Cl **69B**   *SC* **69B**   *P* **185**   *L* **2**   # 43

JONES, WILLIAM W   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **R**

I'm extremely pleased with changes in the 69B.4 channel parameters; specifically the removal of the PILD equation (69B-24) and the Psys equation (69B-25), and the accounting for these penalties directly in the ICRmin equation (69B-26). ICR now adequately enables flexibility in design trade-offs for backplane interconnects. These changes remove my concerns on making the channel parameters normative. Normative channel parameters are essential to enabling appropriate tests by which to assess the claim for conformance of the implementation.

SuggestedRemedy

Clause: 69B, Page 185, Line: 2
Replace: informative With: normative
Clause: 69B.2, Page 185, Line: 9-10
Delete: informative
Clause: 69B.4.1, Page 186, Line: 5-6
Delete: informative
Clause: 69B.4.1, Page 186, Line: 8-9
Delete: informative
Clause: 69B.4.1, Page 186, Line: 11-12
Delete: informative
Clause: 70.8, Page 66, Line: 9-10
Delete: informative
Clause: 71.8, Page 82, Line: 29-30
Delete: informative
Clause: 72.8, Page 115, Line: 9-10
Delete: informative
Clause: 69B.4.6, Page: 191, Line 41-43
Replace:The following equations and informative model assume that aggressors and victim may driven by a compliant PHY of any type.
With: The following equations and model assume that aggressors and victim may driven by a compliant PHY of any type.
Clause: 69B.4.6.4, Page 192, Line 16:
Replace: It is recommended that ICRfit be greater than than or equal to ICRmin as defined by the following equation:
With: ICRfit shall be greater than or equal to ICRmin as defined by the following equation:
Subclause: 69B.4.5, Page 190, Line 47-48:
Replace: It is recommended that the channel return loss, RL, measured in dB at TP1 and TP4, be greater than or equal to RLmin as defined by the following equations:
With: The channel return loss, RL, measured in dB at TP1 and TP4, shall be greater than or equal to RLmin as defined by the following equations:
Subclause: 69B.4.4.
Page 190: Line 8-9
Replace: It is recommended that ILD be within the high confidence region defined by the following equations:
With: The ILD shall be within the high confidence region defined by the following equations:

Response   *Response Status*   **U**

REJECT.

Refer to the reponse to Draft 3.0 comment #16.

This point was debated by the Task Force and it was decided that the channel parameters would remain informative, which is consistent with the position assumed throughout working group ballot.

Strawpoll #1:
Make the channel normative per suggested remedy:

Yes:6
No:8
Abstain:1

Motion #1:
Move to reject the suggested remedy:
Moved by: George Zimmerman
Seconded by: Chris Diminico
Technical (75% required)
Yes:
No:
Abstain:

All voters in the room are 802.3 voters

Mover and seconder have withdrawn the motion #1.

Motion #2:
Move to Accept the suggested remedy:
Moved by: George Zimmerman
Seconded by: Chris Diminico
Technical (75% required)
Yes: 4
No:9
Abstain:0
All voters in the room are 802.3 voters
Motion fails.

There is no consensus to make the suggested change.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **69B**   Page 1 of 2
SC **69B**   12/4/2006 4:02:21 PM

Cl **69B**   *SC* **69B.4**   *P* **220**   *L*   # 44
MCCLELLAN, MR BRETT A   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **R**

The channel parameters in this section have been updated in draft 3.1. However, these parameters will only ensure interoperability if they are specified as normative requirements rather than informative text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change informative references to normative requirements.

Response   *Response Status*   **U**
REJECT.

Refer to comment #43

Cl **72**   *SC* **72.7.1**   *P* **105**   *L* **52**   # 32
GHIASI, ALI   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **R**

Max ouptut jitter specifications is not clear with 3 jitter components adding to 0.335 UI but listing total jitter of 0.28 UI

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to define
Max Jitter Ouptut = 0.28 UI
Max Deterministic Jitter = 0.15 UI
In the table foot note add note "Max Duty Cycle Jitter Portion of DJ < 0.035 UI".
In Section 72.7.1.8 You can reference MJSQ as well as define max RJ = 0.28 - DJ.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**
REJECT.

The numbers in the jitter tables are correct. The compliant transmitter must have jitter less than or equal to all the maximum values. The DJ and RJ values cannot be maximum at the same time. Footnote states that the duty cycle distortion is part of deterministic jitter. This table is specified in a format consistent with Clause 54 and Clause 71 jitter specification.

No changes to the table are needed.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **72**
SC **72.7.1**

Page 2 of 2
12/4/2006 4:02:21 PM