

# IEEE802.3bj draft 1.2 COM update review

Thursday, October 25, 2012

5:52 PM

Slides on COM operation were presented. A change in naming convention was made to avoid confusion with the Draft nomenclature. COM\_d1p2.m and the corresponding spreadsheet config\_COM2L\_d1p2.xls is an implementation what is documented in Draft 1.2.



Slide were presented showing an example of how COM may be used to determine spec parameter impact. Slides comparing KP4 and KR4 w/o FEC, with and without packages were presented. John raised concern that issues generated from including packages and relation to the Tx jitter sections seems to cause lack of spec focus and confidence. Mike suggested that values used for sigma\_rs and Add may be too pessimistic. Rich made the suggestion that these could be addressed as comments to the draft as COM code is an implementation what is published.

The Tx/Rx return loss specified in the Tx/Rx section were used to determine the package models used in COM. These packages have far more return loss than those indicated originally in moore\_01\_0311. Hence Rich suggest that the strong package impact is not unexpected as illustrated is the COM comparison slides.

Piers would like to see the NRZ with FEC results. Data was present for NRZ without FEC only. Adam clarified that the draft does not specify an option raw SER0 (bit error ratio) of 1e-12. SER0 is 1e-5 for KR4 and KP4. A slide sent as attachment in this mail shows comparisons for the package case.

The request was reiterated to determine COM for KR4 w/wo FEC and KP4 by folks who developed channel models. No more scheduled meetings are planned unless there is a request to review new data.



- Richard Allred Guest
- Rick Rabinovich Guest
- Scott Irwin Guest
- Shanbhag, Megha 
- Stephen Alie Guest
- Tracy, Nathan L. 
- vasu Guest
- Vasu Parthasarathy Guest
- Vittal Balasubramanian Guest
- Walter Guest
- Wheling Cheng, Juniper Netw... Guest
- will bliss Guest

10/25/2012

Piers Dawe  
Charles Moore