change" not "insert" and no further details are required.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the instruction to: "Change Table 116-2 as follows (some unchanged rows not shown)". Similar for Table 116.4.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Simplify editing instructions

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.3**   *P* **37**   *L* **10**   # 115

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

802.3cw is not expected to be published before 802.3db, so its modifications (400GBASE-ZR) should not be included here.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the editorial instruction, and remove the columns and rows for 400GBASE-ZR.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove these references to 802.3cw

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.4**   *P* **36**   *L* **16**   # 174

Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

400GAUI-4 is missing from Table 116-5, but is present in Table 167-2

SuggestedRemedy

Add 120F and 120G to Table 116-5 with the same editors note that is after Table 167-2.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove references to 802.3ck

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.4**   *P* **36**   *L* **29**   # 173

Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

200GAUI-2 is missing from Table 116-4, but is present in Table 167-2

SuggestedRemedy

Add 120F and 120G to Table 116-4 with the same editors note that is after Table 167-2.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove all references to 802.3ck

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.4**   *P* **36**   *L* **32**   # 187

Huber, Tom   Nokia

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

The heading for the new columns in Table 116-4 is "Clause 167", while all other columns in the table only have the clause number as a heading.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the heading from "Clause 167" to "167"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference without breaking others.

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.4**   *P* **36**   *L* **34**   # 86

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

"Clause 167" column header is different than the others which just have numbers

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Clause 167" to "167" (as active xref)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference without breaking the others

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 **116**
SC **116.1.4**

Page 20 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.4**   *P* **37**   *L* **14**   # 188

Huber, Tom   Nokia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Table 116-5 includes columns for 400GBASE-ZR, assuming that P802.3cw would be published prior to P802.3db. Since P802.3cw is not yet in working group ballot, it not clear tha it would be published first.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the columns for 400GBASE-ZR from the table, and modify the editing instruction to delete "(as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cw-202x)"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove references to 802.3cw

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.4**   *P* **37**   *L* **17**   # 248

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communications

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Table 116-5 seems to have an unfinished term "400GBASE-ZR PCS and"

SuggestedRemedy

Seems like part of the statement was cut over? Restore the missing entry in the table

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Ensure this table is consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.4**   *P* **37**   *L* **17**   # 247

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communications

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

Table 116-5 has unnecessary thick lines on the right-top side of the table around "400GBASE ZR PCS and" and "400GBASE-ZR PMD"

SuggestedRemedy

Remove unnecessary thick lines

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix the line thickness in this table

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.4**   *P* **37**   *L* **18**   # 21

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Fix cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

change "Clause 167" to "167"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this without breaking other cross references

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.4**   *P* **37**   *L* **20**   # 87

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

"Clause 167" column header is different than the others which just have numbers

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Clause 167" to "167" (as active xref) (2 places)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference without breaking the others

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.1.4**   *P* **37**   *L* **23**   # 22

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

SR4.2 shouldn't be underlined

SuggestedRemedy

remove underline from 400GBASE-SR4.2

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove this underline

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 **116**
SC **116.1.4**

Page 21 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **116**　　　*SC* **116.2.5**　　　　　*P* **38**　　　*L* **0**　　　# 171

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　　*Bucket*

116.2.5 lists the clauses that provide the definition for 200G and 400Gs PMDs. Need to include 167 in that list.

SuggestedRemedy

Add Clause 167 into the last paragraph for 116.2.5 for rate.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add modified paragraph and editing instructions as needed.

Cl **116**　　　*SC* **116.4**　　　　　*P* **38**　　　*L* **4**　　　# 193

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

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

unchanged rows not shown

SuggestedRemedy

some unchanged rows not shown

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Update editing instructions

Cl **116**　　　*SC* **116.4**　　　　　*P* **38**　　　*L* **14**　　　# 51

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　General Motors

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

existing text doesn't match P8023_D2p1_ALL_SECTIONs.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Change "8192" to "8 192"
on L 21 change "4096" to "4 096".

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make the change in these two rows to match 802.3dc.

Cl **116**　　　*SC* **116.4**　　　　　*P* **38**　　　*L* **18**　　　# 160

Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　　　Marvell

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

The format of the Max bit times isn't consitent in the same table

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the space in "4 096" also on line 19. The same issue may exist in Table 116-7 but the other lines aren't shown

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add space on rows above an below.

Cl **116**　　　*SC* **116.4**　　　　　*P* **38**　　　*L* **28**　　　# 189

Huber, Tom　　　　　　　　　　Nokia

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

The changes to be made to table 116-7 don't include anything that would be impacted by 802.3cw, so there is no need for the editing instruction to reference 802.3cw. Given that 802.3cw is not yet in working group ballot, it is also unclear that it would be published before 802.3db.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "(as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cw-202x)" from the editing instruction

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove references to 802.3cw

Cl **116**　　　*SC* **116.4**　　　　　*P* **38**　　　*L* **38**　　　# 116

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

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

Inserted content is not underlined.

SuggestedRemedy

Apply underline formatting for the two inserted rows.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Underline added rows to this table

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 **116**
SC **116.4**

Page 22 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **116**　　　*SC* **116.5**　　　　　　　*P* **38**　　　*L* **54**　　　　# 190

Huber, Tom　　　　　　　　　　　　　Nokia

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

The changes to be made to tables 116-8 and 116-9 don't include anything that would be impacted by 802.3cw, so there is no need for the editing instruction to reference 802.3cw. Given that 802.3cw is not yet in working group ballot, it is also unclear that it would be published before 802.3db.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "(as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cw-202x)" from the editing instruction

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove references to 802.3cw

Cl **167**　　　*SC* **167**　　　　　　　*P* **41**　　　*L* **1**　　　　# 88

Zimmerman, George　　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

Missing editing instruction

SuggestedRemedy

Add editing instruction "Insert clause 167 after clause 166 as shown:"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add the appropriate editing instructions at the start of Clause 167.

Cl **167**　　　*SC* **167**　　　　　　　*P* **41**　　　*L* **2**　　　　# 38

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum/Marvell

Comment Type **ER**　　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　　　　*Bucket*

The dash between the PMDs is missing

SuggestedRemedy

Please repalce 100GBASE VR1 with 100GBASE-VR1, etc. Why is the title in the table of content different that title on this page?

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The hyphens are present in the PMD names
in Clause 167 title. Also TOC has the same title as the Clause (TOC is generated by FM).

Cl **167**　　　*SC* **167.1**　　　　　　*P* **41**　　　*L* **11**　　　　# 137

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

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

Presumably 100 Gigabit Ethernet operates over one fiber, 200 over two, and 400 over four. Change wording to reflect that. Append the sentence with ", respectively".

SuggestedRemedy

"The PMD sublayers provide point-to-point 100, 200, and 400 Gigabit Ethernet links over one, two, or four pairs of multimode fiber, respectively." Apply similar change at page 42 line 49 and page 43 line 2.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add "respectively" where appropriate.

