Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **1**   *L* **8**   # 260

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

Draft Standard for Ethernet
Amendment:
Standard for Ethernet Amendment:
repetition?

SuggestedRemedy

Draft standard for Ethernet
Amendment:
or
Standard for Ethernet
Draft amendment:
Also on page 29.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change:
"Draft Standard for Ethernet
Amendment:
Standard for Ethernet Amendment:"
To:
"Draft Standard for Ethernet
Amendment:"

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **10**   *L* **1**   # 261

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

XX Month 201X

SuggestedRemedy

XX Month 202X

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

To be consistent with formatting elsewhere…
Change "201X" to "20XX".

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **21**   *L* **16**   # 262

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

Italics

SuggestedRemedy

Should be upright as usual?

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: Page number updated from 20.]
The font in several lines in the TOC are italic rather than normal.
Fix the fonts in the TOC.

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.1.3.2**   *P* **30**   *L* **21**   # 263

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *AUI definition [bucket]*

These paragraphs about 100GAUI-n, 200GAUI-n and 400GAUI-n are written as if each is a single interface, as in "conformance with implementation of **this interface** ... is recommended, since it allows maximum flexibility" when there are multiple variants, which are not interoperable. Some of these errors should be fixed in maintenance but this project should not be adding new ones.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "and a one-lane version (100GAUI-1)" to "and two one-lane versions (100GAUI-1),".
Change "and a two-lane version (200GAUI-2)" to "and two two-lane versions (200GAUI-2),".
Change "and a four-lane version (400GAUI-4)" to "and two four-lane versions (400GAUI-4),".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make it clear that C2C and C2M interfaces are uniquely specified. With appropriate editorial mark-ups implement the following…
Change: "Four widths of CAUI-n/100GAUI-n are defined"
To: "For each of chip-to-chip and chip-to-module interfaces, four widths of CAUI-n/100GAUI-n are defined"
Change: "Three widths of 200GAUI-n are defined"
To: "For each of chip-to-chip and chip-to-module interfaces, three widths of 200GAUI-n are defined"
Change: "Three widths of 400GAUI-n are defined"
To: "For each of chip-to-chip and chip-to-module interfaces, three widths of 400GAUI-n are defined"

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **1**   Page 1 of 14
SC **1.1.3.2**   10/9/2020 3:43:33 PM

Cl **1**　　*SC* **1.3**　　　　*P* **31**　　*L* **14**　　# 264

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*[bucket]*

The base document subclause 1.3 already has an entry for SFF-8665, Rev 1.9, June 29, 2015

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this duplicate

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1**　　*SC* **1.4.36**　　　*P* **32**　　*L* **1**　　# 265

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*[bucket]*

1.4.36 isn't inserted by 802.3cd, it's in the base document

SuggestedRemedy

Change "as inserted" to "as modified"

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment correctly points out that the text was not inserted by 802.3cd. The correct term is "changed" rather than "modified".
Change "as inserted by" to "as changed by".

Cl **1**　　*SC* **1.4.36**　　　*P* **32**　　*L* **6**　　# 266

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　AUI definition *[bucket]*

This says that there is one version of 100GAUI-1 when in fact there are two incompatible ones.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "and a single-lane version (100GAUI-1)" to "and two single-lane versions (100GAUI-1)".
Change "Clause 135, Annex 120F, and Annex 120G for 100GAUI-1." to "Clause 135 and Annex 120F or Annex 120G for 100GAUI-1.".
The (See this for this, that for that...) section is becoming unwieldy: it could be better as separate sentences: For 100GAUI-1, see Clause 135 and Annex 120F or Annex 120G.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make it clear that C2C and C2M interfaces are uniquely specified. With appropriate editorial mark-ups implement the following…
Change: "Four widths are defined"
To: "For each of chip-to-module and chip-to-chip interconnections, four widths are defined"
The portion listing the related clauses is sufficiently clear as written. However, an editorial mark-up is missing.

Cl **1**　　*SC* **1.4.36**　　　*P* **32**　　*L* **8**　　# 267

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　AUI definition *[bucket]*

Why is PMA clause 135 listed but not 83 or 120 in similar text?

SuggestedRemedy

?

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment is written as a question and provides no actionable remedy.
Clause 135 is included for 100GAUI-4, 100GAUI-2, and 100GAUI-1 since some aspect of usage are specified in Clause 135.
Addressing references for CAUI-4 and CAUI-10 are outside the scope of this task force.
No changes to the draft are required.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **1**
SC **1.4.36**

Page 2 of 14
10/9/2020 3:43:33 PM

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4.87**   *P* **32**   *L* **33**   # 212

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *AUI definition [bucket]*

This says that there is one version of 200GAUI-2 when in fact there are two incompatible ones. Notice that 116.1 and 120.5.1 say "Annex 120F *or* Annex 120G".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "and a two-lane version (200GAUI-2)" to "and two two-lane versions (200GAUI-2)". Change ", or Annex 120F and Annex 120G for 200GAUI-2." to ", or Annex 120F or Annex 120G for 200GAUI-2.".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make it clear that C2C and C2M interfaces are uniquely specified. With appropriate editorial mark-ups implement the following…
Change: "Three widths of 200GAUI-n are defined"
To: "For each of chip-to-module and chip-to-chip interconnections, three widths of 200GAUI-n are defined"
The portion listing the related clauses is sufficiently clear as written. However, an editorial mark-up is missing.
Add strike-through to "or " before "Annex 120D".

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4.111**   *P* **33**   *L* **6**   # 213

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *AUI definition [bucket]*

This says that there is one version of 400GAUI-4 when in fact there are two incompatible ones. Notice that 116.1 and 120.5.1 say "Annex 120D, Annex 120E, Annex 120F, *or* Annex 120G".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "and a four-lane version (400GAUI-4)" to "and two four-lane versions (400GAUI-4)".
Change ", or Annex 120F and Annex 120G for 400GAUI-4." to ", or Annex 120F or Annex 120G for 400GAUI-4.".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make it clear that C2C and C2M interfaces are uniquely specified. With appropriate editorial mark-ups implement the following…
Change: "Three widths of 400GAUI-n are defined"
To: "For each of chip-to-module and chip-to-chip interconnections, three widths of 400GAUI-n are defined"
The portion listing the related clauses does not improve the accuracy or clarity of the specification.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.135a**   *P* **54**   *L* **11**   # 43

Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

We've added a footnote stating that the new PRESETs are PHY dependent support, so is C(-3).

SuggestedRemedy

Add a footnote to Tables 45-103a, 45-103b, 45-103c and 45-104d attached to the Coefficient Select and Coefficient Select Echo text stating "Support for a given coefficient is PHY dependent."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **73**   *SC* **73.6**   *P* **66**   *L* **15**   # 214

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

It's hard to tell what's going on here.

SuggestedRemedy

Please show or tell the reviewers and the staff editor how this figure differs from the existing figure.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change editing instruction to "Replace Figure 73–6 with the following figure to make D43 indicate F4 rather than A22."
Underneath Figure 73-6 insert new editing instruction
"Change the last two sentences of the final paragraph of 73.6 as follows:"
Include text to show modification of last two sentences of 73.6 so that it will read as follows:
"D[42:21] contains the Technology Ability Field. D[47:43] contains FEC capability (see 73.6.5)."
Implement with editorial license.

Cl **93A**   *SC* **93A.1**   *P* **195**   *L* **24**   # 28

Healey, Adam   Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

93A.1.2 exists in this document.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a cross-reference link.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **93A**
SC **93A.1**
Page 3 of 14
10/9/2020 3:43:33 PM

Cl **93A**　　*SC* **93A.1.2.2**　　　*P* **198**　　*L* **14**　　# 235

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*[bucket]*

Network

SuggestedRemedy

network (as in the published base document). Also in 93A.1.2.3

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "Network" to "network".

Cl **93A**　　*SC* **93A.1.2.3**　　　*P* **199**　　*L* **14**　　# 53

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*equation [bucket]*

Equation 93A-12A has a typo - denominator should be a sum (as in equation 93A-12).

SuggestedRemedy

Change "-" to "+" in the denominator.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **93A**　　*SC* **93A.5**　　　*P* **202**　　*L* **26**　　# 236

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*ERL tukey [bucket]*

New ERL parameters

SuggestedRemedy

Add rows for Tfx and Tukey window flag in Table 93A-4, ERL parameters

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **93A**　　*SC* **93A.5.1**　　　*P* **202**　　*L* **45**　　# 76

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*ERL tukey [bucket]*

The variable f_r used in equation 93A-58b is not included in the associated variable list.

SuggestedRemedy

Add fr and its definition to the variable list below Equation 93A-58b.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **120F**　　*SC* **120F.3.1**　　　*P* **208**　　*L* **14**　　# 54

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*ERL reference [bucket]*

Reference to dERL in the table should be the subclause that specifies parameters and points to the annex.

SuggestedRemedy

Change reference for dERL in table 120F-1 from 163A.3.2.2 to 120F.3.1.1.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **120F**　　*SC* **120F.3.1.1**　　　*P* **209**　　*L* **4**　　# 56

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*[bucket]*

Subclause heading "Transmitter effective return loss" should be consistent with "Transmitter ERL" in 163.9.2.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change heading to "Transmitter ERL".

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The use of "effective return loss" vs "ERL" is inconsistent throughout 120F, 120G, and 163. In 120F, 120G, and 163, use "effective return loss (ERL)" for the first use then use "ERL" thereafter as appropriate.
[Editor's note: CC: 120F, 120G, 163]

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **120F**
SC **120F.3.1.1**

Page 4 of 14
10/9/2020 3:43:33 PM

Cl **120F**   *SC* **120F.3.1.1**   *P* **209**   *L* **6**   # 80

Brown, Matt   Huawei

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*

delta_ERL should be dERL.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace all instances of delta_ERL with dERL.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **120F**   *SC* **120F.3.1.1**   *P* **209**   *L* **6**   # 33

Healey, Adam   Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*

The parameter is defined to be "dERL" and not "[DELTA]ERL".

SuggestedRemedy

Update the name to be consistent.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #80.

Cl **120F**   *SC* **120F.3.1.1**   *P* **209**   *L* **6**   # 195

Wu, Mau-Lin   MediaTek

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*

The symbol "dERL (min)" here doesn't consist with "dERL (min)" in Table 120F-1.

SuggestedRemedy

Align with "dERL (min)" in Table 120F-1.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #80.

Cl **120F**   *SC* **120F.3.1.1**   *P* **209**   *L* **6**   # 55

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*

Delta sign appears here (ΔERL) but the difference term is called dERL.

Also on line 26.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Delta to d in both cases.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #80.

Cl **120F**   *SC* **120F.3.1.1**   *P* **209**   *L* **26**   # 169

Dudek, Mike   Marvell.

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*

using the symbol for delta is a pain for normal typing and general report writing etc. d is used in table 120F-1 but the delta symbol is ued in other places.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the symbol delta with d throughout Ammex 120F. Additional places I noticed were

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #80.

Cl **120F**   *SC* **120F.3.1.1**   *P* **209**   *L* **26**   # 196

Wu, Mau-Lin   MediaTek

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*

The symbol "dERL (min)" here doesn't consist with "dERL (min)" in Table 120F-1.

SuggestedRemedy

Align with "dERL (min)" in Table 120F-1.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #80.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **120F**
SC **120F.3.1.1**

Page 5 of 14
10/9/2020 3:43:33 PM

Cl **120F**   *SC* **120F.3.2.3**   *P* **212**   *L* **42**   # 170

Dudek, Mike   Marvell.

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

There isn't a return loss spec in 163.9.2.1

SuggestedRemedy

Change "return loss" to "effective return loss"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "return loss" to "ERL".

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.3.1.1**   *P* **226**   *L* **41**   # 242

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

per lane

SuggestedRemedy

for each lane

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Both terms are used in a similar context in both 120F and 120G. Either term conveys the meaning accurately. The proposed change does not improve the accuracy or clarity of the draft.

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.3.1.1**   *P* **226**   *L* **41**   # 241

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

Font size of 53.125

SuggestedRemedy

Fix

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.3.2.2.1**   *P* **230**   *L* **47**   # 248

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

~9.6dB

SuggestedRemedy

approximately 9.6 space dB

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace "~9.6dB" with "approximately 9.6 dB".

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.3.2.2.1**   *P* **230**   *L* **49**   # 249

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

with an exception to use zp = 244.7 mm, and C0 and C1 are both 0 nF

SuggestedRemedy

with the exceptions that zp is 244.7 mm, and C0 and C1 are both 0 nF

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.3.3.2.1**   *P* **232**   *L* **33**   # 251

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *RJT [bucket]*

This sentence refers to the SJ table but doesn't tell the reader what to do. Other clauses and annexes with similar tables say that the entries are used one at a time (you don't apply all the SJ tones at once).

SuggestedRemedy

Please make this explicit.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license using wording similar to that used in 162.9.4.4.2.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **120G**
SC **120G.3.3.2.1**

Page 6 of 14
10/9/2020 3:43:34 PM

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.3.3.2.1**   *P* **233**   *L* **49**   # 253

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*
120E.3.2.1.2

SuggestedRemedy
120G.5.3, if it remains - or delete the sentence. I believe the other specs mean that the following sentence "Pre-emphasis capability is likely to be required in the pattern generator to meet this requirement." would still apply.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace the reference to 120E.3.2.1.2 with a reference to 120G.5.3.

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.5.1**   *P* **238**   *L* **51**   # 207

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*
Cross reference to 120E.3.1 is inaccurate

SuggestedRemedy
Change to 120E.3.1.2

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.6.3**   *P* **243**   *L* **29**   # 185

Maki, Jeffery   Juniper Networks

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*
Major capability/option for the host is missing that is already listed for the module.

SuggestedRemedy
Add row to table with Item = ADE-H; Feature = Adaptive Equalization; Subclause = 120G.3.3; Value/Comment = See 120G.3.3; Status = M; Support = Yes [ ].

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The capability is specified in 120G.3.3, but has not yet been listed in the PICS. Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **135**   *SC* **135.5.1**   *P* **106**   *L* **45**   # 215

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*
These AUI specifications are alternatives

SuggestedRemedy
Change "and" to "or". Also in the next paragraph.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.1**   *P* **133**   *L* **17**   # 46

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*
Incorrect cross reference "Figure 162-3"

SuggestedRemedy
Change to "Table 162-3"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.7**   *P* **138**   *L* **41**   # 216

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *[bucket]*
Blank line(s)

SuggestedRemedy
Remove. Also before tables 162-6 and 7.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   *Cl* **162**   *SC* **162.7**   Page 7 of 14
10/9/2020 3:43:34 PM

Cl **162** *SC* **162.9.3.1.5** *P* **150** *L* **20** # 44

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *TX coefficients [bucket]*

When testing how small you can make the signal there is no constraint on the other tap settings.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following to the start of the sentence "With c(-3), c(-2), c(-1) and c(1) set to zero and c(0)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162** *SC* **162.9.3.1.5** *P* **150** *L* **20** # 45

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *TX coefficients [bucket]*

The order of the ranges tests was +1, -1, -2, -3 prior to add 0, but we placed 0 at the end instead of in it's position in the descending list.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the requirement for testing c(0) range to be the third paragph (between +1 and -1)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162** *SC* **162.9.3.1.5** *P* **150** *L* **20** # 51

Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *[bucket]*

(0) is set in italics

SuggestedRemedy

set to upright

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162** *SC* **162.9.4.3.5** *P* **154** *L* **38** # 219

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *RITT [bucket]*

The FEC symbol error ratio requirement assumes errors are

SuggestedRemedy

The FEC symbol error ratio requirement assumes that errors are

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162** *SC* **162.9.4.4.2** *P* **155** *L* **6** # 220

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *[bucket]*

Table 120D-7

SuggestedRemedy

Table 162-15

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162** *SC* **162.9.4.5** *P* **155** *L* **37** # 158

Dudek, Mike Marvell.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *[bucket]*

Erroneous "be"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "shall be meet the" to "shall meet the" Also on page 157 line 43.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162** *SC* **162.11.3** *P* **157** *L* **40** # 159

Dudek, Mike Marvell.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *[bucket]*

mixture of singular "ERL" with plural "are"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "are" to "is"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **162**
SC **162.11.3**

Page 8 of 14
10/9/2020 3:43:34 PM

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.11.3**   *P* **157**   *L* **43**   # 132

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

..shall be meet ..

SuggestedRemedy

should be …shall meet….

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.11.3**   *P* **157**   *L* **44**   # 133

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *CA IL [bucket]*

Given that for low loss cable the loss is controlled to 1 dB, we should do the same for high loss cable

SuggestedRemedy

The intention of this statement is not clear! Does it mean that if COM >=4 dB then no need to meet ERL?

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #132.

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.11.7.1**   *P* **160**   *L* **52**   # 223

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *CA XTALK [bucket]*

93A.1.2.1 is in this draft now.

SuggestedRemedy

Reference to 93A.1.2.1 should be a hotlink to this draft.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.11.7.1.1**   *P* **161**   *L* **19**   # 160

Dudek, Mike   Marvell.

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *CA XTALK [bucket]*

The wrong name is used and the equation reference is wrong.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "HOSTxP" to "HOSPT" Change Equation 162-12 on line 21 to Equation 162-10

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.11.7.1.1**   *P* **161**   *L* **20**   # 125

Hidaka, Yasuo   Credo Semiconductor

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *CA XTALK [bucket]*

The transmitter PCB signal path is denoted as $S^{\wedge}(HOSPT)$.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "$S^{\wedge}(HOSTxP)$" to "$S^{\wedge}(HOSPT)$".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.11.7.1.1**   *P* **161**   *L* **23**   # 224

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *[bucket]*

=110.3

SuggestedRemedy

= 110.3 (insert space) as in 162.11.7.1.2, or use a word: "of" or "equals"?

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **162**
SC **162.11.7.1.1**

Page 9 of 14
10/9/2020 3:43:34 PM

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.11.7.1.2**   *P* **161**   *L* **50**   # 126

Hidaka, Yasuo   Credo Semiconductor

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *CA XTALK [bucket]*

The comment #127 for D1.2 was not correctly implemented.

The aggressor transmitter host PCB path was denoted as S^(HOTxSP) in clause 136.11.7.1.2, not S^(HOSTxP).

As wirtten in editor's note, the comment #128 for D1.2 had a conflict in the variable name in Equation (162-13) due to this implementation error.

I recommend to implement #127 and #128 for D1.2 and denote the aggressor transmitter host PCB path as S^(HOTxSP) for consistency with clause 136.11.7.1.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "S^(HOSTxP)" to "S^(HOTxSP)" in the following locations:

P161, line 50
P162, line 5, Equation (162-13)
P162, line 11
P162, line 16, Equation (162-14)
P162, line 22

Remove Editor's note.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.11.7.2**   *P* **163**   *L* **6**   # 134

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *MDI [bucket]*

Some explantion is necessary for table 162-20

SuggestedRemedy

"A description would be helpful such as ""cable assemblies are constructed with identical MDI at each end of cable or could be constructed with different MDI for cable A vs B ends, see table ..""
In the table add A end and B end"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Description of the contents of Table 162-20 is given on line 1 of page 163.

Cl **162B**   *SC* **162B.1.3.6**   *P* **260**   *L* **28**   # 179

Haser, Alex   Molex

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *MTF XTALK [bucket]*

Section 110B.1.3.7 does not exist

SuggestedRemedy

Change reference to 110B.1.3.6

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162B**   *SC* **162B.1.3.6**   *P* **260**   *L* **28**   # 116

Kocsis, Sam   Amphenol

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *MTF XTALK [bucket]*

Is the reference to "110B.1.3.7" valid? 802.3-2018

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "110B.1.3.6"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162C**   *SC* **162C.1**   *P* **264**   *L* **52**   # 270

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *terminology [bucket]*

I could not easily find what DL and SL mean

SuggestedRemedy

Add cross-reference to 162.8.1

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add reference 162.8.1 for signal names

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **162C**
SC **162C.1**

Page 10 of 14
10/9/2020 3:43:34 PM

Cl **162C**   *SC* **162C.2.1**   *P* **268**   *L* **6**   # 271

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *MDI [bucket]*

"SFP+ supports one lane", "QSFP+ supports up to four lanes" and so on

SuggestedRemedy

Would it be clearer to say "SFP+ supports one lane in each direction" and similarly for the other connector types?

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "number of lanes" to "number of supported PMDs"

Cl **162C**   *SC* **162C.2.2**   *P* **268**   *L* **46**   # 272

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *MDI [bucket]*

SFP-DD supports up to four lanes

SuggestedRemedy

SFP-DD supports up to four lanes [in each direction]
Similarly for DSFP.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "number of lanes" to number of "supported PMDs"

Cl **162C**   *SC* **162C.3.3**   *P* **275**   *L* **22**   # 273

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *MDI [bucket]*

Order of this table doesn't match the clause

SuggestedRemedy

Please re-order the entries in this table to align with the clause, renumbering the items.
Also, there is no MDI3 so some of them should be renumbered anyway.
Similarly for the table in 162C.3.4.1 Contact Mapping.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Re-order the entries in this table to align with the clause, renumbering the items.
Similarly for 162C.3.4.1.
Implement with editorial license.

Cl **162D**   *SC* **162D.1**   *P* **277**   *L* **14**   # 274

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *MDI [bucket]*

"Hosts have six specified MDI connectors "receptacles"": I read this as describing a 6-port host.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest "There are six types of MDI connectors "receptacles" specified for hosts"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162D**   *SC* **162D.1**   *P* **277**   *L* **32**   # 275

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *MDI [bucket]*

This is the only time "host interface type" is used, and one would expect the phrase to mean PMD or PHY type on a host. We can wordsmith round this because six things were mentioned just above.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "This creates six host interface types and multiple cable..." to "Therefore, there are multiple cable..."

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "interface" to "receptacle"

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **162D**   Page 11 of 14
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *SC* **162D.1**   10/9/2020 3:43:34 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **163**　　　*SC* **163.1**　　　　　*P* **171**　　　*L* **1**　　　　# 225

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*[bucket]*

Layout

SuggestedRemedy

Remove blank lines at 1 and 25, make the first three tables wider so the notes take 2 lines not 3

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The extra lines are a result of forcing the proper order and position of the tables. This can be fixed, but might result in other formatting issues when preceding text is changed in future drafts.

These tables are consistently the same width throughout 802.3ck and in other projects. Potential changes to the footnote in future drafts may change the length of the footnote. There is no need to change the width of the table to fix a hanging word at this time.

Minor issues relating to extra space and line lengths can be addressed toward the end of the project or during the publication editing when the document is more stable.

Cl **163**　　　*SC* **163.9.2**　　　　*P* **176**　　　*L* **44**　　　# 60

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　*ERL reference [bucket]*

Reference to dERL in the table should be the subclause that specifies parameters and points to the annex.

SuggestedRemedy

Change reference for dERL in Table 163–5 from 163A.3.2.2 to 163.9.2.3.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163**　　　*SC* **163.9.2**　　　　*P* **177**　　　*L* **5**　　　　# 63

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　*TX FIR [bucket]*

abs step size " for c(–3), c(–2), c(–1), c(0), and c(1)"

This list includes all possible values, so it is redundant. Clause 162 has "for all taps" instead.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the quoted words to "for all taps", both for min and for ax.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163**　　　*SC* **163.9.2.3**　　　*P* **179**　　　*L* **43**　　　# 66

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　*ERL wording [bucket]*

"The reference for obtaining the reference"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The method for obtaining the reference"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163**　　　*SC* **163.9.2.3**　　　*P* **179**　　　*L* **44**　　　# 32

Healey, Adam　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　*ERL wording [bucket]*

"The reference for obtaining the reference ERL is defined in 163A.3.1." is an awkward sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

120F.3.1.1 has somewhat different wording and 163.9.2.3 could be changed to match. At a minimum, change the sentence to: "The reference transmitter ERL is defined in 163A.3.1."

