Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **1** *L* **24** # 51

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisc

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

Since 802.3cg is in standards association ballot, this amendment will likely be on 802.3-2018 as modified by 802.3cg-201x as well...

SuggestedRemedy

Add 802.3cg-201x to the list of amendments after 802.3bt-2018. Also add 802.3cg summary to the frontmatter at page 10.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
IEEE P802.3cg has not yet completed the standardization process.

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **16** *L* **44** # 13

Dawe, Piers — Mellanox

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

"other IEEE 802.3 amendment projects running in parallel (e.g., IEEE P802.3cd) that modified the same text and tables" but 802.3cd isn't running in parallel now, it's published (although not finished - see other comments).

SuggestedRemedy

Change 3cd to 3cn, or change to:
other IEEE 802.3 amendments (e.g., IEEE Std 802.3cd) and projects running in parallel (e.g., IEEE P802.3cn) that modify the same text and tables.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace “IEEE P802.3cd” with “IEEE P802.3cn”.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **2** *L* **1** # 31

Kabra, Lokesh — Synopsys

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

Does not mention new clause added in 802.3cm as done in Abstract of other specifications like 802.3cd

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Std 802.3-2018 adds Physical" to "Std 802.3-2018 and adds Clause 150. This amendment adds Physical"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace "Std 802.3-2018 adds Physical" with "Std 802.3-2018 adds Clause 150. This amendment adds Physical".

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **10** *L* **51** # 32

Kabra, Lokesh — Synopsys

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

Does not mention new clause added in 802.3cm as done in Abstract of 802.3cd mentioned above in line 44 of page 10

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Std 802.3-2018 and adds Physical" to "Std 802.3-2018 and adds Clause 150. This amendment adds Physical"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.3** *P* **17** *L* **4** # 21

Hajduczenia, Marek — Charter Communications

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

No normative references

SuggestedRemedy

Remove 1.3

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See proposed response to comment #1.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.3** *P* **17** *L* **4** # 1

Anslow, Pete — Ciena

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

As no normative references are being added, remove 1.3

SuggestedRemedy

Remove 1.3 from the draft

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4** *P* **17** *L* **18** # 47

Marris, Arthur — Cadence Design Systems

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

The reach of 150 m does not match the project objective of 100 m specified here: http://www.ieee802.org/3/cm/Adopted_Objectives_NGMMF_01_08mar18.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

No change to the text is required. I would be curious to know why a longer reach was chosen.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The comment does not make a suggestion for a change to the draft. For information, the objective of 100 m was chosen with OM4 cable in mind. Analysis early in the project indicated that a solution that supports 100 m of OM4 cable will support 150 m of OM5 cable; hence this capability was included in the baseline proposal for 400GBASE-SR4.2.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4.110a** *P* **17** *L* **16** # 45

Marris, Arthur — Cadence Design Systems

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

400GBASE-SR4.2 is a really rubbish nomenclature. Choose something better or at least explain why it is called 4.2 in the definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Add extra sentences at the end of 400GBASE-SR4.2
"400GBASE-SR4.2 uses the same medium as 200GBASE-SR4. The 4.2 nomenclature is used to indicate that transmission is actually over eight fibres but in a bi-directional manner."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Insert after “150 m.”: “400GBASE-SR4.2 uses the same medium as 200GBASE-SR4. The 4.2 nomenclature is used to indicate that transmission is over four fiber pairs (eight individual fibers) with the use of two wavelengths on each individual fiber.”

Cl **1** *SC* **1.5** *P* **17** *L* **25** # 22

Hajduczenia, Marek — Charter Communications

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

No new abbreviations

SuggestedRemedy

Remove 1.5 unless there is anything that needs to be added

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See proposed response to comment #2.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.5** *P* **17** *L* **26** # 2

Anslow, Pete — Ciena

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

As no new abbreviations are being added, remove 1.5

SuggestedRemedy

Remove 1.5 from the draft

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.5** *P* **17** *L* **26** # 43

Marris, Arthur — Cadence Design Systems

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

Delete subcluase 1.5 as it makes no changes to the base standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete subcluase 1.5

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See proposed response to comment #2.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.5** *P* **17** *L* **29** # 33

Kabra, Lokesh — Synopsys

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

I did not find the term "ABBR" anywhere in this draft or 802.3cd

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the line

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See proposed response to comment #2.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.5** *P* **17** *L* **29** # 41

Lusted, Kent — Intel

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

The abbreviation "ABBR" is not used anywhere else in the document. I suspect that it is leftover from the FrameMaker template.

SuggestedRemedy

Either define and use the abbreviation "ABBR" or remove the entry from the document.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See proposed response to comment #2.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.5** *P* **17** *L* **29** # 50

Trowbridge, Steve — Nokia

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

Left over instructions for how to use the template remain in the draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Either remove the example and instructions "ABBR expanded version [abbreviations use paragraph tag AcrList,ac]", or remove entirely clauses 1.3 and 1.5 from the draft which do not identify anything to be added or changed

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See proposed responses to comments #1 and #2.

Cl **1** *SC* **4** *P* **17** *L* **16** # 37

Kochuparambil, Beth — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

I don't see precedence for a x.110a and x.110b subclause

SuggestedRemedy

Use different subclause numbering. ie: 1.4.111 and 1.4.112 (shifting the remaining subclause numbering)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The numbering is correct and in accordance with the IEEE style manual. The numbering applies only to the amendment; the subclauses will be renumbered in the next revision of IEEE Std 802.3. As an example, IEEE Std 802.3bs-2017 inserted 1.4.72b for 200GBASE-DR4; this was renumbered as 1.4.83 in IEEE Std 802.3-2018.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.6** *P* **19** *L* **24** # 34

Kabra, Lokesh — Synopsys

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

reserved value of 1011110 can be used for SR4.2 to avoid eating up unnecessary reserved value that may be required for 100G serial modes

SuggestedRemedy

Change "1011110 = reserved" to "1011110 = 400GABSE-SR4.2 PMA/PMMD"
Unstrike line 19 "11xxxxx = reserved"
Delete next 6 rows "111xxxx = reserved" to "1100000 = 400GBASE-SR4.2 PMA/PMD"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The value of 1011110 has been allocated to “400GBASE-CR4 PMA/PMD” so that the block from 1011101 to 1100100 will be in descending reach order when the currently active projects all complete:
400GBASE-ZR PMA/PMD
400GBASE-ER8 PMA/PMD
400GBASE-LR4
400GBASE-FR4
400GBASE-SR4.2 PMA/PMD
400GBASE-SR8 PMA/PMD
400GBASE-CR4 PMA/PMD
400GBASE-KR4 PMA/PMD

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.21.1a** *P* **21** *L* **25** # 23

Hajduczenia, Marek — Charter Communications

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

Make sure line break is not allowed on "/" character to avoid breaking PMA/PMD across lines

SuggestedRemedy

Multiple locations in the draft

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove "/" from the list of characters in "Allow Line Breaks After" for Clause 45.

Cl **116** *SC* **116.1.3** *P* **23** *L* **27** # 15

Dawe, Piers — Mellanox

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

This PHY doesn't have bidirectional lanes. Following discussion on D1.0 comment 7, we chose a different description in:
1.4.110a 400GBASE-SR4.2: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for 400 Gb/s using 400GBASE-R encoding over eight lanes on multimode fiber in a bidirectional WDM format, with reach up to at least 150 m. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 150.)
This text should be consistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Change
400 Gb/s PHY using 400GBASE-R encoding over eight bidirectional lanes of multimode fiber, with reach up to at least 150 m (see Clause 150)
to
400 Gb/s PHY using 400GBASE-R encoding over eight lanes on multimode fiber in a bidirectional WDM format, with reach up to at least 150 m (see Clause 150)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **116** *SC* **116.2.5** *P* **24** *L* **44** # 16

Dawe, Piers — Mellanox

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

This isn't the base text in force, 802.3cd has altered it.
This isn't the second sentence, it's the second paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Either:
Change the second sentence of the second paragraph of 116.2.5 as follows:
The 400GBASE-R PMDs and their corresponding media are specified in Clause 122 through Clause 124
, and in Clause 138 and Clause 150.
Or:
Change the second paragraph of 116.2.5 (as amended by IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018) as follows:
The 200GBASE-R PMDs and their corresponding media are specified in Clause 121, and Clause 122, and Clause 136 through Clause 138. The 400GBASE-R PMDs and their corresponding media are specified in Clause 122 through Clause 124
, and in Clause 138 and Clause 150.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace the editing instruction with:
“Change the second paragraph of 116.2.5 (as amended by IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018) as follows:
The 200GBASE-R PMDs and their corresponding media are specified in Clause 121, Clause 122, and Clause 136 through Clause 138. The 400GBASE-R PMDs and their corresponding media are specified in Clause 122 through Clause 124
, Clause 138, and Clause 150.”

