*Cl* **166** *SC* **166.6.4.8.6** *P* **15** *L* **36** # 1

Dawe, Piers
NVIDIA

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

As pointed out in D2.0 comment 6, this is a technical change.
If the intention is to change the values of TDFOM0 from the arbitrary but not incorrect values in the standard in force, to have the meaning described at line 17 and in the PAR section 5.5 "to yield Transmitter Distortion Figure of Merit (TDFOM) equal to 0 dB in Equation (166–16) for an ideal transmitter" then the TDFOM limits in Table 166-9 and STDFOM conditions in Table 16610 must be reduced by the amounts by which TDFOM0 is increased, so that the same transmitters and receivers pass and fail.
If the intention is to make different transmitters and receivers pass and fail, it is obviously a technical change.

The IEEE SA SB ops manual says that a corrigendum is:
"A document that only corrects editorial errors, technical errors, or ambiguities in an existing IEEE standard."
These numbers are not technical errors in the existing standard. Any errors were in the preparation of the numbers that went into it, and the result is that the standard in force does not represent the intention of some participants; but it is complete and clear, and similar to TWDP and TDECQ in that there are "zero offsets". As the standard is not in error, the proposed changes are not appropriate to a corrigendum.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Withdraw this project. If it is thought worthwhile, propose changes for one of these intentions as an amendment, or part of another amendment project.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
This comment is a restatement of Draft 2.0 Comment #6, and does not provide substantive additional rationale.

While D2.0 Comment #6 was accepted in principle (see https://www.ieee802.org/3/dr/comments/Committee%20report_CommentID_Unsatisfied.pdf) this was because text was added clarifying the intent of the numbers in this table.

This clarifiying text, however, served to further illustrate why the numbers in the table were in error. The main point of D2.0 Comment #6 (that the numbers are not in error) was rebutted.

CRG continues to believe that the numbers in the table are in error and need to be corrected.