

IEEE 802.3db D1.2 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force 3rd Task Force review comments

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P18 L12 # 48  
 Choudhury, Mabud OFS  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 Indicate Editors' Note will be removed prior to publication  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "Editors' Note (to be removed prior to publication):" Also in clause 167.1, page 41, line 53 and clause 167.1, page 42, line 27.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add "(to be removed prior to publication)" to editors' notes as appropriate.

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P18 L14 # 16  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 1.4.33 "100GBASE-R encoding"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Do the subclause numbers such as 1.4.33 need updating?  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Update the subclause numbers in this section in accordance with the latest draft of 802.3dc.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1..2 P20 L14 # 55  
 Nicholl, Gary Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 I see change bars throughout this section, however when I checked I don't see any actual changes to the text compared with 802.3db D1.1.  
 I thought the rule was that change bars are only used to highlight changes to the text compared to the previous draft, and not for example all the way back to the x.0 draft?  
 I suspect this comment applies throughout the draft.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 It is probably too late for this draft, but going forward change bars should be reset at the start of each new draft and removed completely for a x.0 draft.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Ensure that the error bars are correct in subsequent drafts.

Cl 80 SC 80.1.3 P27 L7 # 56  
 Nicholl, Gary Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 There is no change bar associated with the editing instruction " Change list item h) in 80.1.3 as follows:", even though the text has changed from 802.3db D1.1.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 It is to late to do anything with regard to this draft, but please ensure that change bars are used appropriately and highlight all changes in the text from one draft to the next.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Ensure that the error bars are correct in subsequent drafts.

Cl 80 SC 80.1.3 P27 L11 # 57  
 Nicholl, Gary Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket  
 There is an incorrect cross-reference to Clause 167. The current text is "...and in 167 for ..." It should be "... and in Clause 167 for ...", where "Clause 167" is a single cross reference.  
 The same comment applies to the enteries in Table 80-1, i.e. the cross reference text should be "Clause 167" and not "167". Look at the unchanged enteries in the table as an example.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix the cross references according to the comment.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Fix this cross-reference format without breaking other cross-references.

Cl 80 SC 80.1.3 P27 L33 # 58  
 Nicholl, Gary Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket  
 References to clauses 86 and 138 in the Table 80-1 are external references , and thus should be converted to text and use the appropriate green font for "external references". See clause 85, 95 and 140 in the same table as an example. I believe there is a special "External" character style in Frame for exactly this purpose.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix the cross references according to the comment.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Fix this cross-reference format without breaking other cross-references.

IEEE 802.3db D1.2 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force 3rd Task Force review comments

Cl 80 SC 80.1.4 P27 L27 # 18  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 As we are making this long table longer  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make the table full width with the left column sized to contents  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resize the table with editorial license.

Cl 91 SC 91.5.2.7 P30 L11 # 59  
 Nicholl, Gary Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 The underlining in this sentence is incorrect. There would already have been a space between "100GBASE-SR2," and "100GBASE-DR" in the text being changed, and this space should not be underlined (as it is not being added).  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the text from " 100GBASE-SR1 " to " 100GBASE-SR1 " or " 100GBASE-SR1 "  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Remove the underline from the extra space.

Cl 91 SC 91.7.4.2 P33 L26 # 19  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 91.1.0.1  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 91.7.4.2  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Correct the paragraph number manually.

Cl 116 SC 116.1.2 P35 L9 # 20  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 As 8 lane is g and 4 lane is h...  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 2 lane should be i and 1 lane (P802.3cw's "400GBASE-ZR") should be last, at j.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Coordinate with 802.3cw on the ordering of this table.

Cl 116 SC 116.1.2 P35 L14 # 60  
 Nicholl, Gary Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket  
 Incorrect cross-reference format for clause 167. Current text is "... and 167 for ..." , but it should be "...and Clause 167 for...". Use the "ClauseNumber" format for the cross-reference in FrameMaker.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix the cross reference according to the comment, and review (and fix if necessary) for any similar issues throughout the draft. For example the same issue appears on line 18 of the same page, in Table 116-1 and in Table 116-2.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Fix this cross-reference format without breaking other cross-references.

Cl 116 SC 116.1.3 P36 L14 # 22  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 Table layout  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make Table 116-2 full width with the left column narrower (sized to 400GBASE-LR4-6)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resize the table with editorial license.

IEEE 802.3db D1.2 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force 3rd Task Force review comments

Cl 116 SC 116.1.4 P37 L12 # 21  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 Wrong font  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Use the correct font.

Cl 167 SC 167.1 P41 L24 # 24  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 Font too small  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Should be 9 point not 7. Remove override.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Use the correct font.

Cl 116 SC 116.1.4 P37 L42 # 61  
 Nicholl, Gary Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 Why is there a change bar associated with 400GBASE-ZR?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete change bar associated with 400GBASE-ZR in the next draft.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Ensure that the error bars are correct in subsequent drafts.

Cl 167 SC 167.1 P42 L23 # 25  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 78  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 78 (no dot)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Edit the cross-reference to remove the period.

Cl 116 SC 116.4 P38 L6 # 23  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 Missing context  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please show the unchanged rows immediately before and after the changed rows, as in other tables.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add one unchanged below and above the new entries.

Cl 167 SC 167.7.1 P51 L4 # 46  
 Bruckman, Leon Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket  
 Missing reference  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add 167.8 at the end of the sentence  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE 802.3db D1.2 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force 3rd Task Force review comments

Cl 167 SC 167.7.1 P51 L6 # 62

Nicholl, Gary Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

It would be appreciated if chage bars are only used to idenifty rows in the table that have changed from the previous draft. This would make it much easier fr the reviewer to focus on and verify any changes from the previous draft.

SuggestedRemedy

In future drafts please only use change bars to identify rows in tables that include changes from previous draft, rather than marking all rows in a table with change bars (and including rows where there are no changes)

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 167 SC 167.7.1 P51 L12 # 27

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Alignment in unit column

SuggestedRemedy

Centre?

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Center elements in the "Unit" column.

Cl 167 SC 167.7.1 P51 L34 # 30

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Table layout

SuggestedRemedy

Resize column widths to contents

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement with editorial license.

Cl 167 SC 167.7.1 P52 L4 # 32

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Figure is a bitmap

SuggestedRemedy

Insert figure another way so it is a vector graphic. Also figures 167-4, 167-5.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 167 SC 167.7.1 P52 L19 # 33

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

TECQ(dB)

SuggestedRemedy

Insert space. Also Figure 167-5.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 167 SC 167.7.1. P51 L36 # 63

Nicholl, Gary Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket

Table 167-7. The parameter listed as "Transmitter excursion, each lane (max)" should be "Transmitter power excursion, each lane (max)" to be consistent with the name used in 167.8.8 (and in previous specifications such as 802.3cu-2021).

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Transmitter excursion, each lane (max)" to "Transmitter power excursion, each lane (max)"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE 802.3db D1.2 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force 3rd Task Force review comments

Cl 167 SC 167.7.2 P52 L29 # 47  
 Bruckman, Leon Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket  
 Missing reference  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add 167.8 at the end of the sentence  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 167 SC 167.7.2 P52 L29 # 64  
 Nicholl, Gary Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 Extra space before the period.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the extra space.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The reference to subclause 167.8 was missing. The sentence will be corrected to "... per the definitions in 167.8."

Cl 167 SC 167.7.2 P52 L49 # 65  
 Nicholl, Gary Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket  
 Shouldn't the order of the rows "Stressed receiver sensitivity (OMAouter), each lanec (max)" and "Receiver sensitivity (OMAouter), each lane (max)..." be reversed, to be consistent with the definitions in section 167.8 and what was done in 802.3cu-2021  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Reverse the order of the rows mentioned in the comment.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 167 SC 167.7.2 P52 L49 # 35  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 Stressed receiver sensitivity and Conditions of stressed receiver sensitivity test should be next to each other in the table. Compare Table 151-8 and Table 140-7.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Swap Stressed receiver sensitivity and Receiver sensitivity rows  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 167 SC 167.8.7 P58 L33 # 39  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 140.7.5b  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 140.7.7 Also, delete "(in 802.3cu)". Similarly in 167.8.8.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 167 SC 167.8.13 P59 L50 # 40  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket  
 As SECQ and TECQ are the same  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 167.8.5 to 167.8.6. Delete "except that ... from an ideal fourth-order Bessel-Thomson response", which has already been said.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement with editorial license.

IEEE 802.3db D1.2 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force 3rd Task Force review comments

CI 167 SC 167.10.3.3 P65 L8 # 53

Lingle, Robert

OFS

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket

Editor's note states: "a recommendation concerning distinguishing features to inform the user if the MDI is angled or not should be considered." This item should be resolved in this draft cycle or removed, as the answer should be clear by now. It is also not required for IEEE 802.3 to provide such guidance, which is more under the purview of cabling standards.

*Suggested Remedy*

Remove this editor's note

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.