

IEEE P802.3bq D3.1 25G/40GBASE-T Ethernet 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

CI **TBD** SC **TBD** P **42** L **1** # **r01-7**
Rannow, R K APIC Corp

Comment Type **GR** Comment Status **R** Editorial - Required

A couple uses of the "neither ... nor" can be extremely confusing to ESL individuals, leading to missed opportunities.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status **W**

REJECT.

The proposed change in the comment does not contain sufficient detail so that the CRC can understand the specific changes that satisfy the commenter

Comment is out of scope - no changed text at the referenced page

Draft 3.1 of 802.3bq has 3 instances of "neither... Nor combinations" which are in unchanged text, and a fourth (P52 L8), in response to a comment on draft 3.1. IEEE Std 802.3-2015 uses "neither ... nor" language between 30 and 50 times.

IEEE P802.3bq D3.0 25G/40GBASE-T Ethernet Initial Sponsor ballot comments

CI 113 SC 113.7.1 P 178 L 25 # i-109
Rossbach, Martin Nexans Canada Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status R Cabling
Add Class FA for 25GBASE-T Cabling Types

SuggestedRemedy

use the following text for 113.7.1 "The cabling system used to support 40GBASE-T requires 4-pair balanced cabling with a nominal impedance of 100 Ohm listed in Table 113-21. The cabling system used to support 25GBASE-T requires 4-pair balanced cabling with a nominal impedance of 100 Ohm listed in Table 113-22. Operation on other classes of cabling may be supported if the link segment meets the requirements of 113.7.

Additionally:

- a) 40GBASE-T uses balanced cabling listed in Table 113-21-- in a star topology to connect PHY entities.
- b) 40GBASE-T is an application of the balanced cabling listed in Table 113-21-- with the additional transmission requirements specified in this subclause.
- c) 25GBASE-T uses balanced cabling listed in Table 113-22-- in a star topology to connect PHY entities.
- d) 25GBASE-T is an application of the balanced cabling listed in Table 113-21-- with the additional transmission requirements specified in this subclause. "

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

No consensus to make this change to the draft. (see comments i-10 and i-11)

[Editor's note added after comment resolution was complete:

the resolution to comment i-10 was:

No consensus to change the draft.

Straw Poll:

I support the commenter's proposed resolution (including both pages 3 & 4 of the referenced file) with editorial license to align with more recent parallel changes to the draft (e.g., 'star topology' language).

Y:8

N:10

A: 9

Straw Poll:

I support rejecting this comment

Y: 14

N: 9

A: 3

The editor asked whether there were any additional proposals to resolve the comment - there were none. The editor then asked whether there were any who believed there would be proposals after the lunch break or at this meeting - there were none.

the resolution to comment i-11 was:

No consensus to make this change to the draft

Straw Poll:

I support the commenter's proposed resolution (including both pages 3 & 4 of the referenced file) with editorial license to align with more recent parallel changes to the draft (e.g., 'star topology' language).

Y:7

N:8

A:9

Straw Poll:

I support rejecting this comment

Y: 10

N: 7

A: 7

]

IEEE P802.3bq D3.0 25G/40GBASE-T Ethernet Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 113 SC 113.7.2 P 178 L 39 # i-110
Rossbach, Martin Nexans Canada Inc.

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

Add Table 113-22 for 25GBASE-T Cabling Types including Class FA

SuggestedRemedy

Link segment transmission parameters

A link segment consisting of up to 30 m of cabling that meets the transmission parameters of this subclass provides a reliable medium. The transmission parameters of the link segment include insertion loss, delay parameters, nominal impedance, NEXT loss, ACRF, and return loss. In addition, the requirements for the alien crosstalk coupled "between" link segments is specified.

Table 113-21 lists the supported cabling types and distances for 40GBASE-T and Table 113-22 lists the supported cabling types and distances for 25GBASE-T.

Table 113-21 40GBASE-T Cabling types and distances

Cabling Supported link segment distances Cabling references

ISO/IEC Class I / Class II 30 m ISO/IEC 11801-1 Edition 3

Category 8 30 m ANSI/TIA-568-C.2-1

Table 113-22 25GBASE-T Cabling types and distances

Cabling Supported link segment distances Cabling references

ISO/IEC Class I / Class II 30 m ISO/IEC 11801-1 Edition 3

Category 8 30 m ANSI/TIA-568-C.2-1

CLASS FA 30 m ISO/IEC 11801-1 Edition 3 up to 30m / ISO/IEC TR 11801-9905

Response Response Status **U**

REJECT.

No consensus to make this change to the draft. See comment i-10 and i-11

[Editor's note added after comment resolution was complete:

the resolution to comment i-10 was:

No consensus to change the draft.

Straw Poll:

I support the commenter's proposed resolution (including both pages 3 & 4 of the referenced file) with editorial license to align with more recent parallel changes to the draft (e.g., 'star topology' language).

Y:8

N:10

A: 9

Straw Poll:

I support rejecting this comment

Y: 14

N: 9

A: 3

The editor asked whether there were any additional proposals to resolve the comment - there were none. The editor then asked whether there were any who believed there would

be proposals after the lunch break or at this meeting - there were none.

the resolution to comment i-11 was:

No consensus to make this change to the draft

Straw Poll:

I support the commenter's proposed resolution (including both pages 3 & 4 of the referenced file) with editorial license to align with more recent parallel changes to the draft (e.g., 'star topology' language).

Y:7

N:8

A:9

Straw Poll:

I support rejecting this comment

Y: 10

N: 7

A: 7

]

IEEE P802.3bq D3.0 25G/40GBASE-T Ethernet Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 113 SC 113.8.1 P 192 L 8 # i-132
Schicketanz, Dieter Reutlingen University

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

in Kanata 2014 when deciding on the MDI connector the motion for an "RJ45" failed. It passed later by saying it would not preclude other options. This wording was not implemented just old wording used. In the Berlin meeting this was discussed but it was said it would be a technical change. To my knowledge implementing a motion is editorial and not a technical change. I personally was very disappointed about the treatment in Berlin.

Suggested Remedy

Change the sentence to reflect the outcome of the motion that the one mentioned connector is not the only one possible. e.g. Start at line 8: One option is an..... After 7-81 replace "shall" with "to" My English is not sufficient to propose a good wording that would satisfy all.

Response Response Status **U**

REJECT.
No consensus to change the draft for this comment.

Commenter clarifies suggested remedy as:
Change P192 Line 8 to read:
"One option is using eight-pin connectors meeting the requirements of IEC 60603-7-51 with the improved characteristics and frequency extensions specified in IEC 60603-7-81 as the mechanical interface to the balanced cabling."

Straw poll:
I support the clarified suggested remedy for this comment i-132.
Y:9
N:12
A:6

Straw poll:
I support rejecting this comment:
Y:12
N: 8
A: 7

From the September 2014 Task Force meeting, Ottawa, ON, Canada meeting minutes (http://www.ieee802.org/3/bq/public/sep14/unconfirmed_minutes_3bq_0914.pdf)

The secretary & Editor noted that they understood the language of the motion not to preclude additional MDI's should they be offered in the future.

Commenter clarifies that he is requesting that the draft be modified to include an alternative MDI.