Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 25

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*

Now that Clause 74 has been brought in to the draft, there are some instances of "Clause
74" or "74" (in tables) that should be links.
These are:
Page 29, line 42
Page 30, lines 6, 10 and 11
Page 33, lines 42 and 43
Page 98, line 15
Page 99, lines 8 and 33
Page 100, lines 21 and 22
Page 105, line 5
Page 110, line 6
Page 140, line 27
Page 148, line 38

SuggestedRemedy

Make them links.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 147

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *skew end points*

In 92.5, 93.5 and 94.3.4 we have the text:
"and specified at the points SP1 to SP6 shown in Figure 80-4 and Figure 80-5."
but these are all PMDs that use RS-FEC, so the appropriate diagram is Figure 80-5a and
the skew specification includes SP0 and SP7

SuggestedRemedy

In 92.5, 93.5 and 94.3.4 change:
"and specified at the points SP1 to SP6 shown in Figure 80-4 and Figure 80-5." to:
"and specified at the points SP0 to SP7 shown in Figure 80-5a."

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft
2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

The skew is appropriately specified at SP1 to SP6. The RS-FEC deskews the PCS lanes
when encoding and deskews the PMA/PMD lanes when decoding. The skew specification
bounds the accumulated skew between the four PMA/PMD lanes from the encoded output
of the RS-FEC on one end of the link to the encoded input of the RS-FEC on the other end
of the link.

Any skew between PCS lanes at SP7 is due to the RS-FEC decoder and/or the attached
PMA sublayer decoder. In this context, the skew is specified in 83.5.3.7.

The commenter correctly points out that the reference diagram should be Figure 80-5a --
which includes the RS-FEC -- rather than Figure 80-4 or Figure 80-5.

In 92.5 page 187 line 40, 93.5 page 240 line 51, and 94.3.4 page 284 line 21.
replace "Figure 80-4 and Figure 80-5"
with "Figure 80-5a"

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **29**   *L* **42**   # 102

Healey, Adam   LSI Corporation

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*

Clause 74 is now in the draft and is no longer an external cross-reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Add appropriate cross-references for each instance of "Clause 74" in the draft.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 1 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4.60** *P* **24** *L* **39** # 20
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

For the definition of 40GBASE-R, there is no need to state: "and a PMD that employs 2-level pulse amplitude modulation.".
This text is not present for 10GBASE-R. It is needed for 100GBASE-R to distinguish it from 100GBASE-P, but this is not the case for 40GBASE-R.
None of the PMDs for 40GBASE-R say that they use "2-level pulse amplitude modulation", so this addition just causes confusion.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "and a PMD that employs 2-level pulse amplitude modulation."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

The commenter correctly points out that for 40GBASE-R PHYs in 802.3-2012 there is no reference to pulse amplitude modulation. All 40GBASE-R PHYs defined in 802.3-2012 are two-level so there is no ambiguity by implementing the suggested remedy.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.5** *P* **25** *L* **3** # 21
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

The editing instructions says "Insert the following new abbreviation into the definitions list ..." but this should be the abbreviations list.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"... into the definitions list ..." to:
"... into the abbreviations list ..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.5** *P* **25** *L* **6** # 56
Slavick, Jeff Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

RS-FEC should be added as an abbreviation.

SuggestedRemedy

RS-FEC Reed-Solomon Forward Error Correction

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.12.2.1.30** *P* **34** *L* **12** # 16
Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Bucket*

This is a Boolean rather than an Integer

SuggestedRemedy

Change to Boolean
also change aLldpXdot3LocTxFwEcho, aLldpXdot3LocRxFw, aLldpXdot3LocRxFwEcho, aLldpXdot3RemTxFw, aLldpXdot3RemTxFwEcho and aLldpXdot3RemRxFwEcho to Boolean.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the commenter has identified a fault that needs correction.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.5** *P* **26** *L* **27** # 22
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Bucket*

The cross-references in Table 30-1e and Table 30-7 are not formatted correctly.

SuggestedRemedy

Page 26, line 27 "30.5.1" should be in green font
Page 27, line 23 "30.5.1" should be in green font
Page 27, line 50 "30.12.2" should be black and a link
Page 28, line 18 "30.12.3" should be black and a link

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.5.1.1.15** *P* **29** *L* **44** # 24
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Bucket*

In the paragraph: "If a Clause 45 MDIO Interface is present, then this attribute will map to the FEC capability register (see 45.2.8.2 or 45.2.1.89).;"
"Clause 45" should be a link. (same for 30.5.1.1.16 through 30.5.1.1.18 and 30.5.1.1.26 through 30.5.1.1.31)
Also "or 45.2.1.89" should be in underline font as it has been added.

SuggestedRemedy

Make "Clause 45" a link here and in 30.5.1.1.16 through 30.5.1.1.18 and 30.5.1.1.26 through 30.5.1.1.31
Underline "or 45.2.1.89"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 **30**
SC **30.5.1.1.15**

Page 2 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.5.1.1.2**   *P* **28**   *L* **52**   # 23
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*
The "1" in 100GBASE-P is not underlined

SuggestedRemedy
Underline the "1"

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.5.1.1.30**   *P* **32**   *L* **36**   # 57
Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*
aRSFECBypassEnable and aRSFECIndicationEnable MDIO registers are in section 45.2.1.92a

SuggestedRemedy
Change the "see 45.2.1.92b" to "45.2.1.92a" for both.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.7.4**   *P* **40**   *L* **22**   # 135
Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*
Try to keep a consistent order - easier for the readers to find things. I believe that lists of port types and similar that aren't constrained by bit definitions go slow to fast, short to long, wide to narrow - or the reverse.

SuggestedRemedy
40GBASE-FR
100GBASE-KP4
100GBASE-KR4
100GBASE-CR4
100GBASE-LR4, 100GBASE-ER4

Same for the receive fault table.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the editorial instructions to say:

Insert the following between "40GBASE-FR" and "100GBASE-LR4, 100GBASE-ER4" in Table 45-9:

Insert the following between "40GBASE-FR" and "100GBASE-LR4, 100GBASE-ER4" in Table 45-10:

Reverse the order of the additional rows in the both tables.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, this minor change represents a useful improvement to the draft.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.79**   *P* **42**   *L* **1**   # 80
Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Clause lists*
45.2.1.79 lists the clauses that use this register, Clause 92-95 also use this register.

SuggestedRemedy
Add Clause 93, 93 and 94 to the list of clauses.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Bring subclause 45.2.1.79 into the draft and add clauses 92, 93 and 94 to the list of clauses.

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 **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.79**   Page 3 of 46   2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.8**   *P* **33**   *L* **2**   # 136
Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*
Most of this paragraph is a table without the formatting. It keeps on getting more unwieldy.

SuggestedRemedy
Please use a table, like Table 45-9 and Table 45-10.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the clause in the same manner as 45.2.1.7.5, also observe the order as per comment #135

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.92b**   *P* **45**   *L* **10**   # 117
Shah, Sameer   Broadcom

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Align status*
Based on Line #15 on Page #177 in Clause #91, "PCS align status" for Transmitter incorrectly listed here in 1.201.15.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove "PCS align status" bit from 1.201.15 and list it in 1.283.15

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

<Commenter is not an 802.3 voting member. Editor changed comment type from TR to T.>

It is more convenient for management to keep this bit in the RS-FEC status register. Therefore the change should be made in Clause 91 - Change p.177, l.51 from 1.283.15 to 1.201.15

See also comment #5 (& comment #60)

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.92b**   *P* **45**   *L* **10**   # 60
Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Align status*
PCS align status is part of the Encode path of the RS-FEC.

SuggestedRemedy
Change 1.201.15 description to use encoder instead of decoder.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
ACCEPT.

See also comment #117

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.92h**   *P* **48**   *L* **14**   # 58
Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*
BIP error counters are non-rollover but missing that property.

SuggestedRemedy
Add the NR property to the R/W column and define it in the footnote.

Note that 45.2.3.44 (base standard PCS BIP error counter is also missing this property).

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights a legitimate error in the draft that should be addressed.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.92i**   *P* **48**   *L* **21**   # 59
Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*
45.2.1.92h calls the error counter "RS-FEC BIP error counter lane 0"

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the word "PCS" from the end of the first sentence.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights a legitimate error in the draft that should be addressed.

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 **45**
SC **45.2.1.92i**

Page 4 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.92l**   *P* **49**   *L* **5**   # 61

Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *non-separated RS-FEC*

The following is attached to this section (and 45.2.91n), but really applies to all the RS-FEC PCS alignment, BIP checking, mapping registers.

A device that does not implement a separated RS-FEC shall return a zero for all bits in the RS-FEC PCS alignment status 1 register. It is the responsibility of the STA management entity to ensure that a port type is supported by all MMDs before interrogating any of its status bits.

SuggestedRemedy

Add this text to 45.2.1.92h, 45.2.1.92j, 45.2.1.92b.4 as well. Or find a more general location to state it once and refer to that text from all necessary sections.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The additional text suggested is appropriate for the BPI error counter; lane mappings; block lock bits; and am lock bits. However, the align status bit in 45.2.1.92b.4 should be always 1 for a non-separated RS-FEC.

45.2.1.92l already has the sentence:

"A device that does not implement a separated RS-FEC shall return a zero for all bits in the RS-FEC PCS alignment status 1 register."

The sentence "It is the responsibility of the STA management entity to ensure that a port type is supported by all MMDs before interrogating any of its status bits." is true of all the registers in an MMD & is therefore redundant.

Add the equivalent sentence to 45.2.1.92h and 45.2.1.92j as suggested.

Add the following sentence to 45.2.1.92b.4

"A device that implements the RS-FEC status register but does not implement a separated RS-FEC shall return a one for bit 1.201.15."

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.92l.2**   *P* **49**   *L* **50**   # 26

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*

In 45.2.1.92l.2 through 45.2.1.92l.8, the second sentence ends with a double full stop "..". In 45.2.1.92m.2 through 45.2.1.92m.12, the second sentence ends without a full stop ".".

SuggestedRemedy

In 45.2.1.92l.2 through 45.2.1.92l.8, delete one full stop. In 45.2.1.92m.2 through 45.2.1.92m.12, add the full stop.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Recycle the full stop as described.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.92o.12**   *P* **56**   *L* **50**   # 41

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*

This has "1.283.8" instead of "1.283.0" in two places. It also has "lane 0" instead of "lane 8" in two places.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "1.283.8" to "1.283.0" in two places. Change "lane 0" to "lane 8" in two places.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.92o.7**   *P* **56**   *L* **17**   # 40

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*

This has "1.281.28" instead of "1.283.5" in three placed including the title.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "1.281.28" to "1.283.5" in three placed including the title.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 **45**
SC **45.2.1.92o.7**

Page 5 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.98a**   *P* **57**   *L* **15**   # 7

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Pattern generator*

It is not clear what the polynomial identifier is for. It is not explained in 92.7.12

SuggestedRemedy

Either delete bits 12 and 11 or give a proper explanation of what these two bits are used for. It seems they are redundant as it is already possible to set a unique seed for each PMD lane.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The polynomial identifier in bits 12 & 11 for each lane (i) corresponds to the variable polynomial_i as shown in 92.6, Table 92-2.

The commenter has encountered a problem with the explanation in 92.7.12.

Change 92.7.12 – last paragraph, after the first 2 sentences from:

The PRBS generator for each lane shall implement each of the four generator polynomials given in Table 92–5 selectable by polynomial_i (where I goes from 0 to 3), with default for each lane given in Table 92–5. The state of the generator shall be set to the value in seed_i, with default values given in Table 92–5, at the start of the training pattern. An example implementation of the PRBS generator for lane 0 with default settings is given in Figure 92–3. The first 32 bits of the training pattern for a given lane is also provided in Table 92–5.

To:

The PRBS generator for each lane shall implement each of the four generator polynomials (polynomial_n, where n goes from 0 to 3) given in Table 92–5, selectable by identifier_i (where i is the lane number). By default identifier_i is set to lane number i (i.e., identifier_0 = 0; identifier_1 = 1, etc.). The state of the generator shall be set to the value in seed_i (where i is the lane number), with default values given in Table 92–5 for each polynomial, at the start of the training pattern. An example implementation of the PRBS generator for n = 0 with default settings is given in Figure 92–3. The first 32 bits of the training pattern for each polynomial is also provided in Table 92–5.

Change Table 92-5, first two column headings to: n ; polynomial_n, G(x)

Figure 92-3 : Change title "PRBS generator for polynomial_0"

Table 92-2: Change "polynomial_" to "identifier_" - 4 instances

Editorial license to ensure text is consistent.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.98a**   *P* **57**   *L* **5**   # 27

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*

The first sentence says "The assignment of bits in the PMD training pattern registers, lane 0 through 3, is shown in Table 45-72a." but the table is specific to Register 1.1450.
Also, the name of the register is "PMD training pattern lane 0 register"

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence to:
"The assignment of bits in the PMD training pattern lane 0 register is shown in Table 45-72a. The assignment of bits in the PMD training pattern lanes 1 through 3 registers are defined similarly to lane 0.".
Change the title of Table 45-72a to "PMD training pattern lane 0 bit definitions"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.3.9**   *P* **60**   *L* **11**   # 146

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *EEE capability*

With 802.3bm, we'll need two registers for EEE control and capability register bits.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider putting all the 40G and 100G type-by-type support bits in Register 3.21, with the bits for each type in exactly the same positions as in Table 45-15, 40G/100G PMA/PMD extended ability register (Register 1.13).

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Since the fast wake function resides entirely in the PCS, it is redundant to have a separate bit fo reach PHY.

Keep the bit to choose between fast wake & deep sleep.

Change descriptions & bit names - each copper PHY has a bit "EEE deep sleep is supported"

Add a bit - 40GBASE-R "EEE fast wake is supported" & 100GBASE-R "EEE fast wake is supported."

The editor will make the changes in the same style as the current draft.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights an improvement to the draft that should be addressed.

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 **45**
SC **45.2.3.9**

Page 6 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.3.9.a**   *P* **60**   *L* **41**   # 154

Dan Dove   Applied Micro

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Definitions*

"fast wake for LPI operation" Fast Wake mode and Deep Sleep mode terminology varies from one part of the document to the next. Its inconsistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Define Deep Sleep Mode and Fast Wake Mode in an appropriate definition table/location and then use consistent naming for each throughout the document.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add definitions for EEE, Fast Wake Mode and Deep Sleep Mode in Clause 1.4

Change reference in 45.2.3.9.a to be 78.1 (that is an error).