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #66.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general　　　*Cl* **163**　　Page 12 of 14
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn　　*SC* **163.9.2.3**　　10/9/2020 3:43:34 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **163**　　*SC* **163.9.2.3**　　　*P* **179**　　*L* **44**　　# 74

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*ERL wording [bucket]*

Wording

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The reference for obtaining" to "The method for obtaining".

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #66.

Cl **163**　　*SC* **163.9.3.1**　　　*P* **180**　　*L* **34**　　# 164

Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　　　Marvell.

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*[bucket]*

It is strange to have the ERL section that needs the Rx Test fixture ahead of the description of the test fixture.

SuggestedRemedy

Reverse the order of the Rx ERL and Receiver test fixture sections to match the Tx order.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163**　　*SC* **163.9.3.2**　　　*P* **181**　　*L* **1**　　# 75

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*[bucket]*

The test fixture should be defined before defining test specifications and methods. As was done for the TX test fixture subclause, move the RX TF subclause to before the ERL subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Move 163.9.3.2 ahead of 163.9.3.1.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163**　　*SC* **163.9.3.2**　　　*P* **181**　　*L* **3**　　# 69

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*[bucket]*

The receiver test fixture characteristics should be defined before the measurements performed with it, as in the transmitter. Currently Receiver ERL appears first.

SuggestedRemedy

Move subclause 163.9.3.2 before 163.9.3.1.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163**　　*SC* **163.9.3.3**　　　*P* **182**　　*L* **5**　　# 72

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*RITT [bucket]*

In item e), the phrase "where Q3 is 3.2905" should be moved below the equations, with and explanation of what Q3 stands for (as in 136.9.4.2.3).

Alternatively, the equations can be replaced by cross reference to equations 136-8 and 136-9.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

move "where Q3 is 3.2905" below the equations.
Copy notes from 136.9.4.2.3 to explain what Q3 stands for.

Cl **163A**　　*SC* **163A.1**　　　*P* **280**　　*L* **28**　　# 276

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*[bucket]*

for are

SuggestedRemedy

Delete for?

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "for are" to "are".

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **163A**
SC **163A.1**

Page 13 of 14
10/9/2020 3:43:34 PM

Cl **163A**　　*SC* **163A.1**　　　　*P* **280**　　*L* **28**　　# 198

Wu, Mau-Lin　　　　　　　　　MediaTek

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　*[bucket]*

It seems that the term "for" in the following sentence is redundant.
"c) The difference between measured and reference values for are computed using the methods defined in 163A.3.2."

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence of c) into "c) The difference between measured and reference values are computed using the methods defined in 163A.3.2."

Proposed Response　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163A**　　*SC* **163A.3.1.1**　　　*P* **282**　　*L* **5**　　# 57

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　*[bucket]*

In "Tr" r should be in subscript.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the "r" in "Tr" to subscript.

Cl **163A**　　*SC* **163A.3.1.1**　　　*P* **282**　　*L* **18**　　# 38

Healey, Adam　　　　　　　Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　*[bucket]*

In Equation (163A-3), the upper limit of the summation (N_v) should have a capital "N". In addition, the unit interval symbol (T_b) should have a capital "T".

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the typos.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the "r" in "Tr" to subscript.

Cl **163A**　　*SC* **163A.3.1.1**　　　*P* **282**　　*L* **19**　　# 199

Wu, Mau-Lin　　　　　　　　　MediaTek

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　*[bucket]*

The parameter of "N_v" in the equation (163A-3) had been mistakenly set as "n_v".

SuggestedRemedy

Correct "n_v" as "N_v" in the equation (163A-3)

Proposed Response　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggsted remedy with editorial license.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl　**163A**
SC　**163A.3.1.1**

Page 14 of 14
10/9/2020 3:43:34 PM