Cl **FM** SC **FM** P **1** L **28** # 11

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

D2.1

*SuggestedRemedy*

D2.2 (to be D2.3)

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

---

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

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

pdf metadata is at default

*SuggestedRemedy*

Populate with correct data

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

---

Cl **30** SC **30.5.1.1.2** P **18** L **18** # 14

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

This section

*SuggestedRemedy*

Should be single spaced

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

---

Cl **45** SC **45.2.1.6** P **19** L **22** # 15

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *register bit*

Entries should be in descending order

*SuggestedRemedy*

The three rows 1 0 0 1 x x x, 1 0 0 0 1 x x x, 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 x should be below the new entries. Also, where are 1 0 1 0 0 0 x x ?

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #9.

---

Cl **45** SC **45.2.1.6** P **19** L **23** # 9

Zimmerman, George — ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,OnSemi,Sony,SenTekse

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *register bit*

The new rows for 100GBASE-BR… are inserted in the wrong place (101xxxx end up between 10000101 and 1000011x). They should be immediately below the struck out reserved row 101xxxxx. It appears codesfor 101000xx are also missing - are these reserved or are they allocated by df?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move rows for 1010101x through 10100100 above reserved row for 1001xxxx = reserved. Insert new reserved row 101000xx = reserved below row for 10100100 = 100GBASE-BR10-D PMA/PMD (editor to check that this code hasn't been allocated by another standard ahead of this one. If it is allocated by another standard in progress, suggest you inform the editor of that standard of these changes to this register - they will need to align).

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.
Add Editor's note for register bit reserved by 802.3dj.
(101000xx are reserved by dj for 1.6T DR8-2, DR8, CR8 and KR8.)

---

Cl **45** SC **45.2.1.117.7a** P **23** L **48** # 16

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A** *RS-FEC-Int*

100G RS-FEC-Int ability bit applies to 100GBASE-BRx only. A CR or KR doesn't have this bit but it does have the ability.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Need to say so

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add "100G RS-FEC-Int ability bit applies to 100GBASE-BRx." to CL45.2.1.117.7a with editorial license.
Change the title of Table 45–95 to:RS-FEC status register bit definitions.

---

Cl **56** SC **56.1.3** P **30** L **28** # 17

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

Why is 161 here among 25G clauses?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move to near 91

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **56** *SC* **56.1.3** *P* **30** *L* **32** # 18

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

50GBASE-R PMA

*SuggestedRemedy*

50GBASE-R and 100GBASE-P PMA

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change colume title of CL135 to 50GBASE-R and 100GBASE-P PMA, and change table entries of CL83 to O, CL135 to M for 100GBASE-BRx.

*Cl* **80** *SC* **80.1.3** *P* **31** *L* **17** # 19

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

VR1and

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert space

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **80** *SC* **80.1.4** *P* **33** *L* **29** # 20

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

Full stops

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **80** *SC* **80.4** *P* **35** *L* **30** # 21

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

Parts of footnotes a and b don't apply to Table 80-7 but do apply to Table 80-7a. Also, footnote c applies to both tables.

*SuggestedRemedy*

For Table 80-7:
a For 40GBASE-R, 1 bit time (BT) is equal to 25 ps. (See 1.4.215 for the definition of bit time.)
b For 40GBASE-R, 1 pause_quantum is equal to 12.8 ns. (See 31B.2 for the definition of pause_quanta.)
For Table 80-7a:
a For 100GBASE-R, 1 bit time (BT) is equal to 10 ps. (See 1.4.215 for the definition of bit time.)
b For 100GBASE-R, 1 pause_quantum is equal to 5.12 ns. (See 31B.2 for the definition of pause_quanta.)
Add footnote c to Table 80-7a.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

*Cl* **80** *SC* **80.5** *P* **38** *L* **3** # 22

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

Sublayer delay constraints

*SuggestedRemedy*

Summary of Skew Variation constraints

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **80** *SC* **80.5** *P* **38** *L* **7** # 23

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

26.5625GBd

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert space

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **80** *SC* **80.5** *P* **38** *L* **40** # 24

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

Clause 161 through Clause 163, and related annexes

*SuggestedRemedy*

Clause 161 through Clause 163, Clause 168, and related annexes

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **91** *SC* **91.7.3** *P* **41** *L* **24** # 25

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

Too many "or"

*SuggestedRemedy*

There should be just one per list:
100GBASE-BR20, or
100GBASE-BR40 PHY

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

*Cl* **91** *SC* **91.7.4.1** *P* **42** *L* **15** # 26

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

KR4

*SuggestedRemedy*

Should be KP4 as in 3db, 3ck

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change KR4 to KP4.

*Cl* **91** *SC* **91.7.4.2** *P* **43** *L* **7** # 27

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

KR5

*SuggestedRemedy*

Should be KP4 as in 3db, 3ck

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change KR4 to KP4.

*Cl* **135** *SC* **135** *P* **44** *L* **1** # 28

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

135. Introduction to 50 Gb/s networksPhysical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer, type 50GBASE-R and 100GBASE-P

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete "Introduction to 50 Gb/s networks"

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **135** *SC* **135.5.7.2** *P* **44** *L* **25** # 29

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

An PMA

*SuggestedRemedy*

A PMA

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **135** *SC* **135.5.7.2** *P* **44** *L* **44** # 4

Maguire, Valerie — Copperopolis (aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco)

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *consistency*

This sentence is confusing to me. It seems there must be a way to make it clearer. The sentence should start with "A PMA" (not "An PMA").

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace, ". An PMA shall provide 1/(1+D) mod 4 precoding capability on each output lane, except a PMA that is connected to the service interface of a 100GBASE-BRx PMD which may provide such a capability."
with, "A PMA, except one connected to the service interface of a 100GBASE-BRx PMD and already providing such a capability, shall provide 1/(1+D) mod 4 precoding capability on each output lane."

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.
(comment #110 from D2.1)
Change "An PMA" to "A PMA".

---

*Cl* **135** *SC* **135.7.3** *P* **45** *L* **4** # 30

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *quick review*

Need to declare the new major option

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the major option for 100GBASE-BRx

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add a new entry in subclause 135.7.3 for 100GBASE-BRx, use 50GA1 as the reference.
Update table in subclause 135.7.7 with editorial license.

---

*Cl* **157** *SC* **157.4.2** *P* **50** *L* **42** # 31

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **R** *quick review*

Skew constraints - this is for 100G only

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change subclause heading to: Skew constraints for 100GBASE-BRx

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
This subclause introduces general contents to related BiDi PHYs.
50GBASE-BRx and 100GBASE-BRx have skew constraints specified in their own clauses (CL160.3.2 and CL168.3.2).
See comment #32.

---

*Cl* **157** *SC* **157.4.2** *P* **50** *L* **52** # 33

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

For 100GBASE-VR1 and 100GBASE-SR - not

*SuggestedRemedy*

Since the whole subclause is about 100GBASE-BRx - delete

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete the last sentence of the third paragraph in CL157.4.2.
See comment #32.

---

*Cl* **157** *SC* **157.4.2** *P* **50** *L* **52** # 32

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *consistency*

This seems to repeat the material in 168.3.2.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Would it be better to handle it like the delay specs?
Replace contents of subclause with: The Skew and Skew Variation constraints for 100GBASE-BRx PHY sublayers are specified in 80.5.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace CL 157.4.2 with:
The Skew and Skew Variation constraints for 50GBASE-BRx PHY sublayers are specified in 160.3.2.
The Skew and Skew Variation constraints for 100GBASE-BRx PHY sublayers are specified in 168.3.2.

*Cl* **157** *SC* **157.6** *P* **51** *L* **13** # 34

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

Clause 114, Clause 158 through Clause 160, Clause 168

*SuggestedRemedy*

Clause 114, Clause 152, Clause 158 through Clause 161, Clause 168

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **161** *SC* **161.6.10a** *P* **52** *L* **28** # 35

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A** *RS-FEC-Int*

100G_RS_FEC_Int_ability applies to 100GBASE-BRx, but not CR or KR, which don't have this bit but do have the ability.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert sentence: The 100G_RS_FEC_Int_ability variable applies to 100GBASE-BRx. Add sentence at the end: For other PHY types, the ability is determined by the PHY type and there is no such variable.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Insert sentence with editorial license: The 100G_RS_FEC_Int_ability variable applies to 100GBASE-BRx.
Change the title of Table 161–2 to: MDIO/RS-FEC-Int status variable mapping

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.5.9** *P* **59** *L* **35** # 36

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

the PMD_receive_fault function: underscores or not?

*SuggestedRemedy*

If, as appears to be the case, variable names use underscores and function names do not, change PMD_receive_fault function to PMD receive fault function, twice.
Also, insert space in thePMD_receive_fault

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.6.1** *P* **60** *L* **21** # 37

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A** *quick review*

According to D2.1 comment 63, there should be an editor's note calling for contributions on the tolerancing for 100GBASE-BR2 and whether it should use a minimum loss spec.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Consider the tolerancing for 100GBASE-BR2 and whether it should use a minimum loss spec; add editor's note if more study is needed.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add editor's note: BR20 spec adjustment was done to increase OMAouter tolerance between min and max values.
See D2.1 comment #63.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.6.1** *P* **60** *L* **22** # 5

Jackson, Kenneth Sumitomo Electric

*Comment Type* **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *technical*

Modification to Table 168-6 100GBASE-BR10 Tx launch powers (avg, OMA, excursion) based on new MPI calculations.

*SuggestedRemedy*

0.2dB lower transmit launch powers (avg, OMA, excursion). See presentation regarding this comment.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change BR10 in Table 168-6 as in slide 9 of 3dk_jackson_2506_1.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.6.1** *P* **61** *L* **20** # 6

Jackson, Kenneth Sumitomo Electric

*Comment Type* **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *technical*

Modify Eq 168-1 100GBASE-BR10 to reflect lower Tx launch powers based on new MPI calculations

*SuggestedRemedy*

0.2dB lower transmit launch power. See presentation regarding this comment.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change Equation 168-1 to:
-0.5+max(TECQ, TDECQ).
See equation in slide 9 of 3dk_jackson_2506_1.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.6.2** *P* **61** *L* **33** # 8

Jackson, Kenneth — Sumitomo Electric

*Comment Type* **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *technical*

Modify Table 168-7 to refelect lower transmit powers (assuming those proposed 0.2dB lower values are adopted)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Avg Rx power = 4.6dBm Receiver power (OMA(outer) (max) = 4.8dBm
Avg Rx Power (min) = -8.4dBm
Damage threshold =5.6dBm (to maintain consistent methodology)
See presentation regarding this comment

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change BR10 in Table 168-7 as in slide 10 of 3dk_jackson_2506_1.

---

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.6.3** *P* **62** *L* **25** # 7

Jackson, Kenneth — Sumitomo Electric

*Comment Type* **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *technical*

Modify Table 168-8 100GBASE-BR10 Power Budget and Allocation for penalties.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Modify Table 168-8 100GBASE-BR10 Power Budget and Allocation for penalties from 10.6dB to 10.4dB & 4.3dB to 4.1dB, respectively. See presentation regarding this comment.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change BR10 in Table 168-8 as in slide 11 of 3dk_jackson_2506_1.

---

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.6.3** *P* **62** *L* **25** # 38

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

Editor's note "call for further check of the penalty values" has disappeared, contrary to D2.0 comment 25

*SuggestedRemedy*

Review the penalty values; add editor's note if more study is needed.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Add the editor's note as in D2.1.
(D2.1 comment #62)

---

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.1** *P* **63** *L* **5** # 39

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **R** *quick review*

If the definition of RIN measurement is improved (D2.1 comment 25), the only use for square wave in the standard would be as an alternative to SSPRQ for measuring transmitter transition time. But for that, one needs to find 20% and 80% of OMAouter; OMAouter is measured with PRBS13Q or SSPRQ, not square wave, so it's not practical anyway. Transmitter transition time goes with TECQ, extinction ratio, overshoot and undershoot; they can all be obtained from the same measurement with SSPRQ. There is no need for the standard to mandate a second way. Square wave is a very untypical pattern which should not be recommended if there is a practical alternative.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete square wave from tables 168-9 and 168-10. Someone who wants to use it still can, because it still exists in 120.5.11.2.5, and the registers to advertise it and control it still exist in 45, but we should not encourage it in future.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
See comment #47.

---

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.5** *P* **64** *L* **34** # 40

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A** *quick review*

This TDECQ doesn't use the FFE in 121.8.5.4 because that has 38 ps tap spacing for 50 Gb/s and we need 19 ps spacing for 100 Gb/s as in 140.7.5.1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 121.8.5.4 to 140.7.5.4.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change 121.8.5.4 to 140.7.5.1 (TDECQ reference equalizer).
(D2.1 comment #15)

---

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.5** *P* **64** *L* **36** # 41

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

signal rate

*SuggestedRemedy*

signaling rate

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.5** *P* **64** *L* **40** # 42

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *consistency*

This long, hard to understand, run-on sentence has been fixed elsewhere e.g. 150.8.5, 150.8.7, 150.8.10 and 151.8.1

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "GHz, and at frequencies above 1.3 x 53.125 GHz, the response" to "GHz. At frequencies above 1.3 x 53.125 GHz, its response" (2 changes)

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.5** *P* **64** *L* **45** # 43

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A** *quick review*

chayeb_3dj_01_2505 slide 8 shows that a very asymmetric signal can pass all the specs and still be troublesome to receive.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a spec for the maximum tap weight for the tap immediately after the largest tap: max 0.07. (Typically this tap would be -ve)

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add an Editor's note:
There's a proposal to add the maximum tap weight for the tap immediately after the largest tap: max 0.07 in CL 168.7.5.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.5.1** *P* **65** *L* **18** # 44

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A** *quick review*

This says "The link may be as short as 2 m, and the minimum or maximum dispersion may be 0." Actually, the minimum for the test cannot be 0, and the maximum cannot be 0 for 100GBASE-BRx-D. Editorial changes for use of "may", and making the intent clearer.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "A link may be as short as 2 m, therefore the maximum dispersion for 100GBASE-BRx-U is 0 for some transmitter wavelengths."

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.6** *P* **65** *L* **41** # 46

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A** *quick review*

A signal that needed a main tap at 0.8 would be unhealthily over-emphasised and troublesome for the receiver. While the over/under-shoot spec may catch many such signals, it doesn't catch them all. 802.3dj has a limit of 0.9. We should apply the same limit. It is reasonable to do this for TECQ while we study the interplay between this and chromatic dispersion some more.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 0.8 to 0.9, for TECQ: after "except that the test fiber is not used", add "and the largest magnitude tap coefficient, is constrained to be at least 0.9."

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change the last sentence of CL168.7.6 to:
The TECQ of each lane is measured using the methods specified for TDECQ in 168.7.5, except that the test fiber is not used, and the largest magnitude tap coefficient is constrained to be at least 0.9.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.6** *P* **65** *L* **41** # 45

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

Missing cross-reference

*SuggestedRemedy*

168.7.5

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.11** *P* **67** *L* **11** # 47

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **R** *quick review*

We should reconsider unsatisfied D2.0 comment 25: update the RIN definition to align to what is defined in 802.3dj. This is industry practice.

*SuggestedRemedy*

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
There was no consensus to make the change at this time.
See comment #25 in D2.1.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.13** *P* **68** *L* **50** # 48

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *quick review*

"SRS" is not used in Table 168-10, or 121.8.10. It should be defined or removed.

*SuggestedRemedy*

As it appears only twice, remove: change SRS to stressed receiver sensitivity here and on the next page

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.13** *P* **68** *L* **51** # 49

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A** *quick review*

D2.1 comment 49: Add text saying that the PMD's transmitter and any other circuitry that could cause crosstalk should be operational when stressed sensitivity (and regular sensitivity) is measured. The same goes for transmitter measurements such as TECQ and TDECQ. 121.8.5.1 says "with all other lanes in operation but this is interpreted as other lanes in the same Ethernet link, and these PMDs are serial. 167.8.1 says "For a receiver in a multilane device" (as opposed to multilane PHY or multilane PMD"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add suitable text

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.
Add new subclause 168.7.2 as:
168.7.2 Considerations for multi-port equipment
100GBASE-BRx equipment or devices may contain all or parts of multiple PHYs in parallel. These can have crosstalk, so they are taken into account in the same way as the lanes in a multi-lane PHY. This might be significant for TDECQ, TECQ, RINxOMA, receiver sensitivity and stressed receiver sensitivity.
Where relevant, parameters are defined with all co-propagating and counter-propagating lanes in a device operational, so that crosstalk effects are included. While the lanes in a particular direction may share a common clock, the Tx and Rx directions are not synchronous to each other. If Pattern 3 is used for the lanes not under test using a common clock, there is at least 31 UI delay between the PRBS31Q patterns on one lane and any other lane so that the symbols on each lane are not correlated within the PMD.
For a complete PHY (one that includes RS-FEC, PMA and PMD sublayers), the amplitude of the Tx aggressor lanes is set by the product under test. For a partial PHY such as an optical module with an AUI, containing PMA and PMD, the amplitude of the Tx aggressor lanes at the AUI is the same as that of the "victim" AUI of the PMA/PMD under test.
The amplitude of the Rx aggressor lanes is the receive power (OMAouter) (max). This represents signals arriving via transmitters and low-loss optical paths which could be very different to the victim in a receiver test.
Alternative test methods that generate equivalent results may be used.

Add in CL168.7.5:
The device under test receives an optical signal. The OMAouter of this and any applicable Rx aggressor lanes is the receive power (OMAouter) (max) given in Table 168-7. For more information including Tx aggressors, see 168.7.2.

Add in CL168.7.11:
A thorough relative intensity noise measurement takes crosstalk into account. The device under test receives an optical signal. The OMAouter of this and any applicable Rx aggressor lanes is the receive power (OMAouter) (max) given in Table 168-7. For more information including Tx aggressors, see 168.7.2.

Add in CL168.7.12:
A thorough receiver sensitivity measurement takes crosstalk into account. The transmitter of the receiver under test is operational. The OMAouter of any applicable Rx aggressor lanes is the receive power (OMAouter) (max) given in Table 168-7. For more information including Tx aggressors, see 168.7.2.

Add in CL168.7.13:
The transmitter of the receiver under test is operational. The OMAouter of any applicable Rx aggressor lanes is the receive power (OMAouter) (max) given in Table 168-7. For more information including Tx aggressors, see 168.7.2.

---

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.7.13** *P* **68** *L* **52** # 50

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A** *quick review*

No need for the indirection in "The SECQ of the stressed receiver conformance test signal is measured according to 168.7.5, except that the test fiber is not used." because SECQ and TECQ are the same (although I don't remember that this is stated).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "according to 168.7.5, except that the test fiber is not used" to "according to the procedure for TECQ given in 168.7.6"

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change the first sentence in the first bullet "according to 168.7.5, except that the test fiber is not used" to "according to the procedure for TECQ given in 168.7.6".

---

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.10** *P* **72** *L* **8** # 51

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A** *quick review*

This section is about the cabling, not the budget. As I understand it, when cabling is installed it is measured at 1310 nm (and maybe 1550 nm), and that's adequate for all O-band PMDs. Clauses 52 and 59 follow this method clearly.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In the table, for the channel insertion loss rows, insert "1310". Move "Over the wavelength range 1303.6 nm to 1310.1 nm", to Table 168-8, 100GBASE-BRx illustrative link power budgets, where it is applicable. There is no need to adjust any numbers in this clause, because the operating wavelengths are so close to 1310 nm.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Insert "1310" in the wavelength cell in the channel insertion loss row.
Detele "Over the wavelength range 1303.6 nm to 1310.1 nm" in footnote b of Table 168-12, and add a footnote "Over the wavelength range 1303.6 nm to 1310.1 nm" to channel insertion loss row in Table 168-8.
Implement with editorial license.

---

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.10** *P* **72** *L* **24** # 52

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

The new sentence about dispersion doesn't relate to the insertion loss row.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move anchor b to the first dispersion row.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add anchor b to the first dispersion row.

---

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.11.4.1** *P* **75** *L* **15** # 53

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

SP3

*SuggestedRemedy*

SP4?

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **168** *SC* **168.11.4.1** *P* **75** *L* **20** # 54

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

SP3

*SuggestedRemedy*

SP5? If so, O not M

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change SP3 in SC3 to SP5 and change the status of SC3 to O.
Change value/comment of SC1 and SC2 to Device conforms to skew and skew variation constraints.

*Cl* **169** *SC* **169.8.3** *P* **69** *L* **37** # 1

Maguire, Valerie — Copperopolis (aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco)

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **R** *consistency*

Consider simplifying guidance.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace, "It is recommended that proper installation practices, as defined by applicable local codes and regulation, be followed in every instance in which such practices are applicable."
with, "Proper installation practices, as defined by applicable local codes and regulation, should be followed.

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Reference clauses, such as CL140 and ongoing project 802.3dj, all use the same wording. This could be considered as maintenance comment.

*Cl* **169** *SC* **169.8.4** *P* **69** *L* **49** # 3

Maguire, Valerie — Copperopolis (aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco)

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **R** *consistency*

Consider simplifying guidance.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace, "It is recommended that manufacturers indicate in the literature associated with the PHY the operating environmental conditions to facilitate selection, installation, and maintenance."
with, "It is recommended that manufacturers indicate conditions to facilitate selection, installation, and maintenance in the literature associated with the PHY."

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Reference clauses, such as CL140 and ongoing project 802.3dj, all use the same wording. This could be considered as maintenance comment.

*Cl* **169** *SC* **169.8.4** *P* **69** *L* **49** # 2

Maguire, Valerie — Copperopolis (aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco)

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **R** *consistency*

Consider simplifying guidance.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace, "It is recommended that manufacturers indicate, in the literature associated with the components of the optical link, the distance and operating environmental conditions over which the specifications of this clause
are met."
with, "It is recommended that manufacturers indicate distance and operating environmental conditions in the literature associated with the components of the optical link."

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Reference clauses, such as CL140 and ongoing project 802.3dj, all use the same wording. This could be considered as maintenance comment.

*Cl* **Content** *SC* **Contents** *P* **13** *L* **12** # 12

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

Layout

*SuggestedRemedy*

Tab position?

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Follow the latest 802.3 template.

*Cl* **Content** *SC* **Contents** *P* **14** *L* **26** # 13

Dawe, Piers — Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *editorial*

Layout

*SuggestedRemedy*

Tab position?

*Response* *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Follow the latest 802.3 template.