Cl **116** *SC* **116.2.5** *P* **24** *L* **45** # 24

Hajduczenia, Marek — Charter Communications

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

Added text (underline) contains now too many "and"s

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Clause 124, and in Clause 138 and Clause 150." to "Clause 124, Clause 138, and Clause 150."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See proposed response to comment #16.

Cl **130** *SC* **130.10.3.1** *P* **40** *L* **20** # 20

Ghiasi, Ali — Ghiasi Quantum

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

Two MDI are defined for 400GBASE-SR8, option two-row connector is not compatible with installed cable plant but option B single row connector is compatible with installed cable plant and this should be noted.

SuggestedRemedy

Add following text, Two-row twelve fiber interface is not compatible with installed cable plant but single-row sixteen-fiber interface is compatible with installed cable plant.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Both swanson_3cm_01b_0518 and kolesar_3cm_01_0518 indicated that the Dual-Row 12f MPO (or 24f MPO) connector/interface is compatible with structured cabling. From kolesar_3cm_01_0518: “Compatible w standard cabling polarity if without lane numbers of [QSFP-DD] MSA”.
Furthermore, both MDIs are recognized in TIA 568.3.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.5.1** *P* **34** *L* **5** # 5

Brandt, David — Rockwell Automation

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

400GBASE-SR8 is not underlined as an insertion.

SuggestedRemedy

Underline 400GBASE-SR8.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **138** *SC* **1** *P* *L* **13** # 49

Peter, Stassar — Huawei

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

"Four" is new text and should be underlined

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "four" by an underlined "four"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See proposed response to comment #44.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.1** *P* **28** *L* **10** # 3

Anslow, Pete — Ciena

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

There are now no changes being made to the second paragraph of 138.1, so it does not need to be present in the draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing instruction to:
"Change the first paragraph of 138.1, and change Table 138–3, as follows:"
Remove the second paragraph of 138.1 from the draft

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.1** *P* **28** *L* **12** # 26

Hajduczenia, Marek — Charter Communications

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

Lists of PHYs in multiple locations - please avoid enumerating all the PHYs over and over again

SuggestedRemedy

Change repeated enumerations "50GBASE-SR, 100GBASE-SR2, 200GBASE-SR4, and 400GBASE-SR8" indicatign all PMDs to "Clause 138 PMDs" - it is simpler to maintain in the future - multiple locations in the draft

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The enumeration of the PMDs avoids ambiguity.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.1** *P* **28** *L* **13** # 44

Marris, Arthur — Cadence Design Systems

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

No need to add the word "four". It reads better if you simply delete the word "three".

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the word "four" (which should have been underlined) on line 13.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.1** *P* **28** *L* **23** # 35

Kabra, Lokesh — Synopsys

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

Adding 400GBASE-SR8 column to Table 138-3 does not look good since all the rows except "117-RS" are exclsuive and duplicated for 200G & 400G. It may be neater to retain Table 138-3 as-is for 200G and add another table for 400GBASE-SR8. It will look logical as we already have Table 138-1 & Table 138-2 for 50G & 100G respectively

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Table 138-2, or Table 138-3" in line 19 to "Table 138-2, Table 138-3 or Table 138-4a"
Retain Table 138-3 as is for 200G and add another Table 138-4a for 400G;

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The tables for 200GBASE-SR4 and 400GBASE-SR8 are combined in the interests of clarity. See the final response to comment #11 against P802.3cm D1.1.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.1** *P* **29** *L* **11** # 25

Hajduczenia, Marek — Charter Communications

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

"must" in the text of the footnote, we typically void this word per style guide

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must behave" to "is expected to behave"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.1** *P* **29** *L* **21** # 4

Anslow, Pete — Ciena

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

"200 and 400 Gigabit Ethernet is introduced" should be "200 and 400 Gigabit Ethernet are introduced"

SuggestedRemedy

show the "is" in strikethrough font and add "are" in underline font.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.3.1** *P* **32** *L* **23** # 36

Kabra, Lokesh — Synopsys

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

Reference to 116.3 is incorrect for Delay Constraints. In 802.3cd, it is 116.4

SuggestedRemedy

Change "116.3 to 116.4"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace “116.3” with “116.4”.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.4** *P* **33** *L* **22** # 52

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisc

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

While the transmit disables are parameterized n-1 to 0, the register/bit numbers are just 1.9.8 to 1.9.1, which leaves the reader to guess whether n-1 is fixed at 1.9.8, or 0 at 1.9.1 (note, these are clear in clause 45, but the whole purpose of these redundant tables is to keep the reader from having to go back to clause 45)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "1.9.8" to "1.9.n"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.4** *P* **33** *L* **43** # 53

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisc

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

While the transmit disables are parameterized n-1 to 0, the register/bit numbers are just 1.10.8 to 1.10.1, which leaves the reader to guess whether n-1 is fixed at 1.10.8, or 0 at 1.10.1 (note, these are clear in clause 45, but the whole purpose of these redundant tables is to keep the reader from having to go back to clause 45)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "1.10.8" to "1.10.n"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.5.1** *P* **34** *L* **13** # 27

Hajduczenia, Marek — Charter Communications

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

Figure 138-2 should use <0:n> as number of lanes being used, and then descriptive text can be changed as follows: "four lanes, two lanes, and one lane per direction, respectively" to "four lanes (n=8), two lanes (n=4), and one lane (n=2) per direction, respectively" - in thsi way, you do not need to replace the figure every time a new PMD is added.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Adopting the change in the suggested remedy would mean that the diagram showing three lanes would directly apply to a single lane PMD. This would make labeling the three lanes difficult as 50GBASE-SR only has lane 0. Also, there is no expectation that a PMD with a lane count higher than 8 will be added to this clause.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.5.4** *P* **35** *L* **22** # 54

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisc

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

Typo - 100GBSE-SR2 should be 100GBASE-SR2 (service to humanity - it's wrong in the base standard - maintenance has been submitted)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "100GBSE-SR2" to "100GBASE-SR2"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.10.1** *P* **39** *L* **45** # 17

Dawe, Piers — Mellanox

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

Wording should be improved. In the remedy, the stricken "and" is not shown. The last option is the cleanest.

SuggestedRemedy

Change
Only applies to 100GBASE-SR2, 200GBASE-SR4, and 400GBASE-SR8. to
Applies only to 100GBASE-SR2, 200GBASE-SR4, and 400GBASE-SR8. or
100GBASE-SR2, 200GBASE-SR4, and 400GBASE-SR8 only or
Except 50GBASE-SR

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace “Only applies” with “Applies only”.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.11.3** *P* **44** *L* **1** # 28

Hajduczenia, Marek — Charter Communications

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

Rather than reproduce the whole table, it is enough to indicate in editprial instructions to insert a new row as shown below under SR4

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Reproducing the table avoids ambiguity.

Cl **138** *SC* **138.11.4.1** *P* **44** *L* **50** # 18

Dawe, Piers — Mellanox

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

Tidying up, now the list has four items in it.

SuggestedRemedy

Change
Compatible with 50GBASE-R or 100GBASE-R or 200GBASE-R or 400GBASE-R PCS and PMA
to
Compatible with 50GBASE-R, 100GBASE-R, 200GBASE-R, or 400GBASE-R PCS and PMA

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **150** *SC* **8.9** *P* **59** *L* **27** # 48

Peter, Stassar — Huawei

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

The unit for Receiver sensitivity in Equation 150-1 should be dBm instead of dB. Similar in Subclause 138.8.9, even when it is not part of the changes to 138.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "dB" by "dBm"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace “dB” with “dBm”. On line 31, replace “is the SECQ of the transmitter” with “is the SECQ in dB of the transmitter”.
Regarding 138.8.9, the relevant text is not present in the P802.3cm draft and the commenter is recommended to pursue this matter via IEEE 802.3 Maintenance.

Cl **150** *SC* **150.5.4** *P* **51** *L* **43** # 55

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisc

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

The word "must" should be avoided, because it looks like a hidden shall. The meaning would be unchanged by simply deleting "must". However, as this is worded, this might be an implementation note. "should" or "is strongly recommended' is appropriate.
"As an unavoidable consequence of the requirements for the setting of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter,
implementations must provide adequate margin between the input optical power level at which the
SIGNAL_DETECT parameter is set to OK, and the inherent noise level of the PMD including the effects of
crosstalk, power supply noise, etc."

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must provide" to "provides" or, alternatively, Replace "must" with "should" in the referenced sentence.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace “must” with “should”.

Cl **150** *SC* **150.5.4** *P* **51** *L* **47** # 56

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisc

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

"Various implementations are permitted by this standard, including implementations that generate..." The standard is actually implementation-independent. You're trying to give an example, but in the process, suggest that somewhere the standard specifies a bunch of specific implementations and "permits" them.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Various implementations are permitted by this standard, including implementations that generate..." with "Implementations may generate..."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace the fourth paragraph of 150.5.4 with “As examples, implementations may generate the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter values in response to the amplitude of the modulation of the optical signal or implementations may respond to the average optical power of the modulated optical signal.”

Cl **150** *SC* **150.5.5** *P* **52** *L* **1** # 57

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisc

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

Subclause 150.5.5 tells the user nothing about the lane-by-lane signal detect function, or how it is different from the global signal detect function specified in 150.5.4. The text "Various implementations of the Signal Detect function are permitted by this standard"and is not useful, since it suggests a list of implementations are permitted, when, in fact, the standard is implementation independent and does not "permit implementations" but rather specifies behavior, electrical, and sometimes physical characteristics which implementations must conform to. Also, there is no content in this subclause other than the description of how MDIO reports this when implemented. It sets no requirements on the function. Unfortunately, I can't say what the requirements are for lane-by-lane from this.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "Various implementations of the Signal Detect function are permitted by this standard."
Add requirements, or a reference to requirements elsewhere, as relevant to lane-by-lane signal detect, or else, rename or combine 150.5.5 with the previous subclause

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete “Various implementations of the Signal Detect function are permitted by this standard”.

Cl **150** *SC* **150.6** *P* **53** *L* **23** # 30

Ingham, Jonathan — Foxconn Interconnect Technology

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

Typographical error.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "capble" with "capable".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **150** *SC* **150.8.8** *P* **59** *L* **13** # 40

Lusted, Kent — Intel

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

The title of this subsection is RIN12OMA. However, the first sentence of the first paragraph references RIN. Is the name of the method RIN or RIN12OMA?

SuggestedRemedy

Consider changing the title of subsection 150.8.8 to be "Relative intensity noise (RIN)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
In line 15, replace “RIN” with “RIN12OMA”, where “12” is a subscript.

Cl **150** *SC* **150.8.8** *P* **59** *L* **16** # 42

Lusted, Kent — Intel

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

The first list item "a" of exceptions to the methodology in 52.9.6 states that "the optical return loss is 12 dB". In IEEE 802.3-2018 Section 4 (page 638), the procedure in 52.9.6.2 references "optical return loss specified in Table 52–7 for 10GBASE-S, Table 52–12 for 10GBASE-L, and Table 52–16 for 10GBASE-E" which have an optical return loss limit of 12 dB.

This is confusing because the table values are already 12dB yet it is listed as an exception

SuggestedRemedy

Consider removing exception item "a" from the list

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace “shall be as defined by the measurement methodology of 52.9.6 with the following exceptions” with “shall be as defined by the measurement methodology of 52.9.6 using an optical return loss of 12 dB and with the following exceptions”. Delete item (a) in the list and rename items (b) and (c) appropriately.

Cl **150** *SC* **150.8.10** *P* **60** *L* **50** # 46

Marris, Arthur — Cadence Design Systems

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

Minus sign using incorrect font.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the blue colour from the minus sign in:
SECQ - 10log10(Ceq)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **150** *SC* **150.8.10.1** *P* **61** *L* **21** # 58

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisc

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

"10 LB" Looks like a unit, folding units into the variable. It would be much clearer if it said "10 x LB MHz" where x is the multiplication symbol and there are nonbreaking spaces between 10, x, LB, and MHz.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "10 LB" by"10 x LB MHz" where x is the multiplication symbol and there are nonbreaking spaces between 10, x, LB, and MHz.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Italicize “LB”.

Cl **150** *SC* **150.10** *P* **62** *L* **42** # 19

Dudek, Mike — Marvell

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

It is not obvious what a transceiver type is at this point in the document.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "opposite type" to "opposite pair type" Consider adding a sentence in paranthesis "(Bidirectional transceiver pair types are defined in 150.6)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
In line 38 and line 39, replace “bidirectional transceivers” with “TxRx pairs”.
In line 41 and line 42, replace “bidirectional transceiver” with “TxRx pair”.