Energy Efficient Ethernet (EEE) - Provides a protocol for PHYs to coordinate transitions to or from a lower level of power consumption, without changing the link status and without dropping or corrupting frames. (reference Clause 78)

Fast Wake - One of the two modes of operation for EEE. Fast wake refers to the mode for which the transmitter continues to transmit signals during the fast wake state so that the receiver can resume operation
with a shorter wake time. (reference Fig 78-3a)

Deep Sleep - One of the two modes of operation for EEE. Deep Sleep refers to the mode for which the transmitter ceases
transmission during the quiet state to maximize the energy saving potential. (reference Fig 78-3)

Cl **69**   *SC* **69.1.1**   *P* **68**   *L* **7**   # 12

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**

These should be kept as separate paragraphs

SuggestedRemedy

Use the following editing instructions for 69.1.1 instead of the text in draft 2.1 and for the second paragraph instructions underline "full duplex", ", or 100 Gb/s providing a bit error ratio (BER) better than or equal to 10-12 at the MAC/PLS service interface" and "For 100 Gb/s operation, the 100GBASE-R family is extended to include 100GBASE-KR4 and 100GBASE-KP4 that operate over four lanes.":
Change the second paragraph as shown:
Backplane Ethernet supports the IEEE 802.3 full duplex MAC operating at 1000 Mb/s, 10 Gb/s, or 40 Gb/s, or 100 Gb/s providing a bit error ratio (BER) better than or equal to 10-12 at the MAC/PLS service interface. For 1000 Mb/s operation, the family of 1000BASE-X Physical Layer signaling systems is extended to include 1000BASE-KX. For 10 Gb/s operation, two Physical Layer signaling systems are defined. For operation over four logical lanes, the 10GBASE-X family is extended to include 10GBASE-KX4. For serial operation, the 10GBASE-R family is extended to include 10GBASE-KR. For 40 Gb/s operation, there is 40GBASE-KR4 that operates over four lanes. For 100 Gb/s operation, the 100GBASE-R family is extended to include 100GBASE-KR4 and 100GBASE-KP4 that operate over four lanes.

Replace the third paragraph with the following:
Auto-Negotiation enables PHY selection amongst Backplane Ethernet Physical Layer signaling systems.

Replace the fourth paragraph with the following:
Energy Efficient Ethernet (EEE) is optionally supported for all Backplane Ethernet PHYs.

Also consider including the original "69.1.2 Objectives" subclause with strike throughs for consistancy with 80.1.2

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the content of 69.1.1 as follows.

After the heading "69.1.1 Scope" insert the editing instruction "Change the second paragraph as shown."

Insert the paragraph from D2.1 without the last two sentences.

Remove the underline except for the following (to indicate new text):
"full duplex"
", or 100 Gb/s providing … equal to 10-12."
"For 100 Gb/s … over four lanes"

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 **69**
SC **69.1.1**

Page 7 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Add the word "operation" after "full duplex MAC".

Insert the editing instruction "Replace the third paragraph as shown."

Import the text from the third paragraph in 802.3-2012 69.1.1 and format with strike-through (to indicate it is to be deleted).

Insert the second last sentence from D2.1 69.1.1 and format with underline (to indicate it is new text).

Insert the editing instruction "Replace the fourth paragraph as shown."

Import the text from the fourth paragraph in 802.3-2012 69.1.1 and format with strike-through (to indicate it is to be deleted).

Insert the last sentence from D2.1 69.1.1 and format with underline (to indicate it is new text).

Note that that the modifications proposed above, except for addition of the word "operating" only make the editing instructions more clear and do not change any of the resulting content.

Cl **69**	*SC* **69.1.2**	*P* **68**	*L* **18**	# 39

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **A**

As discussed by comment #31 against D1.1, the editing instruction for 69.1.2 says "Delete subclause 69.1.2."
When applied, this will have the effect of renumbering 69.1.3 to be 80.1.2.
The modifications to what was formerly 80.1.3 just below should explicitly note this change. (it has been renumbered silently)
The response to comment #6 against D1.1 (referred to by the response to comment #31 was:
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The resolution to #432 neatly avoids this issue by retaining a vestigial subclause.
For future cases where a subclause might be deleted, there are two options:
a) Leave a vestigial placeholder (subclause heading) with the note that the content of this subclause has been deleted.
b) Delete the subclause and include editing instructions to renumber accordingly.
The group recommends option a) for future cases.

Note, the same issue for 80.1.2 is the subject of a separate comment.

SuggestedRemedy

Either:
Adopt option a) in the response copied above and leave the subclause heading and a note that the content of this subclause has been deleted
or:
Change the editing instruction to "Delete 69.1.2 and renumber subsequent subclauses accordingly."
For 69.1.3 move the editing instructions above the title, leave the number as 69.1.2 and amend the editing instruction to refer to:
"Change item h) of 80.1.3 (now renumbered to 80.1.2) as shown."

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the editing instruction on line 18 to "Delete subclause 69.1.2 as shown and renumber subclause 69.1.3 to 69.1.2."

Import the heading and text for subclause 69.1.2 from 802.3-2012 and mark for deletion (i.e., strike-through).

Renumber the heading "69.1.3 Relationship…" to "69.1.2 Relationship…"

Prior to the heading "69.1.2 Relationship…" add the editing instruction "Change the first paragraph of 69.1.3 (now renumber to 69.1.2) as shown."

In 69.1.2, delete the instruction "Change the first paragraph as shown:"

Note that that the modifications proposed above only make the editing instructions more clear and do not change any of the resulting content.

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 **69**
SC **69.1.2**

Page 8 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **69**　　　*SC* **69.1.3**　　　　　*P* **70**　　　*L* **36**　　　# 18
Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Ciena

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　　　　*bucket*
Comment #43 against D2.0 caused an additional item to be added to the list. However, the editing instruction has not been amended in accordance with this.
Also, the inserted item g) should not be in underline font as it is an insert editing instruction.

SuggestedRemedy
Change the editing instruction to:
"Change item f) and insert items g) and h) as shown:"
Show item g) in normal font

Response　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **69**　　　*SC* **69.1.3**　　　　　*P* **70**　　　*L* **43**　　　# 19
Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Ciena

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　　　　*bucket*
The P802.3bm draft amendment changes the title of Annex 83A to include "ten-lane".
Also, the IEEE style manual says "In general text, isolated numbers less than 10 should be spelled out." but also "Numbers applicable to the same category should be treated alike throughout a paragraph; numerals should not be used in some cases and words in others."

SuggestedRemedy
In item f) change "4 lane" to "four-lane"
In item g) change "10-lane" to "ten-lane"
In item h) change "four lane" to "four-lane"

Response　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **69**　　　*SC* **69.5**　　　　　*P* **72**　　　*L* **48**　　　# 6
Marris, Arthur　　　　　　　　　　　　　Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type　**T**　　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　　　　*bucket*
Add Clause 84 to the list of backplane Clauses

SuggestedRemedy
Add Clause 84 to the list of backplane Clauses

Response　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**
ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

The commenter correctly points out that one of the backplane clauses is missing from the list.

Cl **74**　　　*SC* **74.7.4.8**　　　　　*P* **78**　　　*L* **16**　　　# 62
Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　　　　Avago Technologies

Comment Type　**TR**　　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　　　　*Wording*
Better wording.

SuggestedRemedy
Change
"The locations of the Rapid Alignment Markers, though consistent for each Rapid FEC block for each entry into the wake or refresh states, can be different for a different entry."
to:
"The locations of the Rapid Alignment Markers within the Rapid FEC block is constistent for a given entry into the wake or refresh states, but the locations can vary for subsequent entries."

Response　　　　　*Response Status*　**W**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Slight change to suggestion:

Change
"The locations of the Rapid Alignment Markers, though consistent for each Rapid FEC block for each entry into the wake or refresh states, can be different for a different entry."
to:
"The locations of the Rapid Alignment Markers within the Rapid FEC block are constistent for a given entry into the wake or refresh states, but the locations can vary for subsequent entries."

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　**74**
SC　**74.7.4.8**

Page 9 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **78**   *SC* **78.1.4**   *P* **81**   *L* **9**   # 139

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*

Try to keep a consistent order - easier for the readers to find things. I believe that lists of port types and similar that aren't constrained by bit definitions go slow to fast, short to long, wide to narrow - or the reverse, as in AN priority resolution.

SuggestedRemedy

10GBASE-KR
40GBASE-KR4
40GBASE-CR4
XLAUI/CAUI
100GBASE-KP4
100GBASE-KR4
100GBASE-CR10
100GBASE-CR4
Similarly in Table 78-2.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the editorial instruction to:

Replace the table title and body of Table 78-1 as shown:

Re-order the table with the rows:

10BASE-Te
100BASE-TX
1000BASE-KX
1000BASE-T
XGXS (XAUI)
10GBASE-KX4
10GBASE-KR
10GBASE-T
XLAUI/CAUI
40GBASE-KR4
40GBASE-CR4
100GBASE-KP4
100GBASE-KR4
100GBASE-CR10
100GBASE-CR4

. and make the same changes for Table 78-2

Cl **78**   *SC* **78.4.2.3**   *P* **83**   *L* **10**   # 2

Barrass, Hugh   Cisco

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Definitions*

There are several mentions of FW_enable without any definition. This should refer to LPI_FW in the LPI transmit and receive state diagrams in Clause 82.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances of FW_enable to LPI_FW

Add a definition of LPI_FW in 78.4.2.3

LPI_FW

Boolean variable controlling the wake mode for the LPI transmit and receive functions as defined in 82.2.18.2.2.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights a legitimate error in the draft that should be addressed.

Cl **78**   *SC* **78.4.2.3**   *P* **84**   *L* **15**   # 17

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*

The whole of Table 78-3 was brought into the draft due to comment #37 against D2.0. However, the editing instruction is still "Insert the following rows" which is inappropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing instruction to:
"Change Table 78-3 as shown:"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 **78**
SC **78.4.2.3**

Page 10 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **78**   *SC* **78.5**   *P* **90**   *L* **1**   # 1
Barrass, Hugh   Cisco

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **A**   *Wake times*

In Table 78-4 there are many lines devoted to the fast wake timing for all of the PHYs. Since this function is defined in the PCS it is common for all PHYs of the same speed so this space is wasted. Furthermore, a new project defining EEE for optical PHYs will be forced to open thi sclause in order to write the same information redundantly.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete all of the rows defined for fast wake.

Add a row for 40G and a row for 100G with the same information from those rows.

Delete the references to fast wake in the definition of the cases on page 89.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights an improvement to the draft that should be addressed.

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.1**   *P* **96**   *L* **15**   # 10
Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**   *Bucket*

"40 Gigabit and 100 Gigabit Ethernet is defined for full duplex operation only." is the second paragrap in the base standard so should not be part of the first paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete repeated text:
"40 Gigabit and 100 Gigabit Ethernet is defined for full duplex operation only."

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.2**   *P* **96**   *L* **25**   # 38
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **A**   *Deleted subclause*

As discussed by comment #6 against D1.1, the editing instruction for 80.1.2 says "Delete subclause 80.1.2 as shown."
When applied, this will have the effect of renumbering 80.1.3 through 80.1.5 to be 80.1.2 through 80.1.4.
The modifications to what were formerly 80.1.3 through 80.1.5 just below should reflect this change.
The response to comment #6 against D1.1 was:
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The resolution to #432 neatly avoids this issue by retaining a vestigial subclause.
For future cases where a subclause might be deleted, there are two options:
a) Leave a vestigial placeholder (subclause heading) with the note that the content of this subclause has been deleted.
b) Delete the subclause and include editing instructions to renumber accordingly.
The group recommends option a) for future cases.

Note, the same issue for 69.1.2 is the subject of a separate comment.

SuggestedRemedy

Either:
Adopt option a) in the response copied above and leave the subclause heading and a note that the content of this subclause has been deleted
or:
Change the editing instruction to "Delete 80.1.2 and renumber subsequent subclauses accordingly."
For 80.1.3 through 80.1.5, move the editing instructions above the titles, renumber to 80.1.2 through 80.1.4 and amend the editing instruction to refer to:
"80.1.x (now renumbered to 80.1.y)"

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement option a) from the previous draft (vestigial subclause).

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.1.3**   *P* **97**   *L* **8**   # 28
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**   *Bucket*

References to Clauses 84, 93 and 94 have been added to item h), but these are text rather than links.

SuggestedRemedy

Make Clause 84, Clause 93 and Clause 94 cross-references.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT.

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 **80**
SC **80.1.3**

Page 11 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **80**　　　*SC* **80.1.4**　　　　　*P* **98**　　　*L* **15**　　　# 11
Marris, Arthur　　　　　　　　　　Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　　*Bucket*
Inconsistant capitalisation

SuggestedRemedy
Change to:
"Physical Layer devices"

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **80**　　　*SC* **80.1.5**　　　　　*P* **98**　　　*L* **48**　　　# 29
Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　　Ciena

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　　*Bucket*
In the clean version of D2.1 the text:
"The generic term 40 Gigabit and 100 Gigabit Ethernet refers to any use of the 40 Gb/s and
100 Gb/s IEEE 802.3 MAC (the 40 Gigabit and 100 Gigabit Ethernet MAC) coupled with any
IEEE 802.3 40GBASE or 100GBASE Physical Layer implementations."
Has disappeared from the draft.
If it is to be deleted, then it must be shown in strikeout font.

SuggestedRemedy
Show the deleted text in strikeout font.

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **80**　　　*SC* **80.2.4**　　　　　*P* **100**　　　*L* **29**　　　# 8
Marris, Arthur　　　　　　　　　　Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　　*Bucket*
Delete the word "the"

SuggestedRemedy
Change:
"the PMA specific to the 100GBASE-KP4 is specified in Clause 94"
To:
"the PMA specific to 100GBASE-KP4 is specified in Clause 94"

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

This is fixed in a better manner by comment #30

Cl **80**　　　*SC* **80.2.4**　　　　　*P* **100**　　　*L* **29**　　　# 30
Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　　Ciena

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　　*Bucket*
This says:
"... the PMA specific to the 100GBASE-KP4 is specified in Clause 94." but would be better
as:
"... the PMA specific to the 100GBASE-KP4 PHY is specified in Clause 94."

SuggestedRemedy
Insert "PHY" after "100GBASE-KP4"

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

See also comment #8

Cl **80**　　　*SC* **80.3.2**　　　　　*P* **103**　　　*L* **37**　　　# 42
Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　　Ciena

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　　*Bucket*
According to 80.3.1, the four additional primitives are only defined if the deep sleep mode
option is supported.
However, Figure 80-3b title is:
"Optional inter-sublayer service interfaces for EEE support"
and the figure contains a note:
Note: this diagram illustrates only the service interfaces associated with the optional EEE
function.
This suggests that the extra primitives are required for any EEE support, not just for the
deep sleep option.
Same issue for Note1 in Figures 82-2 and 91-2

SuggestedRemedy
Change Figure 80-3b title to:
"Optional inter-sublayer service interfaces for EEE deep sleep support"
Change the note in Figure 80-3b to:
Note: this diagram illustrates only the service interfaces associated with the optional EEE
deep sleep function.
Change Note1 in Figures 82-2 and 91-2 to:
NOTE 1-FOR OPTIONAL EEE DEEP SLEEP CAPABILITY

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft
2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment
highlights a legitimate error in the draft that should be addressed.

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 **80**
SC **80.3.2**

Page 12 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.5**   *P* **108**   *L* **11**   # 137
Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*

This is getting even more unwieldy. You wouldn't write:
A and B and C and D and E and F and G and H and I

SuggestedRemedy

See 83.5.3.3, 84.5, 85.5, 86.3.2, 87.3.2, 88.3.2, 89.3.2, 92.5, or 93.5
and similarly below.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights an improvement to the draft that should be addressed.

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.5**   *P* **108**   *L* **29**   # 64
Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *UI math*

Bad math.<approximately>49ns / 193.939393ps

SuggestedRemedy

253 UI
Change 258 for "At RS-FEC transmit", "At PCS receive (w/ RS-FEC)" and in table 82.2.12 to 253

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights a legitimate error in the draft that should be addressed.

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.5**   *P* **108**   *L* **38**   # 31
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*

A new note e has been added to Table 80-4 which ends "... with a signaling rate of 25.78125 Gb/s.", but all of the other notes to this table give signaling rates in GBd

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Gb/s" to "GBd"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **80**   *SC* **80.5**   *P* **109**   *L* **29**   # 63
Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Skew*

Skew Variation values in the table are set to N/A for RS-FEC operations.

SuggestedRemedy

Update Table 80-5 with the following values.

At RS-FEC Transmit | 0.4 | N/A | <approximately>10
At RS-FEC receive | 4 | N/A | <approximately>103
At PCS receive (w/)| 0.4 | N/A | <approximately>2

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights a legitimate error in the draft that should be addressed.

Cl **82**   *SC* **82.2.18.2.2**   *P* **124**   *L* **15**   # 3
Barrass, Hugh   Cisco

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Definitions*

The LPI_FW variable is used in both teh transmit and receive functions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the first sentence of the definition to:

Boolean variable controlling the wake mode for the LPI transmit and receive functions. This variable is set true when the link is to use the Fast Wake mechanism, and false when the link is to use the optional deep sleep mechanism for each direction.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights a legitimate error in the draft that should be addressed.

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 **82**   Page 13 of 46
SC **82.2.18.2.2**   2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **82**   *SC* **82.2.8a**   *P* **121**   *L* **53**   # 43
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Misplaced text*

At the end of 82.2.8a which is about Rapid alignment marker insertion, we have text which now says:
The BIP statistics will be first updated after transitioning from RAMs to normal AMs on the first received normal AM when LPI_FW is FALSE and on the second received AM when LPI_FW is TRUE.
But this subclause is about rapid alignment marker insertion, so LPI_FW is never TRUE when this subclause applies.
Also, the second received AM after what? There is no transition from RAMs in fast wake. This is not an appropriate place to put information on when the BIP is updated when the transmitter is in fast wake mode. An implementer building a fast wake only PHY does not need to read this subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Move this information and add text which says that BIP is only valid during RX_ACTIVE to 82.2.8 BIP calculations since that is the location of the text that defines the BIP calculation for the normal alignment markers used for fast wake.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **82**   *SC* **82.6**   *P* **136**   *L* **25**   # 65
Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *down_count*
down_count isn't used in FAST-WAKE operation

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the down_count <= 192 from the TX_FW box.

Response   *Response Status* **W**
ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights an improvement to the draft that should be addressed.

Cl **83**   *SC* **83.1.1**   *P* **140**   *L* **20**   # 32
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*
"does not provide the PMD service interfaces" should be "does not provide the PMD service interface" i.e. interface singular.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "interfaces" to "interface"

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **83**   *SC* **83.6**   *P* **141**   *L* **46**   # 103
Healey, Adam   LSI Corporation

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*
Editorial instruction indicates "fast wake and stop enable." I don't see what Table 83-2 has to do with fast wake.

SuggestedRemedy

Change instruction to "Insert rows at the end of Table 83-2 for stop enable:"

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change instruction to "Insert rows at the end of Table 83-2:"

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 **83**
SC **83.6**

Page 14 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **83A**   *SC* **83A.3.2a**   *P* **325**   *L* **14**   # 110
Healey, Adam   LSI Corporation

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *CAUI shutdown*

The electrical interface that connects PMA sublayers, XLAUI or CAUI, does not provide a means to communicate the primitives required for correct operation of the optional EEE deep sleep capability.

Therefore EEE deep sleep cannot be used with XLAUI or CAUI. Since XLAUI/CAUI shutdown is also incompatible with the optional EEE fast wake capability, it appears that this feature cannot be used at all.

SuggestedRemedy

There a number of ways to address this issue. Two suggestions.

1. Specify that the optional EEE deep sleep capability cannot be used with XLAUI and CAUI. Remove XLAUI and CAUI shutdown from the draft.
2. Incorporate the changes proposed in healey_3bj_01_0713.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights a legitimate error in the draft that should be addressed.

Implement changes per healey_3bj_01_0713 with editorial license.

Cl **84**   *SC* **84.1**   *P* **144**   *L* **20**   # 126
Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Table order*

I don't believe that EEE is at the bottom of the layer stack like AN. It seems to involve interactions between an RS client and PCS for Fast Wake mode, or RS client and PCS/PMA/PMD for Deep Sleep mode.

SuggestedRemedy

For consistency with Fast Wake only clauses, put the new EEE row above the PMA in Table 84-1, perhaps just below or above the RS. Similarly for the other 40G and 100G clauses with similar tables.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The order of rows in Table 84-1 does not have any great significance. The row describing EEE support is at the bottom as EEE is an optional function that pervades all of the other layers of the PHY.

Additionally, the comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Cl **84**   *SC* **84.1**   *P* **144**   *L* **20**   # 138
Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Wording*

"may enter the Low Power Idle mode" reads oddly. Are they allowed to leave it?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to use? enter and exit? 5 times.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The device enters Low Power Idle mode to conserve energy - exiting it would not serve that purpose.

Additionally, the comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Cl **84**   *SC* **84.2**   *P* **144**   *L* **37**   # 109
Healey, Adam   LSI Corporation

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *FEC primitives*

The text includes the following note. "Note: if Clause 74 FEC is in use, only the values DATA, QUIET and ALERT may be passed through the FEC to the PMD."

This sounds like a requirement for the Clause 74 BASE-R FEC sublayer but it is not enforced there. For 10GBASE-R PHYs tx_mode is passed through to the PMA service interface but for 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R PHYs no behavior is defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the appropriate requirements to Clause 74 (now that it is open) and remove this note if necessary.

This note also appears in Clause 85.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add "see 74.5.1.7" to the notes in Clause 84 & 85.

Bring 74.5.1.7 into draft.

Add to the end of the 2nd paragraph: "For speeds greater than 10Gb/s, the tx_mode parameter may also take the values SLEEP, FW, or BYPASS (see 80.3.3.4)."

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 **84**
SC **84.2**

Page 15 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **85**   *SC* **85.1**   *P* **148**   *L* **15**   # 35

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*

In Table 85-1 in the base document, all of the clause numbers are links, so 78 should be a link also.

SuggestedRemedy

Make "78" a cross-reference.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. However, the comment highlights a legitimate error in the draft that should be addressed.

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.2**   *P* **154**   *L* **28**   # 104

Healey, Adam   LSI Corporation

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

For the optional EEE deep sleep capability, the RS-FEC sublayer, via the FEC service interface, receives the parameters tx_mode and rx_mode. The values of these parameters should be passed to the PMA service interface.

In addition the RS-FEC sublayer does not assign a value to the energy_detect parameter that is communicated across the service interface. This should be set to the value that was received from the PMA service interface.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a paragraph to the end of 91.2 that explains these assignments.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the service interface parameters must be defined. Add the following paragraphs to the end of 91.2.

"When the tx_mode parameter of the FEC:IS_TX_MODE.request primitive is QUIET or ALERT, the RS-FEC sublayer may disable transmit functional blocks to conserve energy. Otherwise the RS-FEC transmit function operates normally. The value of tx_mode is passed to the client sublayer via the PMA:IS_TX_MODE.request primitive.

When the rx_mode parameter of the FEC:IS_RX_MODE.request primitive is QUIET, the RS-FEC sublayer may disable receive functional blocks to conserve energy. Otherwise the RS-FEC receive function operates normally. The value of rx_mode is passed to the client sublayer via the PMA:IS_RX_MODE.request primitive.

The energy_detect parameter of the FEC:IS_ENERGY_DETECT.indication primitive is used to communicate that the PMD has detected the return of energy on the interface following a period of quiescence. It is assigned the value that is received via the PMA:IS_ENERGY_DETECT.indication primitive."

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 **91**
SC **91.2**

Page 16 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.5.2.6**   *P* **159**   *L* **16**   # 66

Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

The new AM mapping scheme has the Rx restore the ideal markers back into the data stream. But the Tx swizzles lanes 4-15, and inserts ideal copies of lane 0 & 16.   Since BIP coverage is not used over the RS-FEC link, and we're going to put the ideal markers back at the end of the RS-FEC link, we should insert ideal markers in both sides. This will save area and power.

SuggestedRemedy

Change lines 17-33 to:

For x=0 to 19, amp_tx_x<63:0> is constructed as follows.
a) if x <= 3 lane_num = 0 else if x >= 16 lane_num = 16 else lane_num = x
b) amp_tx_x<23:0> is set to M0, M1, and M2 as shown in Figure 82-9 (bits 25 to 2) using the values in Table 82-2 for PCS lane number lane_num. If am_tx_x corresponds to a Rapid Alignment marker, then the M4, M5, and M6 values are used instead (see Figure 82-9b).
c) amp_tx_x<31:24> = am_tx_x<33:26>
d) amp_tx_x<55:32> is set to M4, M5, and M6 as shown in Figure 82-9 (bits 57 to 34) using the values in Table 82-2 for PCS lane number lane_num. If am_tx_x corresponds to a Rapid Alignment marker, then the M0, M1, and M2 values are used instead (see Figure 82-9b).
e) amp_tx_x<63:56> = am_tx_x<65:58>

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy and change the beginning of the paragraph starting at line 35 as follows.

"This process replaces the fixed bytes of the alignment markers received, possibly with errors, with the values from Table 82-2. In addition it substitutes the fixed bytes of the alignment markers corresponding to PCS lanes 1, 2, and 3 with the fixed bytes for the alignment marker corresponding to PCS lane 0. Similarly, it substitutes the fixed bytes of the alignment markers corresponding to PCS lanes 17, 18, and 19 with the fixed bytes for the alignment marker corresponding to PCS lane 16."

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.5.2.6**   *P* **159**   *L* **35**   # 118

Shah, Sameer   Broadcom

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

With reference to lines 21 and 32, the fixed bytes for alignment markers corresponding to PCS lanes 0 and 16 are being regenerated. Description on Line#35 is not consistent with this.

SuggestedRemedy

Update lines 35-37 to reflect the same -
On line 35, change "PCS lanes 1, 2, and 3" with "PCS lanes 0, 1, 2, and 3"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

<Commenter is not an 802.3 voting member. Editor changed comment type from TR to T.>

See comment #66.

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.5.2.6**   *P* **159**   *L* **36**   # 9

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*

Missing word "the"

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"it replaces fixed bytes"
to:
"it replaces the fixed bytes"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See comment #66.

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 **91**
SC **91.5.2.6**

Page 17 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.5.3.5**   *P* **165**   *L* **53**   # 125

Liu, Zhenyu   Marvell Semiconductor

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**

Here the description is "If rx_coded<0> is 0 and any rx_xcoded<j+1>=1..."

As the reverse of subclause 91.5.2.5 and from other context, this sentence should read:

"If rx_coded<0> is 0 and any rx_xcoded<j+1>=0 for j=0 to 3...."

SuggestedRemedy

Change as suggested.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

The document is in error and needs to be corrected.

Change to:

"If rx_xcoded<0> is 0 and any rx_xcoded<j+1>=0 for j=0 to 3…."

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.5.4.2.1**   *P* **169**   *L* **21**   # 100

Healey, Adam   LSI Corporation

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*

Variables are not in alphabetical order (e.g. rx_align_status is the first variable defined).

SuggestedRemedy

Re-order the variable definition to be alphabetical.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Note that this comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the variable ordering should be alphabetical and will be corrected.

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.5.4.2.1**   *P* **170**   *L* **14**   # 119

Shah, Sameer   Broadcom

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

There is no recommendation on how to derive the FEC lane number from the AM payload sequence. Is it left to user's implementation.

For example: Is tolerating 3/12 nibble errors acceptable when looking at AM for PCS lanes 4-7.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify tolerating 3/12 nibble errors acceptable when looking at AM for PCS lanes 4-7.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

<Commenter is not an 802.3 voting member. Editor changed comment type from TR to T.>

The FEC lane can be identified based on a match to any one of the three central alignment marker payloads. Change the definition of fec_lane as follows.

"A variable that holds the FEC lane number (0 to 3) received on lane x of the PMA service interface when amps_lock<x>=true. The FEC lane number is determined by the alignment marker payloads in the 2nd, 3rd, or 4th positions of the sequence based on the mapping defined in 91.5.2.6. The 48 bits that are in the positions of the known bits in the received alignment marker payload are compared to the expected values for a given payload position and FEC lane on a nibble-wise basis (12 comparisons). If no more than 3 nibbles in the candidate block fail to match the corresponding known nibbles for any payload position on a given FEC lane, then the FEC lane number is assigned accordingly."

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 **91**
SC **91.5.4.2.1**

Page 18 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.5.4.3**   *P* **172**   *L* **47**   *#* 67

Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

The RS-FEC uses Rapid Alignment Markers (RAMs) to infer the LPI state of the PCS. In Fast-Wake mode, the transmission of RAMs has been removed. So the addition of the LPI transmit and receive State Machines are only necessary if EEE capabilty with Deep Sleep mode is supported.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Page 172 Line 46: "When the optional EEE capability is supported" to "When the optional EEE capability is supported and deep sleep operation is supported"

In Figures 91-10 and 91-11
Remove the transition to A from TX_TEST_NEXT and RX_TEST_NEXT
Remove fec_lpi_fw from transition from TX_TEST_NEXT -> TX_QUIET
Remove fec_lpi_fw from transition from RX_TEST_NEXT -> RX_QUIET
Add "AND !fec_lpi_fw" to the exit condition from TX_ACTIVE and RX_ACTIVE

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, it is true that these functions are no longer needed for the optional EEE Fast Wake capability.

Change P172, L46 to "When the optional EEE deep sleep capability is supported, ."

Change Figure 91-10 and Figure 91-11 per the suggested remedy.

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.6**   *P* **177**   *L* **1**   *#* 33

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*

The reference to 45.2.1 should be a link

SuggestedRemedy

Make 45.2.1 a cross-reference

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.6**   *P* **177**   *L* **47**   *#* 4

Szczepanek, Andre   Inphi

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

The location of the "Block x lock" variables is listed as "RS-FEC PCS alignment status register", whereas clause 45 uses the register names "RS-FEC PCS alignment status 1" and "RS-FEC PCS alignment status 2"

The location of the "Lane x aligned" variables is listed as "RS-FEC PCS alignment status register", whereas clause 45 uses the register names "RS-FEC PCS alignment status 3" and "RS-FEC PCS alignment status 4"

SuggestedRemedy

Use concistent register names

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In Table 91-4, change PMA/PMD register names as follows.

For "Block x lock", change to "RS-FEC PCS alignment status 1 and 2 registers".

For "Lane x aligned", change to "RS-FEC PCS alignment status 3 and 4 registers".

<Editor changed subclause from 91-4 to 91.6. Presumably the commenter was referencing Table 91-4.>

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **91**   Page 19 of 46
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **91.6**   2013/07/17 11:38:
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.6**   *P* **177**   *L* **51**   # 5
Szczepanek, Andre   Inphi

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**
The location of register bit "PCS lane alignmnet status" is inconsistent between Clause 45 and 91.
In clause 45 the register bit is at MDIO address 201.15 (RS-FEC status register)
In Clause 91, Table 91-4, it is at MDIO address 283.15

SuggestedRemedy
Resolve the inconcistency between the clauses.

I think the (RS-FEC status register) is probably a better location for the status bit.
However if the PCS alignmnet status bit is to be moved there, shouldn't the "FEC Alignment status" bit currently in the FEC lane mapping register (206.15), also be moved to the RS-FEC status register, for concistency ?

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #117.

Change the location of "PCS lane alignment status" to 1.201.15 in Table 91-4 and 91.6.15.

In addition, change the location of "FEC lane alignment status" to 1.201.14 in Clause 45 and Clause 91 (as well as correct small inconsistencies in the naming).

<Editor changed subclause from "Table 91-4" to 91.6.>

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.6.2**   *P* **178**   *L* **12**   # 14
Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**
This is a variable rather than a bit

SuggestedRemedy
Change "bit" to "variable" and add PICs item.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The normative requirement/PICS are addressed in 91.5.3.3 (see P165, L1) and RF7 (see P183, L27).

Change the second sentence of 91.6.2 as follows.

"This variable has no effect (the decoder does not bypass error indication) if FEC bypass correction enable (1.200.0) is set to one."

Cl **91**   *SC* **91.7.4.2**   *P* **184**   *L* **9**   # 13
Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*
RF11 and RF13 look like duplicates

SuggestedRemedy
Delete RF11 because RF13 looks like a more accurate description

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete the current RF11. Move the current RF13 to be the new RF11. Renumber remaining items accordingly.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.1**   *P* **185**   *L* **18**   # 34
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*
For the Physical Layer clauses associated with ... tables introduced by the P802.3ba project, the clause numbers at the left of each row are links.
This is a useful feature allowing the user to jump straight to the relevant associated clause.
However, this has not been done for Table 92-1, Table 93-1 or Table 94-1

SuggestedRemedy
Make the clause numbers in Table 92-1, Table 93-1 and Table 94-1 cross-references.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Use suggested remedy

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10**   *P* **207**   *L* **47**   # 46
Richard, Mellitz   Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**
MDNEXT and MDFEXT loss are replaced by COM

SuggestedRemedy
Delete last 2 lines in table 92-11 for MDNEXT and MDFEXT loss

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove all instances of "shall" in 92.10.11 and corresponding PICS if any remain; for equations use "is determined using" rather than "shall".

"92.10.11 Cable assembly integrated crosstalk noise (ICN) calculation methodology" is used in "92.11.3.6 Mated test fixtures integrated crosstalk noise" and "92.8.3.6 Transmitter noise parameter measurements".

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 **92**
SC **92.10**

Page 20 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.10**   *P* **215**   *L* **14**   # 49
Richard, Mellitz   Intel Corporation

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**
MDFEXT loss is replaced by COM

SuggestedRemedy
Delete Clause 92.10.10

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #46.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.11**   *P* **215**   *L* **35**   # 50
Richard, Mellitz   Intel Corporation

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**
ICN is replaced by COM

SuggestedRemedy
Delete Clause 92.10.11

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #46.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.11**   *P* **216**   *L* **9**   # 143
Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **R**
This has a 3 dB reference receiver bandwidth of 18.75 GHz (scaled from Clause 85). But 3/4 of signalling rate would be 19.34 GHz.

SuggestedRemedy
Consider if the reference receiver bandwidth should be 19.34 GHz.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Suggested remedy lacks sufficiently defined problem statement to support implementing in the draft.

As commentor points out, CL92 3 dB reference receiver bandwidth of 18.75 GHz (18.75=(7.5/10.3125)*(25.78125) scaled as in Clause 85. Consistent with previous practice.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.3**   *P* **210**   *L* **24**   # 144
Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**
There is no cable assembly insertion loss deviation (ILD) in this draft, but there are still ILD of other things.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete "cable assembly", 5 times, and move the subclause to the definitions section ;-)

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #107.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.3**   *P* **210**   *L* **24**   # 47
Richard, Mellitz   Intel Corporation

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**
ILD is replaced by COM

SuggestedRemedy
Delete Clause 09.10.3

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Commenter was referring to 92.10.3 in suggested remedy.

See comment #107

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.3**   *P* **210**   *L* **24**   # 107
Healey, Adam   LSI Corporation

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**
Cable assembly insertion loss deviation (ILD) is defined but never used (it was overtaken by the COM-based cable assembly specification).

SuggestedRemedy
Delete 92.10.3.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Use suggested remedy

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 **92**
SC **92.10.3**

Page 21 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **92** *SC* **92.10.8** *P* **212** *L* **51** # 121
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Revise 92.10.8 Cable assembly channel operating margin text to correct implementation of cable assembly COMs derivation.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace text in 92.10.8 Cable assembly channel operating margin with text below

The cable assembly COM for each victim signal path (receive lane) is derived from measurements of the cable assembly victim signal path (measured from TP1 to TP4) and the four individual near-end crosstalk paths (measured at TP1 or TP4) and the three far-end crosstalk paths (measured from TP1 to TP4) that can couple into a victim signal path. The derivation method is specified in 93A.1 Channel operating margin.

92.10.8.1 Channel signal path
The channel signal path between TP0 and TP5 for the cable assembly (COM) consists of the cable assembly signal path measurements between TP1 and TP4 and the signal paths TP0 to MDI and TP5 to MDI to account for the transmitter and receiver PCB signal paths and the MDI signal paths. The transmitter or receiver PCB signal paths are calculated using the method defined in 93A.1.2.3. A 1 mm section of the PCB is defined by Equation (93A-9), Equation (93A-10), and the parameters values in Table 92-13. The PCB model consists of one hundred and eighty five 1 mm sections representing an insertion loss of 6.26 dB at 12.89 GHz.

The channel signal path to be used in COM (93A.1.2) is the concatenation of the cable assembly signal path measurement and the TP0 to MDI and TP5 to MDI signal paths (derived above) using the cascade function defined in 93A.1.2.1 given in Equation (92-19).

$SCHSp^\wedge(k)$=cascade(cascade($S^\wedge$(HOSP) $S^\wedge$(CASP)) $S^\wedge$(HOSP)) equation (92-19)
Where: $SCHSp^\wedge(k)$= channel signal path
$S^\wedge$(CASP)= cable assembly signal path
$S^\wedge$(HOSP)= TP0 to MDI or TP5 to MDI signal paths
k=0

92.10.8.2 Channel crosstalk paths
The channel structure includes three far-end and four near-end crosstalk paths. The MDI is the significant contributor to the channel crosstalk. The MDI crosstalk contribution is included in and characterized by the cable assembly crosstalk measurements. The cable assembly crosstalk signal paths to be used in COM are the four individual near-end crosstalk paths and the three far-end crosstalk paths that can couple into a victim signal path adjusted by the TP0 to MDI or TP5 to MDI signal paths (calculated in 92.10.8.2) using the cascaded function defined in 93A.1.2.1 given in Equation (92-21) and Equation (92-22).

$SCHNXTp^\wedge(k)$=cascade(cascade($S^\wedge$(HOSP), $S^\wedge$(CANXTk)), $S^\wedge$(HOSP)) equation (92-21)
Where: $SCHNXTp^\wedge(k)$= channel near-end crosstalk path adjusted by TP0 to MDI or TP5 to MDI signal paths
$S^\wedge$(CANXTk)= cable assembly near-end crosstalk path k
$S^\wedge$(HOSP)= TP0 to MDI or TP5 to MDI signal paths calculated in 92.10.8.2.
k= 1 to 4 near-end crosstalk paths

$SCHFXTp^\wedge(k)$=cascade(cascade($S^\wedge$(HOSp), $S^\wedge$(CAFXTk)), $S^\wedge$(HOSp)) equation (92-21)
Where: $SCHFXTp^\wedge(k)$=channel far-end crosstalk path adjusted by TP0 to MDI or TP5 to MDI signal paths
$S^\wedge$(CAFXTk)= cable assembly far-end crosstalk path k
$S^\wedge$(HOSp)= TP0 to MDI or TP5 to MDI signal paths calculated in 92.10.8.2
k= 1 to 3 far-end crosstalk paths

The cable assembly COM shall be greater than or equal to 4 dB.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

<Commenter did not submit a ballot. Editor changed Comment Type from TR to T.>

See comment #108.

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 **92**
SC **92.10.8**

Page 22 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.8**   *P* **212**   *L* **54**   # 51

Richard, Mellitz   Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

Description is not correct. COM is derived from the path response of differential mode s-parameters and not insertion loss and crosstalk losses.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete
"The cable assembly COM is derived from the cable assembly scattering parameter measurements of the insertion loss of a receive lane and the four individual pair-to-pair differential NEXT losses and three individual pair-to-pair differential FEXT losses that can couple into a receive lane."
Replace with:
The cable assembly COM is derived from the cable assembly differential mode scattering parameter measurements, S^(k)_ca, of each thru path and the associated four near plus three far end crosstalk paths as defined in 93A.1.1 except the measurement is between TP1 and TP4. Differential scattering parameters for COM are required to represent the path between TP0 and TP5.

Delete lines 5 page 213 to line 41 page 214
Keep table 92-13.

Replace with:

The channel path between TP0 and TP5 shall be determined by cascading the board transmission line, S^(lc), paths between TP0 and MDI and MDI and TP5 around the differential scattering parameter measured between TP1-TP5 so that:

S^(k) =cascade(cascade (S^(lc), S^(k)_ca), S^(lc)_ca))

S^(k) is use to determine COM.

Editorial licence granted

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #108.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.8**   *P* **213**   *L* **1**   # 108

Healey, Adam   LSI Corporation

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

The text of this clause refers to the "scattering parameter measurements of the insertion loss" and similarly to "NEXT losses" and "FEXT losses". This can be confusing since "loss" refers to the magnitude, in dB, of the inverse of a scattering parameter. The concatenation of the cable assembly with models of the host transmitter and receiver PCB traces that is described in the subclause require both the magnitude and phase of all differential-mode scattering parameters for the signal path.

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite the text to refer to the scatter parameters of cable assmebly "signal paths" using 93A.1.1 for guidance.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace the contents of 92.10.8 with the following text:

<start>

92.10.8 Cable assembly channel operating margin

The cable assembly COM for each victim signal path (receive lane) is derived from measurements of the cable assembly victim signal path and the four individual near-end crosstalk paths and the three far-end crosstalk paths that can couple into a victim signal path. The derivation method is specified in 93A.1 Channel operating margin.

92.10.8.1 Channel signal path
The channel signal path between TP0 and TP5 for the cable assembly (COM) consists of the cable assembly signal path measurements between TP1 and TP4 and the signal paths TP0 to TP1 and TP4 to TP5 to account for the additional transmitter and receiver PCB signal paths and the MDI signal paths. The channel signal path to be used in COM (93A.1.2) is the concatenation of the cable assembly signal path measurement and the TP0 to TP1 and TP4 to TP5 signal paths (calculated in 92.10.8.1.1) using the cascade function defined in 93A.1.2.1 given in Equation (92-19).

SCHSp^(k)=cascade(cascade(S^(HOSP) S^(CASP)) S^(HOSP)) equation (92-19)
Where: SCHSp^(k)= channel signal path
S^(HOSP)= is the signal path calculated in 92.10.8.1.1
S^(CASP)= cable assembly signal path
k=0

92.10.8.1.1 TP0 to TP1 and TP4 to TP5 signal paths
The additional transmitter or receiver PCB signal paths are calculated using the method defined in 93A.1.2.3. A 1 mm section of the PCB is defined by Equation (93A-9), Equation (93A-10), and the parameters values given in Table 92-13. The PCB model consists of one hundred and eighty five 1 mm sections representing an insertion loss of 6.26 dB at 12.89 GHz not accounted for in the cable assembly measurements between TP1 to TP4.

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 **92**
SC **92.10.8**

Page 23 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

92.10.8.2 Channel crosstalk paths
The channel structure includes three far-end and four near-end crosstalk paths. The MDI is
the significant contributor to the channel crosstalk. The MDI crosstalk contribution is
included in and characterized by the cable assembly crosstalk measurements. The cable
assembly crosstalk signal paths to be used in COM are the four individual near-end
crosstalk paths and the three far-end crosstalk paths that can couple into a victim
signal path using the cascaded function defined in 93A.1.2.1 given in Equation (92-20) and
Equation (92-21).

$SCHNXTp^{\wedge}(k)=cascade(cascade(S^{\wedge}(HOSP), S^{\wedge}(CANXTk)), S^{\wedge}(HOSP))$ equation (92-21)
Where: $SCHNXTp^{\wedge}(k)=$ channel near-end crosstalk path
$S^{\wedge}(CANXTk)=$ is cable assembly near-end crosstalk path k
$S^{\wedge}(HOSP)=$ is the signal path calculated in 92.10.8.1.1
k= 1 to 4 near-end crosstalk paths

$SCHFXTp^{\wedge}(k)=cascade(cascade(S^{\wedge}(HOSp), S^{\wedge}(CAFXTk)), S^{\wedge}(HOSp))$ equation (92-21)
$S^{\wedge}(CAFXTk)=$ is the cable assembly far-end crosstalk path k
$S^{\wedge}(HOSp)=$ is the signal path calculated in 92.10.8.1.1
k= 1 to 3 far-end crosstalk paths

The cable assembly COM shall be greater than or equal to 4 dB.

<end>

Note that the proposed response is not intended to change the requirements but rather to
state them more accurately.

Grant editorial license to ensure grammar and style is correct.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.8**   *P* **213**   *L* **19**   # 124

Ben-Artsi, Liav   Marvell

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**

The representation of 1mm trace used to create the host board may introduce small amount
of non-causality

SuggestedRemedy

Will provide updated coefficients

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.8**   *P* **213**   *L* **47**   # 36

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**   *bucket*

In the "where" section of equations, the variable description should start with "is" as per the
IEEE style manual 16.3 Presentation of equations.
For example:
S(CHILp)   Channel insertion loss between TP0 and TP5
should be:
S(CHILp)   is the channel insertion loss between TP0 and TP5

SuggestedRemedy

Change the "where" sections of Equations 92-19 through 92-22 to start the variable
descriptions with "is"

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implementation will be in resolution to comment #108.

IEEE style manual will be followed.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.8**   *P* **213**   *L* **6**   # 77

Ben-Artsi, Liav   Marvell

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **A**

The Rx side host board and Tx side host board are defined as 6.26dB @ Fb/2 while the
worst case crosstalk would be having as low loss as reasonably possible which would cause
higher near end crosstalk / far end crosstalk.

SuggestedRemedy

Recommend that the host boards (and the corresponding 2xhost board in the case of near
end aggression path / Far end aggression path) be 3dB @ Fb/2 (though the minimal
allowed is lower). Will provide the amount of concatenated sections.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change host board contribution to the following for NEXT and FEXT channels: add 6.26dB
to Rx Host board side and 3dB (90mm) to Tx side of channel (editorial license granted).

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 **92**
SC **92.10.8**

Page 24 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.10.9**   *P* **214**   *L* **44**   # 48

Richard, Mellitz   Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

MDNEXT loss is replaced by COM

SuggestedRemedy

Delete Clause 92.10.9

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #46

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.11.1**   *P* **217**   *L* **3**   # 142

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

Response to D2.0 comment 222 on test fixture terminology says "Test fixture used in base document; IEEE Std 802.3ba-2010; 84.8.1.1 Test fixture; 85.8.3.5 Test fixture. "Test fixture" is well understood description of function performed."
It turns out it's not so simple and there are test fixture within test fixtures.
The test fixture in 84.8.1.1 (as defined for 10GBASE-KR in 72.7.1.1) presents an AC-coupled 2x50 ohm load to the transmitter under test without insertion loss. At least two of the test fixtures in 55.5.2.1 similarly present a 100 ohm load without insertion loss.
By contrast, in 85.8.3.5 Fig 85-5 there is a lossy "TP2 or TP3 test fixture" within a "transmitter test fixture". Similarly, Figure 92-14 shows one test fixture within another.
Further, this project has added further test fixtures in Clause 93. It would help to have fewer things called "test fixture", and some of them have well established names.
Consistency across 802.3 has been lost already.

SuggestedRemedy

As "Host Compliance Board" is well established in the industry, change "TP2 or TP3 Test fixture", or "test fixture" (when referring to this test fixture not the TP1/TP4 or TP0a/TP5a test fixtures or the Transmitter and receiver test fixture), to "Host Compliance Board".

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The response to D2.0 C222 <"Test fixture" is well understood description of function performed.> is not to imply "all" test fixtures are the same, but that "test fixture" describes the function performed.

The Draft 2.1 includes adequate reference to the term "host compliance board". See P217 L3: "The test fixture (also known as Host Compliance Board) …"

To address the test fixture within test fixture…
Change the title of Figure 92-14 to "Transmitter and receiver test setup".

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.11.1.2**   *P* **217**   *L* **42**   # 132

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

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

D2.0 comment 237: "Are the 100GBASE-CR4 HCB, MCB PCB losses achievable in practice? If not, make adjustments, keeping consistency with the OIF/InfiniBand EDR specifications. REJECT. Confidence expressed that current specifications can be met. Implementations to verify are pending."
Repeating the question, specifically for the HCB: has this been verified yet and are the losses achievable?

SuggestedRemedy

If the reference loss is too low, make adjustments, keeping consistency with the OIF and InfiniBand EDR specifications.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.
Suggested remedy lacking sufficient defined problem statement to support implementation in the draft.

Presentation submitted demonstrating 92.11 Test Fixture specifications are achievable. See diminico_3bj_01_0713.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.11.1.2**   *P* **217**   *L* **42**   # 134

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*

It would help to have a graph like Figure 86A-2, Reference differential insertion losses of HCB, MCB excluding connector

SuggestedRemedy

Please add graph.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Graph reference test fixture insertion loss equation (92-30) in subclause 92.11.1.2.

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 **92**
SC **92.11.1.2**

Page 25 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.11.3.2**   *P* **220**   *L* **4**   # 140

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*

Blank line(s).

SuggestedRemedy

Remove.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will try to remove as many blank spaces as possible while otimizing placement of graphs.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.11.3.3**   *P* **220**   *L* **1**   # 141

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*

Blank line(s).

SuggestedRemedy

Remove. Also p222, 223.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Will try to remove as many blank spaces as possible while otimizing placement of graphs.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.7.12**   *P* **193**   *L* **18**   # 94

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

The response time requirement is dependent on the status of frame_lock_i which may be difficult to verify (e.g. if the MDIO interface is unavailable) and synchronize with a captured waveform. In addition, it is not available to the link partner.

It is relatively easy to make the lane frame lock state available as part of the status report field. This information would be very useful in analyzing link training issues and thus promote interoperability.

Comment applies to clauses 93 and 94 as well.

SuggestedRemedy

In clauses 92 and 93, assign cell 14 of the status report field (currently reserved) to represent the value of the PMD status variable frame_lock_i.

In clause 94, use cell 7 of the status report field instead of cell 14 (14 is already assigned, 7 is currently reserved).

Editorial license granted.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

After initial frame lock the the response time should be 2 ms regardless of whether the receiver loses frame lock or not.

Replace:
"In addition to the coefficient update process specified in 72.6.10.2.5, when frame_lock_i is TRUE for lane i
(where i represents the lane number in the range 0 to 3), the period from receiving a new request to responding
to that request shall be less than 2 ms."

With:
In addition to the coefficient update process specified in 72.6.10.2.5, after responding to the first request after training begins, the period from receiving a new request to responding to that request shall be less than 2 ms.

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 **92**
SC **92.7.12**

Page 26 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.7.12**   *P* **193**   *L* **31**   # 68

Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

PMD PRBS polynomial selection is mentioned in this paragraph. In the MDIO registers (1.1450-1.1453) definitions there is a shall statement that states each lane will use a different polynomial. We should have a PICs for the shall statement either in clause 92 or Clause 45, not sure where. It also may make sense to move the unique polynomial requirement to Clause 92 since in the MDIO registers you will have transiant states where 2 MDIO registers are configured to the same value as you change from [0,1,2,3] -> [3,2,1,0] which may to go through [3,1,2,3].

SuggestedRemedy

Add a shall statement to 92.7.12 that requires the polynomial_i values to be unique when training is started.
Add a PICs for it to Clause 92 as well.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Move the following sentence from 45.2.1.98a to 92.7.12.
"The polynomial identifier for each lane shall be unique; therefore no two lanes have the same identifier."

Add appropriate PICS.

In 93.7.12, change the first sentence on P246 to:
"In addition, the training pattern defined in 72.6.10.2.6 shall be replaced with the set of training patterns defined in 92.7.12 which are designed to minimize the correlation between physical lanes."

Add appropriate PICS.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.7.12**   *P* **193**   *L* **32**   # 79

Slavick, Jeff   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

seed_i could be configured set to 0x000 which produces an all zero's pattern.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following sentence:
If seed_i is set to 0x000 then a seed of 0x7FF shall be used as the initial state of the generator at the start of training.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In 92.7.12, add text stating that the value 0x000 is invalid.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.8.3**   *P* **194**   *L* **41**   # 130

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

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

Following up on D2.0 comment 240: inconsistency between S-parameter frequency range and waveform measurement frequency range. Response says "The capability of an instrument to measure higher frequencies is not a justification to specify them." Adding to that, the cost and increased noise of measuring them is a justification to NOT specify them. Notice that in 92.10.11 Cable assembly integrated crosstalk noise (ICN), the 3 dB reference receiver bandwidth is set to 18.75 GHz.

SuggestedRemedy

In clauses 92 and 93, Reduce the observation bandwidth for waveforms, jitter and similar from 33 GHz to between 18.75 GHz and 25 GHz TBD (e.g. 19.34).
Make an exception for transition time.
Alternatively, increase the S-parameter frequency range to the signalling rate, as OIF does.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

The bandwidth was chosen to be sufficiently high to minimize the influence of the test equipment on the measured results.

The D2.0 comment 240 was rejected.

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 **92**
SC **92.8.3**

Page 27 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.8.3**   *P* **195**   *L* **22**   # 115
Hidaka, Yasuo   Fujitsu Laboratories of

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **A**

Far-end transmit output noise is defined in different ways between table 92-6 and equations 92-4 or 92-5.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the value (2) of far-end transmit output noise (max) for low insertion loss channel in table 92-6 with the right hand side (sqrt(sigma_l^2+2^2)) of equation 92-4.
Replace the value (1) of far-end transmit output noise (max) for high insertion loss channel in table 92-6 with the right hand side (sqrt(sigma_h^2+1^2)) of equation 92-5.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

The far-end transmit output noise is not defined in different ways between table 92-6 and equations 92-4 or 92-5.

Editorial changes offered below are for clarification of the specification; requirements have not been changed.

Change 92.8.3 as follows:

(1) Replace sentence P198, L28 with:

"For the low-loss cable assembly, the far-end transmitter output noise (Txfel) shall be less than 2 mV."

(2) Replace equation (92-4) with:

"Txfel = sqrt(RMSdevl^2-sigma_l^2) (92-4)"

(3) Replace sentence P198, L34 with:

"For the high-loss cable assembly, the far-end transmitter output noise (Txfeh) shall be less than 1 mV. "

(4) Replace equation (92-5) with:

"Txfeh= sqrt(RMSdevh^2-sigma_h^2) (92-5)"

5) In step 7 identify RMSdev is the RMS deviation from the mean voltage as follows:

"7) A fixed point on the square wave test pattern is chosen and the RMS deviation from the mean voltage at this observation point is measured; denote this measurement RMSdevl for the low-loss cable assembly and RMSdevh for the high-loss cable assembly."

6) Add note that the Txfeh and Txfel should be considered to be zero if the sqrt argument in equation 92-4 or 92-5, respectively, is negative.

Editorial license to implement the changes.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.8.3**   *P* **195**   *L* **32**   # 127
Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **R**

Depending what happens to the jitter specs, an output noise spec will likely be needed

SuggestedRemedy

If jitter specs don't cover it, add Qsq or SNDR spec.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

An output noise specifiation is in subclause 92.8.3.6.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.8.3**   *P* **195**   *L* **35**   # 129
Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **A**

Total Jitter (BER=1e-12) is not relevant for CR4 with FEC, and it may not be reasonable to keep it below 0.28 UI regardless of the transmit equalization setting for the host channel of 92A.5 (D2.0 comments 165, 227). Without TJ we can't specify Effective Random Jitter as proposed.

SuggestedRemedy

Either do the work to show that it is reasonable to keep TJ below 0.28 UI regardless of the transmit equalization setting for the host channel of 92A.5, or change the spec for CR4.
E.g. replace the spec for TJ-DDJ with one for J5-
DDJ, find Effective Random Jitter for CR4 from J3 and J5.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

See comment #123.

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 **92**
SC **92.8.3**

Page 28 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.8.3.4**   *P* **197**   *L* **49**   # 114

Hidaka, Yasuo   Fujitsu Laboratories of

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*

There is no space between the last line of 92.8.3.4 and the section title of 92.8.3.5.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a blank line before the section title of 92.8.3.5 Transition time.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Use suggested remedy

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.8.3.6**   *P* **198**   *L* **21**   # 145

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

"scrambled idle" is defined in 82.2.10 without RS-FEC. Here, we should allow RS-FEC encoded scrambled idle. Non-FEC scrambled idle would be fine as a crosstalk generator but it's not what a Clause 92 transmitter is supposed to generate.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise the terminology to allow RS-FEC encoded scrambled idle as appropriate. 8 places in this draft. Coordinate with P802.3bm.
Consider if in any of these cases an RS-FEC encoded scrambled Remote Fault would be an acceptable additional alternative (RF is what a transmitter will emit by default when it doesn't detect an input).

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot. The comment does point out the need for clarification.

The PCS is generating scrambled idle which is further encoded by the RS-FEC.

Add RS-FEC to 6) as follows…
"6) The reference lane of the transmitter under test sends a square wave test pattern as specified in 83.5.10 while all other adjacent transmitter lanes send either scrambled idle with RS-FEC encoding or PRBS31."

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.8.3.7**   *P* **200**   *L* **1**   # 99

Moore, Charles   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

Method given in 85.8.3.3 for computing coefficients c(-1), c(0), and c(1) can give different values for the coefficients for the same transmitter at the same equalization setting if different channel are interposed between the transmitter and the measurement. The coefficient value are supposed to measure the transmitter independent of the channel.

Note: Clause 93.8.1.6 has similar problems although not as severe. It probably should be changed as well.

Also: Clause 94.3.12.6 has similar problems although not as severe. It probably should be changed as well.

SuggestedRemedy

I will have a presentation detailing needed changes.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

The commenter points out a legitimate problem with the draft.

In 92.8.3.7, specify that the linear fit to the captured waveform, and the linear fit pulse response, is calculated per 85.8.3.3.5.

Include the method of computing the transmit equalizer coefficients for each equalizer setting that is described by the equations on slides 11 through 13 of moore_3bj_01_0713.pdf, or their equivalent, including the following modifications.

On slide 12, note that the second "=" in the definition of B0, B1, and B2 was incorrectly included.
The offset value "o", labeled "j_offset" in some instances, is swept from –M/2 to M/2.
Use the normalized coefficient values that correspond to the value of "o" that minimizes the mean squared error (epsilon(o)^2).

Change 93.8.1.6 and 94.3.12.6 to refer to the Clause 92 procedure as defined above.

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 **92**
SC **92.8.3.7**

Page 29 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.8.3.9**   *P* **202**   *L* **33**   # 123

Zivny, Pavel   Tektronix

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

Subclause 92.8.3.9.2 "Total jitter" defines "Total jitter excluding data dependent jitter" in a difficult to measure and physically incorrect way; details in zivny_3bj_01_0715.
Subclause 92.8.3.9.4 "Effective deterministic and random jitter" defines "effective random jitter (RJ)" in a difficult to measure way; details in zivny_3bj_01_0715
Same subclause then defines "Effective deterministic jitter excluding data dependent jitter" in a difficult to measure and physically incorrect way; details in zivny_3bj_01_0715.
This comment is a pile-in to comment # 165.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the methodology given in zivny_3bj_01_0715 to define "Effective deterministic jitter excluding data dependent jitter", "Effective random jitter" and "Total jitter excluding data dependent jitter".

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Background in zivny_3bj_01_0713.

Summary of changes to D2.1:
-No change to even-odd jitter.
-Update measurement method for:
   - Effective DJ excluding DDJ.
   - Effective random jitter
-Remove "TJ excluding DDJ"

Change "effective DJ excluding DDJ" to "effective bounded UJ".
UJ = "uncorrelated jitter"

Note that UJ is currently defined in definitions and abbreviations.

Delete subclause "92.8.3.9.3 Data dependent jitter".

Delete subclause "92.8.3.9.2 Total jitter"

Replace content of "92.8.3.9.4 Effective deterministic and random jitter"
- change title to "Effective bounded uncorrelated jitter and random jitter"
- Incorporate the method from zivny_3bj_01_0713 slides 9-12.
- Specify RJ in RMS.
- For RJ, specify maximum of 0.01 UI RMS for 92 and 93.
- For BUJ, specify 0.1 UI PP for both 92 and 93.

Update tables 92-6 and 93-4.

Update relevant sections in 93 which point to the jitter subclauses in 92.

Update PICS.

Grant editorial license.

Cl **92**   *SC* **92.8.3.9**   *P* **202**   *L* **34**   # 116

Hidaka, Yasuo   Fujitsu Laboratories of

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

TJ excluding DDJ is defined regardless of the transmit equalization setting.
This is a problem, because TJ excluding DDJ depends on DDJ as well as the transmit equalization setting.
For instance, if the transmit equalization is changed too weak for insertion loss from TP0 to TP2, while all jitter sources other DDJ are kept same, slow edge due to large ISI increases DDJ as well as TJ excluding DDJ.
TJ excluding DDJ shall be measured with some equalizer which compensates for large ISI. The equalizer may be the transmit equalization function or CTLE in the measurement instrument.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace line 33 and 34 of page 202 with the following:

Total jitter excluding data dependent jitter is the difference between TJ and DDJ and shall be less than or equal to 0.28UI.
TJ shall be measured either with the transmit equalization enabled or after a continuous-time filter function.
If TJ is measured with the transmit equalization, $c(-1)$ shall be set to zero, $c(0)$ shall be set to minimum, and $c(1)$ shall be set to the value which minimizes DDJ.
If TJ is measured after a continuous-time filter function, the filter shall have a transfer function defined by equation (93A-20) and g_DC shall be set to the value which minimizes DDJ.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Response to comment #123 resolves this issues by measuring jitter on a single edge separated by several UI from other transitions.

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 **92**
SC **92.8.3.9**

Page 30 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **92** *SC* **92.8.3.9** *P* **202** *L* **6** # 122

Zivny, Pavel   Tektronix

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Subclause 92.8.3.9 "Transmitter output jitter" sets normative requirements on components of jitter, but does so with a test pattern too long for jitter component separation; total jitter @ BER is not limited and pathological devices might thus be erroneously evaluated as passing.

SuggestedRemedy

Specify the TJ @ BER for pattern PRBS31 (see 83.5.10) or scrambled idle (see 82.2.10) as TJ @BER to be less or equal to 0.28 UI for each link BER target.
Other jitter components should be specified on shorter, measurable patterns, e.g. as proposed in zivny_3bj_01_0715 .

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

See comment #123.

Cl **92** *SC* **92.8.3.9.2** *P* **202** *L* **27** # 131

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

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

The continuing discussion about jitter definitions goes to show that TJ, DDJ, EDJ and ERJ as used in this project are proper nouns because they have definitions that are not the obvious meaning of the phrases: TJ is not all the jitter there is, DDJ is not all the data-dependent jitter, ERJ could contain any fraction that's random, EDJ is not all the deterministic jitter. Other clauses may have used similar but uncapitalized terms without definition (making them common nouns, if ambiguous), or may have simply ignored the editorial rules on proper nouns in Merriam-Webster. Our terms mean what we say they mean and should not be confused with theirs by making different things look the same! Making our newly defined terms look "consistent with similar terms in 802.3-2012" would be misleading the reader.

SuggestedRemedy

Use Total Jitter, Data Dependent Jitter, Effective Random Jitter (ERJ) and Effective Deterministic Jitter (EDJ) (all with capitals) as these are undeniably proper nouns.
Also, Even-odd Jitter can be treated as a proper noun because it has a definition, although its definition agrees with the meaning of the words.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

The substance of this comment was rejected in D2.0 ballot comment #231.

Cl **92** *SC* **92.8.3.9.2** *P* **202** *L* **33** # 128

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

D2.0 comment 227 observed that while these jitter metrics must be met regardless of the transmit equalization setting, for a maximum host channel with the transmitter at Preset, this might be challenging because the eye at TP2 is pretty closed up. But this is not relevant to real-world use with an equalizer. Comment 165 also points out difficulties with the way jitter is specified. For CR4, with FEC, TJ isn't relevant anyway.

SuggestedRemedy

Determine if "regardless of the transmit equalization setting" is too wide, and if the specifications should apply above some threshold of emphasis. Don't use TJ for CR4.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Response to comment #123 resolves this issues by measuring jitter on a single edge separated by several UI from other transitions.

Cl **92** *SC* **92.8.4.4** *P* **104** *L* **25** # 96

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

We recently adopted a change in the receiver tolerance test of clause 93 to use to SER after RS-FEC (using errored symbol counters) instead of BER target before FEC, and added an option of using a transmitter that incorporates training.

The reasons for these changes, presented in moore_3bj_02a_0513, are valid for clause 92 as well.

The test calibration method used in clause 92 does not need to change.

SuggestedRemedy

Use RS-FEC symbol error ratio as the test requirement, with same values as in table 93-7, read from FEC_symbol_error_counter_i (see 91.6.10).

In 92.8.4.4.3 and 92.8.4.4.5, specify using only encoded scrambled idles pattern across all lanes (described in another comment on 93.8.2.3).

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(1)Use RS-FEC symbol error ratio as the test requirement, with same values as in table 93-7

(2) In 92.8.4.4.3 and 92.8.4.4.5, specify using only encoded scrambled idles pattern across all lanes.

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 **92**
SC **92.8.4.4**

Page 31 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **92**　　*SC* **92.8.4.4**　　　　*P* **204**　　*L*　　　# 76
Ben-Artsi, Liav　　　　　　　　　Marvell

Comment Type　**TR**　　*Comment Status*　**A**

The receiver interference tolerance test as described at 92.8.4.4 lacks correlation to COM and therfore may introduce understress or overstress.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following sentence:
Each lane shall also comply with the "Cable assembly channel operating margin" as described in 92.10.8

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Editorial licence to add text to indicate that cable assembly test channel meets channel operating margin as described in 92.10.8.

Cl **92**　　*SC* **92.9**　　　　　*P* **207**　　*L* **16**　　　# 120
DiMinico, Christopher　　　　　　MC Communications

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status*　**A**

Revise 92.9 and 92.10 to addresses changes in CL92 and annex 92A from D2 to D2.1 not included in 92.9 and 92.10 text.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 92.9 text with text below:

The 100GBASE-CR4 channel is defined between TP0 and TP5 to include the transmitter and receiver differential controlled impedance printed circuit board and the cable assembly as illustrated in Figure 92-2. The channel parameters insertion loss, return loss, channel operating margin (COM) and the transmitter and receiver differential controlled impedance printed circuit boards for each differential lane are provided informatively in 92A.4 through 92A.7.
(2)Add sentence (new paragraph) to 92.10 Cable assembly characteristics
The cable assembly channel operating margin is specified in 92.10.8.

(3)Update Table 92-11-Cable assembly differential characteristics summary with additional differential parameters included in D2.1 from D2.0.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT.

<Commenter did not submit a ballot. Editor changed Comment Type from TR to T.>

Use suggested remedy

Cl **92**　　*SC* **92.9**　　　　　*P* **207**　　*L* **22**　　　# 45
Richard, Mellitz　　　　　　　　Intel Corporation

Comment Type　**TR**　　*Comment Status*　**A**

Insertion Loss, ILD, and ICN are not sufficient channel characteristics for determining Channel Operating Margin. They are replace by COM requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete lines 20-22
Insert:
Channel Operating Margin is determined from differential mode channel s-paremeters for signal paths and is defined 93A.1.1.

Editorial licence granted.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #120

Cl **92A**　　*SC* **92A.7**　　　*P* **340**　　*L* **44**　　　# 70
Ben-Artsi, Liav　　　　　　　　　Marvell

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status*　**A**

The interconnect target COM recommendation of being greater or equal to 3dB does not line up with the required margin for implementation.

SuggestedRemedy

Will supply a presentation

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement changes in ran_3bj_02_0713 slides 3, 5 and 6 with editorial license.

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 **92A**
SC **92A.7**

Page 32 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.8.1.1**   *P*   *L*   # 133
Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

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

The compliance boards in SFP+, Annex 86A (nPPI), InfiniBand FDR and Clause 92 each have a defined reference insertion loss curve. A user has an actual compliance board with a similar but not identical loss. For S-parameter measurements, he can de-embed his actual loss and re-embed the reference loss and get an accurate result. The documents also give a loss range, defining what is a good-enough pair of compliance boards. The ideal (reference) compliance board does not have intentional reflections.

Clause 93's test fixtures are defined differently. There is a range of losses, and only at one frequency. Some ILD and reflections are allowed.
A user with an actual compliance board can de-embed his actual loss, but has to re-embed a loosely specified loss, an ILD, and the reflections of Eq 93-1. Depending what he is measuring, he needs to re-embed the least or the most loss, ILD and/or reflections. He has to do the work at least twice over, possibly more times depending how many corners are relevant. Both in design/simulation and in measurement. The allowed test fixture variability leaks into measurement results unless everyone agrees which corners are relevant for which measurements (e.g. least insertion loss, most return loss of the test fixture for measuring product return loss, most loss for linear fit pulse peak, and so on).

SuggestedRemedy

Use the range of losses, ILD and return loss as guidance for an adequate test fixture. But define the REFERENCE (ideal) test fixture with a specific insertion loss (preferably with an equation) and without deliberate ILD or return loss, as the other specs that use compliance boards do.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

The Clause 93 test fixtures are defined differently from SFP+, nPPI, 100GBASE-CR4, etc. but this doesn't necessarily render the definition invalid.

The permitted range of insertion loss at 12.89 GHz is 1.2 to 1.6 dB with an ILD allowance of 0.1 dB. This implies the nominal loss target, allowing for ILD, must be in the range of 1.3 to 1.5 dB. Assuming a reference insertion loss would split this difference e.g. 1.4 dB, the difference between the in situ test fixture and the embedded reference would not exceed 0.1 dB. It seems the de-embedding and embedding process could introduce errors of this degree.

Regarding the use of an equation to define the reference insertion loss over frequency, no equation is provided in the suggested remedy for implementation in the draft.

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.8.1.4**   *P* **249**   *L* **37**   # 151
Ghiasi, Ali   Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

The common mode return loss crosses differential return loss at 6.05 GHz and even for ideal driver/pacakge the common mode return loss can only be as good as differetnial not better

SuggestedRemedy

Please change common mode return loss to follow differetnial return loss of equation 93-2 but 3 dB worse
RLcm(f)>=9.05-f 0.05<=f<=6 GHz
    = 3.45-0.075f 6<=f<19 GHz

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

<Editor changed subclause from 8.1.4 to 93.8.1.4.>

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

The equation in the suggested remedy has a discontinuity at 6 GHz.

