

IEEE P802.3df D3.2 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.5.15 P79 L4 # R2-15

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R editorial

Putting "bit" on a new line looks odd

SuggestedRemedy

The text box for the figure title should be full width. Same issue on next page.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Although the suggested remedy is an improvement to the draft it is an editorial issue that may be addressed by referral to the IEEE SA Editorial staff. This change will be passed to the IEEE staff editor for consideration during final editing.

Cl 124 SC 124.7 L22 # R2-5

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R editorial

Table title is strangely offset to the right. This might be related to the formatting in the base document for multiple tables in Clause 124.

SuggestedRemedy

The text box for the figure titles should be full width. Same issue on next page.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Although the suggested remedy is an improvement to the draft it is an editorial issue that may be addressed by referral to the IEEE SA Editorial staff. This change will be passed to the IEEE staff editor for consideration during final editing.

Cl 124 SC 124.7.1 P111 L49 # R2-7

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R editorial

Bottom border of a table to be continued

SuggestedRemedy

should be thin.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Although the suggested remedy is an improvement to the draft it is an editorial issue that may be addressed by referral to the IEEE SA Editorial staff. This change will be passed to the IEEE staff editor for consideration during final editing.

Cl 124 SC 124.7.1 P112 L40 # R2-2

Dudek, Michael Marvell  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R editorial

In the .pdf version of the draft and also the .pdf version of the compare draft the axis labelling of Figure 124-2a is unreadable. It was correct in draft 3.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace this figure with the one from draft 3.1

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

No changes were made to the graphs in the referenced figures, however, it appears that FrameMaker incorrectly rendered the graphics file in D3.2.

Although the suggested remedy is an improvement to the draft it is an editorial issue that may be addressed by referral to the IEEE SA Editorial staff. This change will be passed to the IEEE staff editor for consideration during final editing.

IEEE P802.3df D3.2 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 124 SC 124.7.2 P114 L46 # R2-3  
 Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R editorial  
 For 400GBASE-DR  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 For 400GBASE-DR4  
 Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 Although the suggested remedy is an improvement to the draft it is an editorial issue that may be addressed by referral to the IEEE SA Editorial staff.  
 This change will be passed to the IEEE staff editor for consideration during final editing.

Cl 124 SC 124.7.2 P115 L9 # R2-10  
 Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R editorial  
 Font or character problem, axes values and labels  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix. Also Figure 124-2c and 2d.  
 Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 No changes were made to the graphs in the referenced figures, however, it appears that FrameMaker incorrectly rendered the graphics file in D3.2.  
 Although the suggested remedy is an improvement to the draft it is an editorial issue that may be addressed by referral to the IEEE SA Editorial staff.  
 This change will be passed to the IEEE staff editor for consideration during final editing.

Cl 124 SC 124.7.2 P114 L46 # R2-4  
 Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R editorial  
 "For 400GBASE-DR receiver sensitivity (OMAouter), each lane (max) is optional" but the lanes are not optional.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Insert a comma after DR. For consistency, insert a comma in Table 124-6 footnote c.  
 Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 Although the suggested remedy is an improvement to the draft it is an editorial issue that may be addressed by referral to the IEEE SA Editorial staff. This change will be passed to the IEEE staff editor for consideration during final editing.

IEEE P802.3df D3.2 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 169 SC 169.1.2 P176 L36 # R2-17

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R figure

We show the sublayer stack in the first figure of each "Introduction to <MAC rate>" clause and the first figure of each sublayer clause in its overview. Usually we include all relevant sublayers, which this gives the reader a familiar map to give the clause context. See figures 69-1, 80-1, 81-1, 82-1, 83-1, 91-1, for example. Also 105 106 107 108 109 for 25G, 131 132 133 134 135 for 50G.

This consistency should be maintained unless changed through the maintenance process. There are few exceptions: when 116, 117, 118, 119 and 120 for 200 Gb/s and 400 Gb/s were written, the first wave of PHYs had no AN, and 3ck did not add them to these diagrams, although AN is included in Figure 161-1 (RS-FEC-Int).

SuggestedRemedy

Add the missing AN sublayer to Figure 169-1 (introduction to 800 Gb/s), like 80, 105, 131. It may be advisable to revert "800GBASE" to "800GBASE-R" for consistency; any future project with a non-BASE-R 800G PHY may choose its own layer stack.

Add the missing AN sublayer to Figure 170-1 (RS and 800GMII), like 81, 106, 132.

Add the missing AN sublayer to figures 171-1 and 3 (800GMII Extender and 800GXS) for consistency.

Add the missing AN sublayer to Figure 172-1 (PCS), like 82, 107, 133.

Add the missing AN sublayer to Figure 173-1 (PMA), like 83, 109, 134.

Either now or via maintenance, (maybe to be implemented in 3dj), insert the missing AN in figures 1 of 116, 117, 118, 119 and 120.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Although this Figure was modified in Draft 3.2, the only modification was changing the label "800GBASE-R" to "800BASE" per comment R1-1 in the following:

[https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/comments/D3p1/8023df\\_D3p1\\_comments\\_final\\_id.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/comments/D3p1/8023df_D3p1_comments_final_id.pdf)

The concerns expressed in this comment (R2-17) are not related to this change in label.

The reference to the figure states "relationships among 800 Gigabit Ethernet, the IEEE 802.3 MAC, and the ISO Open System Interconnection (OSI) reference model are shown in Figure 169-1." The figure is not intended to provide all of the details within all 800 Gb/s PHYs that might be defined.

There are many sublayers and structures that are not included in addition to the AN including the 800GMII Extender, 800GXS, 800GAUI-n, and additional sublayers might be added in the future. Its not practical or necessary to include all of these additional sublayers.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes.

Cl 171 SC 171.6.1 P200 L35 # R2-6

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R editorial

"where ... are defined in 172.2.6.2.2 and + ..." could be improved. If this were a formal equation, each "where" item would go on a separate line.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a comma after 172.2.6.2.2. Also in 172.2.4.6.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Although the suggested remedy is an improvement to the draft it is an editorial issue that may be addressed by referral to the IEEE SA Editorial staff.

This change will be passed to the IEEE staff editor for consideration during final editing.

Cl 172 SC 172.2.4.1 P219 L10 # R2-22

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type T Comment Status R bit ordering

Figure 119-11, 400GBASE-R Transmit bit ordering and distribution, is not consistent.

SuggestedRemedy

There should be a box with tx\_scrambled\_am in it as there is for tx\_xcoded and tx\_scrambled, with the two ends numbered and an arrow coming out of one end to "10-bit round robin distribution" so that the order is clear.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

In regard to this comment, Figure 119-11 is accurate as currently written.

There is no consensus to make the proposed change.

IEEE P802.3df D3.2 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 172 SC 172.2.4.1 P219 L10 # R2-24

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R bit ordering

Unsatisfied D3.1 comment 39: need examples to show some of the output from the PCS. Figure 119-11 implies that bit 0 (rather than 9) of a 10-bit symbol in a FEC codeword goes to the PMA first but there is no indication of what that means, and whether it corresponds to a bit 0 or a bit 9 of tx\_scrambled\_am.

SuggestedRemedy

Define the bit ordering.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 Note that comment R2-13 relates to a similar concern.  
 The distribution and mapping of bits from tx\_scrambled\_am to the codeword message symbols is defined explicitly in 119.2.4.5.  
 If this algorithm is misinterpreted the error would be evident by comparing the outcome to the examples provided in Annex 172A.

Cl 172 SC 172.2.4.1 P219 L10 # R2-23

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type T Comment Status R bit ordering

As this Figure 119-11 is called "Transmit bit ordering..."

SuggestedRemedy

The arrows from "10-bit round robin distribution" should not go to the middles of the FEC messages but to the appropriate end to show which way the FEC messages are filled.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 In regard to this comment, Figure 119-11 is accurate as currently written.  
 There is no consensus to make the proposed change.

Cl 172 SC 172.2.4.1 P219 L10 # R2-18

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type T Comment Status R bit ordering

In Figure 119-11 400GBASE-R Transmit bit ordering and distribution, c\_A29 = m\_A0

SuggestedRemedy

This should say c\_A30 = m\_A0, as in Figure 119-10 200GBASE-R Transmit bit ordering and distribution.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

The comment correctly points out an editorial error in Figure 119-11, which is not part of this project. This error may be addressed through the IEEE 802.3 maintenance process.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes.

Cl 172 SC 172.2.4.1 P219 L10 # R2-19

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type T Comment Status R bit ordering

Figure 119-11, 400GBASE-R Transmit bit ordering and distribution

SuggestedRemedy

should show am\_mapped as another box under tx\_scrambled, with an arrow indicating input to "AM Insertion" (indicating the order).

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 Figure 119-11 is accurate as currently written.  
 There is no consensus to make the proposed change.

IEEE P802.3df D3.2 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 172 SC 172.2.4.1 P219 L35 # R2-14

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type T Comment Status R bit ordering

Unlike Figure 119-10, there is nothing about bit ordering in Figure 172-4. It's all by reference to Figure 119-10.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the arrow beside "66-bit blocks" to show which end of a 66-bit block goes first, or change the figure title from "800GBASE-R PCS transmit bit ordering and distribution" to "800GBASE-R PCS transmit distribution"

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 Figure 172-4 represents the top half of Figure 119-11, with the lower half of Figure 119-11 included in the boxes called "Flow 0 transmit function" and "Flow 1 transmit function", as described in the associated text. In this respect Figure 172-4 is identical to the equivalent part of Figure 119-11, with the exception of the additional "block distribution" function that distributes 66-bit blocks between the "Flow 0 transmit function" and "Flow 1 transmit function" as described in 172.2.4.3."  
 Subclause 119.2.4.2 defines explicitly how the bits in tx\_coded are processed to form a 256B/257B block.  
 Further details in the figure are not necessary.

Cl 172 SC 172.2.4.6 P215 L28 # R2-20

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R wording

Figure 119-7, 400GBASE-R alignment marker mapping to PCS lanes, shows "A = from FEC codeword A B = from FEC codeword B". But this is AM creation, part of the Transmit function. AMs are not from the FEC codewords here, they go into them.

SuggestedRemedy

"from" should be "to", twice.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 The use of the word "from" is correct as the figure is showing how data from the codewords are mapped to each PCS lane.

Cl 172 SC 172.2.4.8 P218 L50 # R2-13

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R bit ordering

Unsatisfied D3.1 comment 39: need examples to show some of the output from the PCS. It turns out that the order of the bits in each 10-bit FEC symbol going into the FEC and coming out of it is not specified in 119. The examples in 172A show what is given to the FEC and what two FEC-coded codeword within the FEC are, but not what is just after the FEC - and it's only informative.

For example, here is what Clause 91 says:  
 The message symbols are composed of the bits of the transcoded blocks tx\_scrambled (including a mapped group of alignment markers when appropriate) such that bit 0 of the first transcoded block in the message (or am\_txmapped<0>) is bit 0 of m\_k-1 and bit 256 of the last transcoded block in the message is bit 9 of m\_0.

SuggestedRemedy

Define the order the bits in each 10-bit FEC symbol going into the FEC and coming out of it.  
 Provide an example of the output of the FEC after 10-bit interleaving "tx\_out", which is after translation from the ordering/numbering that the FEC uses to what most of the PCS uses.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.  
 This comment is a restatement of comment R1-39. The resolution to comment R1-39 is recorded in the following file:  
[https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/comments/D3p1/8023df\\_D3p1\\_comments\\_final\\_id.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/comments/D3p1/8023df_D3p1_comments_final_id.pdf)  
 The response to R1-39 is:  
 ---

"REJECT.  
 The example patterns are provided to help the implementer confirm correct interpretation of the encoding functionality which is complex.  
 Figure 119-11 provides sufficient guidance to correctly implement "Mux and 10-bit symbol distribution". Therefore adding the suggested additional patterns is not necessary.  
 There is no consensus to make the proposed changes."  
 ---

No new evidence has been provided to support the proposed changes.  
 Note that comment R2-24 relates to a similar concern.  
 The distribution and mapping of bits from tx\_scrambled\_am to the codeword message symbols is defined explicitly in 119.2.4.5.  
 If this algorithm is misinterpreted the error would be evident by comparing the outcome to the examples provided in Annex 172A.  
 There is no consensus to make the proposed changes.

IEEE P802.3df D3.2 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 172 SC 172.2.4.9 P219 L3 # R2-21

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R bit ordering

Unsatisfied D3.1 comment 39: need examples to show some of the output from the PCS. Confusion between tx\_out the 1088 x 10 array in 119.2.4.7 and tx\_out<0:16> the contents of the 16 PCS lanes in Figure 119-11.

SuggestedRemedy

As these seem to be different things, they should have different names.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 The tx\_out defined in 119.2.4.7 is the same as tx\_out portrayed in Figure 119-11 so it is not necessary to use a different name as proposed.

Cl 172 SC 172.2.4.10 P219 L22 # R2-25

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems, Inc.  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R editorial

The label "tx\_coded<0>" on the left overlaps the block.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the label leftward so that it does not overlap.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 Although the suggested remedy is an improvement to the draft it is an editorial issue that may be addressed by referral to the IEEE SA Editorial staff.  
 This change will be passed to the IEEE staff editor for consideration during final editing.

Cl 172 SC 172.3.2 P226 L13 # R2-1

Rannow, R K IEEE member / Self Employed  
 Comment Type T Comment Status R wording

Inconsistent use of the term "both". Used as an adverb and predeterminer, and this may create ambiguity.

172.3.2 FEC\_corrected\_cw\_counter FEC\_corrected\_cw\_counter is identical to 119.3.2 with the clarification that the count includes both flows.  
 172.3.3 FEC\_uncorrected\_cw\_counter FEC\_uncorrected\_cw\_counter is identical to 119.3.3 with the clarification that the count includes both flows.

SuggestedRemedy

Recommend consistency throughout to document as an adverb.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 The use of the word "both" is correct in the referenced sentences.  
 [Editor's note: The page was changed from 230 to 226.]

Cl 172A SC 172A P287 L22 # R2-9

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R bit ordering

Another reference would make this easier to use, so the reader can find what "am\_mapped" and "tx\_scrambled\_am" at lines 29, 30 are (am\_mapped does not appear in this amendment anywhere else, and while values for tx\_scrambled\_am are given in the tables, there is no indication of what it is).

SuggestedRemedy

Please insert (see 172.2.4.6) after alignment marker.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 The suggested change is redundant since the opening paragraph points to the subclause that defines the entire transmit function (172.2.4).  
 There is no consensus to make the proposed change.

IEEE P802.3df D3.2 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 172A SC 172A P287 L52 # R2-12

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R bit ordering

Unsatisfied D3.1 comment 39: need examples to show some of the output from the PCS. This says that 10 bits of cx\_A (in reverse order) is one symbol of c\_A. It is not clear whether the reverse order is telling the reader to reverse the order, or it is just weird notation. Also the order of the bits in a symbol of C\_A is not given.

SuggestedRemedy

Explain the bit and symbol ordering using words.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 The mapping is defined by the algorithm on page 287 lines 49 to 54. If this algorithm is misinterpreted by the implementer, the error would be evident by comparing the outcome to the examples provided in Annex 172A.

Cl 172A SC 172A P288 L19 # R2-8

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R editorial  
 tx\_scrambled

SuggestedRemedy

Should be tx\_scrambled\_am as in the column header. Fig 119-11 shows that these are different things. Also for Table 172A-2. Annex 119A is the same, by the way, and should be fixed sometime.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3df D3.1 and D3.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from previous drafts. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.  
 The comment is requesting that, in the title of Figure 172A-1 and Figure 172A-2, change tx\_scrambled to tx\_scrambled\_am.  
 Although the suggested remedy is an improvement to the draft it is an editorial issue that may be addressed by referral to the IEEE SA Editorial staff.  
 This change will be passed to the IEEE staff editor for consideration during final editing.

Cl 172A SC 172A P292 L28 # R2-11

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R bit ordering

Unsatisfied D3.1 comment 39: need examples to show some of the output from the PCS, particularly as the numbering/ordering in the PCS generally and in the FEC (which is different) is confusing, as was recognised in 3bs.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a table here for the start of Flow 0 tx\_out (16 lanes x 80 hex characters would be more than enough). Upload a plain text file to go with the others, and reference it with a NOTE here.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.  
 This comment is a restatement of comment R1-39. The resolution to comment R1-39 is recorded in the following file:  
[https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/comments/D3p1/8023df\\_D3p1\\_comments\\_final\\_id.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/comments/D3p1/8023df_D3p1_comments_final_id.pdf)  
 The response to R1-39 is:

---  
 "REJECT.  
 The example patterns are provided to help the implementer confirm correct interpretation of the encoding functionality which is complex.  
 Figure 119-11 provides sufficient guidance to correctly implement "Mux and 10-bit symbol distribution". Therefore adding the suggested additional patterns is not necessary.  
 There is no consensus to make the proposed changes."  
 ---

No new evidence has been provided to support the proposed changes. There is no consensus to make the proposed changes.

Cl 173 SC 173.5.2.1 P241 L28 # R2-16  
 Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R bit ordering

Unsatisfied D3.1 comment 39: show some of the 8-lane output of an 32:8 bit mux.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In a NOTE, show some of the 8-lane output of a 32:8 bit mux for the beginning of the example in Annex 172A. 8 lanes x 80 hex characters should be more than enough. Cross-reference to 172A. In 172A, cross-reference to here.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

This comment is a restatement of comment R1-39. The resolution to comment R1-39 is recorded in the following file:

[https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/comments/D3p1/8023df\\_D3p1\\_comments\\_final\\_id.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/comments/D3p1/8023df_D3p1_comments_final_id.pdf)

The response to R1-39 is:

---

"REJECT.

The example patterns are provided to help the implementer confirm correct interpretation of the encoding functionality which is complex.

Figure 119-11 provides sufficient guidance to correctly implement "Mux and 10-bit symbol distribution". Therefore adding the suggested additional patterns is not necessary.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes."

---

No new evidence has been provided to support the proposed changes.

Subclause 173.5.2.1 provides sufficient guidance to correctly implement the intended functionality.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes.