In relation to the discussion around K or TDECQ – 10logCeq

What are we actually trying to do?

Peter Stassar, Huawei

IEEE P802.3ct Task Force, March 2020, Interim Teleconference Meeting

What are we trying to do?

Create a very robust specification that supports easy plug-and-play deployment of devices manufactured by different vendors with extremely stable performance.

So what should the spec support:
- *Pass devices that are expected to operate satisfactorily in the field*
- *Reject devices that are not expected to operate satisfactorily in the field*

What should the spec **NOT** do:
- *Fail devices that would work in the field (yield reduction and cost increase)*
- *Pass devices that would not work in the field (unhappy customers and returns that will pass again)*

Claims

There is a claim on the limit for "TDECQ – 10logCeq" that it will reject transmitters that are not expected to operate satisfactorily in the field

There is another claim that a limit for "TDECQ – 10logCeq" will reject transmitters that would work in the field

We need to see the evidence, for either claim.

What evidence have we seen so far?

On the claim that a limit for "TDECQ – 10logCeq" that it will reject transmitters that are not expected to operate satisfactorily in the field:

No evidence so far, except a statement in nicholl_3cu_03_031720:

"Adding a TDECQ-10LogCeq (K) limit clearly provides an incremental benefit (**albeit unquantified**) to the receiver"

On the other claim that a limit for "TDECQ – 10logCeq" will reject transmitters that would work in the field:

Evidence presented in rodes_3cu_01_0320

Thanks!