Channel Model Ad Hoc:
Agenda and General Information

Channel Model Ad Hoc Teleconference

2005 November 2

Charles Moore

SPG of Agilent Technologies

charles_moore@agilent.com

If you are present on today’s call, please send me an e-mail indicating your attendance.

Schedule of Events

Teleconference:

- Wednesday, November 2 (3PM EDT)

Deadline for requests for presentation time.

- Wednesday, November 9 (midnight EST)

IEEE802.3ap taskforce Interim meeting Vancouver, BC

- Sunday November 13-Monday November 14

IEEE802.3 Plenary Meeting Vancouver, BC
Sunday November 13-Friday November 18
IEEE802.3ap will meet Tuesday - Thursday

Meeting Agenda

Old business

2. Discuss comments 259, 262, 299, 578, etc to Annex 69A. See moore_c1_1105
3. Comment 105, see moore_c2_1105
4. Resolve comment 300, if Joe Abler is available and wants to pursue it

New business: discuss other comments to Annex 69A, Interference tolerance test as time and interest allow. This could include

7. Comments having to do with compliance channel: 86, 103, 322, and 581.
8. Comments having to do with extrapolation to BER=1e-12: 106, 169, 332, 333

Comment 86

'Weiner, Nick

“'Equation 69A-1 specifies an amplitude response bound for the of the ""compliance channel"". No phase response is specified. Is a phase response spec needed?”

Suggested remedy:

- **“Add note to the effect that the phase response is not important.**
- **Or else include spec for phase response.”**

Comment 103

Moore, Charles:

“Similarly with defining the main channel, small amounts of ripple may put the Compliance channel out of spec even though it is basically what we want. It will be as stressful (or more stressful because of the ripple) as the speced channel. I would like “

Proposed remedy:

- “change lines 21-23 and equation (69A-1) to:

- The insertion loss of the compliance interconnect shall be generally greater than the worst-case insertion loss. This is assured by subtracting the worst-case insertion loss from the compliance interconnect

Comment 322

Baumer, Howard

"There is no return loss definition for the compliance channel. Without this how are the compliant transmitter return loss to compliance channel return loss interactions taken into account and controlled?"

Suggested remedy:

"Define return loss for the compliance channel"

Comment 581

Ghiasi, Ali:

"The channel is defined by an ideal frequency dependent attenuator."

Suggested remedy:

"The channel must be defined based on realistic impulse response. The channel sterssor can be created using an FIR filter adequately defining the channel. Current channel stressor does not resemble real hardware with discontinuity and reflections"

Comment 106

Moore, Charles”

- *“Method described to extrapolate from standard BER to 1e-12 is*
- *1. likely to difficult to impliment by some*
- *2. not the only valid way, or even necessarily the best*
- *3. as written, mathematically nonsense since it involves taking*

Suggested remedy:

- “Require extrapolation to BER=1e-12 but only suggest a method, not prescribe one
- Try:
- Extrapolate the interference-BER data to a BER of 1e-12. The difference between the interference at standard BER and the extrapolated value at 1e-12
- is the extra

Comment 169

Spagna, Fulvio

“Log(mBER) is a negative number so taking the square root of Log(mBER) is not appropriate.”

Suggested remedy:

“Will be presented in a separate ppt at the September meeting”

Comment 332

Baumer, Howard:

“This equation does not match Figure 69A-3. Equation says sqrt(log(mBER)) whereas the figure shows BER”

Suggested remedy:

“

Comment 333

Baumer, Howard:

“Linear part of the data isn"t defined.”

Suggested remedy:

“Define which points are the liniear part of the data”