Cl **176**   *SC* **176.3**   *P* **240**   *L* **31**   # 12

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Systems

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

Typo in "When the sublayer below then PMA"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "then" to "the"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.213g**   *P* **86**   *L* **37**   # 40

Bruckman, Leon   Nvidia

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

Wrong table name. Table 45-177g is for the Inner FEC, not an RS-FEC

SuggestedRemedy

Change title of Table 45-177g to: "Inner FEC codeword error bin 1 bit definitions"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **116**   *SC* **116.3.3.3**   *P* **125**   *L* **49**   # 42

Bruckman, Leon   Nvidia

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

The acronym for Inter-sublayer link training was already defined in subclause 116.2.9. No
need to spell the whole function name

SuggestedRemedy

Use the acronym ILT throughout this clause

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **169**   *SC* **169.1.2**   *P* **143**   *L* **14**   # 43

Bruckman, Leon   Nvidia

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

Typo: an 4-lane

SuggestedRemedy

Change "an 4-lane" to "a 4-lane"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **184**   *SC* **184.2**   *P* **475**   *L* **33**   # 47

Bruckman, Leon   Nvidia

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

The arrow to the DP-16QAM mapper block is too short

SuggestedRemedy

Make the inut arrow to the DP-16QAM mapper block touch the block

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **184**   *SC* **184.2**   *P* **476**   *L* **13**   # 48

Bruckman, Leon   Nvidia

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

Missing "the"

SuggestedRemedy

Change: When SIGNAL_OK parameter
to: When the SIGNAL_OK parameter

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **48**   Page 1 of 10
8/29/2024 2:04:25 PM

Cl **186**　　*SC* **186.2.2**　　　　*P* **526**　　*L* **43**　　# 51

Bruckman, Leon　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

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

The last part of the last paragraph of this sub-section seems redundant.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the text: "The 64B/66B block stream is then transcoded into a 256B/257B stream, mapped to a 800GBASE-ER1 PCS frame using GMP, and FEC bits are added to this 800GBASE-ER1 PCS frame before transmission."

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **186**　　*SC* **186.2.3**　　　　*P* **526**　　*L* **50**　　# 52

Bruckman, Leon　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

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

This whole sub-clause can be merged with the last paragraph in the previous sub-cluase.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete sub-clause 186.2.3 and change the first sentence of the last paragraph of sub clause 186.2.2 to: "The 800GBASE-ER1 PCS maps the 800GMII signal into 66-bit blocks, and demaps the 800GMII signal from 66-bit blocks, using a 64B/66B coding scheme (see 172.2.3)."

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **186**　　*SC* **186.2.4.9**　　　*P* **534**　　*L* **35**　　# 55

Bruckman, Leon　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

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

Typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "varies" to: "vary"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **186**　　*SC* **186.3.2.1.2**　　*P* **543**　　*L* **24**　　# 57

Bruckman, Leon　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

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

Typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "4800GBASE-ER1" to: "800GBASE-ER1"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.175**　　　*P* **79**　　*L* **14**　　# 295

de Koos, Andras　　　　　　　　Microchip Technology

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

In table 45-139, the value = 0 descriptions for the 4 new bits (bits 1.1800.4:7) are each missing the word 'FEC'

SuggestedRemedy

change
"0 = Inner does not provide information on…"
to
"0 = Inner FEC does not provide information on…"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **186**　　*SC* **186.3**　　　　*P* **541**　　*L* **14**　　# 298

de Koos, Andras　　　　　　　　Microchip Technology

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

Strange that the PCS and PMA are specified in the same Clause. Has this ever been done elsewhere in 802.3?
Though I suppose the PCS and PMA will always be instantiated together.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider separating Clause 186 into two for the PCS and PMA

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **298**

Page 2 of 10
8/29/2024 2:04:25 PM

Cl **186**   *SC* **186.6**   *P* **561**   *L* **20**   # 299

de Koos, Andras   Microchip Technology

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

Presumably, the Clause 186 PMA needs control and status variables, too (not just the CL 186 PCS)

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 'PCS' with 'PCS and PMA'
And either add PMA to the title for tables 186-8 and 186-9, or add separate MDIO mapping tables for the PMA.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **186**   *SC* **186.4**   *P* **553**   *L* **0**   # 300

de Koos, Andras   Microchip Technology

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

Many cut & paste of '400GBASE-ZR' in 186.4

SuggestedRemedy

remove all references to 400GBASE-ZR.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **174A**   *SC* **174A.4**   *P* **612**   *L* **2**   # 323

Healey, Adam   Broadcom Inc.

