Cl **30** *SC* **30.17.1.4** *P***22** *L***7** # 2

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"When set to enabled and the remote peer also supports the packet metadata capability (confirmed through a mechanism beyond the scope of this standard), the packet metadata capability becomes active. The default value is disabled. All packet metadata capabilities are disabled upon link failure."
This means "enable=true" does not actually activate the EMS - it is conditional on negotiation with the remote peer. If that's the case then negotiation should be in scope, because it gates the activation of the function after the management enables it. And strictly speaking, management does not know whether the "enable" took effect or not because the negotiation result is not defined in the standard (out of scope).
It would be cleaner to define this attribute as direct enablement of the capability, and specify that it shall be enabled only after confirmation that the remote peer also supports the capability.

Similarly for 30.17.1.5 aEMSLinkMetadataEnable.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to
"When set to TRUE the packet metadata capability becomes active. The default value is FALSE. This attribute shall not be set to TRUE until it has been confirmed that the remote peer also
supports the packet metadata capability. The confirmation mechanism is beyond the scope of this standard. Upon link failure this attribute is set to FALSE.

Apply corresponding changes in 30.17.1.5 for link metadata capability.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment points out a improvement and clarification for the text related to enabling metadata and link metadata and the connection to negotiation which is out of scope of this standard.

Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Make similar changes to 30.17.1.5 for the link metadata description with editorial license.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.17.1.4** *P***22** *L***7** # 3

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The "Syntax" of this attribute is defined as BOOLEAN with values TRUE and FALSE, but the "BEHAVIOR DEFINED AS" uses the values enabled and disabled.
Similarly for 30.17.1.5 aEMSLinkMetadataEnable.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to TRUE/FALSE, also in 30.17.1.5.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved with the response to comment #47.

Cl **119** *SC* **119.2.6.2.3** *P***48** *L***4** # 10

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

119.2.6.2.3 (in 802.3-2022, currently not in the draft) includes definition of T_TYPE, which should be modified similarly to the one in 82.2.19.2.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Bring in this subclause and apply the necessary changes (also subject of other comments).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **195** *SC* **195.3.2** *P***71** *L***34** # 12

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"The EMS client initiates the transmission of metadata by delivering it to the gRS over the EMSI transmit interfaces. The EMS client accepts received metadata from the gRS over the EMSI receive interfaces."
"transmit interfaces" and "receiver interfaces" are undefined; There are service interface primitives.

Also, "accepts received metadata" is inaccurate - it simply receives it.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "EMSI transmit interfaces" to "EMS_PM.request or EMS_LM.request primitives".
Change "EMSI receive interfaces" to "EMS_PM.indication or EMS_LM.indication primitives".
Change "accepts received metadata" to "receives metadata".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the first two sentences in 195.3.2
from:
"The EMS client initiates the transmission of metadata by delivering it to the gRS over the EMSI transmit interfaces. The EMS client accepts received metadata from the gRS over the EMSI receive interfaces."
to:
"The EMS client initiates the transmission of metadata by delivering it to the gRS using the EMS_PM.request and EMS_LM.request primitives. The EMS client receives metadata from the gRS using the EMS_PM.indication and EMS_LM.indication primitives."

Implement with editorial license.

Cl **195** *SC* **195.3.4.2.3** *P***73** *L***9** # 15

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"the EMS client extracts metadata from the packet_metadata parameter. The action it takes, if any, is beyond the scope of this standard"

"if any" better matches the statement "extracts metadata" because metadata does not exist for all packets. if there is metadata, the EMS client is very likely to take some action, so "if any" makes little sense. Also, it goes without saying, and less is more.

Similarly in 195.3.5.2.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "if any", here and in 195.3.5.2.3.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment points out that the phrase "if any" is not needed. It would be better to remove this from the locations pointed to by the comment.

In 195.3.4.2.3, replace:
"The action it takes, if any, is beyond the scope of this standard."
with:
"The action it takes is beyond the scope of this standard."

In 195.3.5.2.3, replace:
"What actions it takes, if any, based on the extracted metadata is beyond the scope of this standard."
with:
"The action it takes is beyond the scope of this standard."

Cl **195** *SC* **195.4** *P***74** *L***14** # 16

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"These two gRS functions are defined to support the EMSI."
Thie sentence is redundant - the remainder of the paragraph says the same.
An implementation supports the EMSI (or doesn't), not the functions.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the quoted sentence.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **195** *SC* **195.4.1.1** *P***75** *L***9** # 17

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The "packet metadata" subclause has many instances of "shall" and some instances of "can" that don't go together.
Also, for the first "shall" (which encompasses the rest) it is unclear that the gRS is responsible for the actions.

Also applies in 195.4.1.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "the following actions shall occur" to "the gRS shall perform the following actions".
Change the remaining "shall" statements in this subclause to description of the actions - "is replaced", "discards", "replaces", "is transmitted".

Make similar changes in 195.4.1.2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The suggested remedy improves the readability of the draft.

In 195.4.1.1, change the first sentence:
from:
"If the packet metadata capability is enabled, then the following actions shall occur upon receipt of ...."
to:
"If the packet metadata capability is enabled, then the the gRS shall perform the following actions upon receipt of ...."

and change the 3rd sentence of the 2nd paragraph
from:
"... specifies whether octet i of the next transmitted packet shall be replaced."
to:
"... specifies whether octet i of the next transmitted packet is replaced."

and change the 1st sentence of the 3rd paragraph
from:
"... then the gRS shall discard the ..."
to:
"... then the gRS discards the ..."

and change 2nd sentence of the 3rd paragraph
from:
"The gRS shall replace the discarded bits ...."
to:
"The gRS replaces the discarded bits ...."

and change the 1st sentence of the 4th paragrpah
from:
"... the next transmitted packet shall be transmitted unchanged."
to:
"... the next transmitted packet is transmitted unchanged."

Make similar changes to the use of "shall" in 195.4.1.2.

Implement with editorial license.

Cl **195** *SC* **195.4.1.2** *P***76** *L***22** # 20

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"Table 81–3 specifies all permissible encodings of TXC and TXD including the control character for control ordered sets (0x5C)"
This sentence is redundant due to the next paragraph and Table 195-1.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the quoted sentence. In the paragraph above this sentence, change "(TXC=1)" to ""(TXC=1, TXD=0x5C)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove the redundant sentence, but retain the reference to Table 81–3 where the control characters are defined.

Change the two paragraphs at line 17 in 195.4.1.2
from:
"A control ordered set is transmitted on the xMII as a single control character (TXC=1) followed by seven data octets (TXC=0). The control character shall be aligned to lane 0 of the xMII data interface. The general format of a control ordered set is similar to a sequence ordered set (see 81.3.4 and Table 81–5) but uses a different control character.

Table 81–3 specifies all permissible encodings of TXC and TXD including the control character for control ordered sets (0x5C)."

to:
"A control ordered set is transmitted on the xMII as a single control character, TXC=1 and TXD=0x5C (see Table 81–3), followed by seven data octets with TXC=0. The control character shall be aligned to lane 0 of the xMII data interface. The format of a control ordered set is the same as a sequence ordered set (see 81.3.4 and Table 81–5) but with a different control character value."

Implement with editorial license.

Cl **195** *SC* **195.4.2.1** *P***77** *L***32** # 21

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"The gRS does not propagate packet metadata to the MAC."
This sentence is redundant due to the next sentence. Say what is done, not what is not done.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the quoted sentence.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In the second paragraph of 195.4.2.1, the first sentence says the packet metadata is sent to the client. The second sentence says the packet metadata is not sent to the MAC. The third sentence gives specific instructions on how the packet metadata is replaced when transmitting the packet to the MAC. It would be a better introduction to the gRS actions to say the gRS replaces the packet metadata that is sent to the MAC.

Change the 2nd sentences of the 2nd paragraph of 195.4.2.1
from:
The gRS does not propagate packet metadata to the MAC."
to:
"The gRS replaces the packet metadata with a standard preamble and SFD when transmitting the packet to the MAC."

Cl **195** *SC* **195.4.2.2** *P***77** *L***52** # 22

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"Table 81–4 specifies all permissible encodings of RXC and RXD including the value for the control character for control ordered sets (0x5C)"
The only relevant information in Table 81-4 is the fact that the control character is 0x5C. So say it in the previous paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the quoted sentence. In the second paragraph, change "(RXC=1)" to ""(RXC=1, RXD=0x5C)".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove the redundant sentence, but retain the reference to Table 81–4 where the control characters are defined.

