Cl **110** *SC* **110.8.3** *P* **146** *L* **19** # i-55

Dudek, Michael — QLogic Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *TX parameters*

The specification for the peak pulse to steady stage voltage ratio is more relaxed than the value created in COM for cable testing resulting in the possibility of compliant Tx,'s Rx's and cables not meeting the BER requirements. See presentation Dudek_3by_01_0116

SuggestedRemedy

after 92.8.3.9 add "except that the Linear fit pulse peak (min) shall be 0.49*Vf" Also change the PICS TC17 to match.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

There is not sufficient consensus to resolve at this meeting.

See comment i-60.

Cl **110** *SC* **110.10.1** *P* **152** *L* **17** # i-58

Dudek, Michael — QLogic Corporation

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

The critical parameter for the cables should be COM. The Interference Tolerance Test is also using an attenuation that is approximately 0.7dB larger than the max cable attenuation plus host board loss used in COM

SuggestedRemedy

Increase the attenuation for the CA-S cable to 17.18dB and the CA-N to 16.22dB in table 110-9 and in the text at lines 43 and 44 and the PICS CA3 and CA4. Also in table 110A-1 change the ILCamax to these values and change IlChmax to 29.70dB for CA-25G-S and to 28.74dB for CA-25G-N

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

In Clause 92, the 0.7 dB additional loss was introduced to reduce the required injected crosstalk for the same COM and to provide more consistency in spectral shape given the cable assembly to cable assembly crosstalk (noise) variations. It is used to test receiver "interference tolerance"; not intended to be used in extending channel loss budget.

There is no consensus to make the requested changes at this meeting.

See comment i-86.

Cl **111** *SC* **111.8.2** *P* **174** *L* **5** # i-60

Dudek, Michael — QLogic Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *TX parameters*

The specification for the peak pulse to steady stage voltage ratio is more relaxed than the value created in COM for channel testing resulting in the possibility of compliant Tx,'s Rx's and channels not meeting the BER requirements. See presentation Dudek_3by_01_0116

SuggestedRemedy

after 93.8.1.7 add "except that the Linear fit pulse peak (min) shall be 0.78*Vf" Also change the PICS TC19 to match.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

There is not sufficient consensus to resolve at this meeting.

See comment i-55.

Cl **110** *SC* **110.8.4.2.3** *P* **150** *L* **5** # i-80

Dawe, Piers J G — Mellanox Technologie

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *RITT setup*

This recipe needs to be brought back to reality, so the implementer has an idea if he has done it right or not, and to guard against mathematically valid but unrepresentative test setups.

SuggestedRemedy

Give a max/min range of SNDRs and/or RMS injected noises at PGC for each of the 6 tests. Are some of them the same?

Response *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This issue is resolved by enforcing a minimum channel loss.

Resolve using the response to comment i-36.

Cl **110** *SC* **110.10** *P* **151** *L* **53** # i-86

Dawe, Piers J G
Mellanox Technologie

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

I don't see a good reason for breaking the consensus of the September meeting (the last regular comment resolution), which was 15 dB for a 2.75 m cable. The numbers in the draft now (15.5 dB, 3 m cable) require a thicker cable than desirable, and the evidence I have seen about lengths tells me that 2.75 m is enough to cable up a normal rack.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 15.5 dB to 16 dB and 3 m back to 2.75 m for CA-25G-N.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The change of insertion loss to 15.5 dB was done in D2.1, based on Comment #118 against D2.0 and motion #5 of 802.3by in the September 2015 interim meeting. The previous value was 12.98 dB. The comment does not state any justification for changing the value to 16 dB.

The change of 2.75 m to 3 m was done with a clarification that these values indicate achievable lengths, and that "Length of a cable assembly does not imply compliance to specifications". This change does not preclude constructing a 2.75 cable as the comment suggests.

There is no consensus to make the requested changes at this meeting.

See comment i-58.