Cl **1** *SC* **1.4** *P* **31** *L* **28** # 63

Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket4*

The definition for 400GAUI-n in 802.3-2018 clause 1.4.111 needs to be updated for the four lane version of this interface "400GAUI-4" enabled with the 3ck project.

SuggestedRemedy

Add reference to 400GAUI-4 and the relevant clause as appropriate.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with language consistent with the base standard.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4** *P* **31** *L* **28** # 62

Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket4*

The definition for 200GAUI-n in 802.3-2018 clause 1.4.87 needs to be updated for the two lane version of this interface "200GAUI-2" enabled with the 3ck project.

SuggestedRemedy

Add reference to 200GAUI-2 and the relevant clause as appropriate.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with language consistent with the base standard.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4** *P* **31** *L* **28** # 61

Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket4*

The definition for 100GAUI-n in 802.3cd-2018 clause 1.4.3.6 needs to be updated for the single lane version of this interface "100GAUI-1" enabled with the 3ck project.

SuggestedRemedy

Add reference to 100GAUI-1 and the relevant clause as appropriate.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The referenced subclause is 1.4.36.

Implement the suggested remedy with language consistent with the base standard.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.5** *P* **32** *L* **28** # 64

Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket4*

Update the abbreviation of 100GAUI to include the n number of lanes and align consistency with the base standard 802.3-2018 for 200GAUI-n and 400GAUI-n

SuggestedRemedy

Consider changing the abbreviation to be "100GAUI-n   100 Gb/s Attachment Unit Interface over n lanes"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy.

Cl **93A** *SC* **93A.1.2.4** *P* **198** *L* **37** # 159

Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket4*

The usage of cascades of "cascade()" in equations in this annex is becoming inconvenient.

The function is defined in 93A.1.2.1, but only for two arguments, which got us to where we are.

SuggestedRemedy

Bring in 93A.1.2.1 and add another shorthand notation: cascade(A, B, C) is equivalent to cascade(cascade(A, B), C).

Use the new notation to simplify the equations here and in clause 162.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy but generalizing to support any number of sections 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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **93A**
SC **93A.1.2.4**

Page 1 of 3
7/23/2020 3:17:27 PM

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.3.1**   *P* **221**   *L* **34**   # 213

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket4*

Editorial note regarding 17.5 mV common mode can be removed as this is reasonable limit and realxing the common mode has implications due to mode conversion.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the editorial note

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

[Editor's note: Changed line from 13.]

Based the response to comment #28 in regard to KR and C2C there is discussion about concern with these specifications, but there is no consensus to make any changes at this time.

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.3.2**   *P* **224**   *L* **41**   # 214

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket4*

Editorial note regarding 17.5 mV common mode can be removed as this is reasonable limit and realxing the common mode has implications due to mode conversion.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the editorial note

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Based the response to comment #28 in regard to KR and C2C there is discussion about concern with these specifications, but there is no consensus to make any changes at this time.

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.3.3.2.1**   *P* **229**   *L* **4**   # 179

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket4*

The injected jitter in the host stressed input test (C2M) is described as follows: "Random jitter and bounded uncorrelated jitter are added such that the output of the pattern generator approximates the output jitter profile given by maximum JRMS and maximum J4u, and complies with the even-odd jitter specification, in Table 120F–1"

But Table 120F–1 is in the other annex, for C2C - which seems like an error. But it isn't: In Annex 120D this was written explicitly with reference to the C2C specification:

"Random jitter and bounded uncorrelated jitter are added such that the output of the pattern generator approximates the 200GAUI-4 and 400GAUI-8 C2C output jitter profile given in Table 120D–1".

If this is the intent it should be stated more explicitly, as was done in 120D.

SuggestedRemedy

Change
"approximates the output jitter profile given by maximum JRMS and maximum J4u, and complies with the even-odd jitter specification, in Table 120F–1"
To
"approximates the output jitter profile given by maximum JRMS and maximum J4u, and complies with the even-odd jitter specification, of the corresponding chip-to-chip transmitter in Table 120F–1"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

There is only one jitter specification in Table 120F-1 so no further qualification is required.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **120G**   Page 2 of 3
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *SC* **120G.3.3.2.1**   7/23/2020 3:17:27 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.5.2**   *P* **234**   *L* **6**   # 244

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *bucket4*

120G.3 says "A test system with a fourth-order Bessel-Thomson low-pass response with 40 GHz 3 dB bandwidth is to be used for all output signal measurements, unless otherwise specified." This adds "a receiver noise filter as defined in 93A.1.4.1". Too much filtering.

SuggestedRemedy

Use only one of them. For example, insert a sentence "The receiver noise filter is used instead of the Bessel-Thomson low-pass response of 120G.3."

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change:
Capture the PRBS13Q signal y1(k) with the effect of low-pass response equivalent to the specified receiver noise filter with associated parameter fr in Table 120G–9, and using a clock recovery unit with a corner frequency of 4 MHz and slope of 20 dB/decade.
To:
"Capture the PRBS13Q signal y1(k) with the effect of low-pass response equivalent to the specified receiver noise filter with associated parameter fr in Table 120G–9 (instead of the test system response specified in 120G.3.1), and using a clock recovery unit with a corner frequency of 4 MHz and slope of 20 dB/decade."

Cl **162D**   *SC* **162D.1**   *P* **270**   *L* **14**   # 227

Dudek, Mike   Marvell.

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *bucket4*

The text says five specified connectors but the list in table 162D-1 has six entries.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "five" to "six".   Also on line 32.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **162D**   Page 3 of 3
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *SC* **162D.1**   7/23/2020 3:17:27 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line