

Table 1:

Comment Number	Ed or tech	Comment	Resolution
1.	E	Page 2, Clause 2.1, Approved references. The reference to ANSI/TIA/EIA 455-8-00 should read "ANSI/TIA/EIA 455-8-2000" and the title should be corrected to have the proper capitalization, i.e., "Measurement of Splice or Connector Loss and Reflectance Using an OTDR."	Accepted.
2.	E	Page 2, Clause 2.1, Approved references. The reference to ANSI/TIA/EIA 455-34A-1995 - FOTP 34 should read: "Interconnection Device Insertion Loss Test" and the parenthetical expression should be removed.	Accepted.
3.	E	Page 2, Clause 2.1, Approved references. The nomenclature associated with reference ANSI/EIA 455-3-1989 is incorrect. It should be "OFSTP - 3" rather than FOTP - 3.	The called out reference should be 526-3-1989. Otherwise accepted.
4.	E	Page 2, Clause 2.1, Approved references. First reference in the 2nd column, ISO/IEC 825 1: 1993 should read:"ISO/IEC 60825-1: 1998"	Accepted.
5.	E	Page 2, Clause 2.1, Approved references (E) The second reference in the 2nd column ISO/IEC 825 1:1993 should read: ISO/IEC 60825-2: 2000"	Accepted.
6.	E	Page iv. T11 Technical Committee Membership add "D. Coleman" (Current Corning Alternate)	Accepted.

Table 1:

Comment Number	Ed or tech	Comment	Resolution
7.	E	Page v. T11.1 Technical Committee Membership add "D. Coleman" (Current Corning Alternate)	Accepted.
8.	E	p.3, Clause 3.1.20, jitter, data dependent. Recommend that the definition be shortened. It is too long and explanatory for a definition. Perhaps the final edit by the tech writer can be used to accomplish this.	Rejected. This definition matches the one in FC-PI.
9.	T	p.10, Table 4, Optical path, Interchannel Skew. Not able to find a domestic or international standard for cable or fiber that specifies skew. Perhaps a reference should be made as to the source document for this value. If this cannot be provided than I would recommend that this row be removed from the table since this is an application standard rather than a generic fiber or cable standard. Note: The Japanese have made some recommendations on skew for inclusion in IEC 61282-1 Fiber Optic Communications Systems Part 1: Generic Specifications, but none of the recommendations have been formally included in the standard at this point in time. There are no values associated with these recommendations.	Rejected. The skew value given is the amount that is budgeted for skew. It's a number unique to HIPPI-6400 due to our use of dynamic skew compensation.
10.	E	010. (pp.10-11, Table 4 and 5 under the Optical Path Heading Missing column? Why is there no reference to 50µm fiber and values associated with this class of multimode fiber.	Rejected. There are eye safety issues with use of parallel fiber modules at 50 microns.

Table 1:

Comment Number	Ed or tech	Comment	Resolution
11.	T	<p>p.11, Table 5 -- 1300 nm optical parameters. Believe that the operating distances value for 62.5µm MM should be 500 and the SM value should be 3000.</p> <p>Table 5: Replace the column headings "SM value" and "MM value" with the TIA/IEC/ITU fiber type -- Class B1 Fibers. and Class A1b Fibers respectively</p>	<p>Rejected. The limits of distance are not driven by the fundamental fiber limitations, but limits in our usage of them. Our modules and flow control schemes can only operate as shown.</p> <p>Rejected. There is already a note that calls out the fiber types as requested. Removing the "SM" and "MM" headings would reduce clarity.</p>
12.	T	<p>p.15, Annex A, Table A.1. The last two columns don't reflect FDDI grade fibers and may not reflect what is currently produced by fiber manufacturers for 850nm sources at core/cladding diameters of 62.5/125µm. Recommend that the table be removed or that the column values in the last two columns be provided for 1300nm sources at 500Mhz*km and 800 MHz*km.</p> <p>Remove the associated wording in paragraph A.1 regarding commercial availability. They are not appropriate even for an informative annex to a technical standard. They deal with what may be rather than what is.</p>	<p>Rejected. This is only an example and is stated as such. It provides guidance in predicting distance effects.</p> <p>Rejected. The text is required to make the point that the table is just an example.</p>
13.	T	<p>Table 5, p. 10. Bandwidth is not a specified parameter for single-mode fiber. Insert N/A</p>	<p>Accepted.</p>

Table 1:

Comment Number	Ed or tech	Comment	Resolution
14.	E	Clause 8.2 Cable plant loss budget OFSTP-14 applies only to multimode fiber. OFSTP-7 should be referenced for singlemode fiber, i.e., The loss of the fiber plant should be verified by the methods described in OFSTP-14 for Multimode fiber and OFSTP-7 for single mode fiber.	Accepted.
15.	T	Clause 8.3 Optical return loss. Singlemode fiber has a return loss of -26dB. This value should also be included in the wording of this clause. The clause only states return loss for multimode fiber ≥ 20 dB.	Accepted.
16.	E	016. Annex A, paragraph A.2 Connection loss example. The text describes four connector pair points. This implies the use of a cross-connect. This is not in sync with FC-PI or the IEEE Ethernet Standards.	Rejected. HIPPI-6400 has always had a stated goal of support extra connections beyond the number supported by Fibre Channel and Ethernet.