Change the two paragraphs at line 49 in 195.4.2.2
From:
"A control ordered set is received on the xMII as a single control character (RXC=1) followed by 7 data octets (RXC=0). The control character is always aligned to lane 0 of the xMII data interface.

Table 81–4 specifies all permissible encodings of RXC and RXD including the value for the control character for control ordered sets (0x5C)."

To:
"A control ordered set is received on the xMII as a single control character, RXC=1 and RXD=0x5C (see Table 81–4), followed by seven data octets with RXC=0. The control character is always aligned to lane 0 of the xMII data interface."

Cl **195** *SC* **195.5.4.1** *P***80** *L***24** # 23

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

There is a requirement in 195.4.2.1 to restore the original preamble.
The value/comment of PM2 does not mention this requirement, so the item does not fully cover the requirements of the subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the value/comment of PM2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved using the response to comment #24.

Cl **195** *SC* **195.5.4.2** *P* **80** *L* **35** # 24

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Why "can generate" in LM1 - metadata from the EMS client must cause generation of CtlOS
Also for PM1

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the value/comment of LM1 and PM1

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

As the comment points out the "Value/Comment" column for the PICS in PM1, PM2, LM1 and LM2 do not specify everything the function must do. The subclause reference contains the full description. It is better to leave just the subclause reference.

Remove all text from the "Value/Comment " column for PM1, PM2, LM1 and LM2 in 195.5.4.1 and 195.5.4.2.

Cl **195** *SC* **195.5.4.2** *P* **80** *L* **38** # 25

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

There is a requirement in 195.4.2.2 to drop the CtlOS from the bit stream delivered to the MAC.
The value/comment of LM2 does not mention this requirement, so the item does not fully cover the requirements of the subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the value/comment of LM2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved using the response to comment #24.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.5** *P* **20** *L* **23** # 26

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

30.17 is in this amendment

SuggestedRemedy

Make it an active xref

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.17.1.1** *P* **21** *L* **20** # 27

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Clause 195 is in this amendment

SuggestedRemedy

Make it an active xref

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.17.1.11** *P* **23** *L* **41** # 28

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

missing space in "50Gb/s"
Also in 30.17.1.12
Also in 174 in "1.6Tb/s"

SuggestedRemedy

Insert spaces

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Numerical values should be separated from thier units by a space.

Implement the suggested remedy in 30.17.1.11, 30.17.1.12 and in the heading of 174.

Also add a space between the numerical value and the units on page 2 in the "Abstract" section (50Gb/s) as well as any other occurances with the same issue.

Implement with editorial license.

[Editor's note: CC 30, 174, FM]

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.116.aa** *P* **25** *L* **37** # 29

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Cross-references to subclauses should not include "clause" (several times in this subclause)

SuggestedRemedy

Change the xref format to omit "clause"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **82** *SC* **82.2.3.1** *P***32** *L***27** # 30

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

number mismatch "four bits" / "is labeled"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "four bits" to "nibble"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved using the response to comment #89

Cl **82** *SC* **82.2.4** *P***35** *L***13** # 31

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"option not enabled"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "option is not enabled"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment points out that the word "is" is missing from this sentence. The full context is shown in the following instructions.

In 82.2.4, change the last sentense
from:
"If the stateless encoder option not enabled, then the state-diagram encoder defined in 82.2.4.1 is used."
to:
"If the stateless encoder option is not enabled, then the state-diagram encoder defined in 82.2.4.1 is used."

Cl **195** *SC* **195.4.1.2** *P***76** *L***18** # 32

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"The general format of a control ordered set is similar to a sequence ordered set (see 81.3.4 and Table 81–5) but uses a different control character."
could be less wordy.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to
"The format of a control ordered set is similar to a sequence ordered set (see 81.3.4 and Table 81–5) with a different control character."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved with the response to comment #20

Cl **195** *SC* **195.2** *P***70** *L***24** # 33

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"Within the scope of this clause, the term gRS is used"
Unnecessarily wordy; the term is used in the clause, not in its scope

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "the scope of"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **82** *SC* **82.2.4** *P* **35** *L* **10** # 34

de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Typo : BASR-R

SuggestedRemedy

BASE-R

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment points out a typo, that needs to be fixed.

In 82.2.4, change the beginning of the second paragraph
from:
"For 100GBASR-R, the PCS ...."
to:
"For 100GBASE-R, the PCS ...."

Cl **91** *SC* **91.5.3.3** *P* **43** *L* **16** # 39

de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"codeword contains errors that were not corrected… it shall esure than for every other 257-bit block within the codeword…"

Breaking up the old sentence makes the new sentences less clear.

Comment also applies to Clauses 134 and 161

SuggestedRemedy

Rephrase using the word "errored" in the new sentences.
"When using the sparse error marking method, for every other 257-bit block within the errored codeword starting with…"
"When using the full error marking method, for every 66-bit block within the errored codeword and the first four 66-bit blocks of the following codeword…"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The text in question was updated with the least possible chages to the phrashing used in the current baseline. But since the description of the FEC codeword error marking is now much longer to support a new marking mode in addition to the old marking mode, the suggested remedy of adding the adjective "errored" to describe the codeword that is being marked as bad does make the text easier to understand and is a very small change in 91.5.3.3 and 134.5.3.3. However, the same change cannot be made in 161.5.3.3 where ther are blocks of two "associated codewords", which includes at least one errored codeword. The phrase "associated codewords" is used from the preceeding paragraph (in the base documant that is not shown in the 802.3dt updates) and is already sufficiently clear.

In 91.5.3.3. in the 2nd paragraph, change the text in the first sentence
from:
"... for every other 257-bit block within the codeword ..."
to:
"... for every other 257-bit block within the errored codeword ..."

and in the 3rd paragraph, change the text in the first sentence
from:
"... for every 66-bit block within the codeword ..."
to:
"... for every 66-bit block within the errored codeword ..."

Make similar changes to the 2nd and 3rd paragrphs in 134.5.3.3 with editorial license.

Cl **119** *SC* **119.2.3.1** *P***48** *L***4** # 43

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The notation conventions for the 64B/66B code in 119.2.3.1 need to be modified for the new control ordered set in the same way that was done in 82.2.3.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Bring subclause 119.2.3.1 into the draft and modify the second paragraph in the same way as 82.2.3.1 as needed for the sequence ordered sets and control ordered sets

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P***11** *L***28** # 45

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Corrigendum 2 has been approved and published

SuggestedRemedy

Change Cor 2-20xx to Cor 2-2026

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30** *P***19** *L* # 46

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Clause 30.1.4 has text in the penultimate paragraph that needs to be modified to reflect the addition of clause 30.17: "The above items are defined in 30.3 through 30.16.1 of this clause in terms of the template requirements of ISO/IEC 10165-4:1991."

SuggestedRemedy

Bring 30.1.4 into the document, and update the sentence in question to replace 30.16.1 with 30.17.1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.17** *P***21** *L***14** # 47

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Throughout the clause, the way the attributes with BOOLEAN syntax are defined is not consistent with other subclauses. If the APPROPRIATE SYNTAX is BOOLEAN, there is no need to spell out TRUE and FALSE in the APPROPRIATE SYNTAX, as by definition a BOOLEAN only takes those values. The meaning of TRUE and FALSE should be explained in the BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS.

SuggestedRemedy

Update all the BOOLEAN variables so that they read like this:
APPROPRIATE SYNTAX
  BOOLEAN
BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS:
  True if …. and false otherwise. <other behavior as needed>

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license, for the BOOLEAN variables in 30.17.1.1, 30.17.1.2, 30.17.1.3, 30.17.1.4 and 30.17.1.5.

Cl **81** *SC* **81.3.1.2** *P***30** *L***48** # 49

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The wording "Control control character combination of TXC and TXD" is awkward.

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite the sentence to use a structure more like the existing sentence regarding EEE:
A PHY with EMS capability shall use the combination of TXC and TXD as shown in Table 81-3 for Control to transmit control ordered sets (see 195.4.1.2).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **81** *SC* **81.3.2.3** *P***31** *L***49** # 50

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"Control control character" is awkward.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "...Start control character, Terminate control character, Sequence control character, Control control character, or Error control character…"
with
"...Start, Terminate, Sequence, Control, or Error control character…"

Replace "The Control control character is used for control ordered sets as described in 195.4.2.2."
with
"A PHY with EMS capability uses the combination of RXC and RXD as shown in Table 81-4 for Control to identify control ordered sets as described in 195.4.2.2."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **82** *SC* **82.2.4** *P***35** *L***3** # 53

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Since the third paragraph is being replaced by two paragraphs, it would be more clear if the editing instruction also indicated the insertion of the fourth paragraph

SuggestedRemedy

Revise the editing instruction to read:
Change the 3rd paragraph of 82.2.4 and insert new 4th paragraph as follows:

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **82** *SC* **82.2.4** *P***35** *L***12** # 54

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Missing an 'is' in the last sentence

SuggestedRemedy

Change "If the stateless encoder option not enabled, then the state-diagram encoder defined in 82.2.4.1 is used."
to
"If the stateless encoder option is not enabled, then the state-diagram encoder defined in 82.2.4.1 is used."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This comment is a duplicate of comment #31.
Resolved using the response to comment #31.

Cl **82** *SC* **82.7.3** *P***40** *L***27** # 57

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

EMP is not used in any of the subsequent tables, so it should not have a * in front of it

SuggestedRemedy

Change *EMP to EMP

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **119** *SC* **119.7.4.3** *P***50** *L***38** # 64

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Formatting issue on the bottom border of the lower right corner cell

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the formatting

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **133** *SC* **133.5.3** *P* **53** *L* **23** # 66

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

EMP is not used in any of the subsequent tables, so it should not have a * in front of it

SuggestedRemedy

Change *EMP to EMP

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **134** *SC* **134.7.4.2** *P* **57** *L* **45** # 69

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The intent is that the FEC must support at least one of the two error marking options - so the group number in the status should be the same for RF6 and RF7.

SuggestedRemedy

in RF7, change the status from O.2 to O.1

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **172** *SC* **172.3.1** *P* **63** *L* **12** # 71

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The editorial instruction is referring to the wrong table

SuggestedRemedy

Change Table 176-6 to Table 172-1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The "MDIO/PCS status variable mapping" table is Table 172-6 in 802.3df. The editing instruction is correct. It is the table numbering that needs to be fixed.

In 172.3.1, change the number of the table titled "MDIO/PCS status variable mapping" from Table 172-1 to Table 172-6.

Cl **172** *SC* **172.3.1** *P* **63** *L* **20** # 72

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Two formatting problems: right border of the right-most cell in the second row should be consistent with the rest of the table, and the newly inserted row should be shown as inserted (with underlines).

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the formatting

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **82** *SC* **82.7.3** *P* **40** *L* **20** # 86

Shrikhande, Kapil Upscale AI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Spelling error

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Etherent" to "Ethernet"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **195** *SC* **195.1** *P* **70** *L* **8** # 87

Shrikhande, Kapil Upscale AI

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Could use a comma in the first sentence

SuggestedRemedy

add a comma in the first sentence after "packet", as follows "Metadata is information about the data contained within a packet, or about the Ethernet link and the data it is communicating."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The sentence is correct without the comma because it is not joining two independent clauses. It is a two-item list with the form, "Metadata is information [about A] or [about B]."

Cl **195** *SC* **195.4.1.2** *P***76** *L***8** # 88

Shrikhande, Kapil Upscale AI

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Shouldn't sixty-four be 64 ?

SuggestedRemedy

Replace sixty-four by 64. If you agree, there is another instance on pg. 77 line 32.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **82** *SC* **82.2.3.1** *P***32** *L***28** # 89

Nicholl, Shawn AMD

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Currently says "The most significant four bits ... is labeled D'4."

SuggestedRemedy

"The most significant four bits ... are labeled D'4."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In 82.2.3.1, fix the verb tense in the following sentence
from:
"The most significant four bits ... is labeled D'4."
to:
"The most significant four bits ... are labeled D'4."

Cl **82** *SC* **82.2.19.3** *P***36** *L***48** # 90

Nicholl, Shawn AMD

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Currently says "... paragraph of 182.2.19.3 ..."

SuggestedRemedy

It should say 82.2.19.3 (typo).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **133** *SC* **133.5.4.8** *P***54** *L***36** # 91

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The editing instruction reads "Change the table in 133.4.8 as follows" but the Table of Contents lists the PICS State diagrams section as 133.5.4.8, and the analogous section in Clause 82 is referenced as 82.7.4.8. The instruction appears to reference the wrong subclause number (133.4.8 instead of 133.5.4.8).

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing instruction from "Change the table in 133.4.8" to "Change the table in 133.5.4.8".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There is a typo in the editing instruction (a missing digit).

Change the editing instruction in 133.5.4.8
from: "Change the table in 133.4.8 ..."
to: "Change the table in 133.5.4.8 ..."

[Editor's note: corrected the page number of the submitted comment from page 53 to page 54]

Cl **161** *SC* **161.7.4.2** *P***61** *L***27** # 92

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Editing instruction reads "subsequent items (some unchanged rows, are not shown)" — the comma before "are" is extraneous. All other 30+ editing instructions in this draft use "rows not shown" without the comma.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the comma: change "some unchanged rows, are not shown" to "some unchanged rows not shown".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **172** *SC* **172.7.4.2** *P***64** *L***3** # 93

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Editing instruction reads "Change the table in 172.7.4.2 (as amened by IEEE Std 802.3dj-20xx)" — "amened" is a typo for "amended".

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "amened" with "amended".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **174** *SC* **174.2** *P***66** *L***8** # 94

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Editing instruction reads "Insert 174.2.14 after 173.2.13 as follows" but the surrounding context is Clause 174 ("174. Introduction to 1.6Tb/s networks" / "174.2 Summary of 1.6 Terabit Ethernet architecture"). The predecessor clause should be 174.2.13, not 173.2.13.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Insert 174.2.14 after 173.2.13" to "Insert 174.2.14 after 174.2.13".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy..

[Editor's note: corrected the page number of the submitted comment from page 65 to page 66]

Cl **174** *SC* **174.2.14** *P***66** *L***10** # 95

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Section title "174.2.14 Ethernet Metadata Services (EMS)" uses title case for "Metadata Services" while all other EMS subsections (80.2.5a, 82.5a, 116.2.5a, 119.5a, 131.2.5a, 133.3a, 169.2.11, 172.5a, 175.6a) consistently use lowercase: "Ethernet metadata services".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "174.2.14 Ethernet Metadata Services (EMS)" to "174.2.14 Ethernet metadata services (EMS)".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **175** *SC* **175.6a** *P***67** *L***12** # 96

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Two occurrences of "metatdata" (should be "metadata") in 175.6a: (1) "If EMS link metatdata is supported" (line 12) and (2) "If EMS link metatdata or packet metadata are supported" (line 17).

SuggestedRemedy

Replace both instances of "metatdata" with "metadata".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy..

[Editor's note: corrected the page number of the submitted comment from page 66 to page 67]

Cl **175** *SC* **175.6a** *P***67** *L***14** # 97

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

"The PCS shell use the stateless 64B/66B encoder defined in 119.2.4.1.2..." — the normative modal verb "shall" is misspelled as "shell". This is a binding requirement in an IEEE standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "shell" with "shall".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy..

[Editor's note: corrected the page number of the submitted comment from page 66 to page 67]

Cl **175** *SC* **175.9.3** *P***68** *L***6** # 98

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Editing instruction in 175.9.3 reads "some unchanged row not shown" (singular "row"). Same error appears in 175.9.4.1 (page 67, line 27) and in Table 119-5 (page 48, line 9). All other editing instructions in this draft use the plural "rows".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "unchanged row not shown" to "unchanged rows not shown" in 175.9.3, 175.9.4.1, and Table 119-5.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy..

[Editor's note: corrected the page number of the submitted comment from page 67 to page 68]
[Editor's note: CC 119]

Cl **A** *SC* **A** *P***81** *L***0** # 99

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Running header on page 80 reads "IEEE P802.3dt Ethernet Metadata Services 2026Task Force" — the year "2026" is incorrectly concatenated with "Task Force", resulting in "2026Task".

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the running header to "IEEE P802.3dt Ethernet Metadata Services Task Force 10 September 2026".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment appears to be related to the the header on page 81 in Annex A; not the header on page 80 in clause 195.

The header on page 81 in Annex A needs to be fixed as described in the comment and suggested remedy.

Change the header from:
"IEEE P802.3dt Ethernet Metadata Services 2026Task Force"
to:
"IEEE P802.3dt Ethernet Metadata Services Task Force"

[Editor's note: Changed the referenced clause from 195 to Annex A and page number from 80 to 81].

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P***1** *L***3** # 100

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The abstract uses "50Gb/s" (no space between value and unit). IEEE 802.3 convention requires a space. The same no-space form also appears in attributes aEMSLinkMetadataTx (30.17.1.11, p.22 line 41) and aEMSLinkMetadataRx (30.17.1.12, p.22 line 52).

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "50Gb/s" with "50 Gb/s" in the abstract and in the APPROPRIATE SYNTAX statements of 30.17.1.11 and 30.17.1.12.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved with the response to comment #28.

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **12** *L* **0** # 101

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The running header on pages 12-16 reads "IEEE P802.3dt Ethernet Metadavo Services Task Force". "Metadavo" should be "Metadata". This typo appears on five consecutive pages.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Metadavo" with "Metadata" in the running header on pages 12-16.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **12** *L* **16** # 102

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The Table of Contents entry for 82.2.3.9 reads "Oordered set (/O/)" (double capital-O). This appears to be amendment change-markup (strikethrough + underscored text) that was unintentionally rendered in the ToC instead of showing the final clean section title.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Oordered set (/O/)" with "Ordered set (/O/)" in the Table of Contents entry for 82.2.3.9.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The table of contents is auto-generated. The "Oo" in "Oordered set /O/" heading is a byproduct of the editing intructions to fix the heading of 82.2.3.9 to capitalize the the first word of the heading "Ordered" which is in lowercase in the base standard. The editing instructions in the body of the draft show the capital "O" with underline, and the small "o" with a strike-through which represents a replacement of the lowercase "o" with the uppercase "O". This change could be left to the management or revision projects, but since P802.3dt is making changes to this subclasue, this simple correction is also added.

When the 802.3dt amendment is incorportated in to the baseline standard, the double "Oo" will no longer exist, and the table of contents will be generated correctly.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.17.1.9** *P* **22** *L* **22** # 103

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

Management attributes aEMSPacketMetadataRx (30.17.1.9) and aEMSPacketMetadataErrorRx (30.17.1.10) reference a "packet_status" parameter of EMS_PM.indication with enumerated values OK, ERROR_FRAME, and ERROR_PREAMBLE. However, Clause 195.3.4.2 defines EMS_PM.indication with only one parameter: packet_metadata. The "packet_status" parameter and its enumerated values (OK, ERROR_FRAME, ERROR_PREAMBLE) are not defined anywhere in this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Either: (a) add a second parameter "packet_status" to EMS_PM.indication in 195.3.4.2 with values OK, ERROR_FRAME, and ERROR_PREAMBLE and define the conditions for each value; or (b) rewrite 30.17.1.9 and 30.17.1.10 to count frames using only information derivable from the packet_metadata parameter, removing all reference to packet_status.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This parameter was removed from clause 195 in an earlier version of the draft. This management attribute in Clause 30 should also be removed to reflect that change.

Implement option (b) of the suggested remedy to remove references to the "packet_status" parameter. Implement with editorial license.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.17.1.13** *P* **23** *L* **10** # 104

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The BEHAVIOUR text reads: "...that interrupted packet transmission.This corresponds to EMS_LM.request primitive was transmitted during packet transmission...". Two problems: (1) missing space after the period; (2) "This corresponds to EMS_LM.request primitive was transmitted" is grammatically incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with: "...that interrupted packet transmission. This counter is incremented when an EMS_LM.request primitive is transmitted during packet transmission causing a 64-bit-time suspension of the MAC's PLS_DATA.request service (see 195.4.1.2)."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The suggested remedy improves the text and readbility.

In 30.17.1.13, change the last sentence,
from:
" This corresponds to EMS_LM.request primitive was transmitted during packet transmission causing a 64-bit-time suspension of the MAC's PLS_DATA.request service (see 195.4.1.2). This counter is a subset of aEMSLinkMetadataTx.;"
to:
"This counter is incremented when an EMS_LM.request primitive is asserted during packet transmission causing a 64-bit-time suspension of the MAC's PLS_DATA.request service (see 195.4.1.2).;"

Implement with editorial license.

Cl **133** *SC* **133.3a** *P* **52** *L* **30** # 106

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *(bucket)*

The bullet "The RS-FEC shall use the option to invalidate all associated 66-bit blocks (the full error marking method) when the RS-FEC decoder identifies uncorrected codeword errors (see 134.5.3.3)" is missing a terminating period. Compare with the corresponding bullet in 82.5a which ends with "(see 91.5.3.3 and 161.5.3.3)."

SuggestedRemedy

Add a period after "(see 134.5.3.3)" so the sentence ends: "...uncorrected codeword errors (see 134.5.3.3)."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy

[Editor's note: corrected the page number of the submitted comment from page 51 to page 52]