Cl **167**　　　*SC* **167.1**　　　　　　*P* **41**　　　*L* **16**　　　　# 89

Zimmerman, George　　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

Clause 45 is marked external, even though it is an active cross reference and in the draft

SuggestedRemedy

Make clause 45 black and not marked external

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference

Cl **167**　　　*SC* **167.1**　　　　　　*P* **41**　　　*L* **16**　　　　# 23

Parsons, Earl　　　　　　　　　　　CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to internal cross reference to Clause 45

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

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 **167**
SC **167.1**

Page 23 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.1**　　　　　*P* **41**　　*L* **17**　　# 214

Marris, Arthur　　　　　　　　Cadence Design Systems

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

Choose font colour of "Clause 45" from forest green to black

SuggestedRemedy

Choose font colour of "Clause 45" from forest green to black. Similarly for Clause 1, 80, 91 and 116 on the next page.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.1**　　　　　*P* **41**　　*L* **29**　　# 161

Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　Marvell

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

In table 167-1 Clause 91 is out of order compared with table 140-1 in 802.3dc

SuggestedRemedy

Move clause 91 after clause 83

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Reorder this table consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.1**　　　　　*P* **41**　　*L* **46**　　# 136

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type **ER**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket*

Annex 120F and Annex 120G are defined in 802.3ck. 802.3ck is an amendment that comes after 802.3db according to the published timelines and the amendment order proposed by the Working Group Chair. This further established in the front matter on page 1 and page 11 where is clearly shows that 802.3ck does not precede 802.3db. If these Annexes are relevant to the PHYs defined in this clause then this can be addressed by amendments to Clause 162 and other relevant clauses in 802.3ck.
If it is your intent to point out that AUIs with 100 Gb/s per lane signaling may exist then use an editor's note for that.

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 167-1 and Table 167-2 delete rows for Annex 120F and Annex 120G. Remove the related editor's notes.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove references to 802.3ck

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.1**　　　　　*P* **41**　　*L* **46**　　# 102

Lusted, Kent　　　　　　　　Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket*

Table 167-1 references Annex 120F and Annex 120G for the 100GAUI1 C2C and C2M. However, the ammendment order decree from David Law has 3ck publishing after 3db

SuggestedRemedy

Remove references to Annex 120F and Annex 120G in the document

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove references to 802.3ck

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.1**　　　　　*P* **41**　　*L* **46**　　# 117

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **ER**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket*

802.3ck is scheduled to be published after 802.3db, and this draft is an amendment of 802.3-202x with amendments not including 802.3ck. Therefore clauses 120F and 120G are not part of the amended standard and are undefined.

In addition, the nomenclature tables in clauses 80 and 116 do not include annexes 120F and 120G.

802.3ck should amend clause 167 to point to these annexes instead.

If 802.3ck is published first, several changes will be needed in 802.3db, not just these two tables.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the rows for annexes 120F and 120G from Table 167–1 and Table 167–2, and delete the editor's notes referring to them.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove these references to 802.3ck

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 **167**
SC **167.1**

Page 24 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **41**   *L* **49**   # 90

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

Clause 78 is marked external, even though it is an active cross reference and in the draft - also on page 42 in Table 167-2.

SuggestedRemedy

Make clause 78 black and not marked external (2 places)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **41**   *L* **51**   # 232

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

The word "must" is deprecated.

SuggestedRemedy

"must behave" -> behaves

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "must" to be consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **41**   *L* **51**   # 145

Brown, Matt   Huawei

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

The word "must" in this context is deprecated.

SuggestedRemedy

Change footnote a in in Table 167-1 and Table 167-2 to: "The CGMII is an optional interface. However, if the CGMII is not implemented, a conforming implementation behaves functionally as though the RS and CGMII were present."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "must" to be in line with 802.3dc D2.1

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **41**   *L* **52**   # 242

Anslow, Pete   Independent

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

All occurrences of "must" have been removed from the 802.3 revision by comments 17 and 18 against D2.0. See:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dc/comments/P8023_D2p0_comments_final_by_id.pdf#page=5
Remove this "must" in accordance with these changes.
Same issue in Table 167-2 footnote a.

SuggestedRemedy

In footnote a to Table 167-1 and footnote a to Table 167-2, change "must behave" to "behaves".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "must" to be consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **42**   *L* **30**   # 233

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

The word "must" is deprecated.

SuggestedRemedy

"must behave" -> behaves

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "must" to be consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **42**   *L* **37**   # 52

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

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

Clause 80 is included in this draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change Clause 80 to "black".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make this change

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 **167**
SC **167.1**

Page 25 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **42**   *L* **37**   # 24

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to internal cross reference to Clause 81

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **42**   *L* **39**   # 27

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to internal cross reference to 116.2

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **42**   *L* **38**   # 53

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

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

Clause 80.2 is included in this draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change 80.2 to "black".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make this change

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **42**   *L* **39**   # 26

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to internal cross reference to Clause 116

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **42**   *L* **38**   # 25

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to internal cross reference to 80.2

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.1**   *P* **42**   *L* **39**   # 54

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

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

Clause 116 is included in this draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change Clause 116 to "black" and make it a hyperlink.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change this cross reference

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 **167**
SC **167.1**

Page 26 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

| *Cl* **167** | *SC* **167.1** | *P* **42** | *L* **43** | # 55 |

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

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

Clause 78 is included in this draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change Clause 78 to "black".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change this cross reference

| *Cl* **167** | *SC* **167.1** | *P* **42** | *L* **43** | # 28 |

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to internal cross reference to Clause 78

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

| *Cl* **167** | *SC* **167.1** | *P* **42** | *L* **46** | # 29 |

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to internal cross reference to Clause 1

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

| *Cl* **167** | *SC* **167.1** | *P* **42** | *L* **46** | # 56 |

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

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

Clause 1 is included in this draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change Clause 1 to "black".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change this cross reference

| *Cl* **167** | *SC* **167.1** | *P* **42** | *L* **46** | # 119 |

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

The sentence "Further relevant information may be found in Clause 1 (terminology and conventions, references, definitions and abbreviations) and Annex A (bibliography, referenced as [B1], [B2], etc.)." Does not belong in this paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the quoted sentence to a separate paragraph at the end of the subclause.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Move this sentence to match previous clauses.

| *Cl* **167** | *SC* **167.1** | *P* **43** | *L* **13** | # 30 |

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Diagram has some issues

SuggestedRemedy

Fix box alignment between GMII and PCS boxes

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Clean up these boxes

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 **167**
SC **167.1**

Page 27 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.1**　　　　　*P* **43**　　*L* **32**　　　# 149

Stassar, Peter　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type **ER**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket*

Missing em dash between "FIBER" and "50 m" & "100 m"

SuggestedRemedy

Add em dash plus 2 spaces between "FIBER" and "50 m", and between "FIBER" and "100 m"

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add em dash

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.1.1**　　　　*P* **43**　　*L* **43**　　　# 162

Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　　Marvell

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket*

Wrong cross-reference. 1.4.303 is the "end of packet de-limiter".

