IEEE P802.3bm D3.0 40 Gb/s & 100 Gb/s Fiber Optic TF Initial Sponsor ballot comments

C/ 00 S	С 0	P 110	L	# i-35	C/ 83E	SC a	83E.3.3.3	3.1	P 177	L 9	# i-99
Petrilla, John		Avago Techn	ologies		Dudek, Mic	hael			QLogic Corp	oration	
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status A			Comment 7	Гуре	TR	Comment S	tatus A		
The ability of TDP to adequately predict link margin for MMF links is questionable and, consequently, basing the min OMA requirement on TDP measurements is problematic. Another metric, TxVEC (Tx Vertical Eye Closure), provides a better correlation with link margin and has the advantages of not requiring a reference Tx and being easier and lower cost to implement while capturing all the Tx impairments that TDP captures. For more					with this	It is extremely unlikely that a vertical eye closure penalty of 4.5 to 5.5dB will be achievable with this test set up. A pattern generator with 9.5ps risetime and 0.28UI total jitter won't have this eye closure after equalization and there are no additional knobs to adjust.					
					SuggestedRemedy Either delete the requirement for the Vertical eye closure penalty and reduce the Max						
detail see petrilla_01a_0314 and petrilla_02_0714. SuggestedRemedy In Table 95-6, Table 95-8 and Table 95-10 replace 'Transmitter and dispersion penalty' and 'TDP', edit 95.8.1.1 and 95.12.4.4, and replace the subclause 95.8.5 Transmitter and											
					vertical eye closure output from the module in table 83E-3 (suggested new value 3dB) or delete the 9.5ps risetime from the pattern generator and change the sentence to say "The						
				pattern generator risetime should be set such that the host input test signal has a vertical eve closure in the range of 4.5 dB to 5.5 dB with a target value							

'TDP', edit 95.8.1.1 and 95.12.4.4, and replace the subclause 95.8.5 Transmitter and dispersion penalty (TDP) with a new subclause as per the MMF ad hoc recommendation in king_02_0714. If any of the associated values are updated, the updates will be found in petrilla_02_0714.

Response

Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement changes to replace TDP in Clause 95 as described in king_03_0714 See also comment i-8

A straw poll of the Task Force was taken:

Do you support:

a) making no change to the draft due to this comment

b) making the changes shown in king_02_0714_optx (J. Petrilla's proposal)

c) making the changes shown in king_03_0714_optx (P. Dawe)

a) 0

b) 4

c) 7

The target pattern generator 20% to 80% transition in the host stressed input test is 9.5 ps.

Notes:

- modifying the rise/fall time on a pattern generator may not be seen as a trivial request

With loss of mated compliance boards and cables ~5dB, and crosstalk, it has been demonstrated that ~4.5dB is possible from a BERT. This is also a target specification. See:

http://www.ieee802.org/3/bm/public/cuadhoc/meetings/may30_13/misek_01_0530_caui.pdf

C/ 83E SC 83E.3.3.3.1

eye closure in the range of 4.5 dB to 5.5 dB with a target value of 5 dB.

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete:

IEEE P802.3bm D3.0 40 Gb/s & 100 Gb/s Fiber Optic TF Initial Sponsor ballot comments

C/ 95 SC 95.7.1 Dawe, Piers J G	P 110 L 41 Mellanox Technologie	# i-46	<i>Cl</i> 95 Dawe, Pie	SC 95.7.2 rs J G	P 111 Mellanox Tech	L 29 Inologie	# [i-50	
This TDP limit of 5 dB appe spreadsheet; the real TDP	Comment Status A ears to be a "worst bit plus noise" estimate will be considerably lower. TDP of 5 is ne nd dawe_02a_0114_optx.pdf slide 12), is not feasible.	ear to a "cliff" (see	Comment Type TR Comment Status A Are the J2 and J4 values correct? TR comment because this action should follow others to be taken at July meeting. SuggestedRemedy Review them and revise as necessary, consistent with changes to TDP and VECP. Also the SRS eye mask. Response Response Status U ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See response to i-26					
Change TDP limit from 5 dl Consequent changes: char Change OMA (min) from -7	nge OMA-TDP (min) from -8 dB to -7.3 dE .1 dB to -6.4 dB;	3;						
	wer, each lane (min) from -9.1 dB to -8.4 verage receive power, each lane (min) fr		C/ 95	SC 95.7.2	P 111	L 35	# i-26	
	testing with maximum of all penalties, cha e (max) from -5.6 to -3-1.9 = -4.9 dBm;	ange Stressed receiver	Petrilla, John Avago Technologies					
In Table 95-8, 100GBASE- max TDP) from 8.2 dB to 4 In Table 95-8, change Alloc	SR4 illustrative link power budget, chang	Comment Type TR Comment Status R In Table 95-7 the Conditions of stressed receiver sensitivity test do not sufficiently account for instrumentation noise in available test instruments. See petrilla_01_0714 for additional information and details. See petrilla_01_0714 for additional						
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See response to i-34	nge to TxVEC on the budget and penaltie	es should be explored		le 95-7 change ask coordinates	the Conditions of stressed rece as described in petrilla_01_07			
C/ 95 SC 95.7.2	P111 L 28	# i-48	Response		Response Status U			
Dawe, Piers J G	Mellanox Technologie	π <u>1</u> -40		-	the reader that instrumentation ains the text:	n noise may be s	signfiicant.	
VECP is not a true penalty. It would be possible to use it for the unique case of an SRS signal, but not desirable. SuggestedRemedy Replace VECP spec with Signal Penalty (or Transmitter penalty) spec. Here, change "Vertical eye closure penalty (VECP) lane under test 4.2 dB" to "Signal Penalty, lane under test 4.3 dB" (same number as TDP in Table 95-6), modifying footnote d). And see comment against 95.8.8.2. Response Response Status U ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See response to i-59				"Care should be taken when characterizing the test signal because excessive noise/jitter in the measurement system will result in an input signal that does not fully stress the receiver under test. Running the receiver tolerance test with a signal that is under-stressed may result in the deployment of non-compliant receivers. Care should be taken to minimize the noise/jitter introduced by the reference O/E, filters and BERT and/or to correct for this noise."				

C/ 95 SC 95.7.2

			·	•		
C/ 95 SC 95.8.2 Dawe, Piers J G	P 113 L 42 Mellanox Technologie	# i-52	C/ 95 SC Dawe, Piers J G	95.8.8.1	P 115 L 23 Mellanox Technologie	3 # [i-57
Comment Type TR (This "shall" duplicates the requirement in the definitio	Comment Status R one in 95.7.1, which is bad practice. It pur ns section where it doesn't belong. the po spec; we should not be saying it in most o	pint about "if	Comment Type Having impro	oved TDP so it do	nment Status A esn't need VECP, we can use a t all (see other comments). The	
SuggestedRemedy Change the first sentence of shall meet the specification to shall meet the specification 95.8. and similarly for 95.7.2 100 Change "The center wavel within the range given in Ta to "Center wavelength a A or IEC 61280-1-3."	of 95.7.1 from: ons in Table 95-6 per the definitions in 95 ons in Table 95-6 if measured according t OGBASE-SR4 receive optical specification ength and RMS spectral width of each op able 95-6 if measured per TIA/EIA-455-12 and RMS spectral width shall be as define e optical power, 95.8.4 Optical Modulation 8.7 Transmitter optical waveform (transmit	o the definitions in s. tical lane shall be 7-A or IEC 61280-1-3." d by TIA/EIA-455-127- Amplitude (OMA),	penalty (VEC Change "so ti given" to "so specifications In 95.8.8.2, c and frequenc Change "The Signal Penalt Change "grea selection of th be created wi dB value of th bandwidth for	change "The low-p CP)." to "The low-p that the VECP, str that the Signal Pe s given". thange "levels and the Signal levels and the signal levels and the appropriate ba ith sinusoidal inte he Signal Penalty	Is of the dB value of the VECP indwidth for the low-pass filter. rferer 2 or sinusoidal jitter." to " should be created by the select er. Any remaining Signal Penal	rsymbol interference.". ed eye J4 Jitter specifications nd stressed eye J4 Jitter jitter components" to "levels ' to "The required values of should be created by the Any remaining VECP must greater than two thirds of the ction of the appropriate
Response R REJECT.	Response Status U		Response		oonse Status U	
	consistent with other clauses including 52	2, 86, 87, 88.	ACCEPT IN F	PRINCIPLE.	-	
C/ 95 SC 95.8.5 Dawe, Piers J G	P 114 L 41 Mellanox Technologie	# i-55	See response	e to i-59		
Define Signal Penalty as a get consistency between T	Comment Status A simplified scope-based TDP, and use this x and Rx specs. b fix the VECP: find a new "all but" parame					
SuggestedRemedy In either a new 95.8.6 or 95	ransmitter Penalty), as TDP with the follo	wing differences:				
Response R ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See response to i-59	Response Status U					

C/ 95 SC 95.8.8.1

IEEE P802.3bm D3.0 40 Gb/s & 100 Gb/s Fiber Optic TF Initial Sponsor ballot comments

CI 95	SC 95.8.8.1	P 115	L
Petrilla, J	ohn	Avago Technol	ogies

Petrilla. John



L 26



Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The second paragraph of 95.8.8.1 describes setup of the stressed receiver input waveform in conjunction with the block diagram in 95-3 ending with the instruction, "The Gaussian noise generator, the amplitude of the sinusoidal interferers, and the low-pass filter are adjusted so that the VECP, stressed eye J2 Jitter, and stressed eye J4 Jitter specifications given in Table 95-7 are met simultaneously while also passing the stressed receiver eve mask in Table 95-7 according to the methods specified in 95.8.7". Unfortunately, results have not been presented that simultaneously satisfying all conditions is possible. Also, additional consideration should be given to de-embedding reference receiver noise from J2 and J4 jitter versus adjusting J2 and J4 jitter values for the ref. Rx. Consequently, this paragraph should remain open for comments until more experience is accrued and the method can be confirmed.

SugaestedRemedv

Indicate that 95.8.8.1 remains open for comment in draft 3.1.

Response

Response Status U

REJECT.

A contribution which shows that simultaneously satisfying all conditions is not possible together with a proposal for how the paragraph should be modified is requested.

CI 95	SC 95.8.8.2	P 116	L 48	# i-59
Dawe, Pie	ers J G	Mellanox Tech	nnologie	

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The definition of VECP in 87.8.11.2 is for a non-FEC PMD and causes inaccuracy for this PMD. After improving the TDP method so it doesn't rely on VECP and includes all penalties, we can then use a variant of the improved TDP method to calibrate the stressed eye and make the Tx and Rx specs consistent.

SuggestedRemedy

As the improved TDP includes all penalties, replace all references to VECP with references to Signal Penalty (based on TDP as defined in 95.8.8 and its subclauses - see another comment).

Change:

The primary parameters of the conformance test signal are vertical eye closure penalty (VECP), stressed eye J2 Jitter and stressed eye J4 Jitter. VECP is measured at the time center of the eve. half way between the normalized times of 0 and 1 on the unit interval (UI) scale as determined by the eye crossing means. VECP is given by Equation (87-1), and illustrated in Figure 87-4 (see 87.8.11.2).

to:

The primary parameters of the conformance test signal are Signal Penalty, stressed eye J2 Jitter and stressed eye J4 Jitter. Signal Penalty is defined in 95.8.new (or 95.8.5.1). See other comments for associated changes.

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The proposed remedy would leave an incomplete description of the SRS test source set up process. However, it would improve the draft to specify that the SRS test source should be calibrated with the same metric used to determine the transmitter quality (for example TxVEC).

Now that TDP has been replaced with TxVEC (comment i-35): Add "TxVEC of stressed eve conformance signal" to Table 95-7 with 'value' cell to be the same as the TxVEC value in Table 95-6.

In 95.8.8.2, item 3), after the fifth indented paragraph, add a sixth indented paragraph:

"The TxVEC of the stressed eve conformance signal should not exceed the value given in Table 95-7, and is measured according to 95.8.5, except that the combination of the O/E and the oscilloscope used to measure the optical waveform has a fourth-order Bessel-Thomson filter response with a bandwidth of 19.34 GHz."

See also comments i-55 i-57 and i-48

C/ 95 SC 95.8.8.2 Page 4 of 4 16/07/2014 02:53:03