Change Equation 93-3 to:
RLcm(f)
>= 9.05-f for 0.05<=f<=6 GHz
>= 3.5-0.075*f for 6<f<=19 GHz

Also, there is a discontinuity in equation 93-2.
Change bottom term of equation 93-2 to:
6.5 - 0.075*f

Modify equations in Clause 94 to be consistent.

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.8.2.3**   *P* **254**   *L* **43**   # 88
Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*

Missing hyperlinks to figure 93C-2 (twice in this paragraph).

SuggestedRemedy

Add hyperlinks.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 **93**
SC **93.8.2.3**

Page 33 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.8.2.3**   *P* **255**   *L* **10**   # 55

Richard, Mellitz   Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

There are 4 test values columns defined in Table 93-7.
Test 2 values and Test 3 values columns' channel loss limit curves are the same. Test 2 values column is without error correction. Test 3 values column is with error correction. Test 4 values column seems more demanding the Test 3 values column. Both are with error correction. Test 3 seems superfluous.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Test 3 values column from Tabel 97-3

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Test 3 is not superfluous. It verifies higher noise tolerance for the 30 dB channel when error correction is included. It is different from test 4 which investigates the receiver's ability to compensate for a maximum loss channel.

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.8.2.3**   *P* **255**   *L* **2**   # 85

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

The criterion for this test (in table 93-7) is RS-FEC symbol error rate. The test pattern should enable counting symbol errors using the errored symbol counter (step 11 of 93C.2). This means the RS-FEC decoder has to be functional; it requires the data to be transcoded and RS-FEC encoded, and specifically include alignment markers (for RS-FEC codeword alignment).

PRBS31 generation is an optional function of a PMA sublayer, so the PMA can theoretically override the RS-FEC output with PRBS31; but in that case, the received signal would not be RS-FEC decodable so the RS-FEC error counters would not function. Using an optional PMA sublayer between RS-FEC and PCS (as described in 91.3) would not solve this problem either, since PRBS31 is not encodable by RS-FEC (no valid 66-bit blocks and no alignment markers).

Note that if transcoding and RS-FEC encoding are used, then any valid PCS output (not just idles) would enable using the RS-FEC errored symbol counter. I don't see a reason to restrict the pattern to scrambled idles only.

Note that clause 94 interference tolerance test uses only the scrambled idles test pattern.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "either PRBS31 or the scrambled idles test pattern" to "scrambled idles or valid PCS output, encoded by the RS-FEC sublayer", with editorial license.

Consider noting in 91.3 that the optional PMA test patterns in 83.5.10 cannot be used as input to the RS-FEC sublayer.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the last sentence of the third paragraph (P255, L2) of 93.8.2.3 as follows.

"The test pattern to be used is any valid PCS output (such as scrambled idle) which is subsequently encoded by the RS-FEC sublayer."

Regarding the addition of a note in 91.3, the PMA test patterns work no better through Clause 74 BASE-R FEC or "upwards" toward the PCS. It should be understood that any test mode (including loopback etc.) may compromise the end-to-end communication of the link. Regarding test modes to verify PMD compliance, these most likely originate from the PMA adjacent to the PMD.

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 **93**
SC **93.8.2.3**

Page 34 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.8.2.3**   *P* **255**   *L* **28**   # 71
Ben-Artsi, Liav   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**
The Rx interference tolerance test Target COM of 1.5dB does not line up with required margin for implementation

SuggestedRemedy
Will supply a presentation

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #78.

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.8.2.3**   *P* **255**   *L* **28**   # 54
Richard, Mellitz   Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**
Table 93-7 specifies COM of 1.5 dB for the Test 4 values column.

For a 35dB loss channel the headroom over the noise is only 2.8 mV (pre amplification). i.e. available signal - noise.
That seems excessively demanding of a reciever.

SuggestedRemedy
Change to COM 2.5 dB for the Test 4 values column

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #78.

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.8.2.3**   *P* **255**   *L* **30**   # 90
Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*
Missing hyperlinks to 93C.2 and figure 93C-4 (twice).

SuggestedRemedy
Add hyperlinks.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.8.2.3**   *P* **255**   *L* **30**   # 101
Healey, Adam   LSI Corporation

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *bucket*
The references to Annex 93C in the footnotes of Table 93-7 are not "live".

SuggestedRemedy
Please add the appropriate cross-references.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

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 **93**
SC **93.8.2.3**

Page 35 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **93** *SC* **93.8.2.4** *P* **256** *L* **1** # 86

Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

If jitter tolerance test is done with PRBS31, then BER can be measured at the PMD service interface if it is exposed, or at the PMA if the optional PRBS31 check is implemented, or externally if the optional PMA remote loopback is implemented.

If it is done with scrambled idles, measuring BER prior to RS-FEC correction is impossible - the recovered scrabmled idles test pattern is only available at the PCS, after RS-FEC decoding that either corrects errors or marks them (complete bypass is not allowed); so it can only be checked there.

The current test definition works only with PRBS31, and even then depends on optional features. To enable using scrambled idles (or any valid PCS output), without requiring optional features, we should allow measuring SER instead of BER, and define the required SER in that case.

Note that clause 94 jitter tolerance test (93.8.2.4) uses only the scrambled idles test pattern, and counts symbols errors rather than bit errors.

Comment also applies to the jitter tolerance test in 92.8.4.5, where the test patterns are defined indirectly. It also applies to interference tolerance test (92.8.4.4.5) which currently uses only BER; this is addressed by another comment.

SuggestedRemedy

Change
"The BER at the output of the receiver under test, and prior to error correction by the RS-FEC sublayer, is measured."

to

"If PRBS31 is used, the BER is measured at the PMA sublayer (see 83.5.10). If scrambled idles pattern is used, the BER is estimated by dividing FEC_symbol_error_counter_i (see 91.6.10), where i is the lane under test, by 10."

Apply similarly to 92.8.4.5 and possibly 92.8.4.4.5.

Editorial license granted.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, since the receiver interference tolerance requirements are now based on RS-FEC symbol error ratio, it is not clear why jitter tolerance requirements should continue to be based on bit error ratio.

Change the end of the fourth paragraph and the end of the fifth paragraph as follows.

"The test transmitter then transmits any valid PCS output (such as scrambled idle) which is subsequently encoded by the RS-FEC sublayer. The RS-FEC symbol error ratio is measured using the errored symbol counter FEC_symbol_error_i where i is the lane number of the receiver under test.

The RS_FEC symbol error ratio shall be less than or equal to 10^(-4) for each case listed in Table 93-8."

Modify Clause 92 to be consistent.

Cl **93** *SC* **93.8.2.4** *P* **256** *L* **4** # 105

Healey, Adam LSI Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

For consistency with the receiver interference tolerance requirements, the receiver jitter tolerance requirements should be expressed in terms of FEC symbol error ratio.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"The BER shall be less than or equal to 10^(-5) for each case listed in Table 93-8."

To:
"The RS-FEC symbol error ratio, measured using the errored symbol counter FEC_symbol_error_i where i is the lane number of the receiver under test, shall be less than or equal to 10^(-4) for each case listed in Table 93-8."

Note that in both cases (interference and jitter tolerance) it is unclear how the RS-FEC symbol error ratio can be measured with the cited counter and a PRBS31 pattern. It is likely that the test pattern also needs to be limited to scrambled idles or a different way of arriving a symbol error ratio needs to be defined.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #86.

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 **93**
SC **93.8.2.4**

Page 36 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.9.1**   *P* **256**   *L* **43**   # 112

Kochuparambil, Beth   Cisco Systems

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

With multiple changes in COM since adoption in the draft, analysis of range of compliant channels has only been done on limited submitted channels.

System analysis needs to be done to verify broad market potential.

SuggestedRemedy

Once COM changes taper, channel verification is needed to confirm if 3dB limit is a realistic channel design limit.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.9.1**   *P* **256**   *L* **43**   # 78

Ben-Artsi, Liav   Marvell

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

The Channel COM margin of 3 dB is not aligned with the required margin for implementation.

SuggestedRemedy

Will supply a presentation

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the changes in ran_3bj_02_0713 slides 3, 4, 6 with editorial license.

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.9.1**   *P* **257**   *L* **12**   # 72

Ben-Artsi, Liav   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

The Device package model includes Single ended ball capacitance and not Single ended board capacitance

SuggestedRemedy

Change the description of Cb in table 93A-1 to Single-ended ball capacitance

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Update the terminology to be consistent with Annex 93A (see #73 and #74).

Cl **93**   *SC* **93.9.1**   *P* **257**   *L* **43**   # 83

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

The value of eta_0 was supposed to cause equation 93A-32 to yield sigma_N = 1 mV (see response to comment #73 on D2.0). However, calculation according to the new equations in annex 93A results in <approximately>0.92 mV.

The value used is probably based on an estimate done during the May meeting, which did not include the effect of the CTLE with g_DC=0.

Same value of eta_0 should be used in clause 94 as well.

SuggestedRemedy

Change value of eta_0 from 5.2e-8 to 6.0e-8, in table 93-9 and in table 94-18.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

The response to comment #73 did not direct the editor to include H_ctf(f) with g_DC=0 in the calculation.
"Replace sigma_r with a noise spectral density at the input to the receiver noise filter that yields 1 mV RMS at its output for 100GBASE-KR4."

The receiver equalizer was not included in the calculation of the noise spectral density (sigma_r^2/fr) implied on slide 12 of ran_3bj_01a_0513.pdf.

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 **93**
SC **93.9.1**

Page 37 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **93A**   *SC* **93A.1**   *P* **341**   *L* **24**   # 81
Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**

A_n currently has two meanings in this annex - total noise peak, and NEXT amplitude. The letter n is also commonly used as an enumerator, including several occurrences in this annex. More meaningful labels are preferred.

For uniformity, replacing A_f is also suggested.

SuggestedRemedy

Use A_noise instead of A_n in equation 93A-1 and 93A.1.7.

Use A_NEXT instead of A_n and A_FEXT instead of A_f in table 93A-1 and 93A.1.5.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the variable names are overloaded. Change A_f to A_fe and A_n to A_ne when referring near-end aggressor amplitude.

Change and A_n to A_ni when referring to "noise and interference" amplitude (A_noise was not chosen since there are references to specific "noise" terms in the computation of the total interference and noise distribution).

Cl **93A**   *SC* **93A.1**   *P* **341**   *L* **9**   # 148
Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *late*

COM is a proper noun (not the ordinary English meaning of the three words "channel operating margin" but this particular figure of merit defined by this particular mathematical computation.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to Channel Operating Margin throughout.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, since this amendment will set the precedent for the capitalization of "Channel Operating Margin", it should abide by the expected capitalization of proper nouns.

<Late comment.>

Cl **93A**   *SC* **93A.1.2.1**   *P* **343**   *L* **35**   # 98
Moore, Charles   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

At the time my Comment 91 to D2.0 was discussed we decided to accept in principle, but i was asked to provide some real analysis on the difference between worst case slow (for victim) and worst case fast (for NEXT) package models. I have done this analysis and come to the following conclusions

1. Changing Cd and Cb values is not the best approach, we should change zp, the package trace length.
2. Current zp value of 12mm used in 93.9.1, and 94.4.1 could be a good value for NEXT channel but victim needs a longer package.
3. changing zp will require changes in zp in 93.9.1 and 94.4.1 and to peak/vf in 93.8.1.6., 94.3.12.6, and possibly 92.8.3.7.1

SuggestedRemedy

I will have a presentation detailing needed changes.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

According to material presented it is not possible for the measured rise time to be lower than or equal to the minimum specified value. Delete minimum rise time specification in Clauses 93 and 94.

Modify 93A.1.2 to use the minimum Z_p specified by the invoking PMD clause package for the NEXT aggressor transmitters.
Modify 93A.1.2 so that the capacitor (C_d, C_b) values are not halved for k corresponding to a NEXT aggressor.

For other changes requested by this comment see comment #78.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **93A**   Page 38 of 46
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **93A.1.2.1**   2013/07/17 11:38:
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **93A**   *SC* **93A.1.2.4**   *P* **344**   *L* **50**   # 73
Ben-Artsi, Liav   Marvell

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

The Tx/Rx PKG is the result of cascading the die cap + PKG trace and ball capacitance. No board capacitance was taken into account in the PKG modeling, therefore any board related discontinuity is expected to be a part of the measured/simulated/extracted channel S-parameters

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "... are the result of the cascade connection of the device capacitance, package transmission line, and board capacitance as defined..." to: "... are the result of the cascade connection of the device capacitance, package transmission line, and ball capacitance as defined..."
Perform the same change also to the Rx PKG description on page 345 line 24.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The test points TP0 and TP5 clearly demarcate the transmitter and receiver from the channel at the "package-board" interface." Per 93A.1.1, the channel is measured between these points hence the board contribution to the excess capacitance at the interface should be included in the channel measurements.

The term "board capacitance" was introduced per comment #89 against Draft 2.0 but regardless of the name this quantity has always referred to the package contribution to the excess capacitance at the package-board interface.

Change the notation in 93A and invoking PMD clauses to:
C_p = "single-ended package capacitance at package-to-board interface"

Cl **93A**   *SC* **93A.1.2.4**   *P* **345**   *L* **5**   # 69
Ben-Artsi, Liav   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

The representation of the 1mm PKG trace may introduce a small non-causality

SuggestedRemedy

Updated values will be supplied

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Update the coefficient values according to slide 3 of benartsi_3bj_01_0713.

Cl **93A**   *SC* **93A.1.6**   *P* **347**   *L* **7**   # 91
Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

The title of this subclause "Signal Amplitude" does not represent its content.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the title to "Linear equalization".

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

93A.1.6 is not only about linear equalization and moreover the phrase "linear equalization" is not elsewhere in the Annex.

Change to:
"Determination of variable equalizer parameters"

Cl **93A**   *SC* **93A.1.6**   *P* **348**   *L* **24**   # 84
Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

Transmitter noise (other than jitter efects) is not included in FOM and COM calculations.

SuggestedRemedy

A presentation expanding on the comment and proposing a remedy will be supplied.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #78.

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 **93A**
SC **93A.1.6**

Page 39 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **93A**   *SC* **93A.1.7.1**   *P* **349**   *L* **17**   # 82

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

The note recommends using voltage bin size of 0.1 mV. For some high loss channels (e.g. 35 dB in patel_01_0511.zip) A_s can become lower than 10 mV and FEXT/NEXT impulses below 0.1 mV can be significant, but may be zeroed out by the quantization. When that happens, results might be too optimistic.

For the channel mentioned above, setting bin size to 0.01 mV instead of 0.1 mV results in a degradation of 0.6 dB in COM, which is non-negligible.

Proposed remedy is to recommend Delta_y to be small enough to prevent zeroing out any contribution.

SuggestedRemedy

Change
"It is recommended that Delta_y be no larger than 0.1 mV in order to limit the error"

to
"In order to limit the error, it is recommended to set Delta_y to a small enough value so that equation 93A-36 is not reduced to a single Dirac Delta function at y=0, for any interference component to which h(n) corresponds. A value of 0.01 mV is usually a safe choice".

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, a refinement of this point is warranted. The suggested remedy implies that DELTAy/2 cannot be larger than the smallest magnitude of h(n). This seems to be a dangerous approach since numerical calculations of h(n) can yield very small numbers. It would be better to establish what is "close enough" to zero .

Change the last sentence of the note in 93A.1.7.1 to the following.
"It is recommended that DELTAy be no larger than As/1000 or 0.01 mV, whichever is smaller."

Cl **93A**   *SC* **93A.12.4**   *P* **344**   *L* **5**   # 152

Ghiasi, Ali   Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

Current set of cofficent in table 93A-2 produces non passive s-paramters. To fdurther improve the fit and reduce the resonance number of section may need to be increased.

SuggestedRemedy

Need to get on Adhoc plate toward a resolution for Sept meeting

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Suggested remedy does not propose any specific change to the draft.

See comment #69.

<Editor changed subclause from 12.4 to 93A.12.4>

Cl **93A**   *SC* **93A-1**   *P* **342**   *L* **12**   # 74

Ben-Artsi, Liav   Marvell

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

The Device package model includes Single ended ball capacitance and not Single ended board capacitance

SuggestedRemedy

Change the description of Cb in table 93A-1 to Single-ended ball capacitance

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #73.

<Changed subclause from 93A-1 to 93A.1. Presumably the commenter was referencing to Table 93A-1.>

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 **93A**
SC **93A-1**

Page 40 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **93C**   *SC* **93C**   *P* **354**   *L* **23**   # 150

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **R**

The new interference tolerance test for clauses 93 and 94 allows a wide range of transmitter bandwidths, which will affect the results. There is no equivalent of the correction for transition time in eq. 92-9.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the transition time measured at TPta of Figure 93C-3 in the COM calculation. At present, COM does not contain an internal transition time. Add one, and/or in Table 93-9 and Table 94-18, adjust zp, within limits, to best fit the observed waveform.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT.

<Late comment.>

The bandwidth of the transmitter is taken into consideration in the test method.

In 93C.2, step 8 includes the following instruction with respect to the COM calculation:
"If a transmitter with high quality termination is used, in the COM calculation, the termination is modeled as ideal and a Gaussian low pass filter is added to equation 93A-17 which has the same 20%-80% transition time as the transmitter measured at Tpta."

Cl **93C**   *SC* **93C**   *P* **354**   *L* **3**   # 149

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**

(informative) - not

SuggestedRemedy

Delete.
Also please try to get the format fixed so that annex titles appear in the pdf bookmarks.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT.

<Late comment.>

See also comment 106

Cl **93C**   *SC* **93C**   *P* **354**   *L* **3**   # 106

Healey, Adam   LSI Corporation

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **A**

Annex 93C cannot be both informative and normative.

SuggestedRemedy

Pick one (suspect normative) and remove the other.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See also comment 149

Make it normative like 69A the Annex for 10G backplane interference tolerance testing.

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 **93C**
SC **93C**

Page 41 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **93C**   *SC* **93C**   *P* **354**   *L* **30**   # 93

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **A**

Annex 93C is a significant step forward in specifying receiver requirements. People implementing this test should have a clear understanding of what passing or failing the test means.

The clauses that invoke the test specify the items listed in the introduction to the annex. The way they are specified in clauses 93 and 94 should be understood as minimum stress values; the test can be performed with higher stress parameters (e.g. higher-than-minimum thru channel loss) and be within its specification.

There is a common interpretation that "if a test is performed with parameters within its specification, it should pass". This interpretation is unsuitable here; higher stress values can clearly cause any device to fail the test. If that is interpreted as disqualifying the device, then all devices can be disqualified, and the test is meaningless.

To avoid confusion between vendors, testers, and customers, we should clarify the intended interpretation - qualify, rather than disqualify; a device is only expected to pass the test under some conditions that meet the requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a note after the list of items:

"Note: The PMD clause specifies the items above as minimum stress conditions. Tests can be performed with higher stress for practical reasons, but a device is not expected to pass the test under any stress conditions, and failing an over-stressed test does not disqualify a device, as long as it passes the test under lower stress conditions that are within the specifications".

With editorial license.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The reference should be to the "invoking PMD clause".

The constraints are not limited to the items listed in the opening text of Annex 93C; further constraints are listed in the test setup and method that follow.

The constrained parameters fall into two classes as follows:
(1)   Constraining some parameters to be at or beyond worst case specified limits (e.g., the transmitter tap values are constrained so as not to exceed minimum required pre-emphasis).
(2)   Constraining other parameters to be anywhere within the specified limits that parameter (e.g., return loss must be within limits of the specification).

The intent of the interference tolerance test is to ensure that the PHY operates correctly with a transmitter with parameters anywhere within the specified limits.

The word disqualify implies a selection process, whereas this standard specifies compliance

or not.

Add the following note after the list of items:
"Note: The intent of the interference tolerance test is to ensure that the PHY receiver operates correctly with transmitter parameters anywhere within the specified limits including the case where all parameters are at the specified limits. Testing of the receiver with transmitter parameters beyond the specified limits may be helpful to determine margin or to provide comparative metrics, but failure of the receiver to operate correctly under these conditions is not to be interpreted as non-compliance."

Cl **93C**   *SC* **93C.1**   *P* **355**   *L* **20**   # 89

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**

Interference tolerance test is done with all lanes on both devices active. Since training is performed during the test, and FEC decoding requires all lanes to be received, all the signals must be routed between the DUT and the remote device (test setup) just as in a regular link, and the FEXT/NEXT transmitters can't be turned off or terminated.

Crosstalk in the test fixture is not taken into account in the noise calibration procedure, and can create an over-stressed test.

Test fixture design may or may not be driven to minimize NEXT and FEXT; it is worth stating the implication explicitly.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a note in 93C.1:
FEXT and NEXT in the test fixture are not accounted for in the test channel calibration (93A.2). It is recommended that test fixtures be designed to minimize these effects.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add a note:
"FEXT and NEXT in the test setup are not accounted for in the test channel calibration (93A.2). It is recommended that the test setup be designed to minimize these effects."

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 **93C**
SC **93C.1**

Page 42 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **93C**   *SC* **93C.1**   *P* **355**   *L* **20**   # 95

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

Following comment #234 on D2.0, the test setup now requires that "During the test, the transmitters of the PMD under test transmit the pattern specified by the PMD clause that invokes this method, with the transmitters in the preset condition."

But, since training requires transmitting a training sequence, the "pattern specified by the PMD clause" mentioned above can only be applied after the training procedure is completed (step 10 of 93C.2).

SuggestedRemedy

Move the requirement of setting the local transmitter pattern and equalization state to step 10 of 93C.2.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In the last paragraph of 93C.1, delete:
"During the test, the transmitters of the PMD under test transmit the pattern specified by the PMD clause that invokes this method, with the transmitters in the preset condition."

In step 10 it is necessary to remove mention of the PCS as the test pattern may also be generated by the PMA.

In step 10 of 93C.2 delete "PCS" and add similar text to the text deleted from 93C.1 so it reads:
"Using the test setup in Figure 93C-2, the transmitter taps and transmit noise as determined in step 4, and the channel noise as determined in step 8, configure the transmitter to transmit the test pattern specified in the PMD clause that invokes this method. Also configure the transmitters of the PMD under test to transmit the same test pattern, with their transmitters in the preset condition."

Cl **94**   *SC* **94.1**   *P* **269**   *L* **11**   # 37

Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*

In the second paragraph of 94.1 "Figure 94-1" and "Clause 45" should be links

SuggestedRemedy

Make "Figure 94-1" and "Clause 45" cross-references

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **94**   *SC* **94.3.11.1**   *P* **297**   *L* **1**   # 44

Lusted, Kent   Intel

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

The text says ""The distinguishing differences are that the training pattern is truncated to 48 training frame words (4320 bits)..."

However, 1 training frame work (TFW) is 92 bits. The ALERT frame training pattern is 48 TFW *92 bits/TFW = 4416 bits

SuggestedRemedy

Change 4320 to 4416.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

<Editor changed comment type from TR to T because the balloter voted to approve draft 2.1>

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However a legitimate problem has been identified and needs to be corrected.

Cl **94**   *SC* **94.3.12.4**   *P* **301**   *L* **47**   # 153

Ghiasi, Ali   Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

The common mode return loss crosses differential return loss at 6.05 GHz and even for ideal driver/pacakge the common mode return loss can only be as good as differetnial not better

SuggestedRemedy

Please change common mode return loss to follow differetnial return loss of equation 94-5 but 3 dB worse
$RLcm(f) \geq 9.05-f$ $0.05 \leq f \leq 6$ GHz
$= 3.45-0.075f$ $6 \leq f < 10$ GHz

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

<Editor changed subclause from 3.12.4 to 94.3.12.4.>

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

See response to comment 151 against Clause 93.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **94**   Page 43 of 46
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **94.3.12.4**   2013/07/17 11:38:
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **94**　　　*SC* **94.3.12.7**　　　　　*P* **304**　　　*L* **49**　　　# 52
Richard, Mellitz　　　　　　　　　Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**

Clause 94.4.3 is "Return Loss" and ICN is not specified.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete first sentence of 94.3.12.7

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment 87 which deletes the entire subclause.

Cl **94**　　　*SC* **94.3.12.7**　　　　　*P* **304**　　　*L* **49**　　　# 92
Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type **ER**　　*Comment Status* **A**

"The transmitter far-end output noise is a source of noise in addition to the channel integrated crosstalk noise (ICN) specified in 94.4.3."

This sentence is outdated. 94.4.3 deals with recommended channel return loss. ICN is not used in clause 94.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this sentence.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment 87 which deletes the entire subclause.

Cl **94**　　　*SC* **94.3.12.7**　　　　　*P* **304**　　　*L* **51**　　　# 87
Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**

The procedure defined in 85.8.3.2 uses the square wave pattern specified in 83.5.10 (PMA clause). But the the 100GBASE-KP4 PHY does not use this PMA - and the PMA defined in 94.2 does not have a square wave test pattern. Therefore, this measurement can't be conducted as specified.

SuggestedRemedy

A few alternatives for task force consideration:

1. Add the square wave test pattern to the PMA, use same method.
2. Add a 4-level slow pattern (such as the one described in 94.3.11.6 in D1.1) to the PMA, instead, and change the method to match it; has larger coverage than (1).
3. Remove this subclause, as its requirements somewhat parallel the SNDR.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However a legitimate problem has been identified and needs to be corrected.

Far-end output noise is redundant and obsolete.

Delete subclause 94.3.12.7 and far end output noise parameters in Table 94-13.

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 **94**
SC **94.3.12.7**

Page 44 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **94**   *SC* **94.3.12.9**   *P* **306**   *L* **25**   # 97
Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

SNDR requirement is not completely aligned with the TX and channel specifications. It may also be difficult to measure and pass with any allowable transmit equalizer setting.

COM assumes TX is fully linear except for jitter; jitter typically causes the "worst-SNDR phase" to be near transitions, and leaves a better SNDR in the desired sampling phase. An SNDR-compliant TX may have additive noise instead of jitter, with a "flat" SNDR that would have worse impact on the receiver performance. COM does not represent this type of transmitter well.

As a consequence, RX interference tolerance test calibration which adds BBN at the TX side in order to reach the target SNDR, might stress for the receiver more than using a high-jitter transmitter.

SuggestedRemedy

A presentation expanding on the comment and proposing a remedy will be supplied.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement changes in ran_3bj_02_0713 on slides 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and ran_3bj_01a_0713 slide 13 with editorial license.

Cl **94**   *SC* **94.3.13.3**   *P* **308**   *L* **9**   # 53
Richard, Mellitz   Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

Table 94-16 specifies COM of 1.5 dB for the Test 2 values column.

For a 33dB loss channel the headroom over the noise is only 3.6 mV (pre amplification). i.e. available signal - noise.
That seems excessively demanding of a reciever.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to COM 2.5 dB for the Test 2 values column.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #97.

Cl **94**   *SC* **94.4.1**   *P* **310**   *L* **16**   # 111
Kochuparambil, Beth   Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Bucket*

Annex 93A in its entirety does not discribe the COM procedure. Actually 93A.1 is all that is needed.

Current text:
"The channel operating margin (COM) computed using the procedure in Annex 93A and the parameters in Table 94-18 [...]"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Annex 93A" to "93A.1" ... this remedy is also consistant with text in clause 93.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However a legitimate problem has been identified and will be corrected.

Cl **94**   *SC* **94.4.1**   *P* **310**   *L* **17**   # 113
Kochuparambil, Beth   Cisco Systems

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

With multiple changes in COM since adoption in the draft, analysis of range of compliant channels has only been done on limited submitted channels.

System analysis needs to be done to verify broad market potential.

SuggestedRemedy

Once COM changes taper, channel verification is needed to confirm if 3dB limit is a realistic channel design limit.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

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 **94**
SC **94.4.1**

Page 45 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38:

Cl **94** *SC* **94.4.1** *P* **310** *L* **32** # 75

Ben-Artsi, Liav   Marvell

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

The Device package model includes Single ended ball capacitance and not Single ended board capacitance

SuggestedRemedy

Change the description of Cb in table 93A-1 to Single-ended ball capacitance

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment 73.

Cl **94** *SC* **94.6.4.2** *P* **318** *L* **12** # 15

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Remove redundant PICs entries for SP2

SuggestedRemedy

Delete DFS3 on line 11
Delete DFS2 on line 13

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

The comment does not apply to the substantive changes made between Draft 2.0 and Draft 2.1 and hence is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However a legitimate problem has been identified and needs to be corrected.

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 **94**
SC **94.6.4.2**

Page 46 of 46
2013/07/17 11:38: