

IEEE 802.3dk D2.0 Bidirectional 100Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI **FM** SC **FM** P1 L23 # 112

Zimmerman, George ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,OnSemi,Sony,SenTekse

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A** resolved

This draft is amending IEEE Std 802.3-2022 which has already been amended now by at least 9 published amendments, and at least one in WG ballot ahead of this draft. It is important to keep track of the other changes so that the new changes are properly correlated with clause numbers and other changes made. Since this amendment makes changes to clauses 30 & 45 in places near or at where other amendments have, this may create errors. Hence my marking this comment, which seems minor, as required.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "IEEE Std 802.3y-20xx" with the list of published amendements and those ahead of this amendment in the process. (Note - Include at least the published amendments (dd, cs, db, ck, de, cx, cz, cy, df, and Cor1 listed in the introduction), as well as 802.3da which is ahead of this amendment.

Editor to review edits to existing clauses (30, 45, and 80) to determine whether any section numbering or editing instructions for location of changes are altered.

Response Response Status **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace "IEEE Std 802.3y-20xx" with the list of published amendements and those ahead of this amendment in the process.

Follow the latest template (Version 5.5).

CI **00** SC **0** P1 L # 28

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R** resolved

The project description refers to "a single strand of single-mode fiber". The word "strand" appears two more times in the draft, but is not defined in it. The base standard has only 3 instances of "strand", all related to copper wires, not optical fibers. It is unclear what "strand" means.

SuggestedRemedy

Assuming "strand" means a single fiber, as it seems from the draft, I suggest changing "a single strand of single-mode fiber" to "one single-mode fiber", consistent with the text added in 30.5.1.1.2.

Implement across the draft (3 instances, and possibly other places as appropriate).

Response Response Status **W**

REJECT.

Strand is used in cp abstract and list of amendment.

All the abstracts will not be incorporated into the 802.3 base standard.

Keep consistent with 802.3cp.

CI **00** SC **0** P8 L4 # 223

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **R** resolved

The box under "Introduction" needs to be updated with P802.3dk information.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: Std 802.3-20xx

To: Std 802.3dk-202x

and Change: Amendment title (copy from PAR)

To: Greater than 50 Gb/s Bidirectional Optical Access PHYs Task Force

Response Response Status **U**

REJECT.

See comment #222.

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

CI **00**

SC **0**

Page 1 of 1

2025/5/27 22:22:10

802.3dk D2.1 Bidirectional 100Gb/s Optical Access PHYs 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comment

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.8 P17 L22 # 66
Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC
Comment Type ER Comment Status R cross-ref
Subclause 45.2.1.8.1 should not have been removed as Table 45-12 is in this subclause.
SuggestedRemedy
Restore subclause 45.2.1.8.1
Response Response Status W
REJECT.
Table 45-12 is part of 45.2.1.8, not 45.2.1.8.1.
See D2.0 comment #142.

CI 168 SC 168.3.2 P29 L2 # 27
Zimmerman, George ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,OnSemi,Sony,SenTekse
Comment Type TR Comment Status R D2.0 unresolved
"is" is for statements of fact. The limitation on the skew seems to be a requirement.
Further, the requirements in 83.5.3.4 go further and specify skew variation. Is that to be
specified? While 83.5.3.4 was mentioned earlier defining skew, it isn't clear that those
requirements apply. Here is where that should be stated.
SuggestedRemedy
Change "Skew at SP2 is limited to 43 ns as defined by 83.5.3.4" to "Skew and skew
variation at SP2 shall comply with the requirements of 83.5.3.4"
Response Response Status W
REJECT.
The signal at SP2 is not under control of PMD, so "shall" is inappropriate.
Keep consistent with Clause 140.

CI 168 SC 168.7.11 P40 L51 # 25
Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd
Comment Type TR Comment Status R D2.0 unresolved
802.3 dj has extensively discussed the definition of RINxOMA. Consensus was made to
update the definition of RINxOMA which better describes the actual behaviour and aligns
with what is being used in the field. Related contribution from Ahmad and JJ,
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_09/chayeb_3dj_01_2409.pdf
SuggestedRemedy
align to what is defined in dj.
Response Response Status W
REJECT.
The group made consensus to keep consistent with CL140.