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

"This requirement is equivalent to...". There is no "requirement" stated. The preceding sentence is phrased as an "expectation".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "This is equivalent to...". Similar considerations should be made in 174A.5 (lines 16 and 18) and 174A.2 (page 611, line 31).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176E**   *SC* **176E.6.6**   *P* **707**   *L* **46**   # 328

Healey, Adam   Broadcom Inc.

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

"...transmit equalization is controlled by the inter-sublayer link training (ILT) function for a Type A1 interface, specified in Annex 176A, or by equivalent methods." The term "equivalent" seems too strong since Annex 176A defines a complex handshaking protocol to which other valid methods (such as forcing values via direct register access) are arguably not equivalent.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "...specified in Annex 176A, or by other methods." See also 179.9.5.2 (page 345, line 14).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4.7**   *P* **341**   *L* **39**   # 329

Healey, Adam   Broadcom Inc.

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

It seems odd to describe requirements for 200 Gb/s per lane AUIs in the this subclause. Annexes 176D and 176E include subclauses for "Output jitter" which just refer to 179.4.7. The content specific to those Annexs should be included in their respective "output jitter" subclauses.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the description of J4u03 from 179.4.7 to 176D.3.3.6 and 176E.6.9.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **329**   Page 3 of 10
8/29/2024 2:04:26 PM

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **293**   *L* **50**   # 360

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

"If one or two 200GAUI-n is implemented in a PHY"
possible number mismatch (two / is).

In addition, for KR and CR PHYs only one AUI can be included in a PHY.

The footnote can be phrased better to avoid the number mismatch and difference between PHYs.

There are 19 instances with 200GAUI-n, 400GAUI-n, 800GAUI-n, and 1.6TAUI-n.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "If a PHY includes any 200GAUI-n" and similarly for all instances.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.6**   *P* **298**   *L* **13**   # 362

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

"625 fs for 1.6TBASE-CR8"
Should be KR in this clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Change CR to KR.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.8.2**   *P* **301**   *L* **14**   # 365

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

The words "each lane" are not helpful for "signaling rate". All specifications hold for each lane - signaling rate is not special. Also it cannot be aggregated (unlike power and bit rate).

This occurs in multiple tables and rows in electrical clauses. "Each lane" should be in the text above the table or in the table heading, not on specific rows.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "each lane" from the parameter names in all tables as appropriate.
Where necessary add indication in the text that the spefications are defined for each lane separately unless noted otherwise.
Apply in all electrical PMD clauses and annexes.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.9**   *P* **301**   *L* **17**   # 366

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Table 178-6 has some parameters in mV units and others in V units.
The style manual (16.3.1) advises against this: "The same units of measure shall be used throughout each column. ohms shall not be combined with megohms, millimeters with centimeters, or seconds with minutes".

There are multiple tables with this mixture and some units that appear in the text. mV units can be changed to V for consistently in all new clauses.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the units to V and adjust the values.
Apply in all tables and text in 178, 179, 176D, 176E.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **366**   Page 4 of 10
8/29/2024 2:04:26 PM

Cl **178**　　　*SC* **178.9.3.3**　　　　　*P* **307**　　　*L* **39**　　　　# 373

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

The abbreviation ILdd is not defined anywhere and is potentially confusing; "dd" can be interpreted as die-to-die, which is not the intent here.
Similarly for ILcd, ILdc, RLcd and RLdc.

SuggestedRemedy

Add ILcd, ILdc, ILdd, RLcd, and RLdc to the abbreviations list in 1.5.

Go over occurences of these terms in all clauses and ensure they are fully expanded before being used.

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **178**　　　*SC* **178.10.**　　　　　*P* **309**　　　*L* **21**　　　　# 375

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Reference for Minimum channel ERL should be 178.10.3

SuggestedRemedy

Change per comment

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **178**　　　*SC* **178.13**　　　　　*P* **316**　　　*L* **41**　　　　# 381

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Reference to the definition in another clause should be phrased clearly to reduce potential confusion.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The PMD control and status variables are defined in 179.14" to "The PMD control and status variables are identical to those defined in 179.14".

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179**　　　*SC* **179.8.3**　　　　　*P* **332**　　　*L* **52**　　　　# 382

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Stray table.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete it

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179**　　　*SC* **179.9.4.1.4**　　　　　*P* **339**　　　*L* **18**　　　　# 384

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Footnote a has "PRESET1" twice, but the value of ic_req is "preset 1" in the table and in its definition. Also in Table 176E-8.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances of "PRESET1" to "preset 1".

