

CI 166	SC 166.6.4.8.6	P15	L36	# 7
--------	----------------	-----	-----	---

Dawe, Piers

NVIDIA

<i>Comment Type</i>	TR	<i>Comment Status</i>	D
---------------------	-----------	-----------------------	----------

As pointed out in D2.0 comment 6, this is a technical change.

If the intention is to change the values of TDFOM0 from the arbitrary but not incorrect values in the standard in force, to have the meaning described at line 17 and in the PAR section 5.5 "to yield Transmitter Distortion Figure of Merit (TDFOM) equal to 0 dB in Equation (166-16) for an ideal transmitter" then the TDFOM limits in Table 166-9 and STDFOM conditions in Table 16610 must be reduced by the amounts by which TDFOM0 is increased, so that the same transmitters and receivers pass and fail.

If the intention is to make different transmitters and receivers pass and fail, it is obviously a technical change.

The IEEE SA SB ops manual says that a corrigendum is:

"A document that only corrects editorial errors, technical errors, or ambiguities in an existing IEEE standard."

These numbers are not technical errors in the existing standard. Any errors were in the preparation of the numbers that went into it, and the result is that the standard in force does not represent the intention of some participants; but it is complete and clear, and similar to TWDP and TDECQ in that there are "zero offsets". As the standard is not in error, the proposed changes are not appropriate to a corrigendum.

SuggestedRemedy

Withdraw this project. If it is thought worthwhile, propose changes for one of these intentions as an amendment, or part of another amendment project.

<i>Proposed Response</i>	<i>Response Status</i>	W
--------------------------	------------------------	----------

PROPOSED REJECT.

The comment is in support of an unsatisfied previous comment, as described by the commenter (Draft 2.0 Comment #6), associated with a Disapprove vote and does not provide substantive additional rationale.

The unsatisfied previous comment (Draft 2.0 Comment #6) was previously considered by the CRG and accepted in principle (see https://www.ieee802.org/3/dr/comments/Committee%20report_CommentID_Unsatisfied.pdf)

Disposition status is "reject" based on IEEE SA Balloting and Comment Resolution Process Guidelines <https://standards.ieee.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Ballot-and-Comment-Resolution-Process-Guidelines-clean.pdf#page=4>, third "rejected disposition status" use case.