

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI **FM** SC **FM** P1 L10 # 147
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 State this is amendment 11 and list the prior amendments
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Amendment: 11" - "This draft is an amendment of IEEE Std 802.3-2018 as amended by IEEE Std 802.3cb-2018, IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018, IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018, IEEE Std 802.3cn-2019, IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019, IEEE Std 802.3cq-2020, IEEE Std 802.3cm-2020, IEEE Std 802.3ch-2020, IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020, and IEEE Std 802.3cr-20xx"
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P1 L24 # 86
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 The paragraph is dated. On the date of this comment, we now have 9 approved amendments, 6 of which are published, and at least 2 amendments likely to receive amendment numbers 10 and 11 that are ahead of the 3 projects in initial WG ballot.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add IEEE Std 802.3cr-20xx to the list as the 10th amendment (before IEEE Std 802.3cu-20xx).
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P1 L13 # 11
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Suggest to break title before "and 50"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert line break before "and 50" to make title look a bit better
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P1 L24 # 68
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 Missing some existing amendments in the frontmatter.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Propose to replace ", and IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018" with ",IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018, IEEE Std 802.3cn-2019, IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019, IEEE Std 802.3cq-2020, IEEE Std 802.3cm-2020" as well as any other relevant in-progress amendments.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P1 L23 # 50
 Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 The list of "as amended by" is not up to date.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please align with the latest FM template available on the website. This should at a minimum include "IEEE Std 802.3cb-2018, IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018, IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018, IEEE Std 802.3cn-2019, IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019, IEEE Std 802.3cq-2020, and IEEE Std 802.3cm-2020"
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P1 L24 # 51
 Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 This draft is for Initial Working Group ballot
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Draft D1.3 is prepared for Task Force review [review/balloting stage]" to "Draft D2.1 is prepared for the the first Working Group recirculation ballot"
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI FM SC FM P1 L24 # 12
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 This is not draft D1.3
 SuggestedRemedy
 FM summary must be filled in as well
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P1 L25 # 284
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 [review/balloting stage]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P1 L24 # 283
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 D1.3
 SuggestedRemedy
 Would be D2.1 next time
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P2 L1 # 99
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Abstract needs to be completed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: Abstract: This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 [abstract text].
 To: Abstract: This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 adds bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P1 L24 # 282
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 [complete]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Complete it
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P2 L1 # 285
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Abstract
 SuggestedRemedy
 Write it
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P1 L24 # 281
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 [list to be populated during publication process]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Populate it now, consistent with lines 23-24. If necessary, say that the list may be amended during the publication process.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI **FM** SC **FM** P2 L1 # 6
 Anslow, Pete Self
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 The abstract and keywords are not populated
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add appropriate abstract text and suitable keywords
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P2 L1 # 148
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 Missing abstract text
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add abstract text
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P2 L1 # 87
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Front matter is incomplete.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add Abstract.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P2 L1 # 13
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 Abstract and keywords should be filled in at this time
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please fill in abstract and keywords
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P2 L2 # 100
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Keywords need to be completed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: Keywords: Ethernet; [keywords list].
 To: Keywords: Ethernet, rrGBASE-BRx-d, 10GBASE-BR10, 10GBASE-BR20, 10GBASE-BR40, and 10GBASE-BR40+, 25GBASE-BR10, 25GBASE-BR20, 25GBASE-BR40, and 25GBASE-BR40+, 50GBASE-BR10, 50GBASE-BR20, 50GBASE-BR40, and 50GBASE-BR40+, IEEE 802.3cp™
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P2 L2 # 286
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X** LATE
 Keywords
 SuggestedRemedy
 List them
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P2 L3 # 88
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Front matter is incomplete.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add Keywords.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI **FM** SC **FM** P7 L4 # 89
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 This number of this standard is known.
 SuggestedRemedy
 802.3cp
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P7 L19 # 90
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 The WG ballot group list is now known.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fill in WG list.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P7 L9 # 146
 Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 The IEEE 802.3 WG Recording Secretary is now "Jon Lewis", not "Pete Anslow"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "Jon Lewis"
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P9 L4 # 101
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Amendment title is not added in box.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: Amendment: Amendment title (copy from PAR).
 To: Amendment: Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P7 L9 # 49
 Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 Pete Anslow is no longer the 802.3 WG secretary
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Pete Anslow" to "Jon Lewis"
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P9 L29 # 102
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Ammendment identifier not added.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: IEEE Std 802.3xx-20xx
 To: IEEE Std 802.3cp-20xx
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P7 L15 # 14
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 When editor is change, it is usual to designate them separately as Phase 1 and Phase 2 editors
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI **FM** SC **FM** P10 L1 # 15
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 Front Matter is not up to date
 SuggestedRemedy
 Update FM text and content to match the latest amendments published. Yes, it is a constant process.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P10 L47 # 149
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 This list is missing amendments 4 to 10
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add descriptions of amendments 4 to 10
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P10 L48 # 107
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Missing amendment descriptions
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add: IEEE Std 802.3ch™-2020
 Amendment 8—This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and adds Clause 149, Annex 149A, Annex 149B, and Annex 149C. This amendment adds physical layer specifications and management parameters for operation at 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s over a single balanced pair of conductors.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P10 L48 # 104
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Missing amendment descriptions
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add: IEEE Std 802.3cg™-2019
 Amendment 5—This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and its amendments and adds Clause 146 through Clause 148 and Annex 146A and Annex 146B. This amendment adds 10 Mb/s Physical Layer specifications and management parameters for operation on a single balanced pair of conductors.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P10 L48 # 105
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Missing amendment descriptions
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add: IEEE Std 802.3cq™-2020
 Amendment 6—This amendment includes editorial and technical corrections, refinements, and clarifications to Clause 33 and related portions of the standard.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P10 L48 # 103
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Missing amendment descriptions
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add: IEEE Std 802.3cn™-2019
 Amendment 4—This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and adds 50 Gb/s, 200 Gb/s, and 400 Gb/s Physical Layer specifications and management parameters for operation over single-mode fiber with reaches of at least 40 km.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI FM SC FM P10 L48 # 108

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Missing ammendment descriptions

SuggestedRemedy

IEEE Std 802.3ca™-2020

Amendment 9—This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 extends the operation of Ethernet Passive Optical Networks (EPONs) to multiple channels of 25 Gb/s providing both symmetric and asymmetric operation for the following data rates (downstream/upstream): 25/10 Gb/s, 25/25 Gb/s, 50/10 Gb/s, 50/25 Gb/s, and 50/50 Gb/s. This amendment specifies the 25 Gb/s EPON Multi-Channel Reconciliation Sublayer (MCRS), 25GBASE-Nx25G-EPON PHYSical Coding Sublayers (PCs), Physical Media Attachments (PMAs), and Physical Medium Dependent sublayers (PMDs) that support both symmetric and asymmetric data rates while maintaining backward compatibility with already deployed 10 Gb/s EPON equipment. The EPON operation is defined for distances of at least 20 km, and for a split ratio of at least 1:32.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P10 L48 # 106

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Missing ammendment descriptions

SuggestedRemedy

Add: IEEE Std 802.3cm™-2020

Amendment 7—This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and adds Clause 150. This amendment adds Physical Layer (PHY) specifications and management parameters for 400 Gb/s operation on four pairs (400GBASE-SR4.2) and eight pairs (400GBASE-SR8) of multimode fiber, over reaches of at least 100 m.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P10 L49 # 91

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Incomplete list of amendment descriptions, including a self description for IEEE Std 802.3cp-20xx which others can copy into their front matter.

SuggestedRemedy

Add amendments 4 through 9 at a minimum, copying from the published or approved drafts. If properly written, this draft should also be dependent on P802.3cu. Recommend using Mr. Laws list of 24 June that has this project as Amendment 12.

Write a description of this amendment.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P10 L49 # 109

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Missing description of this ammendment.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: IEEE Std 802.3xx™-20xx
This amendment includes [complete]
To: IEEE Std 802.3cp™-20xx

This amendment includes includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and adds Clause 157, Clause 158, Clause 159, and Clause 160. This ammendment adds bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P10 L49 # 52

Lewis, Jon Dell EMC

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Template is still in the draft for additional ammendments.

SuggestedRemedy

Update from line 49 to include prior amendments to the base standard.

Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI FM SC FM P10 L50 # 150
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Missing description for "IEEE Std 802.3cp™-20xx"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "[complete]" with suitable text
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P13 L28 # 287
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Formatting problem with the contents list for the new clauses. Missing tab in the template?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P10 L51 # 7
 Anslow, Pete Self
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 The amendment summary is not populated
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add appropriate summary text
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P13 L49 # 92
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 For some reason, a 43 is added to the end of the clause title. Same thing with clause 159 and clause 160. Each ends with "-BR40+", and each has a different number tacked onto the title.
 SuggestedRemedy
 If this is a FrameMaker "feature" perhaps appending spaces or something to the end of the title may help eliminate the TOC problem. It is a mystery to me though what to do if this is a FrameMaker problem with a title ending in "+".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P12 L1 # 110
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 There should not be blank pages in the document.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete blank page (Instruction on how to do this are in the 802.3 template on page 15 of version 4p2
 Also delete blank page 16, 20, 38, 64, and 82.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC P L # 2
 DeAndrea, John Finisar/ II-VI
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Table 159-4 The Table shows a value of -20 dBm for 25GBASE-BR10 and -26 dBm for 25GBASE-BR-10. I believe there is a typo, because the PMD has (4) types, -BR10, -BR20, -BR40, and -BR40+
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest change: add other (2) PMD types and comment for power levels
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 165
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Editorial comments
 SuggestedRemedy
 To follow
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 0 P7 L15 # 231
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Duane Remein is no longer an editor or this project.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove his name or revise the text.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 164
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Tecehnical comments
 SuggestedRemedy
 To follow
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 0 P9 L15 # 232
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The word "Ethernet" in this line is incorrect
 SuggestedRemedy
 See maintenance request 1350
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 0 P1 L15 # 159
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "50" and "Gb/s" should be on the same line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert non-breaking space between "50" and "Gb/s" in the title of the amendment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 0 P10 L49 # 158
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Missing the descriptive content for amendments 4 through 11
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace content on lines 49 through 52 with descriptive content for amendments 4 through 11 in draft 2.0 of IEEE 802.3cv (lines 49 - 54 on page 10 and lines 1 -50 on page 11)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 0 P7 L9 # 230
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Pete Anslow is no longer 802.3 WG Secretary
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Pete Anslow" with "Jon Lewis"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 00 SC 0 P12 L1 # 53
 Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 blank page
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the blank page. Also page 16, 20, 38 is blank. Please remove all blank pages in the document. The latest template has instructions for removing blank pages throughout the draft if necessary.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 1 SC 1.3 P18 L1 # 16
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 No normative references, no need for 1.3
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike 1.3
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 1 SC 1.3 P18 L1 # 111
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete empty section.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 1 SC 1.4 P18 L8 # 228
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Definition of all PHYs in 1.4, indicate that each PHY includes two different specifications for -D and _U. However, the scope of the approved PAR for 802.3cp states -
 The scope of the project defines physical layer specifications and management parameters for symmetric bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s operation over single strand of single mode fiber of at least 10 km.
 It does not appear that specifications for symmetric bidirectional links were defined, as there are different specifications for upstream and downstream.
 Therefore, this specification is not per the scope of the approved PAR.

SuggestedRemedy
 It is assumed that different specifications are necessary for upstream / downstream. Therefore, the scope of the PAR needs to be updated.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 1 SC 1.4 P18 L12 # 288
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 "The link includes two different specifications": I know this is copied from before but it disagrees with the definition of "link" and anyway a link is a thing not a document; it does not contain specifications.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "There are different specifications for 10GBASE-BR10-D and 10GBASE-BR10-U; a link connects one to the other." ?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 1 SC 1.4 P18 L13 # 18
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Units need to be separated from numeric value/
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert a space (non-breaking) before "km"
 Scrub the draft
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 1 SC 1.4 P18 L14 # 17
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 We do not reference amendments, but baseline standard
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "IEEE Std 802.3cp" to "IEEE Std 802.3", all definitions in 1.4
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 1 SC 1.4 P18 L20 # 229
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Distinct Identiy concerns. Each of the speeds has two PHYs that address at least 40km (BR40 and BR40+) which are noted as differing by -40+ having a larger loss budget, which means that there are two different solutions that can address the lower loss budget.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Choose 1 solution for 40km for each rate.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 1 SC 1.4 P18 L26 # 19
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 "10GBASE-BR40+-D" looks and reads terrible.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the PMD name to "10GBASE-BR50-D" or any other combination that avoids the use of + followed by - sign
 Scrub the draft
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 1 SC 1.4.52a P18 L12 # 69
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 Definitions contain a reference to IEEE Std 802.3cp which should be IEEE Std 802.3 once the amendment is approved.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Propose to replace "See IEEE Std 802.3cp" with "See IEEE Std 802.3" in this sub-clause and other sub-clauses found in sub-clause 1.4
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 1 SC 1.4.52a P18 L12 # 289
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X** LATE
 10km
 SuggestedRemedy
 10 space km Several places
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 1 SC 1.4.52d P18 L24 # 239
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X** LATE
 with a larger loss budget: larger than what?
 SuggestedRemedy
 with a larger loss budget than 10GBASE-BR40.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 1 SC 1.4.52d P18 L24 # 219
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Please do not use '+' as part of the PHY name, due to its position it is resulting in the string '+-' in PHY names.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please clarify the difference between the 40 and 40+ PHYs and based on the difference choose an additional letter to add after the '40' separated with a dash. This would be of the format 10GBASE-BR40-X, with a 10GBASE-BR40-X-D and 10GBASE-BR40-X-U where 'X' is the chosen letter.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 1 SC 1.4.52d P18 L25 # 70
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Concerns about readability of "+-" in 10GBASE-BR40+-D and 10GBASE-B40+-U PMD names.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Propose to replace "10GBASE-BR40+" with something else. Perhaps "10GBASE-BR40X", where X is a letter A-Z (perhaps "L" for "Legacy" or "Long"). Perhaps "10GBASE-BR40-X", where X is a number (i.e. in the format of 40GBASE-LR4-6 found in P802.3cu).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 1 SC 1.4.91d P18 L23 # 233
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 I believe that introducing a new symbol other than dash (and dash has been bad enough) will be problematical over the long haul in the popular press editorial sense.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from "25GBASE-BR40+" to "25GBASE-BR40plus" here and throughout the draft.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 1 SC 1.4.128 P18 L45 # 93
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Insert point is wrong.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The insert should be after 1.4.128aac which was inserted by IEEE Std 802.3ca-20xx. Inserts are then numbered 1.4.128aad through 1.4.128aag.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 1 SC 1.4.128d P19 L5 # 234
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 I believe that introducing a new symbol other than dash (and dash has been bad enough) will be problematical over the long haul in the popular press editorial sense.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change from "50GBASE-BR40+" to "50GBASE-BR40plus" here and throughout the draft.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P21 L16 # 151
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Missing line feed
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "...10GBASE-BR10-D" to "...10GBASE-BR10-D"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P21 L16 # 20
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Seems like "... " should be in a separate line above?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix the location of "..."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P22 L1 # 166
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 All the other -D Phys are OLT
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change ONU to OLT
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P22 L14 # 21
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix line spacing in 30.5.1.1.2
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P23 L8 # 40
 Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Editing instruction lists modifying amendments to Table 45-3, and includes "802.3xx" which does not exist. Additionally, omits at least 802.3cg-2019 and 802.3ch-2020, which modified this table. Since most amendments modify this table, the 'modified by' list is generally left out.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete "(as modified by ... 802.3xx)" from editing instruction
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P23 L8 # 112
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Incorrect editor instructions. Cb and cd didn't make any changes that impact the changed rows in cp.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make editor instruction: Change Table 45-3 as shown (unchanged rows not shown):
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P23 L8 # 152
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 What is IEEE Std 802.3xx?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete 802.3xx or correct it to the right amendment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P23 L15 # 113
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 missing rows above and below changed rows to show there are rows above and below that aren't changed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add row above and below the contented rows. "straddle" each row then add an "..." - See 45.2.1 in the 802.3 FM template for example.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.7 P25 L18 # 42
 Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 130.6.8, 71.6.10, 113.4.2.2, and 137.8.9 should be marked as external references in Table 45-9. Similarly for 130.6.9, 71.6.11, 89.5.9, and 137.8.10 in Table 45-10, and 130.6.5, 71.6.6, 113.4.2.3, and 137.8.10 in Table 45-12
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change references not in the draft to externals
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.6 P24 L12 # 115
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 missing rows above and below changed rows to show there are rows above and below that aren't changed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add row above and below the contented rows. "straddle" each row then add an "..." - See 45.2.1 in the 802.3 FM template for example.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.7.1 P25 L20 # 240
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 This very long table can be laid out better
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the left column wider, at least wide enough to fit the contents, as done for Table 45-12. The right column could be narrower.
 Also Table 45-10.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.7 P25 L7 # 41
 Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Tables 45-9 and 45-10 are commonly modified, modifying amendments are generally left out. However, if they are to be included, at least 802.3cg and 802.3ch which modified these tables should be included
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete "(as modified by ...)" from editing instructions for Tables 45-9 and 45-10
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.7.1 P25 L20 # 8
 Anslow, Pete Self
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Table 45-9 and Table 45-10 do not include "and" in any of the existing rows (although Table 45-12 does).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete all instances of "and" from Table 45-9 and Table 45-10
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.16 P24 L4 # 153
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 I thought 802.3ct was amending 802.3cp
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete reference to 802.3ct and review the changes indicated in the bit description in Table 45-7. Deleting both 11xxxx and 1111001 does not seem right.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.27b P31 L7 # 22
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Title says "25G" and all entries show "50GBASE"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix the table title to say "50G PMA/PMD"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.27a P28 L33 # 167
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 All the other bits are RO this one is blank.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make it RO
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1 P33 L5 # 116
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The editorial instruction includes (as changed by P802.3ca) which is not the correct way to write this.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: (as changed by P802.3ca)
 To: (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.27a.4 P29 L25 # 168
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 25GBASE-BR20-U should not be described in a section titles 25GBASE-BR40-D and it needs its own bit.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make this paragraph a different section with its own bit and title and renumber the rest of the sub-clauses.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1 P33 L5 # 154
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change P802.3ca to IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change P802.3ca to IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 56 SC 56.1 P33 L14 # 117
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 This should show the changes made by ca.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: and Figure 56-5 for EPoC topologies
 To: Figure 56-5 for EPoC topologies, and
 Figure 56-5a for Nx25G-EPON topologies.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1 P33 L38 # 241
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 Wrong PCS; wrong font. As the lower sublayers are rate-specific too, I don't know that we
 need to give that detail in the figure.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either change to 10GBASE-R PCS 25GBASE-R PCS 50GBASE-R PCS, in the usual font,
 and make the stacks of boxes wider,
 or change to PCS PCS PCS, in the usual font.
 Also Fig 157-1.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.1 P34 L1 # 23
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 What does text in {} mean?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Use known designation for text and editorial instructions
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.1.1 P34 L18 # 24
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 External references (not live) are to be marked in Forest Green - "as defined in >>66.1<<"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Multiple locations in the draft - please scrub accordingly.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.1.1 P34 L18 # 43
 Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 66.1 and 66.2 (line 20) should be external cross references
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change references not in the draft to externals
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.1.1 P34 L21 # 242
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Too much "support"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 sublayers are used to support a bit rate
 to
 sublayers are used for a bit rate
 four times
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 56 SC 56.1.1.1 P34 L24 # 243
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Should mention the FEC sublayers too where they are required for all variants.
 SuggestedRemedy
 25GBASE-R PCS, RS-FEC, and PMA sublayers
 50GBASE-R PCS, RS-FEC, and PMA sublayers
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.2.2 P34 L44 # 118
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 ca was approved in 2020
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 802.3ca-YYYY
 To 802.3ca-2020
 Also P36L1
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.2.1 P34 L40 # 61
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Subclause number repeated twice
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete an extra "56.1.2.1"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P35 L9 # 26
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 None of the lists added in 56.1.3 need to be lettered, we do not reference them.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Convert lettered lists into bulleted ones
 Other locations include page / line: 39/31,
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.2.1 P34 L40 # 25
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Seems like subclause number is doubled?
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove one instance of 56.1.2.1
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P37 L # 246
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 RS-FEC is missing. Maybe EEE is missing.
 SuggestedRemedy
 OAM
 EEE
 100BASE-LX10 PMD
 ...
 10GBASE-R PCS
 25GBASE-R RS-FEC 108
 10GBASE-R PMA
 10GBASE-BRx PMD
 25GBASE-R PCS
 10GBASE-R RS-FEC 108
 25GBASE-R PMA
 25GBASE-BRx PMD
 50GBASE-R PCS
 50GBASE-R RS-FEC 134
 50GBASE-R PMA ...
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P37 L # 245
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Order: should go down the layers. Compare Table 44-1, Table 105-2, Table 131-3 and several others
 SuggestedRemedy
 10GBASE-R PCS
 10GBASE-R PMA
 10GBASE-BRx PMD
 25GBASE-R PCS
 25GBASE-R PMA
 25GBASE-BRx PMD
 50GBASE-R PCS
 50GBASE-R PMA
 50GBASE-BRx PMD
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P37 L18 # 244
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Sublayer names
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 10GBASE-BRx PMA to 10GBASE-R PMA
 10GBASE-BRx PCS to 10GBASE-R PCS
 25GBASE-BRx PMA to 25GBASE-R PMA
 25GBASE-BRx PCS to 25GBASE-R PCS
 50GBASE-BRx PMA to 50GBASE-R PMA
 50GBASE-BRx PCS to 50GBASE-R PCS
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P37 L21 # 203
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The title for Clause 49 is 'Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) for 64B/66B, type 10GBASE-R' therefore the text in the Clause 49 heading in Table 56-2 should read '10GBASE-R PCS'. This matches the existing Clause 66 column which is labelled '1000BASE-X PCS, PMA' even though the PCS is used to from the 1000BASE-LX10 and 1000BASE-BX10 PHYs. A similar change needs to be made to the Clause 107 and 133 column headings.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change '10GBASE-BRx PCS' to read '10GBASE-R PCS' for the Clause 49 column heading, '25GBASE-BRx PCS' to read '25GBASE-R PCS' for the Clause 107 heading, and '50GBASE-BRx PCS' to read '50GBASE-R PCS' for the Clause 133 heading.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P37 L21 # 204

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The title for Clause 51 is 'Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer, type Serial' therefore the text in the Clause 51 heading in Table 56-2 should read '10GBASE-R PMA'. This matches the existing Clause 66 column which is labelled '1000BASE-X PCS, PMA' even though the PCS is used to from the 1000BASE-LX10 and 1000BASE-BX10 PHYs. A similar change needs to be made to the Clause 109 and 153 column headings.

SuggestedRemedy

Change '10GBASE-BRx PMA' to read '10GBASE-R PMA' for the Clause 51 column heading, '25GBASE-BRx PMA' to read '25GBASE-R PMA' for the Clause 109 heading, and '50GBASE-BRx PMA' to read '50GBASE-R PMA' for the Clause 133 heading.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 56 SC 56.1.4 P37 L50 # 27

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter

Comment Type E Comment Status X

56.1.4 is empty

SuggestedRemedy

Remove it please

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 78 SC 78.1.4 P L # 247

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE

Need to modify the EEE clause

SuggestedRemedy

Modify Table 78-1 to show which PHYs may optionally support EEE. For each, footnote b applies: The deep sleep mode of EEE is not supported for this PHY.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 108 SC 108 P L # 248

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE

Clause 108, Reed-Solomon Forward Error Correction (RS-FEC) sublayer for 25GBASE-R PHYs, will need some modifications for its new use as a 10G FEC.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC P39 L1 # 4

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The term BiDi is used extensively throughout the document, but there isn't a clear definition, nor is it found anywhere else in the existing standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider if BiDi definition should be added to clause 1.4

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157 P38 L1 # 28

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Title missing "and" when listing speeds

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Introduction to 10 Gbps, 25 Gbps, and 50 Gbps BiDi PHYs"

Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 157 SC 157 P39 L1 # 9
 Anslow, Pete Self
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 802.3 uses Gb/s rather than Gbps. See:
http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG_tools/editorial/requirements/words.html#bps
 which states: "only Mb/s and Gb/s should be used"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the title of Clause 157 to "Introduction to 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, 50 Gb/s BiDi PHYs"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157 P39 L1 # 249
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 802.3 doesn't use Gbps
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to Gb/s (3 times)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.1 P38 L11 # 29
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Extra "-" in Net-work
 SuggestedRemedy
 Scrub the draft, there are multiple instances where likely import from Word resulted in
 spurious "-" characters
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.1 P39 L10 # 144
 Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 the term "BiDi" is used repeatedly throughout the document as an abbreviation for
 Bidirectional. However, it is not defined as an abbreviation in the base standard.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "BiDi" as an abbreviation for "Bidirectional" in Clause 1.5
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.1 P39 L11 # 250
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Net-work
 SuggestedRemedy
 Network
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.1 P39 L11 # 196
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 ... Net-work ...' should read '... Network ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.1 P39 L11 # 71
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Typo "Net-work"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Net-work" with "Network"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 157 SC 157.1.1 P39 L23 # 197
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The PMA sublayer is listed twice, yet the PMD sublayer is missing. In addition the list ends with '... Coding Sublayer (PCS) sublayers and ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest the text '... Physical Medium Attachment (PMA), Physical Medium Attachment (PMA), forward error correction (FEC), and Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) sublayers ...' be changed to read '... Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS), forward error correction (FEC), physical medium attachment (PMA), physical medium dependent (PMD) sublayers ...'.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.1 P39 L26 # 198
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 ... model are shown in Table 157-1.' should read '... model are shown in Figure 157-1'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.2 P38 L31 # 30
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Seems like "see Clause XXX" should be in (), or at least preceded with a comma
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add comma before "see" in lines 31, 33, and 35
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.2 P39 L26 # 223
 Trowbridge, Steve Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Reference to Table 157-1 should be reference to Figure 157-1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.2 P39 L27 # 251
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 are specified in 44.1.3 (for 10 Gb/s), 105.1.2 (for 25 Gb/s), and 131.1.2 (for 50 Gb/s) apply - not grammatical.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete "are" or "apply"?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.2 P39 L28 # 169
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Sentence isn't correct (has two verbs)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete "apply" on the end of the sentence.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 157 SC 157.1.2 P41 L34 # 222
 Trowbridge, Steve Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The wide rectangle at the top of the XGMII should be against the line for the bottom of the rectangle for the Reconciliation Sublayer, as are those for the other two rates.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L39 # 253
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Within this clause the Multi-Gigabit Ethernet Bidi PHY device use the following nomenclature.
 SuggestedRemedy
 For Multi-Gigabit Ethernet Bidi PHYs, the following nomenclature is used.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P38 L40 # 31
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 use the formatting for naming nomenclature defined in 802.3ca - it is way more readable that way
 SuggestedRemedy
 See 141.2.6 PMD naming for reference
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L39 # 5
 Baggett, Tim Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 There are six occurrences of "Bidi" when I suspect the intention is "BiDi".
 P39 L39
 P44 L11
 P44 L17
 P44 L27
 P44 L38
 P44 L45
 SuggestedRemedy
 Search for "Bidi" and replace with "BiDi"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L37 # 252
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Space before "Nomenclature"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L41 # 155
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "rr" is hard to decipher in the nomenclature
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider changing "rr" to "r"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L47 # 221
 Trowbridge, Steve Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The "x" should go as the next element of the list other than BR. The text describing x should retain the hanging indent instead of wrapping back to the next line.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L47 # 63
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 In Sentence "Bidirectional 64B/66B encoding.x refers to the PHY reach; 10 (10 km), 20 (20 km), 40 (40 km), or 40+ (legacy 40 km)" it is not clear what "legacy 40 km" means. Is legacy 40 km different than a "new 40 km"?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either strike the "(legacy 40 km)" or add an explanation of what that means.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L47 # 254
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 encoding.x refers
 SuggestedRemedy
 encoding.
 x refers
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L47 # 75
 Laubach, Mark Self
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 For readability, suggest a tab
 SuggestedRemedy
 add tabs to align "(40 km)..." under "Bidirectional"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L47 # 143
 Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 the variable "x" and its associated text is on the same line as the variable "BR"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the variable "x" and its associated text a separate line
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L48 # 215
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 It is not clear what is mean by '40+ (legacy 40 km)', perhaps it is in reference to the optical budget.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please provide a description of the technical difference is between '40' and '40+'.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L53 # 255
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 GMII
 SuggestedRemedy
 XGMII
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P39 L53 # 170
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 GMII is for 1G which isn't part of this project.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change GMII to XGMII
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P40 L5 # 44
 Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 All phy names in Tables 157-1, 157-2, 157-3, and 157-4 have an extra hyphen (e.g., 10G-BASE-BR10-D should be 10GBASE-BR10-D as it is elsewhere).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change names in Table 157-1 to remove hyphen after speed
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P40 L5 # 10
 Anslow, Pete Self
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The draft contains 52 instances of "xxG-BASE", which should all be "xxGBASE"
 The first example is in Table 157-1 where "10G-BASE-BR10-D" should be "10GBASE-BR10-D"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change all 52 instances of "xxG-BASE" to "xxGBASE"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P40 L5 # 119
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 There are "-" in the names after 10G/25G/50G here that aren't in the rest of the document.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the "-" after the "G" in each of the names.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P40 L5 # 257
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 This table is too long (spills over onto the next page) and too repetitive.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a sentence of introduction including the common information (over one single-mode fiber), and instead of one Description column with a sentence in each cell, use columns for rate, position (OLT or ONU), coding, reach, and clause reference.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P40 L5 # 256
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 fi-ber
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the right hand column wider, set the hyphenation fragment length to at least 3.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P41 L22 # 200
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Move the four vertical dots on the right hand side of the layer diagram so that the lowest aligns with the top of the LLC as they do on the left had side.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P40 L12 # 199
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The description of the 10G-BASE-BR40-D and 10G-BASE-BR40+-D both read '10 Gb/s OLT PHY using 10GBASE-R encoding over one single-mode fiber, with reach up to at least 40 km (see Clause 158)'. This is also the case for the other five BR40 and BR40+ PHYs. As their descriptions are identical it makes it very difficult for a user to decide which of these two PHYs to select.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Provide a distinct description for BR40 and BR40+ PHYs.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P41 L37 # 145
 Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Figure 157-1 uses "10GBASE-X PCS", "25GBASE-X PCS", and "50GBASE-X PCS" in the architectural diagrams, which are not the correct names for these PCS layers. However, the PCS sections referenced in Table 157-2, 157-3, and 157-4 have them correct.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "10GBASE-X PCS" to "10GBASE-R PCS", "25GBASE-X PCS" to "25GBASE-R PCS", and "50GBASE-X PCS" to "50GBASE-R PCS"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P41 L1 # 258
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 If the table spills over onto a second page, the continuation header should say (continued) in italics.
 SuggestedRemedy
 There's a correct way to do this.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P41 L37 # 156
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 These are BASE-R PCSes
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change BASE-X to BASE-R in Figure 157-1
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P41 L37 # 202
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The PCS used for all three PHY speeds in a 'BASE-R PCS', not a 'BASE-X PCS'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that the text '10GBASE-X PCS' be changed to read '10GBASE-R PCS',
 '25GBASE-X PCS' be changed to read '25GBASE-R PCS' and '50GBASE-X PCS' be
 changed to read '50GBASE-R PCS'.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P41 L40 # 211
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The MDI is part of the Physical Layer of the OSI reference model, see IEEE Std 802.3-
 2018 figure 1-1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move the dotted line from the bottom of the Physical Layer to the bottom of the PMD box to
 be from the bottom of the Physical Layer to the bottom of the MDI box.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.3 P41 L47 # 32
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 GMII is defined in Figure 157-1, but not used in the figure. XGMII, 25GMII, and 50GMII are
 used and not defined
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix the xMII definition issues
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L5 # 33
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 In IEEE 802.3 standard, we do not use "must" except for specific cases outlined in Style
 Manual
 SuggestedRemedy
 "PHY types must meet the requirements" - change to "shall"?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L9 # 206
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 10G-BASE-BRx' should read '10GBASE-BRx'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L9 # 259
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 10G-BASE
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L13 # 76
 Laubach, Mark Self
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "158" is indicated forest green, yet it is included in this addendum. Same respective issue on line 41 with "159".
 SuggestedRemedy
 change clause numbers included in this addendum to active cross references.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L13 # 120
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Clause 158 is in this draft.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the 158 in the heading a crosslink.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L13 # 34
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Clause 158 should not be marked in gree, but linked live
 SuggestedRemedy
 Same applies to Tables 157-3, and 157-4 for Clauses 159, and 160, respectively
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L19 # 260
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 As it's Fast Wake only, EEE is above PCS the PCS at least; I believe it's above the RS.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move the EEE column to between "Nomenclature" and RS.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L20 # 201
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 As the title for Clause 49 is 'Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) for 64B/66B, type 10GBASE-R', and since the 'PCS' column for Table 157-3 and 157-4 are labelled '25GBASE-R PCS' and '50GABSE-R PCS' respectively, please change the Table 157-2 'PCS' column to '10GBASE-R PCS'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that the text '64B/66B PCS' be changed to read '10GBASE-R PCS'.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L20 # 205
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Clause 46 specifies the XGMII, not the GMII.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the text 'GMII' to read 'XGMII' in the right hand Clause 46 column.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L36 # 235
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 The way Table 157-3 is split across the page break is, at a minimum, confusing. It needs to be controlled appropriately.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Keep the table on a single page or pro-actively control the row split at a logical point with new column headings on the new page. Change the title on the 2nd piece to Table 157-3 (continued).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L36 # 207
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 25G-BASE-BRx' should read '25GBASE-BRx'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P43 L18 # 208
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 50G-BASE-BRx' should read '50GBASE-BRx'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P42 L41 # 121
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Clause 159 is in this draft.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the 159 in the heading a crosslink.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P43 L21 # 123
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Clause 160 is in this draft.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the 160 in the heading a crosslink.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P43 L1 # 122
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The table title needs (continued) in it.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See instructions in 200.1.1.1.1 in the 802.3 FM template.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.2 P44 L1 # 236
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 The definition of "syblayers" is unknown to me.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "syblayers" to "sublayers."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.1.4 P43 L1 # 209
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 25G-BASE-BRx' should read '25GBASE-BRx'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.2 P44 L1 # 261
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 syblayers
 SuggestedRemedy
 sublayers
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 157 SC 157.2.1 P44 L11 # 45
 Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Is it BiDi or Bidi...?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change Bidi to BiDi on P44, Lines 11, 17, 24, 38, 45, and page 39 line 39
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.2.2 P44 L15 # 214
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Suggest that '... the MII ...' should be changed to read '... the xMII ...' here and on line 17.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.2.2 P44 L16 # 65
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The draft uses "sublayer" everywhere except in three places on page 44, where it uses "sub-layer"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove hyphens in "sub-layer" on lines 16 (two ninstances) and line
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.2.3 P44 L10 # 263
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 specific RS and xMII specified
 SuggestedRemedy
 particular RS and xMII specified
 or, delete the second "specified"
 Also in 157.2.2, 157.2.3, 157.2.4 and 157.2.5.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.2.3 P44 L11 # 264
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 for a given ... is given
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "for a given" to "for each".
 Also in 157.2.2, 157.2.3, 157.2.4 and 157.2.5.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.2.3 P44 L22 # 262
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 Now that FEC is required for some PMDs, "An FEC sublayer is available for all Multi-Gigabit BiDi PHYs" is too weak.
 SuggestedRemedy
 An FEC sublayer is optional for 10G-BASE-BR10 and 10G-BASE-BR40, and required for all other Multi-Gigabit BiDi PHYs.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 157 SC 157.2.4 P44 L35 # 237
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 The statement "The PMA also may provide an observable electrical interface for the 25GAUI or 50GAUI chip-to-chip 35 (C2C) or chip-to-module (C2M)." has no meaning within the scope of the standard. Anything that is not forbidden in the standard may be provided.
SuggestedRemedy
 If optional standardized test points are specified or called out then say so. If that is not the case then delete the text.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 157 SC 157.3 P45 L25 # 124
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Either PHYs should be possessive or the s should be removed.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change: PHYs sublayers
 To: PHY's sublayers
 Or To: PHY sublayers
 Also on L27 and L29
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 157 SC 157.4 P45 L18 # 238
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 I believe that PAUSE operation is not the only reason that demands that there be an upper bound on the propagation delays through the network. I am given to understand that both maximum and minimum transit time need to be specified to support TSN.
SuggestedRemedy
 Generalize the reasons for specifying delay and include specification of minimum delay as well.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 157 SC 157.4 P45 L25 # 72
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 Currently, the sentence reads "The maximum delay ... are specified". This is improper grammar.
SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed to replace "The maximum delay for" with "The maximum delay values for".
 Another alternative is "The maximum delay constraints for".
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 157 SC 157.4 P45 L25 # 265
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X** LATE
 44.3 will need modification to include FEC delay
SuggestedRemedy
 Modify Table 44-2.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 157 SC 157.6 P45 L43 # 66
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 "All members of the Multi-Gigabit Ethernet BiDi PHY family are required to include PCS registers or variable equivalents that:
 1) indicate the receive status of the PCS (see 49.2.14.1 and 45.2.3.15.1), and
 2) disable the PHYs transmitter(see 45.2.1.8)."
 As described, both OLT and ONU will disable the transmitter. This is not what should happen.
SuggestedRemedy
 The setting to use silent mode must be pre-configured before a device is connected to a network. Using PCS registers or variables is an implementation choice irrelevant here. It is better to introduce Active/Passive Mode for all BRx PHY. If BRx is pre-configured to be in Active Mode, it does not disable the TX. In Passive Mode, the TX disabled until a valid Rx is confirmed. (see 57.2.9 for a similar issue resolved for OAM peers)
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 157 SC 157.6 P45 L45 # 213
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 I'm not sure if it is the case that 'The access network ... by nature, are less well controlled than other telecommunications networks.', but I don't see a need to provide this text.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the entire first paragraph of subclause 157.6 with the text 'Silent Start is provided by Multi-Gigabit Ethernet BiDi ONU PHYs to reduce the likelihood of disruption to established services if a Multi-Gigabit Ethernet BiDi ONU PHY is inadvertently attached to a Point-to-Multipoint network.'
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.6 P45 L46 # 212
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 If my comment to replace this paragraph is not accepted, suggest that '... are, by nature, less well ...' should be changed to read '... are, by their nature, less well ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.6 P45 L52 # 35
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 A hidden "shall" in "All members of the Multi-Gigabit Ethernet BiDi PHY family are required to include PCS registers"
 SuggestedRemedy
 convert this text into "shall" statement if this is intended as a requirement. Otherwise, soften the language.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.6 P46 L1 # 36
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Missing space in "transmitter(see)"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add missing space
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.6 P46 L10 # 67
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 "Once transmission is enable it should not be disabled until the receive signal is lost."
 SuggestedRemedy
 This sentence is not intended as an optional requirement and no corresponding PICS exists. Also, a typo in "is enable".
 Rephrase as "Once transmission is enabled, it is not be disabled until the receive signal is lost."
 A better explanation would be this:
 "Once transmission is enabled, it remains enabled until the optical receive power is lost, even if the PCS detects the received signal fault."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 157 SC 157.6 P46 L10 # 37
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Is this intended to be an optional requirement: "Once transmission is enable it should not be disabled until the receive signal is lost."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add to PICS if intended, or change the language to avoid "should"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 158 SC 158 P L # 181
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Requirements for interoperability between the various PMDs are missing. See latest version of P802.3cu D2.2. Also for 159 and 160.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add requirements for interoperability for various PMDs in 158, 159 and 160
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 158 SC 158 P46 L2 # 163
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 10GBASE-BR40+ is a bad name and 10GBASE-BR40+-U is even worse
 SuggestedRemedy
 Choose something else e.g. 10GBASE-BR40p, 10GBASE-BR50
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 158 SC 158 P47 L1 # 62
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 PMD name 50GBASE-BR40+-D is confusing as it reads like BR40 "plus/minus" D.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider the following PMD names instead:
 50GBASE-BR41 - "BR41" PMD class slightly better than class "BR40".
 50GBASE-BR40XB - "XB" for "eXtended Budget"
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 158 SC 158.1 P47 L7 # 186
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 Despite the fact that in the past for 10G PHYs reference was made to "baseband medium" in more recent optical PMDs this term has not been used, as in new clauses 159 and 160. Also no reference is made to "serial" in 159.1 and 160.1, so it shouldn't be needed in 158.1. Thus comments also applies to 159.1 and 160.1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make wording consistent with 159.1 and 160.1
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 158 SC 158.1 P47 L8 # 114
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 typo
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 10BASE-BR10
 To: 10GBASE-BR10
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 158 SC 158.1 P47 L17 # 266
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X** **LATE**
 Not the usual wording
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "defined in 45" to "defined in Clause 45, or equivalent"
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 158 SC 158.1 P47 L17 # 46
 Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "defined in 45" - the cross reference should read "Clause 45" (same thing in 159.1 and 160.1)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change cross reference to read "Clause 45"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.1 P47 L32 # 267
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Order of sublayers should be top to bottom.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move the row "108 RS-FEC Optional Required" to between PCS and PMA (as it is in 159 and 160).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.1 P47 L25 # 126
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 All the "Associated clause"s in the table are not included in the draft and should be external.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the character tag on "46" (2x), "47", "49", "51", "108" to External which will turn them green.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.1 P47 L34 # 125
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Clause 108 should be marked as an external link as it isn't in this draft.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the character tag on "Clause 108" to External which will turn it green.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.1 P47 L32 # 210
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 According to Table 158-1, Clause 108 RS—FEC is optional for both a 10GBASE-BR10 and 10GBASE-BR40 PHY. It is not clear that a 10GBASE-BR10 PHY that implements the optional RS-FEC sublayer can interoperate with a 10GBASE-BR10 PHY that does not implement the optional RS-FEC sublayer. Since the IEEE P802.3cp nomenclature doesn't provide a way to indicate if a 10GBASE-BR10 or a 10GBASE-BR40 PHY does or does not implement optional FEC, it appears that user has no way to know if a 10GBASE-BR10 or a 10GBASE-BR40 PHY implements RS-FEC or not. This seems to mean that a user won't know if one particular 10GBASE-BR10 PHY will interoperate with another 10GBASE-BR10 PHY, similarly for any two 10GBASE-BR40 PHYs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 If a 10GBASE-BR10 (or 10GBASE-BR40) PHY that implements the optional RS-FEC sublayer can't interoperate with a 10GBASE-BR10 (or 10GBASE-BR40) PHY that does not implement the optional RS-FEC sublayer, add a way to indicate if the optional RS-FEC sublayer is implemented to the IEEE P802.3cp nomenclature.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.1 P47 L34 # 77
 Laubach, Mark Self
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Cross reference not colored in table footnote.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Clause 108" for forest green.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot c

CI 158 SC 158.1 P47 L34 # 157
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Is it really adequate to just say "Clause 108 describes an FEC for 25 Gb/s PHY, but the same scheme can be applied to 10 Gb/s PHYs"?

SuggestedRemedy
 Consider opening up clause 108 to explain how it works with 10G PMDs

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.1 P48 L14 # 225
 Trowbridge, Steve Nokia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 I'm not aware there is an RS-FEC for 10GBASE-R PHYs

SuggestedRemedy
 I suspect you may have intended Clause 74 Firewire FEC. Provide an appropriate reference to the correct FEC type and clause reference

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.1 P47 L34 # 171
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The footnote says the 108 RS-FEC is described for 25Gb/s. It should not be left to the reader to work out how to apply it to 10Gb/s

SuggestedRemedy
 Bring appropriate edits to Clause108 into the document. E.g. The delays in ns are probably wrong. The introduction would need work etc. Whether this RS FEC meets the delay constraints for 10G networks in Clause 44 should also be investigated if this has not already been done.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.1.1 P47 L45 # 47
 Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The BER is specified to be at the "PHY service interface" - I can't find any other reference to a "PHY service interface" in this draft. Clauses 58, 59, and 75 use the term as well, but it is undefined. Clause 113 (25GBASE-T) defines its PHY service interface as the 25GMII (see 113.1.2). However, this clause is only specifying a PMD sublayer, and references a PMD service interface elsewhere - as just a PMD, Clause 158 cannot specify a BER at the xMII. Is the PMD service interface meant? (otherwise this requirement needs to go in the PMA, and something needs to be partitioned to the PMD)

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "PHY service interface" to "PMD service interface"

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.1 P48 L13 # 224
 Trowbridge, Steve Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Sloppy alignment of rectangles for XGMII, PCS, RS-FEC in Figure 158-1

SuggestedRemedy
 Fix it

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.1.1 P48 L1 # 268
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Blank line

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove

Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 158 SC 158.1.1 P48 L30 # 269
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Blank lines
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.5.1 P49 L37 # 64
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Per IEE style manual, the word "will" is deprecated.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the sentences containing "will" to use present tense at the following locations:
 P49-L37
 P56-L20
 P56-L21
 P68-L2
 P86-L37
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.5.2 P49 L40 # 78
 Laubach, Mark Self
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 PMD_UNITDATA.request is neither defined or referenced in this draft. Same for PMD_UNITDATA.indication on line 49.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either provide the definitions of these functions in this draft or a cross reference to where they are defined.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.5.2 P49 L44 # 79
 Laubach, Mark Self
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 and line 50. The constant "ONE" is not defined in this draft. There are only these two occurrences.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Definitions should be fixed when implementing the proposed change for PMD_UNITDATA.request and PMD_UNITDATA.indication.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.5.6 P51 L11 # 127
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 This sentence isn't clear. What's optional, the function? Th PMD? The optical transmitter?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: PMDs compliant with this clause shall include the PMD_global_transmit_disable function which allows the optical transmitter to be disabled is optional.
 To: Change: PMDs compliant with this clause shall include the PMD_global_transmit_disable function which allows the optical transmitter to be disabled.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.5.6 P51 L11 # 48
 Zimmerman, George ADI, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 It seems the font size in 158.5.6 has gotten smaller.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct font size in 158.5.6 to be consistent with the rest of the draft
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 158 SC 158.5.6 P51 L11 # 73
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Small font in paragraphs in this sub-clause. It looks different than surrounding sub-clauses.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Check the font and paragraph spacing in this sub-clause.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6 P L # 187
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 It is very confusing why 2 PMDs 40km and 40+km are specified to satisfy a single 40km objective, also considering that in Table 158-5 only one 40km distance is given. It is also not clear what "+" refers to. If the 40+km spec is technically and economically feasible, delete the 40km spec. This comment also applies to 159 and 160.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove one of 40km/40+km and create a single 40km specification optimized for lowest cost. This can be done via a single power budget with 2 distance options as in Clause 114 for 25GBASE-ER. Applies to 158, 159 and 160
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6 P L # 188
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 For several parameters in Table 158-6, 158-7 and 158-8 there is a "zero" after the decimal point. Remove the decimal point and "zero" after it.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the decimal point and "zero" after it for those parameters with integer values
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6 P51 L45 # 270
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 There should be something about the possibilities (or not) for interoperation between the different grades of PMD. Also for Clause 159. The text in 160 needs attention; a minimum insertion loss would be needed, I think.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See P802.3cu for examples of how to do this.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6.1 P52 L19 # 271
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Blank line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6.1 P52 L29 # 218
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Doesn't the -D PHY Tx centre wavelength range have to match the -U PHY Rx centre wavelength range, and vice versa? As an example, the 10GBASE-BRx-D PHY Tx centre wavelength (range) is 1320 to 1340 nm in Table 158-6 (page 52, line 29) which is the same as the 10GBASE-BRx-D PHY Rx centre wavelength (range) of 1320 to 1340 nm in Table 158-7 (page 53, line 24), while the 10GBASE-BRx-U PHY Rx centre wavelength (range) is 1260 to 1280 nm in Table 158-7 (page 53, line 26). This doesn't seem correct.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct here, and for other PHYs, if necessary.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 158 SC 158.6.1 P52 L48 # 80
 Laubach, Mark Self
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 and line 50. The unit cells are blanks for eye mask. Same for Table 159–6 on page 71, Table 159–7 on page 72.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert "U" for the Unit value in the table for these two rows (or other appropriate unit value).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6.2 P53 L49 # 273
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 Extinction ratio: 3.5 dB is OK for 10GBASE-L, 3 dB for 10GBASE-E, 3 for 25GBASE-LR, 4 for 25GBASE-ER, why would 10GBASE-BR40 need 5.5 dB? Is this a typo?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Reduce to lower than 10GBASE-BR20 and 10GBASE-BR40+, e.g. 4.5 or 4 dB.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6.1 P52 L49 # 272
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 Definition B is preferable
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest remove the obsolete transmitter eye mask definition A
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6.3 P54 L14 # 192
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 It doesn't make sense to have 15 dB for 20km and 18 dB for 40km. 15 dB would rather be a channel loss for a 30km channel as in clause 114 for 25GBASE-ER. Also applies to 159 and 160
 SuggestedRemedy
 Define an appropriate channel insertion loss for 20km, e.g. 11 or 12 dB, and optimize power values in Table 158-6 and Table 158-7. Also in 159 and 160
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6.2 P53 L40 # 182
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 In latest optical PMD specifications no longer "Receive electrical 3 dB upper cutoff frequency (max)" is included because it cannot be measured at TP3 and is part of the implementation
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove row for "Receive electrical 3 dB upper cutoff frequency (max)"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6.3 P54 L14 # 191
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Channel insertion loss numbers do not add up using the attenuation coefficient and the allocation for connector and splice loss of 2 dB. This comment is related to another comment requesting a change in attenuation coefficient. Compare with other recent optical PMDs and make numbers consistent between Clauses 158, 159 and 160.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make numbers consistent for channel insertion loss in Clauses 158, 159 and 160
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 158 SC 158.6.3 P54 L21 # 81
 Laubach, Mark Self
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Suggest a cross reference for table footnote c.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a cross reference to CL158.11.1
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6.3 P54 L22 # 190
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 An attenuation of 0.4 dB/km is used, 0.43 dB/km in Table 159-8 and 0.5 dB/km in Table 160-6. Use a single value for all 3 clauses, preferably 0.5 dB/km to make the specifications consistent. Now they are all different. Applies similarly to 159 and 160
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change loss to 0.5 dB/km consistent with other recent PMDs like P802.3cu in 158 and 159 and with clause 160
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.6.3 P54 L22 # 189
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Reference is made to Table 52-11 and cross reference is missing. Change to Table 158-5 with cross reference
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to Table 158-5 with cross reference
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.8 P37 L50 # 277
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 The minimum dispersion for a 40 km PMD was set at zero in 52.9.10.2 because the 1550 nm signal was always at a longer wavelength than the dispersion zero. Here, we don't know that. All we know is that the 10GBASE-BRx-U signal is always at a shorter wavelength than the dispersion zero.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The table could be split for U and D. If not, the simple solution is:
 PMD Min Max
 BR10 min(f1(lambda), 0) max(f2(lambda), 0)
 BR0 min(f3(lambda), 0) max(f4(lambda), 0)
 BR40 min(f5(lambda), 0) max(f6(lambda), 0)
 where f1 2 3 4 6 are as now, f5 is 0.93.lambda.[1- (1324 / lambda)^4]
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.8 P54 L33 # 274
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 "Optical measurement requirements" this was copied from Clause 38 to 52 then 58-60 but later it was decided that this was incorrect; 802.3 is not a test spec, the measurements are not required, only the compliance is. So Clause 68 and later optical PMD clauses use different wording.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to:
 Definition of optical parameters and measurement methods
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 158 SC 158.8 P54 L37 # 275
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 "shall be conducted" isn't suitable wording, as there is no requirement to conduct the test. Here is example wording based on what has been used in 802.3ba and later projects:
 SuggestedRemedy
 Stressed receiver sensitivity shall be within the limits given in Table 158-7 if measured using the method defined by 52.9.9, with the additional condition that the transmitted optical signal and the reflectance of the optical link are at their maximum levels.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.8 P54 L38 # 276
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 What does "condition that the transmitted optical signal and ... should be at their maximum levels" mean?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should this say that the transmitter reflectance should be at maximum?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.8 P54 L47 # 178
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The dispersion equation provides too high values for current latest G.652 fibers. Value of 0.2325 should be 0.23. Applies also to 160.7
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 0.2325 to 0.23. In Clauses 158 and 160
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.8 P54 L49 # 179
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The dispersion equation provides too high values for current latest G.652 fibers. Value of 0.465 should be 0.46. Applies also to 160.7
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 0.465 to 0.46. In Clauses 158 and 160
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.8 P54 L51 # 180
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The dispersion equation provides too high values for current latest G.652 fibers. Value of 0.93 should be 0.92. Plus the negative dispersion is not zero but similar equation as for minimum dispersion for 20km but with 0.92 as a coefficient, Applies also to 160.7
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 0.93 to 0.92, plus add equation for minimum dispersion. In Clauses 158 and 160
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.9 P55 L6 # 184
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Safety requirements have recently been changed. Please refer to P802.3cu requirements. Also applies to 159 and 160
 SuggestedRemedy
 Implement safety requirements as in P802.3cu D2.2 151.9. Also in 159.8 and 160.8
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 158 SC 158.9 P55 L6 # 94

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

An indirect reference like this should not be used because of the difficulty of properly maintaining the document. Because the subclauses of 52.10 specifically reference port types, it could be argued that the requirements do not apply because clause 52 does not reference 10BASE-BRx port types.

SuggestedRemedy

A general safety subclause should copy P802.3cr 52.10.1, and the other clauses can copy the relevant subclauses of the latest revision or amendment that changes the text of the relevant subclause.

If indirection is still desired, the port type lists in Clause 52 need to be deleted (preferred) or expanded to include 10GBASE-BRx.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.10 P56 L4 # 216

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The vertical bar separating the top two rows of Table 158-10 'Fiber optic cabling (channel) characteristics' seem to exclude the fibre type and wavelength rows for 40+ which doesn't seem to be correct.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the vertical bar separating the top two rows of Table 158-10.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.10 P56 L7 # 217

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The operating distance (max) specified in Table 158-10 'Fiber optic cabling (channel) characteristics' is really a 'minimum operating distance (max)', for example a 10GBASE-BR20 PHY that can operate at 25 km is a conformant 10GBASE-BR20 PHY even though it exceeds the 20 km operating distance (max) specified in Table 158-10 for that PHY type. For the same reason a 10GBASE-BR40 PHY that can operate in excess of 40 km is a conformant 10GBASE-BR40 PHY. It is therefore not clear what the difference is between a 10GBASE-BR40 PHY and a 10GBASE-BR40+ PHY as it is conformant for both to operate in excess of 40 km.

SuggestedRemedy

Please clarify what the reach difference is between a 10GBASE-BR40 PHY and a 10GBASE-BR40+ PHY, as well as for the 25GBASE-BR40 PHY and a 25GBASE-BR40+ PHY and the 40GBASE-BR40 PHY and a 40GBASE-BR40+ PHY.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.10 P56 L12 # 193

Stassar, Peter Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Reference is made to Table 158-9 so that the reader will need to calculate maximum dispersion numbers themselves. Chromatic dispersion values at nominal wavelengths are likely to provide too optimistic estimates for worst case TDP (or TDECQ in 160). The applicable values at extreme wavelengths need to be in this Table as in other recent optical PMDs. Also applies to 159 and 160

SuggestedRemedy

Add chromatic dispersion numbers at extreme wavelengths for each PMD, e.g. as in Clause 114, Table 114-11 for 25GBASE-LR/ER and use similar Table formatting as for Clause 114.

Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 158 SC 158.10 P56 L25 # 278
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Blank line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.11.1 P56 L33 # 194
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 For recent optical PMDs, reference is made to ITU-T G.652 or G.657 fibers as in P802.3cu. Also applies to 159.10 and 160.10
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to fiber types in P802.3cu, D2.2, Subclause 151.11.1 "The optical fiber cable requirements are satisfied by cables containing ITU-T G.652.B (dispersion unshifted), type G.652.D (low water peak, dispersion unshifted), or type G.657.A1, or type G.657.A2 (bend insensitive) fibers...." or similar. In 158, 159 and 160
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.11.1 P56 L37 # 279
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X LATE
 This NOTE was written for a 1550 nm PMD.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Needs review because different wavelength here
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.12 P58 L1 # 280
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X LATE
 Subclause title is shorter than past clauses, which is an improvement. However, "for 158" is too abrupt.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the format of the cross-reference to 158 so that the title becomes: Protocol implementation conformance statement (PICS) proforma for Clause 158 or Protocol implementation conformance statement (PICS) proforma for Clause 158, Physical Medium Dependent (PMD) sublayer and medium, types 10GBASE-BR10, 10GBASE-BR20, 10GBASE-BR40, and 10GBASE-BR?? Similarly for 159.11 and 160.11.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.12.2.2 P58 L40 # 54
 Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Date is shown specifically and should be 202x as the draft isn't published
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "IEEE Std 802.3cp-2020" to "IEEE Std 802.3cp-202x"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.12.4.3 P61 L19 # 38
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Empty subclause or table anchor was moved?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix the table placement
 The same applies for 158.12.4.5, 158.12.4.8
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot c

CI 158 SC 158.12.4.3 P61 L19 # 82
 Laubach, Mark Self
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 This subclause looks empty. Same for 158.12.4.5 on the next page. And same for 158.12.4.8.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Adjust framemaker to have the tables flow properly with the headings.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.12.4.7 P62 L32 # 39
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Text format in 158.12.4.7 table is inconsistent with the rest of PICS tables
 SuggestedRemedy
 Align the formatting
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.12.4.3 P61 L21 # 55
 Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Headings are listed with the tables out of order. Table with BR101 should be before 158.12.4.4
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move Table with BR101 above the heading line for 158.12.4.4
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.12.4.8 P63 L3 # 57
 Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Headings are listed with the tables out of order. Table with ES1 should be before 158.12.4.9
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move Table with ES1 above the heading line for 158.12.4.9
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.12.4.5 P62 L3 # 56
 Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Headings are listed with the tables out of order. Table with BR401 should be before 158.1.4.6
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move Table with BR401 above the heading line for 158.12.4.6
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.12.4.8 P63 L8 # 58
 Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Clause 52 is currently part of P802.3cr. The referenced text needs to align with P802.3cr.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the Value/Comment field to "Conforms with J.2" where J.2 is green for external cross reference.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 158 SC 158.12.4.9 P63 L8 # 95
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 In E1 through E4, the subclause should not be pointing to something in clause 52.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Point to whatever the result is in clause 158 based on changes from other comments.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.12.4.9 P63 L8 # 96
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 E1 is not properly written. P802.3cr is eliminating references to IEC 60950-1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The PICs should point to J.2 which is being inserted by P802.3cr. If indirection is retained, the PICs could be written more like E1 in Clause 159 to eliminate a contradiction to P8023cr.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 158 SC 158.12.4.9 P64 L1 # 160
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Extra blank page
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete blank page
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 5.4 P69 L9 # 1
 DeAndrea, John Finisar/ II-VI
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Table 159-4, SIGNAL_DETECT value, FAIL, outlines (2) average powers for the PMD options, of (4) types, -10, -20, -40, and -40+
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggested change: add other (2) PMD types and comment for power levels
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 5.4 P69 L9 # 3
 DeAndrea, John Finisar/ II-VI
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Table 159-4 The Table shows a value of -20 dBm for 25GBASE-BR10 and -26 dBm for 25GBASE-BR-10. I believe there is a typo, because the PMD has (4) types, -BR10, -BR20, -BR40, and -BR40+
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest modifying, from "-26 dBm for 25GBASE-BR-10" to "-26 dBm for 25GBASE-BR-20"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.1 P65 L8 # 74
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 PMDS should have a lowercase "S".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "PMDS together" with "PMDs together"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 159 SC 159.3 P67 L5 # 161
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "1" and "pause_quantum" should be on the same line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert non-breaking space between "1" and "pause_quantum"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.5.4 P69 L13 # 172
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 It is inappropriate in a standard to say "and poor 25GBASE-BR20 is left to the wind".
 SuggestedRemedy
 This problem needs to be fixed to create an inter-operable standard.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.5.9 P70 L9 # 128
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 typo
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 25BASE-BRx-U
 To: 25GBASE-BRx-U
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.6 P73 L19 # 83
 Laubach, Mark Self
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 88.11.2.1 needs to be an indicated cross reference.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change text color to forest green
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.6.1 P71 L15 # 133
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX Inc
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Propose to revise Average launch power (min) for BR20 in Table 159-6 in order to align with the ITU-T G.9806
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 159-6
 Revise the average launch power (min) spec from -6 dBm to -7.5 dBm
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.6.1 P71 L15 # 134
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX Inc
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Propose to revise Average launch power (min) for BR40+ in Table 159-6 in order to align with the ITU-T G.9806
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 159-6
 Revise the average launch power (min) spec from +2 dBm to +0.5 dBm
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.6.1 P71 L21 # 135
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX Inc
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Propose to revise Optical Modulation Amplitude (min) for BR20 in Table 159-6 in order to align with the ITU-T G.9806
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 159-6
 Revise the Optical Modulation Amplitude (min) spec from -3.0 dBm to -4.5 dBm
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 159 SC 159.6.1 P71 L21 # 136
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX Inc
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Propose to revise Optical Modulation Amplitude (min) for BR40+ in Table 159-6 in order to align with the ITU-T G.9806
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 159-6
 Revise the Optical Modulation Amplitude (min) spec from +5.0 dBm to +3.5 dBm
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.6.2 P72 L17 # 140
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX Inc
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Propose to revise Average receive power (min) for BR 40+ in Table 159-7 in order to align with the ITU-T G.9806
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 159-7
 Revise the Average receive power (min) spec from -21.0 dBm to -22.5 dBm
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.6.1 P71 L22 # 137
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX Inc
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Propose to revise Launch power OMA minus TDP (min) for BR20 in Table 159-6 in order to align with the ITU-T G.9806
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 159-6
 Revise the Launch power OMA minus TDP (min) spec from -4.0 dBm to -5.5 dBm
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.6.2 P72 L17 # 139
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX Inc
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Propose to revise Average receive power (min) for BR 20 in Table 159-7 in order to align with the ITU-T G.9806
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 159-7
 Revise the Average receive power (min) spec from -21.0 dBm to -22.5 dBm
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.6.1 P71 L22 # 138
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX Inc
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Propose to revise Launch power OMA minus TDP (min) for BR40+ in Table 159-6 in order to align with the ITU-T G.9806
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 159-6
 Revise the Launch power OMA minus TDP (min) spec from +4.0 dBm to +2.5 dBm
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 159 SC 159.6.2 P72 L23 # 141
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX Inc
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Propose to revise Rx sensitivity (max) in OMA for BR 20 in Table 159-7 in order to align with the ITU-T G.9806
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 159-7
 Revise the Rx sensitivity (max) in OMA spec from -19.0 dBm to -20.5 dBm
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 159 SC 159.6.2 P72 L23 # 142
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX Inc
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Propose to revise Rx sensitivity (max) in OMA for BR 40+ in Table 159-7 in order to align with the ITU-T G.9806
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 159-7
 Revise the Rx sensitivity (max) in OMA spec from -19.0 dBm to -20.5 dBm
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 159 SC 159.8 P73 L33 # 97
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 The indirection is getting a bit absurd. This points to 114.8, and 114.8 points to 112.8. Then you have the same problem of 112.8 specifications being specific to 25GBASE-SR.
 SuggestedRemedy
 If still using indirection, remove the two levels of indirection and point to 112.8. Fix corresponding PICS items in 159.11.4.8.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 159 SC 159.6.3 P73 L20 # 129
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 88.11.2.1 should be marked as an external link as it isn't in this draft.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the character tag on "88.11.2.1" to External which will turn it green.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 159 SC 159.9 P73 L48 # 173
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Table 159-9 is split across a page break which makes it hard to read.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Put it all on one page.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 159 SC 159.7 P73 L20 # 183
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 By referring to 114.7 automatically all the requirements of 114 are followed, introducing a lot of differences with the values in 159.6. Add full details as in other reject optical PMDs and apply all changes appropriate for 159. Especially the channel requirement in 114.7 refer to 88.8.5.2. Missing are requirements for 20km. Also applies to 158.8 referring to 52.9 and 160.7 referring to 139.7
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add full details as in other reject optical PMDs and apply all changes appropriate for 159, and also 158 and 160. Including table for Transmitter compliance channel specifications
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 159 SC 159.9 P74 L1 # 130
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 The table title needs (continued) in it.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See instructions in 200.1.1.1.1 in the 802.3 FM template.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot

CI 159 SC 159.11.2.2 P76 L42 # 59
 Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Date is shown specifically and should be 202x as the draft isn't published
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "IEEE Std 802.3cp-2020" to "IEEE Std 802.3cp-202x"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.1 P83 L16 # 131
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 When referring to the "top" of a Clause, you need to include "Clause" in the reference.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 45
 To: Clause 45
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.3 P85 L # 195
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Skew constraints as in 139.3.2 as missing
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add skew constraints consistent with 139.3.2
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.3 P85 L36 # 162
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "2" and "pause_quantum" should be on the same line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert non-breaking space between "2" and "pause_quantum"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.5.4 P87 L42 # 174
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The average receive power min fo BR20 etc. is -17.6dB. So a power of -17dB should have signal detect =OK, but the other line says <-16dB is Fail. It can't meet both lines
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the signal detect FAIL level from <-16dBm to <-20dBm for BR20 etc.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.6 P L # 185
 Stassar, Peter Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Specification methodology and parameters for PAM4 optical signals have recently been modified in P802.3cu. Parameters have been deleted, added or modified. Often to simplify the specification. Align with P802.3cu D2.2. Especially TDECQ – 10log10(Ceq)c (max) has been removed as Tx parameter and SECQ – 10log10(Ceq)f (max) as Rx parameter. TECQ has been added, as well as TDECQ - TECQ, Transmitter over/under-shoot (max), Transmitter peak-to-peak power (max). "OMA minus TDECQ = value" has been modified to "OMA = value + TDECQ". In a similar way receiver sensitivity specification has been modified. Etcetera
 SuggestedRemedy
 Align PAM4 specification methodology with P802.3cu D2.2.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.6 P88 L52 # 220
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The text 'A PMD that exceeds the operating range requirement ...' is followed by the example 'e.g., a 50GBASE-BR10 PMD operating at 2.5 km ...'. This however isn't an example of a PMD that exceeds the operating range requirement as 2.5 km is within the operating range requirement of 2 m to 10 km.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that the text '... at 2.5 km ...' be changed to read '... at 12.5 km ...'.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot (

CI 160 SC 160.6 P88 L 53 # 226
 Maki, Jeffery Juniper Networks
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The provide example (e.g., a 50GBASE-BR10 PMD operating at 2.5 km meets the operating range requirement of 2 m to 10 km) has a typo.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 2.5km with 12.5km.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.6 P88 L 54 # 227
 Maki, Jeffery Juniper Networks
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 "The 50GBASE-BR40 PMD interoperates with the 50GBASE-BR10...". The 50GBASE-BR40 transmit and receive wavelength is not compatible with 50GBASE-BR10.
 50GBASE-BR10-D center wavelengths (range): 1320nm to 1340 nm
 50GBASE-BR10-U center wavelengths (range): 1260nm to 1280 nm
 50GBASE-BR40-D center wavelengths (range): 1306nm to 1322nm
 50GBASE-BR40-U center wavelengths (range): 1281nm to 1297nm
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove 50GBASE-BR10 PMD as an example of interoperability with the 50GBASE-BR40 PMD leaving one example, the 50GBASE-BR20 PMD.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.6.1 P89 L 14 # 84
 Laubach, Mark Self
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 121.8.5.3 needs to be an indicated cross reference. Same in footnote of next table.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change text color to forest green
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.6.1 P89 L 51 # 175
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The Average launch power of OFF transmitter must be less than the Fail level of the Signal detect for the signal detect to work properly.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the value for BR20 etc. to -20dBm (see other comment for why -20 not -16)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.6.1 P90 L 14 # 132
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 121.8.5.3 should be marked as an external link as it isn't in this draft.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the character tag on "121.8.5.3" to External which will turn it green.
 Also on P91L8
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.6.2 P90 L 42 # 176
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The receive power (OMAouter) max values are wrong for BR20 and BR40+. (or the Tx OMA outer max values are wrong) The min attenuation for 20km is 0dB, for 40km 10dB.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change BR20 to 4.4dBm, and BR40+ to 2.4dBm.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

2.3cp D2.0 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot c

CI 160 SC 160.7 P91 L35 # 177

Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status X

The sentence is wrong. Measurements don't meet the specifications and there are exceptions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Optical measurement methods are defined in 139.7 with the following exceptions.

1 The transmitter is tested using an optical channel that meets the requirements listed in Table 160-9.

2 The stressed receiver conformance test shall be conducted under the additional condition that the transmitted optical signal and the reflectance of the optical link should be at their maximum levels."

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.11.3.1 P96 L1 # 85

Laubach, Mark Self
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

The heading text is broken across two pages.

SuggestedRemedy

Keep the entire heading text on the same page.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.8 P92 L6 # 98

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Another example of indirection problems. Laser safety descriptions include port types in the description. General safety is changed by P802.3cr, etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Change (or not) consistent with changes made to 158 and 159.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 160 SC 160.11.2.2 P94 L40 # 60

Lewis, Jon Dell EMC
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

Date is shown specifically and should be 202x as the draft isn't published

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IEEE Std 802.3cp-2020" to "IEEE Std 802.3cp-202x"

Proposed Response Response Status O