



---

# Channel Model Ad Hoc: Report

***IEEE Interim Task Force Meeting  
2005 November 15***

***Charles Moore  
Agilent Technologies  
charles\_moore@agilent.com***



---

# Goals:

1. Provide recommended responses to comments 105, 128, 300 against sub-clause 69.3
2. Provide recommended responses to technical comments against annex 69A



# Procedure:

---

- ♦ Had 3 phone conferences:
  2. 2005 September 28
  3. 2005 October 12
  4. 2005 November 2
- ♦ Reviewed 5 prepared presentations.
- ♦ Held 2 straw polls, see below.



# Accomplishments:

---

- ♦ On Comment 105 to tie ICR spec to interference tolerance spec:
- Heard 2 presentations from Charles Moore, commenter, showing some results indicating that either channel spec or interference tolerance spec must be made tighter.
- A summary will be shown later.
- No consensus.



# Accomplishments:

---

- ◆ On Comment 128 to specify a limit on a log-linear fit to ICR rather than on ICR directly, to avoid having ripple make good channels be out of spec.
- Consensus approval of verbiage I will present when we discuss Comment 128. Verbiage has been sent to Schelto



# Accomplishments:

---

- ◆ On Comment 300 to extend range of ICR spec in frequency for 10G-BASEKR
- Consensus approval of extending frequency range to Nyquist frequency



# Accomplishments:

---

- ◆ On Comments 259, 262, 299, 578 against Annex 69A, having to do with the “compliant transmitter”
- Reviewed moore\_c2\_1105.pdf proposing verbiage to address issues covered by these comments. Straw poll found (Chicago rules):

1	No jitter tolerance test (most similar to existing spec)	4
2	Combine jitter tolerance test with interference tolerance test (most similar to moore_c2_1105)	7
3	Separate jitter tolerance test	7
4	Eliminate interference tolerance test and replace with jitter tolerance test	1
- There is no clear consensus.



# Accomplishments:

---

On comment 311 asking that compliance channel be moved above Amax:

- Straw poll vote: “Should the compliance channel be the same or lossier than Amax”:

Yes            5

No             1

Abstain      4

Which I interpret as a weak agreement to reject comment 311.