SuggestedRemedy

Change 1.4.303 to 1.4.344 .　Also on line 52

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.2**　　　　　*P* **44**　　*L* **7**　　　# 120

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　Cisco

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

It seems that there is an unnecessary line break after "VR2,", maybe because the paragraph is not justified.

SuggestedRemedy

Apply paragraph formatting to justify the paragraph (and others if necessary). Delete the line break if it exists.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Justify this paragraph correctly

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.3.1**　　　　*P* **45**　　*L* **21**　　　# 57

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　General Motors

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

Clause 80.4 is included in this draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change 80.4 to "black".

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change this cross reference

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.3.1**　　　　*P* **45**　　*L* **21**　　　# 58

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　General Motors

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

Hyperlink missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Make 116.4 a hyperlink.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make this a cross reference

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.3.2**　　　　*P* **45**　　*L* **26**　　　# 243

Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　Independent

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

All occurrences of "must" have been removed from the 802.3 revision by comments 17 and 18 against D2.0. See:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dc/comments/P8023_D2p0_comments_final_by_id.pdf#page=5
Remove the two instances of "must" in accordance with these changes.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "… FEC lanes must be kept within limits ..." to "… FEC lanes is kept within limits ..."
On line 27 change "The Skew Variation must also be limited…" to "The Skew Variation is also limited …"

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "must" to be consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

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 **167**
SC **167.3.2**

Page 28 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.3.2**   *P* **45**   *L* **26**   # 234

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

The word "must" is deprecated.

SuggestedRemedy

"must be" -> "needs to be"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "must" to be consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.3.2**   *P* **45**   *L* **26**   # 148

Brown, Matt   Huawei

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

The word "must" in this context is deprecated. For similar clauses elsewhere this wording has been addressed by comments against 802.3dc D2.0 and will be reflected in 802.3dc D2.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Expunge "must" as done in similar clauses in 802.3dc D2.1. Also in 167.5.3

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "must" to be in line with 802.3dc D2.1

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.3.2**   *P* **45**   *L* **27**   # 235

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

The word "must" is deprecated.

SuggestedRemedy

"must also be" -> "also needs to be"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "must" to be consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.3.2.1**   *P* **45**   *L* **30**   # 150

Stassar, Peter   Huawei

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Unnecessary adding of subclause 167.3.2.1

SuggestedRemedy

Move contents of 167.3.2.1 to 167.3.2 and remove heading of 167.3.2.1

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Check D2.1 of 802.3dc and make changes to be consistent with previous clauses

---

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.3.2.1**   *P* **45**   *L* **33**   # 59

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

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

Clause 116.5 is included in this draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change 116.5 to "black" and make it a hyperlink.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change this cross reference

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.3.2.1**   *P* **45**   *L* **33**   # 31

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to internal cross reference to Clause 116.5

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

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 **167**
SC **167.3.2.1**

Page 29 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.3.2.1**　　　*P* **45**　　*L* **52**　　# 32

Parsons, Earl　　　　　　　　　　CommScope

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

Change cross reference

SuggestedRemedy

Switch to internal cross reference to Clause 45

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.4**　　　*P* **45**　　*L* **48**　　# 60

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　　General Motors

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

Clause 116.5 is included in this draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change 116.5 to "black" and make it a hyperlink.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change this cross reference

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.4**　　　*P* **45**　　*L* **53**　　# 61

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　　General Motors

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

Clause 45 is included in this draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change Clause 45 to "black".

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change this cross reference

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.5.1**　　　*P* **46**　　*L* **40**　　# 151

Stassar, Peter　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type **ER**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket*

The wording "The block diagrams for 200GBASE-VR2 and 200GBASE-SR2, and 100GBASE-VR1 and 100GBASE-SR1 are equivalent to Figure 167–2, but for two lanes and one lane per direction, respectively." is ambiguous

SuggestedRemedy

Change wording to "The block diagrams for 200GBASE-VR2 and 200GBASE-SR2 are equivalent to Figure 167–2, but for two lanes per direction. The block diagrams for 100GBASE-VR1 and 100GBASE-SR1 are equivalent to Figure 167–2, but for one lane per direction."

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make this change

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.5.1**　　　*P* **46**　　*L* **47**　　# 163

Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　　　Marvell

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

missing words.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "defined in are made" to "defined in this clause are made" or add cross reference to 167.7.1

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add cross reference to 168.8.

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.5.1**　　　*P* **46**　　*L* **47**　　# 62

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　　General Motors

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

Remove random word "in".

SuggestedRemedy

Change:　all transmitter measurements and tests defined in are made at TP2.
To:　all transmitter measurements and tests defined are made at TP2.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
A refence to 167.8 is missing which makes the sentence look incorrect. Insert the reference to 167.8 consistent with previous clauses.

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 **167**
SC **167.5.1**

Page 30 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.5.1**   *P* **47**   *L* **1**   # 164

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

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

missing words.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "defined in are made" to "defined in this clause are made" or add cross reference to 167.7.2

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add cross reference to 168.8.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.5.1**   *P* **47**   *L* **1**   # 63

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

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

Remove random word "in".

SuggestedRemedy

Change: all receiver measurements and tests defined in are made at TP3.
To: all receiver measurements and tests defined are made at TP3.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
A refence to 167.8 is missing which makes the sentence look incorrect. Insert the reference to 167.8 consistent with previous clauses.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.5.2**   *P* **47**   *L* **36**   # 121

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

The transmit function converts symbol streams to optical signals, not signal streams to optical signal streams.

This text seems to originate in clause 138, which has similar incorrect language (and should be fixed in maintenance). The precedence in most other clauses (e.g. 121.5.2, 122.5.2, 123.5.2, 124.5.2, 151.5.2) should be followed instead.

Similarly for the receive function, in the other direction, in 167.5.3.

SuggestedRemedy

In 167.5.2, change from
"The PMD Transmit function shall convert the one, two, or four signal streams requested by the PMD service interface messages PMD:IS_UNITDATA_i.request into one, two, or four separate optical signal streams"
to
"The PMD Transmit function shall convert the one, two, or four symbol streams requested by the PMD service interface messages PMD:IS_UNITDATA_i.request into one, two, or four separate optical signals".

In 167.5.3, change from
"The PMD Receive function shall convert the one, two, or four parallel optical signal streams received from the MDI into separate symbol streams"
to
"The PMD Receive function shall convert the one, two, or four parallel optical signals received from the MDI into one, two, or four separate symbol streams".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make corrections in line with previous clauses.

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 **167**
SC **167.5.2**

Page 31 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.5.2**　　　*P* **47**　　*L* **43**　　# 122

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　　　　　　*Bucket*

"tx_symbols zero, one, two, and three" - The sentence refers to values of tx_symbol, the argument of PMD:IS_UNITDATA_i.request. "tx_symbols" is undefined.

This text seems to originate in clause 138, which has similar incorrect language (and should be fixed in maintenance). The precedence in most other clauses (e.g. 121.5.2, 122.5.2, 123.5.2, 124.5.2) should be followed instead.

Similarly for the receive function, with rx_symbols, in 167.5.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "tx_symbols zero, one, two, and three" to "tx_symbol values zero, one, two, and three".

Similarly for rx_symbols in 167.5.3.

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make corrections in line with previous clauses.

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.5.4**　　　*P* **48**　　*L* **30**　　# 236

Grow, Bob　　　　　　　　　　　　RMG Consulting

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

The word "unavoidable" has been purged from P802.3/D2.1.

SuggestedRemedy

"As a conquence …"

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "unavoidable" to be consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.5.4**　　　*P* **48**　　*L* **30**　　# 244

Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　　　Independent

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

All occurrences of "must" have been removed from the 802.3 revision by comments 17 and 18 against D2.0. See:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dc/comments/P8023_D2p0_comments_final_by_id.pdf#page=5
Remove the "must" in accordance with these changes.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"As an unavoidable consequence of the requirements for the setting of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter, implementations must provide adequate margin …" to:
"As a consequence of the requirements for the setting of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter, implementations need to provide adequate margin …"

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "must" to be consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.5.4**　　　*P* **48**　　*L* **31**　　# 237

Grow, Bob　　　　　　　　　　　　RMG Consulting

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

The word "must" is deprecated.

SuggestedRemedy

"must" -> "need to"

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "must" to be consistent with D2.1 of 802.3dc

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.5.5**　　　*P* **48**　　*L* **42**　　# 123

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

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

The sentence "Various implementations of the Signal Detect function are permitted by this standard" seems irrelevant here, and is probably repeated from the previous subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the quoted sentence.

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
This sentence comes from previous standards. The commenter has not provided a reason to remove it.

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 **167**
SC **167.5.5**

Page 32 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**　　　*SC* **167.5.10**　　　　　*P* **49**　　　*L* **38**　　　# 64

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　General Motors

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

Clause 45.2.1.7.4 is included in this draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change 45.2.1.7.4 to "black" and make it a hyperlink.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference

Cl **167**　　　*SC* **167.5.10**　　　　　*P* **49**　　　*L* **38**　　　# 91

Zimmerman, George　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

45.2.1.7.4 is marked external even though it is in the draft

SuggestedRemedy

make 45.2.1.7.4 an active cross reference, not external, and black

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix these cross references

Cl **167**　　　*SC* **167.5.11**　　　　　*P* **49**　　　*L* **46**　　　# 65

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　General Motors

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

Clause 45.2.1.7.5 is included in this draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change 45.2.1.7.5 to "black" and make it a hyperlink.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference

Cl **167**　　　*SC* **167.5.11**　　　　　*P* **49**　　　*L* **46**　　　# 92

Zimmerman, George　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

45.2.1.7.5 is marked external even though it is in the draft

SuggestedRemedy

make 45.2.1.7.5 an active cross reference, not external, and black

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Fix this cross reference

Cl **167**　　　*SC* **167.6**　　　　　*P* **50**　　　*L* **1**　　　# 124

Ran, Adee　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **T**　　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*Bucket*

There is no RS-FEC sublayer in 200GBASE-R and 400GBASE-R. The lane reordering is a PCS function in these PHYs.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "the RS-FEC sublayer is" to "the PCS and the RS-FEC sublayer are".

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make this change to be consistent with previous clauses.

Cl **167**　　　*SC* **167.7**　　　　　*P* **50**　　　*L* **9**　　　# 152

Stassar, Peter　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type **ER**　　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*Bucket*

Missing comma after 200GBASE-SR2

SuggestedRemedy

Add comma after 200GBASE-SR2

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **167**
SC **167.7**

Page 33 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7**   *P* **50**   *L* **19**   # 66

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

There is no objective for a 30m link. The VR links are specified to be 50m everywhere else in this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete row: 0.5 m to 30 m for OM3

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The objectives in 802.3db are written the same way as recent multi-mode link standards, e.g., 802.3cm, 802.3cd and 802.3bm. All these projects have defined links for both OM3 and OM4 for broad market potential.

The link length in the objectives is for OM4 fiber.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7**   *P* **50**   *L* **24**   # 67

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

There is no objective for a 60m link. The SR links are specified to be 100m everywhere else in this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete row: 0.5 m to 60 m for OM3

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
See response to comment #66.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7**   *P* **50**   *L* **28**   # 175

Nicholl, Shawn   Xilinx

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

Table 167-6 contains references to 100G PMDs and a footnote that reads "The PCS FEC correction function …"

For 100G operation, the FEC (Clause 91) is not part of the PCS (Clause 82).

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to change the footnote text from "The PCS FEC correction function" to "The RS-FEC error correction function".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7.1**   *P* **51**   *L* **12**   # 215

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

I thought for new projects the tolerance on the transmit signalling rate is being tightened to 50 ppm

SuggestedRemedy

Consider changing 100ppm to 50ppm

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

DISCUSS

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7.1**   *P* **51**   *L* **28**   # 195

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**

As the channel or signal is relatively slower than for any other optical PMDs so far, we should expect higher Ceq, contributing to TDECQ, but we should not expect higher K because we have 9 taps rather than 5, and 2% threshold adjust rather than 1%. We expect that TDECQ, Ceq and K measurements with 2% threshold adjust will be more accurate than for previous specs, so we need less padding for measurement issues. We should re-optimise the spec considering these things, encouraging good equalisable signals both after and before the fibre.   The K' limit can catch some bad transmitters that an overshoot limit intended to pass a good signals would miss - and K' is a free by-product of TECQ.
The K' limit is similar to VEC in C2M and EVM in coherent: a screen for signals that are bad after equalisation.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert row for K'=TECQ-10.log10(Ceq'), limit 4 dB (where K' and Ceq' are the two parts of TECQ as K and Ceq are the two parts of TDECQ). For both VR and SR.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

DISCUSS

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7.1**   *P* **51**   *L* **30**   # 179

Murty, Ramana   Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **X**

The overshoot/undershoot (max) value of 26% at 3E-3 hit ratio in Table 167-7 is low. One should use the same value as single mode links (802.3cu) since the receiver configuration is similar, PIN-TIA-FFE.

SuggestedRemedy

Specify overshoot/undershoot (max) as 29% at 3E-3 hit ratio (equivalent to 22% at 1E-2 hit ratio, value in 802.3cu).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

Review accompanying presentation.

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 **167**
SC **167.7.1**

Page 34 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7.1**   *P* **51**   *L* **32**   # 180

Murty, Ramana   Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **X**

Transmitter power excursion (max) of 2 dBm in Table 167-7 was proposed for a hit ratio of 1E 2.

SuggestedRemedy

Specify transmitter power excursion (max) as 2.3 dBm at 3E-3 hit ratio.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

Review accompanying presentation.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7.1**   *P* **52**   *L* **23**   # 36

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum/Marvell

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Receiver reflectance of -12 combined with -20 dB results in much larger reflection than transmitter may tolerate, 2 connectors at 20 dB result in 14 dB RL, 3 connectors result in 10.7 dB, and 4 connectors in 8.4 dB.

SuggestedRemedy

One option is to increase cable plant RL to 26 dB but that require possibly replacing cable plant, simpler option is to require 20 dB RL for the receiver and keep the current 12 dB tolerance for the transmitter.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7.2**   *P* **53**   *L* **44**   # 40

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum/Marvell

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**

It was shown that TDECQ with MMSE is accurate and reduce test time and associated test cost.
https://www.ieee802.org/3/db/public/September-09-September-29-2021/ghiasi_802.3db_01_092321.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

MMSE is representative of real receiver and a full grid search may produce results sliglty better, as shown by in Ghiasi contribution there is excellent correlation for scope measurements. MMSE will reduce test time specillay given 802.3db reference receiver is 9 taps will longer to do full grid search and will increase test cost.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

DISCUSS

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7.3**   *P* **53**   *L* **13**   # 68

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

There is no objective for a 30m link. The VR links are specified to be 50m everywhere else in this draft.
There is no objective for a 60m link. The SR links are specified to be 100m everywhere else in this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete OM3 columns in Table 167-9

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
See response to comment #66.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7.3**   *P* **53**   *L* **32**   # 196

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

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

Figure is a bitmap and looks bad

SuggestedRemedy

Insert figure another way so it is a vector graphic. It may be better to avoid diagonal text.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See comment #249.
Use .svg format for figure in the next draft.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.7.3**   *P* **53**   *L* **32**   # 245

Anslow, Pete   Independent

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Figure 167-3 is a bit map. This has several drawbacks: the rendition of the figure is poor making small text difficult to read, the use of bit maps increases the file size unnecessarily, th text content of the figures is not searchable and most importantly, including non-editable figures makes life difficult if changes are required in Maintenance after the figure has been incorporated into the next revision.
If it would help, I can provide a suitable .svg file together with the Octave script that generates it.

SuggestedRemedy

Since this figure illustrates equations, use a vector graphics (e.g., .svg) format and apply the annotations to the lines in FrameMaker.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
A .svg file will be used for the next draft.

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 **167**
SC **167.7.3**

Page 35 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.7.3**　　　　*P* **53**　　*L* **53**　　# 249

Hajduczenia, Marek　　　　　　Charter Communications

Comment Type **ER**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket.*

Figure 167-3 is heavily rasterized. Consider using higher resolution figure

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #245. A .svg file will be used for the next draft.

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.8**　　　　*P* **54**　　*L* **3**　　# 125

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**

The normative requirements from PMDs are stated in 167.7.1 and 167.7.2 with "shall" statements that encompass all the requirements, and refer to 167.8 for definitions.

There is no need to have additional "shall" statements for each of the definitions in 167.8 and its subclauses. These are not additional requirements but definitions of the requirements stated above.

Specifically, the "shall" in 167.8 is not a requirement but a definition of the test conditions. Also, the references to 121.8.9.1, 121.8.9.2, and 121.8.9.3 for SRS are incorrect.

The suggested remedy is to rephrase text in some of the subclauses of 167.8 as definitions, and to delete statements in other subclauses which are repetitions of the existing normative requirement.

(The commenter is aware that the text in question is based on similar text found in many clauses of the base document; However, each clause is independent and a project may and should divert from copied text if it improves the standard. Changing the base document to include these improvements is a separate activity).

SuggestedRemedy

In 167.8, change "shall be made" to "is made".

In 167.8.2, change "shall be within the range given in Table 167–7 if measured per IEC 61280-1-3" to "measurement method is defined in IEC 61280-1-3".

In 167.8.3, change "shall be within the limits given in Table 167–7 if measured using the methods given in IEC 61280-1-1" to "measurement method is defined in IEC 61280-1-1".

In 167.8.4, change "The OMAouter of each lane shall be within the limits given in Table 167–7 if measured as defined in 121.8.4." to "The OMAouter measurement method is defined in 121.8.4."

In 167.8.5, change "The TDECQ of each lane shall be within the limits given in Table 167–7 if measured using the methods specified in 121.8.5" to "The TDECQ measurement method is specified in 121.8.5".

In 167.8.6, delete "The TECQ of each lane shall be within the limits given in Table 167–7 if measured using a test pattern specified for TECQ in Table 167–11."

In 167.8.7, delete "The overshoot/undershoot of each lane shall be within the limits given in Table 167–7 if measured using a test pattern specified for overshoot/undershoot in Table 167–11."

In 167.8.8, delete "The transmitter power excursion of each lane shall be within the limits given in Table 167–7 if measured using a test pattern specified for transmitter power excursion in

---

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 **167**
SC **167.8**

Page 36 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Table 167–11."

In 167.8.9, change "The extinction ratio of each lane shall be within the limits given in Table 167–7 if measured using the methods specified in 121.8.6" to "The extinction ratio measurement method is as specified in 121.8.6".

In 167.8.10, delete "The transmitter transition time of each lane shall be within the limits given in Table 167–7 if measured using a test pattern specified for transmitter transition time in Table 167–11."

In 167.8.11, change "RIN shall be as defined by the measurement methodology of 52.9.6 " to "The RIN12OMA measurement method is as specified in 52.9.6".

In 167.8.12, delete "The receiver sensitivity (OMAouter) of each lane shall be within the limits given in Table 167–8 if measured
using a test pattern specified for receiver sensitivity in Table 167–11."

In 167.8.13, change "Stressed receiver sensitivity shall be within the limits given in Tab 167–8 if measured using the methodology defined in 121.8.9.1 and 121.8.9.3, with the conformance test signal at TP3 as described in 121.8.9.2" to "The stressed receiver sensitivity measurement method is as defined in 121.8.10".

Delete the PICS table in 167.11.4.4.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
DISCUSS

The text noted in the comment is taken from 802.3cd. The word "shall" is indeed repeated.

The sentence construction is intended to provide links to Tables in subclause 167.7.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.1.1**   *P* **55**   *L* **26**   # 126

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

This subclause deals with "Multi-lane testing considerations", mostly related to receiver testing. Its hierarchical placement under 167.8.1 "Test patterns for optical parameters" is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy
Change the hierarchy to make this a level 2 subclause (167.8.2).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
DISCUSS

167.8.1.1 is a continuation of the description of testing in 167.8.1.

Subclause 167.8.2 to 167.8.13 describe specific items in the tables in subclause 167.7.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.1.1**   *P* **55**   *L* **28**   # 153

Stassar, Peter   Huawei

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Wrong cross reference.

SuggestedRemedy
Change cross reference "Figure 167.1.1" to section "167.1.1"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.1.1**   *P* **55**   *L* **30**   # 176

Nicholl, Shawn   Xilinx

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

Table 167-10 Pattern 5 contains a "Pattern description" column that reads "Scrambled idle encoded by RS-FEC".

Later, 167.8.1.1 sub-clause text contains a reference with the words shuffled around.

SuggestedRemedy
Propose to change the sub-clause text from "Pattern 5 (RS-FEC encoded scrambled idle)" to "Pattern 5 (Scrambled idle encoded by RS-FEC)" such that the paragraph text matches the previous earlier table.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.1.1**   *P* **55**   *L* **33**   # 146

Brown, Matt   Huawei

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

The word "must" in this context is deprecated.

SuggestedRemedy
Change text to the following or similar: "If each lane is stressed in turn, the BER is diluted by the three unstressed lanes, and the BER for that stressed lane alone is found"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

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 **167**
SC **167.8.1.1**

Page 37 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.1.1**   *P* **55**   *L* **33**   # 238

Grow, Bob   RMG Consulting

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

The word "must" is deprecated.

SuggestedRemedy

"must be" -> "needs to be"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.1.1**   *P* **55**   *L* **42**   # 127

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **X**   *Bucket*

The sentence "Alternative test methods that generate equivalent results may be used" does not apply only to "Multi-lane testing considerations". Within this clause, it does not make sens in the middle of a paragraph that deals with various considerations specific for multi-lane testing.

SuggestedRemedy

Either move this sentence to the parent subclause 167.8, or to a separate paragraph at the end of this subclause, or delete it.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

DISCUSS

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.3**   *P* **56**   *L* **5**   # 128

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

"Figure 53–6" is a broken link (not found in this document), and is not formatted in green.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to regular text and format in forest green.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.5**   *P* **56**   *L* **11**   # 181

Murty, Ramana   Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *Bucket*

The TDECQ test for a multi-mode link uses a fiber emulation filter in place of a real fiber.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a figure to show the TDECQ conformance test block diagram, simiilar to Figure 121-4.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #205.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.5**   *P* **56**   *L* **35**   # 194

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

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

"The normalized power density spectrum, N(f)" is missing a word (noise).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to ""The normalized noise power density spectrum, N(f)" as in 121.8.5.3, TDECQ measurement method

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.5**   *P* **56**   *L* **37**   # 147

Brown, Matt   Huawei

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

The word "must" in this context is deprecated.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to the following or similar: "If an equivalent-time sampling oscilloscope is used, the impact of the sampling process and the fiber emulation is also compensated for, so that the correct magnitude of noise is present at the output of the equalizer."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

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 **167**
SC **167.8.5**

Page 38 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.5**   *P* **56**   *L* **44**   *#* 93

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Editor's note should not be indented as a list item - also, this is a note about a proposed substitution. The editor's note should be removed during working group ballot, prior to SA ballot.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove editor's note.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment #40.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.5**   *P* **56**   *L* **47**   *#* 250

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communications

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

Missing "continued" flag in Table 167-12 + missing heading tag. Alternatively, make sure the table does not break over pages.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.5**   *P* **56**   *L* **47**   *#* 94

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

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

Table 167-12 should be on the same page - the headers are on one page and the body on the next. It's a short table

SuggestedRemedy

Fix page alignment so the table all goes on one page.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Try getting Table 167-12 on one page.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.5**   *P* **57**   *L* **33**   *#* 44

Lingle, Robert   OFS

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

Editor's note states: "Use of minimum mean squared error optimization in place of optimization of TDECQ has been proposed." This topic has had a presentation in TF & discussion in TF and offline. Whatever the TF decides during comment resolution on D2.0, I think the Editor's Note has served its purpose (of stimulating consideration) and should be removed at this point.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this editor's note

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #40.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.5.1**   *P* **57**   *L* **15**   *#* 165

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

The sentence isn't precisely stating that the reference equalizer has 9 taps (just that 9 taps ar shown in Figure 167-4

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "A function model of the 9 tap reference equalizer is shown…."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

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 **167**
SC **167.8.5.1**

Page 39 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.6**   *P* **57**   *L* **40**   # 205

Zivny, Pavel   Tektronix

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

The configuration of TDECQ measurement and of TECQ measurement is insuficiently clear.
A figure should be added for better clarity.
The figure (on page 2 of the ppt) is as was (email from Zivny to Dudek et al. Tue 9/21/2021
2:06 PM PDT) in ppt tAlso attached to the comment email.

SuggestedRemedy

in the clause "167.8.6 Transmitter eye closure for PAM4 (TECQ)" do replace the following tex
"The transmitter eye closure for PAM4 (TECQ) is a measure of the optical transmitter's eye
closure at TP2."
with
"The transmitter eye closure for PAM4 (TECQ) is a measure of the optical transmitter's eye
closure at TP2; see figure XYZ".
ALso, in "167.8.5 Transmitter and dispersion eye closure for PAM4 (TDECQ)",
append line 16 "Table 167–11 specifies
the test pattern to be used for measurement of TDECQ."
with line
"See Figure XYZ for measurement setup."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Review accompanying presentation.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.6**   *P* **57**   *L* **42**   # 166

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

The fiber dispersion is now the first filter not the second

SuggestedRemedy

Change "except that the second filter representing the dispersion of the fiber is not used" to
"except that the first filter representing the dispersion of the fiber is omitted"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.7**   *P* **57**   *L* **50**   # 167

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

With TDECQ always having a narrower bandwidth filter than TECQ it is extremely unlikely to
have larger overshoot/undershoot making the test with the waveform captured for TDECQ
unnecesary.   (Note this is different than single mode where the fiber dispersion can reduce o
increase the overshoot.)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Overshoot and undershoot are measured using the waveform captured for the
TDECQ test (see 167.8.5) and
the waveform captured for the TECQ test (see 167.8.6), but without the reference equalizer
being applied in
each case." to
"Overshoot and undershoot are measured using the waveform captured for the TECQ test
(see 167.8.6), but without the reference equalizer being applied "

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.8.7**   *P* **57**   *L* **53**   # 168

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Better wording could be used as 140.7.7 uses a different hit ratio.   Make a similar change on
page 58 line 12.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "using the methods in 140.7.7 with the hit ratio of 3E-3" to "using the methods in
140.7.7 except that a hit ratio of 3E-3 is used"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

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 **167**
SC **167.8.7**

Page 40 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.8.11**　　　*P* **58**　　*L* **42**　　# 204

Zivny, Pavel　　　　　　　　　Tektronix

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**

The measurement bandwidth mandated for RIN measurement by the text
"b) The upper –3 dB limit of the measurement apparatus is to be approximately equal to the signaling rate (i.e., 53.125 GHz)."
is an copy/oaste from past standards. It is neither justified nor feasible. Standard measurement bandwith should be used.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the text
"b) The upper –3 dB limit of the measurement apparatus is to be approximately equal to the signaling rate (i.e., 53.125 GHz)."
with
"b) The bandwidth of the measurement apparatus shall be the same as in "167.8.10 Transmitter transition time".

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Discuss

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.8.11**　　　*P* **58**　　*L* **42**　　# 97

Nicholl, Gary　　　　　　　　Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **D**

The spec requires 53.125GHz integration bandwidth for RIN, which is significantly higher than the receiver bandwidth. The high integration bandwidth is not needed and can make measurements expensive.

SuggestedRemedy

b) The upper –3 dB limit of the measurement apparatus is to be approximately 26.5625 GHz

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Discuss

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.8.13**　　　*P* **59**　　*L* **13**　　# 169

Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　　Marvell

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*Bucket*

SECQ is not described in 167.8.6. It needs to be tied to TECQ that is described. Also two different aspects are combined in one bullet.

SuggestedRemedy

Make one bullet   "The stressed receiver conformance test signal has a transition time that is no greater than the value specified in Table 167-7"
Make the second bullet "The SECQ of the stressed recevier conformance test signal is equal to the value of the TECQ of the signal measured accodring to 167.8.6 except that the optical splitter and variable reflector shown in Figure 121-4 are omitted.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.8.13.1**　　*P* **59**　　*L* **46**　　# 42

Maguire, Valerie　　　　　　　The Siemon Company

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*Bucket*

LB is identified as an upper frequency bound, but it's not clear what the units are

SuggestedRemedy

Replace, "LB = loop bandwidth; upper frequency bound..." with, "LB = loop bandwidth (MHz); upper frequency bound..."

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The upper freqeuncy bound is represented by the symbol LB and units are not required.

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.9.1**　　　*P* **59**　　*L* **53**　　# 129

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **ER**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Bucket*

The "General safety" subclauses in the base document now refer to Annex J.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the body of this subclause to "All equipment subject to this clause shall conform to th general safety requirements as specified in J.2".

Also change PICS item ES1.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Reference Annex J in line with D2.1 of 802.3dc

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 **167**
SC **167.9.1**

Page 41 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:31 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.9.1**   *P* **59**   *L* **54**   # **69**

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Should refer to Annex J. IEC 60950-1 is obsolete.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: All equipment subject to this clause shall conform to IEC 60950-1.
To: All equipment meeting this standard shall conform to the general safety requirements as specified in J.2.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change reference to IEC 60950-1 to Annex J.

See also comments #95

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.9.1**   *P* **59**   *L* **54**   # **95**

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope, M

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

IEC 60950-1 has been withdrawn. See IEEE 802.3-202x Annex J.

SuggestedRemedy

replace "conform with IEC 60950-1" with "shall conform to J.2"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Refer to Annex J

See comment #69

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.9.1**   *P* **59**   *L* **54**   # **177**

Lewis, Jon   Dell Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

IEC 60950-1 has been removed and the updated references are in Annex J

SuggestedRemedy

Change line 54 to read "All equipment that meets the requirements of this standard shall conform to J.2."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Refer to Annex J

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.10.1**   *P* **61**   *L* **35**   # **70**

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Remove reference to OM3 as it doesn't meet the project objectives.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete: As OM4 and OM5 optical fiber meet the requirements for OM3, a channel compliant to the "OM3" column may use OM4 or OM5 optical fiber, or a combination of OM3, OM4, and OM5.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
See response to comment #66.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.10.2.1**   *P* **62**   *L* **44**   # **197**

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

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

Problems with footnote f: "these applications" isn't defined, "application" is too vague a word for a standard. What can the reader do with "should have"? I think we mean that older OM3 and OM4 comply to the new spec. When it says "OM3 and OM4 fibers compliant to previous versions ... are suitable for these applications", does that mean that fibers compliant to the current version aren't? Are the old fibres unsuitable at less than maximum length?

SuggestedRemedy

Change
Amendment 1 to IEC 60793-2-10 reflects the fact that the chromatic dispersion values of OM3, OM4 and OM5 should have the same specification. OM3 and OM4 fibers compliant to previous versions of IEC 60793-2-10 are suitable for these applications at the maximum length specified.
   to
These limits are consistent with IEC 60793-2-10 Amendment 1 (202x). For OM5, they are the same as previous versions of IEC 60793-2-10. OM3 and OM4 fibers compliant to previous versions of IEC 60793-2-10 are considered compliant for 100GBASE-VR1, 200GBASE-VR2, 400GBASE-VR4, 100GBASE-SR1, 200GBASE-SR2, and 400GBASE-SR4 Physical Layer types.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Discuss this footnote.
See also responses to comments #4 and 132

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 **167**   Page 42 of 47
SC **167.10.2.1**   11/8/2021 9:09:32 AM

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.10.2.2**　　*P* **62**　　*L* **7**　　# 71

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　General Motors

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*Bucket*

There is no objective for a 30m link. The VR links are specified to be 50m everywhere else in this draft.
There is no objective for a 70m link (not consistent). The SR links are specified to be 100m everywhere else in this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete OM3 columns in Table 167-14

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
See response to comment #66.

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.10.2.2**　　*P* **62**　　*L* **8**　　# 96

Ferretti, Vince　　　　　　Corning

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*Bucket*

Table 167–14—Fiber optic cabling (channel) characteristics incorrectly calls out operating distance for OM3 fiber for SR lengths as 70 m

SuggestedRemedy

Change OM3 operating distance to 60 m to match operating distances in other sub-clauses

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change 70 m to 60 m to match OM3 operating distance elsewhere in Clause 167.

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.10.2.2**　　*P* **62**　　*L* **25**　　# 72

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　General Motors

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*Bucket*

Remove reference to OM3 as it doesn't meet the project objectives.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete OM3 columns in Table 167-15

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
See response to comment #66.

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.10.2.2**　　*P* **62**　　*L* **29**　　# 130

Ran, Adee　　　　　　Cisco

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

In "MHz.km" the period is in appropriate. Per IEEE Std 260.1 (referred to by the style manual), either a multiplicative dot or a non-breaking space should be used.

To align with the table footnote, use a multiplicative dot.

SuggestedRemedy

change to "MHz·km".

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make this change

Cl **167**　　*SC* **167.10.2.2**　　*P* **62**　　*L* **39**　　# 131

Ran, Adee　　　　　　Cisco

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

The footnotes to Table 167–15 are about the size of the table itself. Footnote e seems to contain information pertinent separately to each of the fiber types, so may be more adequate as part of the table.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider moving the content of the footnotes into the table or to the body of the subclause.

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See responses to comments #33, 43
This footnote will be condensed and streamlined.

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 **167**
SC **167.10.2.2**

Page 43 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:32 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.10.2.2**   *P* **62**   *L* **40**   # 43

Lingle, Robert   OFS

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

Footnote e of Table 167-15 contains excessively detailed information about fiber bandwidths, well beyond what is necessary for the reader to understand the standard and implement it. This information in should be available in contributions presented to the TF during standards development, and that should be sufficient for someone wishes to delve into the rationale for the fiber emulation filter bandwidth values prescribed in Table 167-12.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace footnote e of Table 167-15 with "Effective modal bandwidth guidance is provided at all wavelengths in the 840 nm to 953 nm range in IEC 60793-2-10. OM5 multimode fiber has the same minimum bandwidth as OM4 at 850nm but is specified to have improved minimum bandwidth for wavelengths longer than 850nm."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Discuss as a Task Force

See also comments #33 and 131

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.10.2.2**   *P* **62**   *L* **40**   # 33

Parsons, Earl   CommScope

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

Footnote e is too long

SuggestedRemedy

streamline the EMB information in this table and footnote

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Discuss

See also response to comments #43 and 131

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.10.2.2**   *P* **62**   *L* **44**   # 132

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

"IEC 60793-2-10" appears in the normative references list in 1.3 without a date. If amended, the updated reference pointer (with the expected publication year) should be placed in 1.3 as well as the editor's note about its expected publication.

If this document been liaised to 802.3, please include its pointer in the editor's note.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
This footnote needs to be discussed.

See response to comments #4 and 197

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.10.2.2.2**   *P* **63**   *L* **6**   # 5

Swanson, Steven   Corning Incorporated

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

The maximum discrete reflectance is only specified for PC connectors; we need to include a specification for APC connectors

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:
"The maximum discrete reflectance shall be less than –20 dB."

with:
"The maximum discrete reflectance shall be less than –20 dB for PC connectors and –35 TBC dB for APC connectors

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Discuss as a Task Force

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 **167**
SC **167.10.2.2.2**

Page 44 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:32 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.10.3**   *P* **63**   *L* **17**   # 133

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Receiver compliance testing is done at TP3 which is the MDI per 167.5.1. So the note should apply only to the transmitter.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the NOTE text to "Transmitter compliance testing is performed at TP2 as defined in 167.5.1, not at the MDI".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
TP3 is"at the output of the fiber optic cabling at the MDI" and not the MDI itself. The current text is appropriate.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.10.3.1**   *P* **63**   *L* **18**   # 134

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

It is unclear why there are no optical lane assignments for the 100GBASE-VR1 and 100GBASE-VR1 MDIs.

SuggestedRemedy

Either add text and a diagram for the single-lane MDI lane assignments, or add a text or NOTE to explain why they are not specified.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
This is consistent with previous clauses i.e. Clause 138.

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.10.3.2**   *P* **64**   *L* **23**   # 198

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

I think this section says that 100GBASE-VR1 or 100GBASE-SR1 must use a non-angled PC interface while 167.10.3.3 must be angled. For "breakout" use, this is enough of a contradiction that it could cause problems

SuggestedRemedy

Add text saying that a device/port/module with multiple 1-lane PMDs can use the adapter, receptacle or plug according to 167.10.3.3 and one of the active lane positions given in 167.10.3.1.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Discuss as a Task Force

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.11.3**   *P* **67**   *L* **1**   # 191

Huber, Tom   Nokia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

In the Major Capabilities PICS table, the Item codes *VR1, *VR2, and *VR4 are not referenced in any of the subsequent tables. As such, they should not have the * in the name.

SuggestedRemedy

Rename these items VR1, VR2, VR4.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make this change

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.11.3**   *P* **67**   *L* **1**   # 192

Huber, Tom   Nokia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

In the Major Capabilities table, the item codes *VR2, *SR2, *VR4, and *SR4 are used twice, once for the PMD and once for the MDI. The SR2 and SR4 item codes are used in 6 of the rows in 167.11.4.6; it is unclear if these are referring to the PMD Major Capability, the MDI Major Capability, or both.

SuggestedRemedy

Use different names for the 4 MDI rows (e.g. xxx-MDI) in the Major Capabilities table, and update 167.11.4.6 to reflect the intended conditions.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make these changes

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.11.4.3**   *P* **69**   *L* **36**   # 135

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

The Value/Comment in S1 and S2 are invalid and unnecessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the Value/Comment in both items.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Double check those two cells in this table to see what should be in them.

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 **167**
SC **167.11.4.3**

Page 45 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:32 AM

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.11.4.3**   *P* **69**   *L* **37**   # 170

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

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

Missing references

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Per definitions in 167.8 " on lines 36 and 38

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add correct reference

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.11.4.5**   *P* **70**   *L* **34**   # 178

Lewis, Jon   Dell Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

IEC 60950-1 has been removed and the updated references are in Annex J

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Conforms to J.2"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Refer to Annex J

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.11.4.6**   *P* **71**   *L* **25**   # 252

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communications

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

Missing OC9 and OC13?

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber OC10-14

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Use correct numbering

Cl **167**   *SC* **167.11.4.6**   *P* **71**   *L* **30**   # 251

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communications

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Bucket*

OC12 mixes "or" with "*" in the same Status entry. Use "INS and (SR2 or SR4):M" or
alternatively "INS*(SR2 + SR4):M" syntax.
The same in OC14. If *+ syntax is used, alto consider changing OC8 and OC10.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Revise this section to be consistent

Cl **167**   *SC* **Table 167-7**   *P* **51**   *L* **27**   # 1

Swanson, Steven   Corning Incorporated

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

The TDECQ is the same for both variants.

SuggestedRemedy

Merge cells.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

DISCUSS

TDECQ (max) is shown in separate cells for VR and SR links because it is measured with
different filters.

Cl **167**   *SC* **Table 167-7**   *P* **51**   *L* **29**   # 2

Swanson, Steven   Corning Incorporated

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

The TECQ is the same for both variants.

SuggestedRemedy

Merge cells.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

DISCUSS along with response to comment #1.

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 **167**
SC **Table 167-7**

Page 46 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:32 AM

Cl **167**	*SC* **Table 167-7**	*P* **51**	*L* **43**	# 3		

Swanson, Steven   Corning Incorporated

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Encircled flux is a requirement for the transmitter.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:
"If measured into type A1a.2 or type A1a.3, or A1a.4, 50 µm fiber, in accordance with IEC 61280-1-4."

with:
"When measured into type A1a.2 or type A1a.3, or A1a.4, 50 µm fiber, in accordance with IEC 61280-1-4."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **167.1**	*SC* **Table 167-15**	*P* **62**	*L* **44**	# 4		

Swanson, Steven   Corning Incorporated

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Amendment 1 to IEC 60793-2-10 will be published before 802.3db. Therefore, there is no need for footnote "f."

SuggestedRemedy

Delete footnote "f;" the amendment to IEC 60793-2-10 just updates the specification to reflect improvements in the measurement of the chromatic dispersion of the OM3, OM4 and OM5 fibers - the specified values for zero dispersion wavelength and the chromatic dispersion slop are still conservative values for all three fiber types. OM3 and OM4 fibers compliant to previous versions of IEC 60793-2-10 are fully compliant to the revised specification and there is no need for footnote "f."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Revise footnote f.

See also response to comments #132 and 197

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 **167.1**
SC **Table 167-15**

Page 47 of 47
11/8/2021 9:09:32 AM