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **180**　　　*SC* **180.5.1**　　　　　*P* **376**　　　*L* **29**　　　　# 398

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

802.3 editorial guidelines recommends "implementer" (not "implementor"), and indeed most instances in this document (12) follow.
Also in 182.5.1 and in an editor's note in 176A.11.2.4.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "implementer".

Proposed Response　　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **398**　　　Page 5 of 10
8/29/2024 2:04:26 PM

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.7.1**   *P* **379**   *L* **26**   # 401

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

The words "each lane" are not helpful for "signaling rate". All specifications hold for each lane - signaling rate is not special. Also it cannot be aggregated (unlike power and bit rate).

This occurs in multiple tables and rows in optical clauses. "Each lane" should be in the text above the table or in the table heading, not on specific rows.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "each lane" from the parameter names in all tables as appropriate.
Where necessary add indication in the text that the spefications are defined for each lane separately unless noted otherwise.
Apply in all optical PMD clauses.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.7.2**   *P* **382**   *L* **3**   # 405

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Figure 180-4 does not show the pass and fail regions for receiver sensitivity vs. TECQ.

SuggestedRemedy

Add labels to clarify.
Also in other optical PMD clauses.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176E**   *SC* **176E.3**   *P* **695**   *L* **35**   # 411

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Figure 176E-2 should depict the test points being inside the component packages and include a corresponding NOTE as done in Figure 176D–2. (This was intended but omitted due to an editorial mistake).

SuggestedRemedy

Update Figure 176E-2 with the format of Figure 176D-2 with the appropriate changes from C2C to C2M (including test point names and location of AC coupling caps).

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176E**   *SC* **176E.4.1**   *P* **696**   *L* **15**   # 414

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

"mechanically equivalent with" on L16 but "to" on L17

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "mechanically equivalent to"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176E**   *SC* **176E.4.1**   *P* **696**   *L* **19**   # 415

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

"Figure 176E–3 depicts the location of compliance points for each lane in which host characteristics are specified."
The phrase "for each lane" is confusing in its current location.

Similarly for MCB on P697 L1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to
"Figure 176E–3 depicts the location of compliance points in which host characteristics are specified. The test points are separate for each lane."

Change similarly on P697.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176E**   *SC* **176E.5**   *P* **701**   *L* **33**   # 419

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

The phrase ", with its associated insertion loss (ILdd), " is not helpful, and can cause confusion because ILdd is not defined here. The channel is not specified at all.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the quoted phrase.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **419**

Page 6 of 10
8/29/2024 2:04:26 PM

Cl **177A** *SC* **177A** *P* **720** *L* **3** *#* 424

Ran, Adee — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

128 bit

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 128 bits

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179A** *SC* **179A.5** *P* **742** *L* **5** *#* 426

Ran, Adee — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Equation 179A-10 includes the terms "ILdd_{Host1, Max+TF}" and "ILdd_{Host2, Max+TF}", which are not defined.

Apparently these correspond to "ILdd_{Host1}" and "ILdd_{Host2}" in the equation variable list.

SuggestedRemedy

Rename the variables, preferably in the equation.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179A** *SC* **179A.5** *P* **742** *L* **7** *#* 427

Ran, Adee — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Equation 179A-10 includes the terms "ILdd_{Host1, Min}" and "ILdd_{Host2, Min}", which are not defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the definitions for these variables and refer to a table as appropriate.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179A** *SC* **179A.5** *P* **742** *L* **15** *#* 428

Ran, Adee — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

ILdd_Host1 definition is "from TP0d to TP2d", and ILdd_Host2 definition is "from TP3d to TP5d".

In addition, the reference to Table 179A-2 is confusing, as there is no column for these parameters in that table. Both minimum and maximum loss (with the variable names) should appear clearly for each host designation. Preferably it should be separate from the configuration matrix in Table 179A-2.

SuggestedRemedy

Change TP2d to TP2, and TP3d to TP3.

Add a new table with recommended min and max ILdd for each host designation.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179A** *SC* **179A.5** *P* **742** *L* **15** *#* 429

Ran, Adee — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

"for link configurations Table 179A–3" is unnecessary and seems incorrect - the host ILdd (max and min) is defined (recommended) regardless of the link it is in.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the phrase "for link configurations Table 179A–3".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **429**

Page 7 of 10
8/29/2024 2:04:26 PM

Cl **179A**   *SC* **179A.5**   *P* **742**   *L* **17**   # 430

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

"mated test fixture" here and elsewhere in 179A (15 instances"
"mated test fixtures" in 179B.1 and elsewhere in 179B (25 instances excluding editor's notes and PICS)

We should be consistent...

SuggestedRemedy

Preferably change "mated test fixture" to "mated test fixtures" globally.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179A**   *SC* **179A.5**   *P* **742**   *L* **34**   # 431

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

In Table 179A-3 column "ILdd_{Ca,max}" should have "CA" instead of "Ca". The column should contain values in dB, not the cable assembly designation. The loss limits for each cable assembly designation are normative and are mapped in Table 179–13, so the designations should not be repeated here.

Table 179A-3 and Table 179A-4 are similar and would be better merged into one table showing both minimum and maximum values.

SuggestedRemedy

Merge the tables into one with min and max for CA and for Ch. Cable assembly designations can appear in footnotes.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179A**   *SC* **179A.5**   *P* **744**   *L* **2**   # 436

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Stray circle at the top of Figure 179-4

SuggestedRemedy

Delete it

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179B**   *SC* **179B.2.1**   *P* **745**   *L* **41**   # 438

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

f is defined as the frequency in GHz, meaning f itself is a pure number. So the limits should not include "GHz".

Similarly for Equations 179B-2, 179B-4, and 179B-5 (179B-3 is correctly limited by pure numbers).

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "GHz" from the frequency range limits in all listed equations.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179B**   *SC* **179B.3.1**   *P* **746**   *L* **44**   # 440

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

The insertion loss defined here is a reference; it should be labeled accordingly, as in 179B.2.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "ILdd_catf" to "ILdd_catfref" in the equation and variable list.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **440**   Page 8 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   8/29/2024 2:04:26 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **179B** *SC* **179B.3.1** *P* **747** *L* **47** # 441

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

"93A.4" is an external reference

SuggestedRemedy

Format accordingly

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179D** *SC* **179D.1.1** *P* **771** *L* **30** # 449

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

"112" should probably be "SFP-DD224"

SuggestedRemedy

Correct as appropriate

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.3.2.1.2** *P* **56** *L* **16** # 450

Sluyski, Mike Cisco Systems Inc.

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

Does 800GBASE-ER1 encompass 800GBASE-ER1-20 or should 800GBASE-ER1-20 reference an subclause of Clause 186

SuggestedRemedy

Add 800GBASE-ER1-20 and Clause 186 type 800GBASE-ER1-20 after line 16

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.3.2.1.3** *P* **56** *L* **35** # 451

Sluyski, Mike Cisco Systems Inc.

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

Does 800GBASE-ER1 PCS encompass 800GBASE-ER1-20 or should 800GBASE-ER1-20 have it's own listing

SuggestedRemedy

Add 800GBASE-ER1-20 and Clause 186 type 800GBASE-ER1-20 PCS after line 44

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.60d** *P* **71** *L* **35** # 452

Sluyski, Mike Cisco Systems Inc.

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

Missing Parenthesis after (Register 1.75

SuggestedRemedy

Add closing parenthesis

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **45** *SC* **Table 45-139** *P* **79** *L* **5** # 454

Sluyski, Mike Cisco Systems Inc.

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

Table 45 Descriptions are not consistent "1" mentions FEC "0" does not include the term FEC.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove … "inner" FEC … from name column or remove FEC in description column or add "inner FEC for desciption when "0".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **454** Page 9 of 10
8/29/2024 2:04:26 PM

Cl **172**   *SC* **172.1.3**   *P* **185**   *L* **19**   # 455

Sluyski, Mike   Cisco Systems Inc.

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

Doesn't read well

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The 800GBASE-R PCS provide all services require by the 800GMII"… to "The 800GBASE-R PCS provides all of the services required by the 800GMII" ….

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **171**   *SC* **Figure 171.2a**   *P* **169**   *L* **1**   # 456

Sluyski, Mike   Cisco Systems Inc.

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

Can't tell from 802.3dj/D1p1 whether 171.2 is the equivalent PHY 800GXS block diagram.

SuggestedRemedy

If Figure 171.2 is the 800G equivalent to 171.2a they should be able to be combined. If not then there is no 800G XS drawing.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4**   *P* **334**   *L* **54**   # 525

Simms, William (Bill)   NVIDIA

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

Differential pk-pk voltage is called Vdi where elsewhere is is Vppd. Transmit enabled is omitted

SuggestedRemedy

change to Vppd and add 'Transmit enabled' if needed

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4**   *P* **334**   *L* **47**   # 576

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

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

Table 178-6 and 179-7 are ordered differently. 178-6 groups the pk-pk voltages for disabled and enabled (although putting disabled first isn't intuitive) while 179-7 separates them.

SuggestedRemedy

Use a consistent order

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **576**   Page 10 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   8/29/2024 2:04:26 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID