

CI 00 SC 0 P L # 501  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The draft is not consistent in its use of significant digits. For example, Table 86-11 has limits of 4.0 V and 5 %. Why not 4 V or 5.0 %?

The base standard is not consistent on this issue. Table 52.16 has "Transmitter and dispersion penalty (max)" of "3.0 dB" but, "Extinction ratio (min)" of "3 dB"

It would be a good idea to decide on a format and use it consistently throughout the draft. Since the limits given do not have any associated tolerance, i.e. a Max limit of 3 dB is the same as one of 3.0 dB where 2.999999 is compliant and 3.000001 is not, it is proposed to only use as many digits as is required to express the number.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Throughout the draft, only use as many significant digits as is required to express the number. Values less than 1 are shown with a leading 0.

Valid examples are:

0.1 nm  
 3 dB  
 100 m

Invalid examples are:

0.10 nm  
 3.0 dB  
 100.0 m

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Affects all clauses, needs further discussion.

CI 00 SC 0 P 119 L 44 # 622  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Skew

Nomenclature: D1.1 uses 'Total Skew' and 'Dynamic Skew'. D1.0 used 'skew' and 'dynamic skew'. I saw nothing in the comment database to justify 'Total Skew', and it isn't a total. It is not likely that what is called 'Dynamic Skew' will be dynamic (means fast-moving) and however slowly it changes, it still matters.

Before this project, OIF-CEI-02.0 had defined 'Uncorrelated Wander' but they don't seem to have a good name for the largest skew between any two lanes in a group, either.

Names like 'Maximum Skew' or 'Greatest Skew' could allow confusion between a maximum across lane-pairs and a maximum through time.

I've made this a TR because it affects multiple clauses.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change 'Dynamic Skew' to 'Uncorrelated Wander' throughout.

Change 'Total Skew' to 'All-lanes Skew' (unless people prefer something else, e.g. 'Maximum Skew' or 'Greatest Skew').

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Needs further discussion in the task force

CI 00 SC 0 P 248 L 28 # 537  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Why 'MEDIUM:'? We don't have category headings for the other abbreviations. Also, the medium IS multimode fiber, it's not FOR multimode fiber.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Delete 'MEDIUM:'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[This comment applies to layer diagrams in all PMD clauses]

Delete MEDIUM and leave the abbreviations S, C, K, L, E in respective layer diagrams

**Cl 01**    **SC 1.3**                      **P 22**            **L 49**            # **336**  
 Ganga, Ilango                                  Intel  
**Comment Type**    **ER**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 New references have been added to 1.3, hence delete Editor's note.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete the Editor's note in 1.3  
**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 01**    **SC 1.4**                      **P 23**            **L 23**            # **383**  
 D'Ambrosia, John                              Force10 Networks  
**Comment Type**    **E**                **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The XLAUI is defined as a 4 lane intra-sublayer, but this is actually in only one direction.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change  
 "A 4 lane"  
 to  
 "An"  
**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 01**    **SC 1.4**                      **P 23**            **L 44**            # **384**  
 D'Ambrosia, John                              Force10 Networks  
**Comment Type**    **E**                **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The CAUI is defined as a 10 lane intra-sublayer, but this is actually in only one direction.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change  
 "A 10 lane"  
 to  
 "An"  
**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 [Editor's note: Commenter did not indicate comment type, hence added comment type as Editorial]

**Cl 04**    **SC 4.4.2**                      **P 25**            **L 5**                # **337**  
 Ganga, Ilango                                  Intel  
**Comment Type**    **E**                **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Change "40 Gb/s and 100Gb/s" to "40 Gb/s and 100 Gb/s"  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 As per comment  
**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 30**    **SC 30**                              **P 27**            **L 3**                # **338**  
 Ganga, Ilango                                  Intel  
**Comment Type**    **E**                **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Delete the Editor's note below Clause title.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 As per comment  
**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.2.5**                      **P 34**            **L 22**            # **190**  
 Anslow, Peter                                    Nortel Networks  
**Comment Type**    **E**                **Comment Status**    **D**  
 There is just a heading for 30.2.5 after 30.6.1.1.5  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove heading or pace in correct order if there are further changes to be inserted in this clause.  
**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See #341

**Cl 30**      **SC 30.2.5**                      **P 34**              **L 22**              # **341**  
 Ganga, Ilango                                      Intel

**Comment Type**    **ER**              **Comment Status**    **D**

Since there are no changes identified for 30.2.5 Capabilities, delete this subclause title.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete 30.2.5 Capabilities

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 30**      **SC 30.3.2.1.3**                      **P 27**              **L 38**              # **188**  
 Anslow, Peter                                      Nortel Networks

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

Subclause 30.3.2.1.3 is missing an editing instruction

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Add "Change 30.3.2.1.3 for PHY type list:

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 30**      **SC 30.5.1.1.15**                      **P 32**              **L 44**              # **345**  
 Ganga, Ilango                                      Intel

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

30.5.1.1.15 aFECCorrectedBlocks counter needs to be enumerated for 4 lanes and 20 lanes for multilane BASE-R Phys

30.5.1.1.16 aFECUncorrectableBlocks counter is defined as a single counter, this needs to be enumerated for 4 and 20 lanes for multilane BASE-R PHYs

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Update 30.5.1.1.15 and 30.5.1.1.16 to include multiple FEC counters for 4 and 20 lanes for BASE-R PHYs and update the text and cross references to registers in Clause 45 accordingly.

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The commenter does not provide much detail in the remedy.

Change 30.5.1.1.15 as follows:

First sentence of SYNTAX to read: "Array of generalized nonresetable counters."

Add initial paragraph into BEHAVIOUR:  
 "An array of counters enumerated as counters 1 to N, where N is the number of PCS lanes in use." Each counter applies to the corresponding lane and behaves in the following manner."

Also change the references to:

45.2.8.5, 45.2.1.86 and 45.2.1.87a

Change 30.5.1.1.16 in the same manner, with the references changing to:

45.2.8.6, 45.2.1.87 and 45.2.1.87b

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.5.1.1.2**    **P 30**    **L 10**    # **340**  
Ganga, Ilango    Intel

**Comment Type ER**    **Comment Status D**

Rephrase the PMD discription in the list as follows to match the definition of PMDs in 1.4.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change the following definition in the list as suggested:

"40GBASE-R PCS/PMA over 4 WDM lane single mode fiber PMD, with long reach, as specified in Clause 87."

"100GBASE-R PCS/PMA over 4 WDM lane single mode fiber PMD, with long reach, as specified in Clause 88."

"100GBASE-R PCS/PMA over 4 WDM lane single mode fiber PMD, with extended reach, as specified in Clause 88."

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.5.1.1.2**    **P 30**    **L 3**    # **339**  
Ganga, Ilango    Intel

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

Add "cross-reference" links to Clause 84 through Clause 88 in the list (total of 10 instances from line 3 to line 30)

**SuggestedRemedy**

As per comment

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
PROPOSED REJECT.

None of the other clauses mentioned in this section have cross references in the base document. That is the reason that none of the other clauses are printed in blue text for this draft.

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.5.1.1.2**    **P 30**    **L 31**    # **189**  
Anslow, Peter    Nortel Networks

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

Inserted text says "and the PCS control 2 register 45.2.3.6.." - missing "specified in" and double ".."

Also, some external links in this paragraph are not shown blue and some internal paragraphs are not cross-referenced.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change to "and the PCS control 2 register specified in 45.2.3.6."

Clause 22, clause 35, 22.2.4.1, Clause 28, Clause 37 should be dark blue.

45.2.3.6.1, 45.2.1.6.1, 45.2.1.1, 45.2.3.6, Clause 73 should be cross-references.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.5.1.1.2**    **P 30**    **L 32**    # **372**  
Ganga, Ilango    Intel

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

Delete double period at the end of sentence:  
"PCS control 2 register 45.2.3.6."

**SuggestedRemedy**

As per comment

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See #189

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.5.1.1.2**    **P 30**    **L 4**    # **386**  
 D'Ambrosia, John    Force10 Networks

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

Listing of PHYs defines the number of conductors or fibers for medium for simplex operation (includes 40GBASE-CR4, 40GBASE-SR4, 100GBASE-CR10, and 100GBASE-SR10), i.e. 40GBASE-CR4 is over 4 lane shielded copper balanced cable, when actually 40GBASE-CR4 uses 8 lanes, 4 in each direction.

**Suggested Remedy**

Two options:

1. use the number of lanes for full duplex operation
2. delete the number of lanes and leave in general terms

example 40GBASE-CR4 over shielded copper balance cable

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See #340

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.5.1.1.4**    **P 32**    **L 9**    # **592**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

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

In clause 45, the MDIO bits are not 'logic one' and 'logic zero', they are just one and zero.

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete 'logic', 7 times on this page.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Note that this is changing the text from the base document.

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.6.1.1.5**    **P 34**    **L 14**    # **346**  
 Ganga, Ilango    Intel

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

30.6.1.1.5 aAutoNegLocalTechnologyAbility

Mapping of FEC Requested bit is missing in the list for aAutoNegLocalTechnologyAbility attribute.

This has been missing in the base spec as well.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the following sentence to the list below "FEC Capable"

FEC Requested    FEC Requested as specified in Clause 73 (See 73.6.5) and Clause 74.

Also update the sentence for FEC Capable to include reference to Clause 73 and Clause 74 as follows:

FEC Capable    FEC ability as specified in Clause 73 (See 73.6.5) and Clause 74.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

FEC requested is not an ability.

It is appropriate that "FEC capable" is listed as an ability, not "FEC requested."

**Cl 45**    **SC 45**    **P 35**    **L 3**    # **191**  
 Anslow, Peter    Nortel Networks

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

The actions in the Editor's note have been performed.

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove note.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 45**    **SC 45**                      **P 35**            **L 3**            # **342**  
 Ganga, Ilango                              Intel

**Comment Type**    **ER**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Delete Editor's note below Clause 45 title

Add the following subclause title "45.2 MDIO Interface Registers" next to Editing instructions, since table 45-1 is under subclause 45.2

*SuggestedRemedy*  
 As per comment.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 45**    **SC 45.2.1**                      **P 37**            **L 12**            # **316**  
 Ofelt, David                                      Juniper Networks

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The editors note asks if a figure describing the PMA numbering as well as possibly showing the system and line loopback definitions would be useful.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
 I think it would be useful to have a figure in this section clearly showing the PMA addresses for each level. Pictorially showing what the "line" and "system" loopbacks are would also make the document clearer.

An alternative to adding a figure here would be to reference the figure 83-2 for the PMA numbering (and to add the numbers to the figure rather than just having them in the text in 83.1.4 p183 line 43) and figure 83-5 for the loopback definition. That said, a new figure would likely be better.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(changed subclause designation)

See #344

**Cl 45**    **SC 45.2.1**                      **P 37**            **L 12**            # **126**  
 Barrass, Hugh                                      Cisco

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Editor's note asks a question...

The answer is "no"

*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Delete the editor's note.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See also #344

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 37 L 12 # 344  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Provide a diagram to show how multiple PMA sublayers are addressed and delete the Editor's note.

An example illustration will definitely help as this is the first time such multiple PMA instances are addressed.

Also clarify the second sentence in 45.2.1 on line 2 "These sublayers are all addressed by MMD 1 by default, but may also be instantiated in multiple addressable instances."

As per this statement if all sublayers can be addressed by MMD1 by default, provide explanation on how this is performed.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a diagram and additional clarification for second sentence in 45.2.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Fig 83-2 shows the multiple sublayers.

Add a reference to fig 83-2 and change:

"These sublayers are all addressed by MMD 1 by default, but may also be instantiated in multiple addressable instances."

to:

"By default, these sublayers are all implemented as one instance addressed by MMD 1. Alternatively they may be implemented in multiple addressable instances with separate MMD addresses."

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 37 L 3 # 343  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Change "40Gb/s" to "40 Gb/s".  
Also add cross-reference link to Clause 83 on line 4  
Add cross-reference link to 45.2, Table 45-2 on line 9

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See also #192

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 37 L 3 # 192  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Spaces missing, internal reference

SuggestedRemedy

insert space in 40Gb/s (line 3) and MMD1 (line 9)  
Table 45-2 should be cross reference (line 10)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 37 L 45 # 127  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Register must support PRBS31 and PRBS9.

SuggestedRemedy

Change register names from PRBS31 to PRBS

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 37 L 46 # 128  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Two sets of registers are needed for PRBS error counters.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change PRBS31 error counters to PRBS Tx error counters  
Add PRBS Rx error counters, lane 0 through lane 9 (registers 1.30 - 1.39)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 37 L 9 # 124  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

MMD1 - missingspace

*SuggestedRemedy*

add a space

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See also #192

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 37 L 9 # 125  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

45.2, Table 45-2.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to a reference - Table 45-2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.1.4 P 42 L 30 # 196  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

83.xxxx should be a cross-reference to 83.5.7

*SuggestedRemedy*

change 83.xxxx to a cross-reference to 83.5.7

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.1.4a P 42 L 1 # 1  
Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

If local clock frequencies are different, line-side loopback at bit-level requires that TX path be clocked using RX (recovered) clock instead of local clock in normal operation (buffering cannot work at bit-level). This is not guaranteed to meet TX jitter spec and may prevent remote RX from receiving correct data, although both one-way paths are fully operational. Therefore, this test mode is over-stressing.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete subclauses 45.2.1.1.4a and 83.5.8

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

[Editor's note: Comment also applies to Clause 83]

The line side loopback was added as the resolution to comment #643 in D1.0

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.1.4a P 42 L 10 # 195  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

83.xxxx should be a cross-reference to 83.5.8

*SuggestedRemedy*

change 83.xxxx to a cross-reference to 83.5.8

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.



CI 45 SC 45.2.1.1.4a P 42 L 11 # 194  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This says "the system loopback ability bit is specified in"  
 This should be "line loopback" if comment to re-name is rejected and "remote loopback" if  
 comment to re-name is accepted.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to "the remote loopback ability bit is specified in" or "the line loopback ability bit is  
 specified in"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to "remote" if #193 & #201 are accepted.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.12 P 51 L 33 # 373  
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Delete double period at the end of sentence: "shall read all zeroes."

Page 53, line 5: Similarly delete double period at the end of sentence in 45.2.1.77: "is  
 shown in Table 45-54."

Also in Page 57, line 22

*SuggestedRemedy*

As per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.12a.9 P 51 L 21 # 649  
 Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Reference to 83.6.7 seems incorrect - 83.5.9 is test patterns, 83.6 is PMA MDIO function  
 mapping. Same in line 22.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace with 83.5.9 or 83.6 depending on what was intended.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace with 83.5.9

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.12b P 50 L 46 # 129  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This comment cycle will resolve the issues raised by the editor's note

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the editor's note

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.12b P 50 L 49 # 130  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Title of register needs to change

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change PRBS31 to PRBS

Register title, 3 instances in text and 1 in Table.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 45**      **SC 45.2.1.12b**      **P 51**      **L 10**      # **131**  
Barrass, Hugh      Cisco

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

Table 45-12b and associated text needs to change to accommodate PRBS31 & PRBS9, with generate and check in both directions.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change Table 45-12b so that the bit assignments are as follows:

15 - PRBS pattern ability  
14 - PRBS31 ability  
13 - PRBS9 ability

11 - Tx generator ability  
10 - Tx checker ability  
9 - Rx generator ability  
8 - Rx checker ability

7 PRBS31 enable  
6 PRBS9 enable

3 Tx generator enable  
2 Tx checker enable  
1 Rx generator enable  
0 Rx checker enable

Replace the text following the table as follows:

Register 1.19, bit 14 indicates that the device supports PRBS31 generation or checking. Register 1.19, bit 13 indicates that the device supports PRBS9 generation or checking. In both cases, if the device indicates support for the PRBS type, then it shall support that test for all of the generator and checker types that are indicated by the assertion of bits 11:8.

Register 1.19, bit 11 indicates that the device supports PRBS generation in the transmit direction. Register 1.19, bit 10 indicates that the device supports PRBS checking in the transmit direction. Register 1.19, bit 9 indicates that the device supports PRBS generation in the receive direction. Register 1.19, bit 8 indicates that the device supports PRBS checking in the receive direction.

Register 1.19, bit 7 enables testing with the PRBS31 pattern defined in 83.6.7. Register 1.19, bit 6 enables testing with the PRBS9 pattern defined in 83.6.7. The assertion of register 1.19 bits 7 and 6 is mutually exclusive. If both bits are asserted the behavior is undefined. The assertion of register 1.19, bits 7 and 6 works in conjunction with register 1.19, bits 3:0. If none of the bits 3:0 are asserted then bits 7 and 6 have no effect.

Register 1.19, bit 3 enables PRBS generation in the transmit direction. Register 1.19, bit 2 enables PRBS checking in the transmit direction. Register 1.19, bit 1 enables PRBS generation in the receive direction. Register 1.19, bit 0 enables PRBS checking in the

receive direction.  
**Proposed Response**      **Response Status W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 45**      **SC 45.2.1.12b**      **P 55**      **L 4**      # **659**  
Trowbridge, Stephen      Alcatel-Lucent

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

Clause 83 indicates separate enable for test pattern generate and test pattern detect. Also need enable for selected short test pattern (e.g., PRBS9)

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add separate enable for test pattern checker (which may be in different PMA from the generator), and for short test pattern generate and check.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See #131

**Cl 45**      **SC 45.2.1.12b**      **P 55**      **L 4**      # **660**  
Trowbridge, Stephen      Alcatel-Lucent

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

Need enable square wave test pattern, per lane?

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add enable square wave test pattern.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

If square wave test pattern is accepted in Clause 83 then add ability & enable bits in addition to resolution of #131

**Cl 45**      **SC 45.2.1.12c**      **P 51**      **L 10**      # **588**  
Dawe, Piers      Avago Technologies

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

Bit 1.19.15 cannot always be 1. MMDs are expected to return zero for addresses they don't use - and e.g. 10G MMDs don't use this address. In other words, the register is implemented even if the feature isn't.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change table entry and text to the usual 1 for able, 0 for not able.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.12c P 51 L 24 # 658  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

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

The PMA clause indicates a per lane error counter register (up to 10 lanes toward a physically instantiated interface) and not only a single register. Also need error counters in Tx and Rx direction. Can use the same error counter register for PRBS31 and whatever is selected as the short test pattern (e.g., PRBS9)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to per lane test pattern error counter registers in each direction.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See resolutions to #128

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.12c P 51 L 25 # 132  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

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

Register name needs to change

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change PRBS31 to PRBS Tx

Title, 7 instances in text, 1 Table title.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.12c P 51 L 32 # 134  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

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

Double period..

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete one of the periods.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.12c P 51 L 46 # 288  
Szczepanek, Andre Texas Instruments

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**

The PRBS31 pattern testing error counter is a twelve bit count as defined in 83.6.7

There is no sub-clause 83.6.7 in Draft 1.1

*SuggestedRemedy*

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(changed subclause designation)

Change to 83.5.9

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.12c P 51 L 49 # 133  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

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

Add a set of registers for Rx direction error counters.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add subclause 45.2.1.12d

PRBS Rx pattern testing error counter (Register 1.30, 1.31, 1.32, 1.33, 1.34, 1.35, 1.36, 1.37, 1.38, 1.39)

The PRBS Rx pattern testing error counter registers are used for PHY types that implement PRBS pattern testing in the PMA. This function is described in 83.6.7. The assignment of bits in the PRBS Rx pattern testing error counter registers is identical to the PRBS Tx pattern testing error counter as shown in Table 45-12c. Register 1.30 contains the PRBS pattern testing error counter for lane 0, register 1.31 contains the PRBS pattern testing error counter for lane 1, and registers 1.22 through 1.29 contain the PRBS pattern testing error counters for lanes 2 through 9 respectively. Counters corresponding to lanes that are not implemented in a PMA shall read all zeroes.

The PRBS Rx pattern testing error counter is a twelve bit count as defined in 83.6.7. These bits shall be reset to all zeros when the register is read by the management function or upon execution of the PMA reset. These bits shall be held at all ones in the case of overflow.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.76 P 52 L 3 # 387  
 D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Amendment reads

The BASE-R PMD control register is used for 10GBASE-KR and other PHY types using the backplane PMD described in Clause 72, 84 or 85.

The PMD is not just for backplanes.

There are multiple instances of this sentence throughout Clause 45.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the work "backplane" in the sentence. Do this for all instances of this sentence in Clause 45.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.77 P 54 L 1 # 313  
 Ofelt, David Juniper Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Most of the register descriptions subsections seem to go from most significant bit to least significant. This section goes the other way - from bit zero to bit fifteen. Spot checking the full clause 45- it looks like msb->lsb is the normal order.

Other subsections with the same problem:

45.2.1.81a  
 45.2.1.81b  
 45.2.1.84  
 45.2.1.85  
 45.2.3.4.4  
 45.2.3.4.5

There may be others, so if this matters, please double check the other sections.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Flip the order of the subsections.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

(changed subclause designation)

All of the registers added by 802.3ap (Backplane) have been numbered in this way, for reasons only known to the editors of that project. This project should not change the order of some of these registers while leaving the others. Therefore the job of making things consistent should be left to a revision project (where the whole document is open for change).

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.81a P 56 L 3 # 388  
 D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The BASE-R PMD status register 2 is used for 100GBASE-CR10 and other PHY types using the backplane PMD described in Clause 72, 84 or 85 over more than 4 lanes.

Issue 1 - use of "backplane" PMD  
 Issue 2 - "more than 4 lanes" - this is for simplex operation.

SuggestedRemedy

reword sentence

The BASE-R PMD status register 2 is used for 100GBASE-CR10 and other PHY types using the PMD described in Clause 72, 84 or 85 over more than 4 lanes in a given direction.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.16a P 69 L 49 # 317  
 Ofelt, David Juniper Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The text says that "These bits shall be held at all ones in the case of overflow". Given the paragraph is for just the upper bits and there is an explicit indication for the lower bits that they do not saturate if the high-order register is implemented, I think the text should be explicit in referring to the 20b counter being held at all ones.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text to read "The 20 bit counter shall be held at all ones in the case of overflow".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

(changed subclause designation)

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.16b P 70 L 25 # 311  
 Ofelt, David Juniper Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The text says that "These bits shall be held at all ones in the case of overflow". Given the paragraph is for just the upper bits and there is an explicit indication for the lower bits that they do not saturate if the high-order register is implemented, I think the text should be explicit in referring to the 22b counter being held at all ones.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text to read "The 22 bit counter shall be held at all ones in the case of overflow".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: The commenter did not indicate the comment type, hence added comment type as Technical]

CI 45 SC 45.4 P 41 L 35 # 193  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The terms "PMA line-side loopback" and "PMA system loopback" do not clearly convey what function they perform. Also, clause 83 uses the term "line loopback"  
 A separate comment is submitted against clause 83 - these comments must be resolved together.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances of "line-side loopback" to "remote loopback" and all instances of "system loopback" to "local loopback"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See #201, resolution must match between Clauses 45 & 83.

**Cl 69**    **SC 69.2.3**                      **P 91**            **L 28**            # **534**  
 Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 AUTO-NEGOTIATION

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Auto-Negotiation

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

This text is taken directly from the IEEE 802.3 base document and so should not be changed without good reason.

**Cl 69**    **SC 69.3**                      **P 92**            **L 1**            # **389**  
 D'Ambrosia, John                                      Force10 Networks

**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 the reader is pointed to Clauses 80, 81, 82, and 84. It would seem we could be a bit more specific. Relevant subclauses are 80.3, 81.1.4, 82.5, and 84.4.

Also, 80.3 only provides informative specifications.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Suggest rewording

For 40GBASE-KR4 normative delay specifications may be found in 81.1.4, 82.5, and 84.4. Informative delay specifications may be found in 80.3

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 69B**    **SC**                                      **P 345**            **L**            # **291**  
 Marris, Arthur                                      Cadence

**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Multilane correlated cross needs to be described in Annex 69B

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 As above

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Need a suggested remedy

**Cl 69B**    **SC 4**                                      **P 346**            **L 32**            # **665**  
 Balasubramanian, Vittal                                      FCI USA, Inc.

**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The equation for generating the fit line for any data to test to the limit line as specified in Figure 69B-8 is faulty (See attached supporting document.)

The fit line, as it stands now, can cause some connectors which actually pass the requirements in raw data to fail the requirements with the fit line.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Need to come up with a new equation for the fit line which takes into account the low frequency data also when coming up with the fit line to test against the limit line.

Resolution will be provided in a supporting document.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The supporting document needs review and agreement in the task force.

If the commenter believes the 802.3ap-2007 standard is faulty the commenter should consider submitting a maintenance request against the base standard.

**Cl 73**    **SC 73.2**                                      **P 93**            **L 29**            # **390**  
 D'Ambrosia, John                                      Force10 Networks

**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The use of "AUTONEG" in the figure is inconsistent with other layer diagrams that use "AN"

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change "AUTONEG" to "AN"

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

This comment refers to Figure 73-1

CI 73 SC 73.7.4.1 P 96 L 40 # 444  
 Valliappan, Magesh Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Draft says "Parallel Detection is not performed for 10GBASE-KR"

Similarly, parallel detection can not be performed for 40GBase-CR4/KR4 and 100GBase-CR10. Specify those PMDs as well

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "Parallel Detection is not performed for 10GBASE-KR, 40GBase-CR4, 40GBase-KR4 and 100GBase-CR10."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: Commenter has not indicated the comment type. Assigned comment type as Technical]

Delete the sentence:  
 "Parallel Detection is not performed for 10GBASE-KR"

CI 74 SC 74 P 101 L 3 # 170  
 Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove the Editor's note.

*SuggestedRemedy*

As above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 74 SC 74.11 P 111 L 1 # 352  
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

74.11 PICS and requirements for 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R:

Current PICS in 74.11 in base specification applies to 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R implementations as well. Add any new PICS entries that are specific to 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R PHYs.

For example add separate shall statements in 74.7.4.5 to indicate the decoding errors requirements to PCS for 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R. So this will result in separate PICS entries for single lane and multi-PCS lane implementations.

Current statements in 74.7.4.5 does not provide clarity regarding specific requirements for single and multi-PCS lane PHYs.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update 74.7.4.5 to provide separate requirements for 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R PHYs and add corresponding PICS entries. (for e.g. PICS entry FE9 or FE11 in 74.11.5 may get split accordingly)

Also do the same for other requirements of 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R in Clause 74, if any.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 74 SC 74.3 P 101 L 38 # 391  
 D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"BASE-R FEC" is inconsistent with other layer diagrams

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "BASE-R FEC" to "FEC"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

This comment refers to Figure 74-1.

CI 74 SC 74.3 P 101 L 51 # 347  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Change Figure 74-1 title to BASE-R (from 10GBASE-R) as suggested:

BASE-R FEC relationship to ISO/IEC Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) reference model and the IEEE 802.3 CSMA/CD LAN model

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change Figure 74-1 title as follows:

BASE-R FEC relationship to ISO/IEC Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) reference model and the IEEE 802.3 CSMA/CD LAN model

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 74 SC 74.4 P 102 L 1 # 292  
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Need to remove gearbox for 40G and 100G operation as this has a bit stream interface

*SuggestedRemedy*

As above and also check for any places where Clause 74 needs to be updated for the 40G/100G service interface definition.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

see comment 351

CI 74 SC 74.5 P 103 L 44 # 157  
Chung, Hwan Seok ETRI

Comment Type T Comment Status D

For the entire document, the unit description for baud rate is GBd, not Gbd. Thus, 10.3125 Gbd should be changed to 10.3125 GBd. Also, in page 105, line 32, 'Gbd' should be 'GBd'.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

also see comment 161

CI 74 SC 74.5 P 103 L 5 # 392  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The FEC service interface section does not discuss that the implementation shown in Fig 83-2, where the XLAUI / CAUI is above the FEC sublayer.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph in 74.5:

The XLAUI / CAUI is an optional physical instantiation that may be used for the logical FEC interface.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add sentence after first sentence in first paragraph of 74.5:  
"The FEC service interface is equivalent to PMA service interface."

Add third paragraph to 74.5

"Optional physical instantiations of the PMA service interface have been defined (see Clause 51 and Clause 83). There is XSBI (10 Gigabit Sixteen Bit Interface) for 10GBASE-R, XLAUI for 40GBASE-R and CAUI for 100GBASE-R. These physical instantiations may also be used for the FEC service interface."

also see comment 395 against Clause 83

CI 74 SC 74.5.2 P 105 L 12 # 348  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Add cross reference link to Clause 83 and also provide exact reference to 83.3.

The FEC service interface directly maps to the PMA service interface defined in Clause 83 (See 83.3)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change sentence as follows:

The FEC service interface directly maps to the PMA service interface defined in Clause 83 (See 83.3)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

see response to comment 392



**Cl 74**    **SC 74.5.2.1.2**    **P 105**    **L 32**    # **161**  
 Gustlin, Mark    Cisco

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Gbd s/b/ GBd.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 as above.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

also see comment 157

**Cl 74**    **SC 74.5.2.2.2**    **P 106**    **L 4**    # **162**  
 Gustlin, Mark    Cisco

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Here you used Gtransfers/s, but in 74.5.2.1.2 you used GBd, should be consistent.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to GBd.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

also see comment 349

**Cl 74**    **SC 74.5.2.2.2**    **P 106**    **L 4**    # **349**  
 Ganga, Ilango    Intel

**Comment Type**    **ER**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Change 10.3125 Gtransfers/s to 10.3125 GBd to be consistent with other subclauses (for example tx\_bit is defined in GBd).

Also change Gbd to GBd throughout this clause.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 As per comment

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

also see comment 162

**Cl 74**    **SC 74.5.2.3.1**    **P 106**    **L 22**    # **353**  
 Ganga, Ilango    Intel

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The FEC\_SIGNAL.indication is set to True only if fec\_signal\_ok variable is true for all lanes or data streams and is set to fail if fec\_signal\_ok is false in any one or more of the lanes. Hence rephrase the appropriate sentences in 74.5.2.3.1 to provide clarity.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change two sentences in 74.5.2.3.1 as follows:

"..PMA sublayer indicated by the fec\_signal\_ok variable equal to true, for all data streams, and this payload.."

"A value of FAIL denotes that errors have been detected by the Receive process indicated by the fec\_signal\_ok variable equal to false, in any of the data streams, that prevent valid data.."

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 74**    **SC 74.7.4**    **P 106**    **L 40**    # **351**  
 Ganga, Ilango    Intel

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 74.7.4 Functions within the FEC sublayer, should be updated to include the operation of a bit serial interface for 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R PHYs.

The reverse gearbox function is not needed. A presentation or text will be provided to show the operation of Clause 74 FEC for operation with 40 and 100G multi lane PHYs

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 A supporting presentation will be submitted to show the operation of Clause 74 FEC with multi lane operation with 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R PHYs. Text and figures in 74.7.4 needs to be updated accordingly.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

implement the changes suggested in ganga\_02\_0109.pdf

also check for any places where Clause 74 needs to be updated for the 40G/100G service interface definition and fix accordingly.

**Cl 74**    **SC 74.7.4.5**    **P 79**    **L 46**    # **541**  
Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

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

Follow-up from D1.0 comment 322: need to determine whether the error bursting expected in 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10 degrades MTTFFPA too much.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Do the analysis.  
If it does, several options are available.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Suggested remedy is not complete

Comment 322 against D1.0 requested the ability to detect FEC errors without correcting them. For reference the final accepted response was:

"This needs approval by the task force.

Also the proposed remedy is not complete. MTTFFPA, power, latency need to be analyzed before a change can be proposed.

Cannot use as background error monitor alone without adding latency because giving up sync header redundancy without being able to mark blocks bad due to FEC code will significantly increase MTTFFPA.

Could affect PCS high BER and lock state machines if a single error multiplies to mark the entire block bad."

**Cl 74**    **SC 74.7.4.5.1**    **P 107**    **L 42**    # **393**  
D'Ambrosia, John    Force10 Networks

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

The last sentence of the last paragraph contains a "shall" statement but there is no corresponding PICS

**SuggestedRemedy**

Generate PIC statement

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 74**    **SC 74.8**    **P 108**    **L 24**    # **350**  
Ganga, Ilango    Intel

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

In Table 74-1, change the width of the last column, to fit the variable to fall within a single line. Currently the last digit spills over the next line.

**SuggestedRemedy**

As per comment

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 80**    **SC 80.1.2**    **P 113**    **L 25**    # **171**  
Gustlin, Mark    Cisco

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

Here the phrasing is "at least 10 km on a single mode fiber", but then in 80.1.4 the phrasing changes to "up to at least 10 km in length", we need to be consistent. This applies for all of the physical layers.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change to make it consistent.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #159

**Cl 80**    **SC 80.1.2**    **P 113**    **L 25**    # **159**  
Chung, Hwan Seok    ETRI

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

According to comment#466 in 'p8023ba-D10\_AcceptedResponses\_by\_Clause.pdf', 'at least' which described operating distance of PHY was changed to 'up to at least', because the wording 'at least' implied that shorter cables are not compliant. Thus, to avoid any misunderstanding, 'at least' in 80.1.2 should be changed to 'up to at least'.

**SuggestedRemedy**

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The use of phrase "at least" is same as in 40G and 100G objectives. However phrase "up to at least" was added to text in 80.1.4 for better clarity during D1.0 comment resolution. Hence propose to change 80.1.2 to use "up to at least" for consistency.

Also see comment # 171

Cl 80 SC 80.1.3 P 114 L 48 # 640  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
physically implemented or physically instantiated?

*SuggestedRemedy*

No preference, but different clauses have made different choices of words and it should probably be consistent. Also line 51 and many other places.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED REJECT.

This use of this phrase is consistent with Clause 44 in base standard

Cl 80 SC 80.1.3 P 114 L 7 # 394  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
In Fig 80-1 FEC sub-layer is noted as being "conditional", but it is actually conditional for the PHY type, but then optional.

*SuggestedRemedy*

add second note that indicates that the FEC sub-layer is also optional. Apply to other layer diagrams throughout the document, where appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED REJECT.

The tables in PMD clauses and in Clause 80 provides information on which layer/interface is optional or mandatory.

It was decided in earlier TF discussions to not use optional in the layer diagrams.

Cl 80 SC 80.1.4 P 115 L 22 # 434  
Abbott, John Corning Incorporated

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
Subclause 80.1.4(Nomenclature) page 115 lines 22-25

For 10GBASE, The letters S and L represent the wavelength, with S being approximately 850nm and L being approximately 1300nm+. For example 10GBASE-LX4 and 10GBASE-LRM use 1310nm lasers, while 10GBASE-SR uses 850nm lasers over the same link distance as LX4.

*SuggestedRemedy*

40Gb/s and 100Gb/s should retain the same terminology.

Alternatively, if the change in terminology is intentional, additional text should be added in this section clarifying that a change in terminology has been made to eliminate any misunderstanding.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED REJECT.

The nomenclature employed by the 40 and 100 Gigabit physical layers is defined in 80.1.4 since it is different from 10G.

Cl 80 SC 80.1.4 P 115 L 27 # 650  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
Should we say here that links >30km are engineered links with attenuation below the limits described in clause 88?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Qualify the 40km of SMF optical fiber to be 40km with attenuation less than the worst case specified for B1.1 or B1.3 SMF.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED REJECT.

The intent of 80.1.3 is to define the nomenclature employed by 40G and 100G, so it not necessary to be so specific in this subclause.

Cl 80 SC 80.1.4 P 115 L 29 # 396  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

use of "optical lanes" should clarify that optical lanes can either be via wavelengths or number of fibers

SuggestedRemedy

modify sentence

The numeric suffix in the port type (e.g. 40GBASE-CR4 or 100GBASE-CR10) represents the number of electrical or optical lanes.

to

The numeric suffix in the port type (e.g. 40GBASE-CR4 or 100GBASE-CR10) represents the number of electrical or optical (i.e. number of wavelengths or optical fibers) lanes.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change sentence to:

The numeric suffix in the port type (e.g. 40GBASE-CR4 or 100GBASE-CR10) represents the number of electrical or optical lanes (i.e. number of wavelengths or optical fibers) .

Cl 80 SC 80.2.1 P 115 L 36 # 172  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove the editor's note. It is made clear what the 40 and 100G instantiations of the MII are.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 80 SC 80.2.2 P 116 L 1 # 542  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Order of material; the table specifying the correlation between nomenclature and clauses interrupts the list of sublayers.

SuggestedRemedy

Move 80.2.2 to become 80.1.5.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Move 80.2.2 to become 80.1.5 and renumber the subclauses 80.2.2.1 to become 80.2.1 and so on.

Cl 80 SC 80.2.2 P 116 L 12 # 174  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In table 80-1 we should add in a column on the PPI interface? And mark it appropriately?

SuggestedRemedy

As above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The optional PPI is defined within Clause 86, so it may not be needed in Table 80-1, if needed we could add a column and mark as optional for SR4 and SR10.

Cl 80 SC 80.2.2 P 116 L 16 # 522  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

AUTO-NEGOTIATION

SuggestedRemedy

Auto-Negotiation

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 80 SC 80.2.2 P 116 L 18 # 173  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In table 80-1, the clause 74 heading is 10GBASE-R FEC, but now we differentiate FEC based on 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R, so we should add columns for 40GBASE-R FEC and 100GBASE-R FEC, then mark the columns appropriately.

SuggestedRemedy

As above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the column heading from 10GBASE-R FEC to BASE-R FEC Clause 74 Title

CI 80 SC 80.2.2 P 116 L 35 # 641  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Legend of O=Optional, M=Mandatory can be done just as a note rather than a table footnote as it applies to all of the cells and not just the two indicated with the superscript "a"

SuggestedRemedy

Eliminate the superscript "a"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 80 SC 80.2.2.2 P 116 L 51 # 175  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Change:  
"In addition the PMAs perform clock recovery from the received data stream and optionally provide data loopback at the PMA service interface."  
to:

"In addition the PMAs perform clock recovery from the received data stream, optionally provide data loopback at the PMA or PMD service interface, and optionally provide test pattern generation and checking."

SuggestedRemedy

As above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 80 SC 80.2.3 P 117 L 10 # 523  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The subclauses summarising the sublayers are nearly all in order, from top to bottom (the management interface is a special case) - except FEC.

SuggestedRemedy

Move 80.2.3 Forward Error Correction (FEC) sublayer to after 80.2.2.1 Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) and before 80.2.2.2 Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 80 SC 80.2.7 P 117 L 46 # 651  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type T Comment Status D

lanes should be 0 to n-1 (rather than 0 to n) to align with description in clause 83

SuggestedRemedy

replace "n" with "n-1". Also on line 47.

Note that the PMD service interface description seems to have "n" be 3 or 9 with the number of lanes being "n+1". Consider aligning.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "x = 0 to n" to "x = 0 to n-1" in 80.2.7 (4 instances)

CI 80 SC 80.3 P 118 L 15 # 652  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Missing row in table for 100GBASE-R PMA

Delay

SuggestedRemedy

Add row below 40GBASE-R PMA for 100GBASE-R PMA. Note that value for PMA roundtrip delay expected from Mark Gustlin presentation.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment #168 for PMA delay constraints

**Cl 80**    **SC 80.3**    **P 118**    **L 24**    # **539**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**    **Delay**  
 Table of delay limits is incomplete.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Add rows for FEC and AN. If AN delay is counted as part of PMD delay, say so in a table note and give a cross-reference

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add row for FEC to Table 80-2

**Cl 80**    **SC 80.3**    **P 118**    **L 25**    # **540**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**    **Delay**  
 Defining delay for PMA or PMD in MAC bit times is inappropriate as well as misleading; these sublayers have no knowledge or visibility of the MAC clock, or MAC bits. With multi-lane sublayers, 'bit time' becomes even more confusing. We improved things a little in D1.1 but not enough.  
 Is a table note that says 'Note that' normative or informative?  
 I suppose that we mean that if a clock is running slow (within the +-100ppm limits), one is allowed extra time.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Turn note a into a NOTE (or regular text) at line 13, add extra sentence 'One pause\_quantum is 512 MAC bit times.'  
 Either,  
 If MAC and PCS engineers want their 'bit time' entries, insert a heading below the PCS in the second column 'Maximum at nominal signaling rate (ns)' and give the PMA and PMD entries in ns.  
 Or,  
 As MAC and PCS engineers can multiply by 512 and probably aren't considering a serial MAC or PCS implementation anyway, replace the whole second column with 'Maximum at nominal signaling rate (ns)' and give all the entries in ns.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This issue was discussed in the task force in Nov08 and decided to add notes in D1.1

The MAC bit time and pause quantum is provided for the system designer to plan buffers based on the delay number through the MAC/PHY stack and the medium. This is consistent with the unit(s) used in 802.3 base standard.

Discuss and add additional notes for better clarity or add an additional column with absolute delay as appropriate.

*Cl* **80**    *SC* **80.3**                      *P* **118**                      *L* **25**                      # **168**  
Gustlin, Mark                                      Cisco

*Comment Type*    **T**                      *Comment Status*    **D**                                      *Delay*

Add in the round trip delay for the PMA:  
First lets look at the dynamic skew since some PMAs have to account for that:

SP1, SP5, SP1 and back to SP5 again is what we need to worry about, plus we need to multiply these numbers by 2 since people will start fifos at the half full mark...

So:  $(3.6ns + .2ns) * 2 * 2 = 15.2ns$  or 1474 bits due to dynamic skew buffers.

Now in the worst case you can have multiple PMAs, but they still have to meet the above skew points so I think we don't have to add any more for the skew for multiple PMAs.

Now there is some inherent delay in the muxing stages etc, and we put down for max skew 13ns per pma stage. So delay must be at least that much. Lets add another 66b word to that , so that is  $13 + 6.4 = 19.4ns$ , now multiply  $x4 = 77.6ns$  or 7540 bits.

So a total of  $1474 + 7540 = 9014$  bits, or rounded up to the nearest 512 chunk is  $18 * 512 = 9216$  BT.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the TBDs to 9216 BT, or 18 pause quanta. Make this applicable for 100GBASE-R and 40GBASE-R PMAs (right now it only has an entry for 40GBASE-R PMAs)

*Proposed Response*                      *Response Status*    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Discuss PMA delay constraints in the Task Force

*Cl* **80**    *SC* **80.3**                      *P* **118**                      *L* **44**                      # **166**  
Gustlin, Mark                                      Cisco

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

Remove "[Editor's note (to be removed prior to publication) - The adopted delay number of 4800 BT (see Comment #300) has been been rounded to the nearest pause quanta]"

*SuggestedRemedy*

As above.

*Proposed Response*                      *Response Status*    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

*Cl* **80**    *SC* **80.4**                      *P* **119**                      *L* **11**                      # **411**  
D'Ambrosia, John                                      Force10 Networks

*Comment Type*    **TR**                      *Comment Status*    **D**                                      *Skew*

Fig 80-2 and Fig 80-3 are very complex drawings as they try to capture the flexibility and multiple options inherent in the draft.

Neither figure shows that XLAUI / CAUI is an optional physical instantiation. Also, FEC should be conditional based on PMD type.

Given the various architectures it is also not obvious which SPx need to be measured.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Note that the XLAUI / CAUI are optional.  
Note that FEC is also conditional based on PMD type.

add a statement that the reader should review the relevant clauses, as shown in Tables 80-3 and 80-4, to see which skew points need to be measured.

*Proposed Response*                      *Response Status*    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Task force discussion: See supporting presentation dambrosia\_01\_0109

*Cl* **80**    *SC* **80.4**                      *P* **119**                      *L* **20**                      # **553**  
Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

*Comment Type*    **T**                      *Comment Status*    **D**                                      *Skew*

Figures 80-2 and 80-3 imply that the PMA next to the PMD is optional. Yet there must always be a PMA next to the PMD; one cannot connect to a PMD with nAUI.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Mark the XLAUIs and CAUIs with 1 for optional.

*Proposed Response*                      *Response Status*    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #411

**Cl 80**    **SC 80.4**    **P 119**    **L 7**    # **653**  
Trowbridge, Stephen    Alcatel-Lucent

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**    **Skew**

Need to qualify statement about dynamic skew since it isn't absolute (there is no guarantee that if the link is brought down and back up again, the PCS lanes will be on the same physical lanes).

**SuggestedRemedy**

Replace "The Dynamic Skew must be limited to ensure that a given PCS lane always traverses the same physical lane." with "From the time the link is brought up, Dynamic Skew must be limited to ensure that a given PCS lane always traverses the same physical lane while the link remains in operation."

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 80**    **SC 80.4**    **P 120**    **L 1**    # **430**  
Abbott, John    Corning Incorporated

**Comment Type**    **ER**    **Comment Status**    **D**    **Skew**

Need to consolidate definitions of skew/dyanamic skew so that they appear at earliest reference (here), that they agree for all PMD types. Also "time that the link is operational" needs to be defined -- is it only the length of time needed to measure BER = 10<sup>-12</sup> or something shorter or longer?

**SuggestedRemedy**

- a.move this text which is nomenclature/definition to the front of subclause 80.4
- b.this line references a later clause 82.2.12. It is appropriate for the definition to appear in the first subclause it is used, hence move the 82.2.12 definition to this subclause.
- c.Note in subclause 86.7.3.1 it is noted that the correct definition of skew and dynamic skew may need to be redefined differently for multimode fiber. This difference in definition should be noted in subclauses 80.4 and/or 82.2.12. There is a problem because 82.2.12 is primarily a definition appropriate to electronics.
- d.For completeness, the definition in 82.2.12 says the dynamic skew is defined as the change in total skew over the "time that the link is operational". This "operational time" itself needs to be defined - is it only the length of time needed to measure BER = 10<sup>-12</sup> or something shorter or longer?

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Discuss in task force

**Cl 80**    **SC 80.4**    **P 121**    **L**    # **280**  
Isono, Hideki    Fujitsu Limited

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**    **Skew**

Regarding the skew values at SP3 & SP4, they should be revised considering the flexible Optical MUX/DEMUX device selection. In case of using 1x2 port O-MUX/DEMUX devices, the skew of 10nm each (for Sending & Receiving portion, respectively) is necessary.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Regarding Table80-3, the skew value at SP3 & SP4 should be revised.

SP3: 44ns-->53ns, 454UI-->547UI, 227UI-->273UI

SP4: 144ns-->136ns, 1484UI-->1403UI, 742UI-->701UI

Related sections below should be revised accordingly,

Sec 84.5 The 3rd & 4th paragraph

Sec 85.5 The 3rd & 4th paragraph

Sec 86.2.2 The 3rd & 4th paragraph

Sec 87.3.2 The 3rd & 4th paragraph

Sec 88.3.2 The 3rd & 4th paragraph

There exists a presentation on this issue.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: This comment also affects Clause 84, Clause 85, Clause 86, Clause 87, and Clause 88]

Also see comment #445

Discuss in Task Force



CI 80 SC 80.4 P 121 L 10 # 445  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Skew

There is insufficient skew allowed for some desirable implementations between SP2 and SP3, and between SP4 and SP5 for the WDM mux/demuxes. There is more than enough skew allocated for the transmission medium

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change SP3 Total skew to 54ns (558 UI for 40G, and 279 UI for 100G) and SP4 skew to 134ns (1380 UI for 40G and 690 UI for 100G). in table 80-3

Also in clause 83 section 83.5.3.5 page 190 line 53 change 144ns to 134ns

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #280

CI 80 SC 80.4 P 121 L 22 # 642  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Should use same number of significant digits for 1 ui for 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R.  
Also line 46-47.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Use same number of significant digits for both 40GBASE-R and 100GBASE-R.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change 193.9394 ps to 193.939394 ps

Change 38.7879 ps to 38.787879 ps

CI 80 SC 80.4 P 121 L 33 # 625  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Skew

Dynamic Skew at SP2 (400 ps or 4 UI) is excessive; OIF has 1.5 UI at SP1(?) and that's after they sandbagged it. Because a group of 4 differential traces can be kept more equal in length than a group of 10, the Dynamic Skew for 40G should be lower than that for 100G. See another comment for estimates of dynamic skew; it's hard to see it being as large as 50 ps at SP1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change limit for Dynamic Skew at SP1 to 0.1 or 0.15 ns (which is 1.5 UI for 10G lanes).  
Change limit for Dynamic Skew at SP2 to 0.2 or 3 ns (which is 3 UI for 10G lanes).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Discuss proposed limits in Task Force

CI 80 SC 80.4 P 121 L 44 # 177  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Skew

Tabel 80-4 does not have an entry for 100GBASE-R dynamic skew in UIs at the PCS receive, in clause 82 we do have it.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add in 21 UI for a pcs lane dynamic skew at the 100GBASE-R rx pcs.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Discuss in Task Force

CI 81 SC 81.1 P 123 L 49 # 176  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove the editor's note and live with the MII name.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 81 SC 81.1 P 124 L 8 # 397  
 D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The MII is scalable and capable of supporting speeds of operation above 10 Gb/s.

anything other than 40 Gb/s or 100 Gb/s is out of scope for the project

SuggestedRemedy  
 reword sentence -  
 The MII is scalable and capable of supporting speeds of 40Gb/s and 100Gb/s.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 81 SC 81.1.5 P 124 L 52 # 398  
 D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

rewording

The XLGMII and CGMII (like the original MII, GMII and XGMII) maximize media independence by cleanly separating the Data Link and Physical Layers of the OSI seven-layer reference model.

SuggestedRemedy  
 The XLGMII and CGMII maximize media independence by cleanly separating the Data Link and Physical Layers of the OSI seven-layer reference model.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 81 SC 81.1.6 P 125 L 33 # 643  
 Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Don't need to phrase descriptive text as a requirement.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "The 64 TXD and eight TXC signals shall be organized into eight data lanes, as shall the 64 RXD and eight RXC signals (see Table 81-2)." with "The 64 TXD and eight TXC signals are organized into eight data lanes, as are the 64 RXD and eight RXC signals (see Table 81-2)."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This is consistent with clause 46, and also has a PICS associated with it.

Cl 81 SC 81.1.7 P 125 L 44 # 644  
 Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Don't need to phrase descriptive text as a requirement

SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "The Reconciliation Sublayer (RS) shall map the signals provided at the MII to the PLS service primitives defined in Clause 6" with "The Reconciliation Sublayer (RS) maps the signals provided at the MII to the PLS service primitives defined in Clause 6"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This is consistent with clause 46.

Cl 81 SC 81.3 P 138 L 20 # 158  
 Chung, Hwan Seok ETRI

Comment Type T Comment Status D signaling

There two types of description for 'signaling' in D1.1 such as 'singling' or 'signalling.' Both description are correct, but 'singaling' is mostly used across the entire document. So, to maintain consistency, it will be better to change 'signalling' to 'signaling'. These change also should be done in the following line.

page 255, line 39  
 page 278, line 6  
 page 279, line 6  
 page 352, line 17 & line 24  
 page 351, line 46  
 page 352, line 35, ...

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Note that this will also impact clause 86 and 83A. We will go with Signaling.

CI 81 SC 81.3.4 P 138 L 20 # 275  
 Chang, Sun Hyok ETRI  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D signaling  
 'signalling' is used at the same time with 'signaling' through the draft 1.1.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest to use one kind of spelling.  
 I suggest 'signaling'.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Also a duplicate of #158 and #310.

CI 81 SC 81.3.4 P 138 L 20 # 197  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 "Clause 46" is an external link  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make it dark blue  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 81 SC 81.3.4 P 138 L 20 # 310  
 Estes, Dave UNH - IOL  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D signaling  
 "signalling" should be "signaling"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "signalling" to "signaling"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Agreed, this is a duplicate of #158.

CI 81 SC 81.3.4 P 138 L 21 # 639  
 Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D osets  
 Since the same external encoding is used for ordered sets as in clause 46, better to say that they are aligned to 8-byte boundaries rather than that they are extended to 8 bytes.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "The behavior of the fault signalling is the same as it is for Clause 46 with the exception that the ordered sets are extended to eight bytes." with "The behavior of the fault signalling is the same as it is for Clause 46 with the exception that the ordered sets are aligned to eight byte boundaries."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 [Editor's note: Commenter has not indicated the comment type. Assigned comment type as Technical]  
 Replace  
 "The behavior of the fault signalling is the same as it is for Clause 46 with the exception that the ordered sets are extended to eight bytes."  
 with  
 "The behavior of the fault signalling is the same as it is for Clause 46 with the exception that the ordered sets are aligned to eight byte boundaries, padding the upper four bytes with 0's."

CI 82 SC 2.10 P 160 L 27 # 318  
Ofelt, David Juniper Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D tpat

The text says that the PCS sends out the test pattern on four or twenty lanes simultaneously and then goes on to say that the scrambler generates the test pattern. I think the text would be clearer if it made explicit that the test pattern is generated as a single stream by the scrambler and then distributed to the lanes in the same way as normal packet data coming from the upper layers.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move the third paragraph to be the first in the subsection, then change the current first to read something like:

"When the transmit channel is operating in test-pattern mode, the encoded data stream is distributed to the PCSL in the same way as normal packet data. There will be four separate data streams ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Chang:

"When the transmit channel is operating in test-pattern mode, it sends the test pattern in 4 separate data streams (for 40GBASE-R) or 20 separate data streams (for 100GBASE-R) of test pattern at a time via PMA\_UNITDATA.request primitives. The test-pattern generator shall be implemented.

There is a single type of required PCS transmit test pattern: pseudo-random. The pseudo-random test-pattern mode is suitable for receiver tests and for certain transmitter tests.

When pseudo-random pattern is selected, the test pattern is generated by the scrambler. No seeding of the scrambler is required during test pattern operation. The input to the scrambler is a control block (block type=0x1e) with all idles as defined in figure 82-5. Note that the alignment markers are also added to the stream so that the receive PCS can align and deskew the lanes."

To:

"There is a single type of required PCS transmit test pattern: pseudo-random. The pseudo-random test-pattern mode is suitable for receiver tests and for certain transmitter tests.

When pseudo-random pattern is selected, the test pattern is generated by the scrambler. No seeding of the scrambler is required during test pattern operation. The input to the scrambler is a control block (block type=0x1e) with all idles as defined in figure 82-5. Note that the alignment markers are also added to the stream so that the receive PCS can align and deskew the lanes.

When the transmit channel is operating in test-pattern mode, the encoded data stream is distributed to the PCS Lanes in the same way as normal packet data. There will be 4 separate data streams (for 40GBASE-R) or 20 separate data streams (for 100GBASE-R) of test pattern at a time via PMA\_UNITDATA.request primitives. The test-pattern generator

shall be implemented."

CI 82 SC 2.14 P 161 L 30 # 319  
Ofelt, David Juniper Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

There is no mention of the fact the PCSL need to get muxed back into a single stream in this part of the document. 82.2.2 does mention re-forming the single stream of 66b blocks, but it seems appropriate to also include it in the more detailed list of functions.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add text to the Alignment marker removal subsection:

"Once the alignment markers are removed, the lanes are muxed together in the proper order to reform the single stream of blocks"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Add in:

"Once the alignment markers are removed, the lanes are muxed together in the proper order to reform the single stream of blocks"

At line 31.

CI 82 SC 2.18.3 P 169 L 20 # 314  
Ofelt, David Juniper Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Figure 82-10

The block labeled "TSEST\_SH2" should be "TEST\_SH2"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change label to "TEST\_SH2"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 82 SC 2.18.3 P 170 L 24 # 315  
Ofelt, David Juniper Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Figure 82-11

Goto labels are different style than other figures.

Figure 82-14 on page 172 has house shaped boxes for the gotos and circled letters for the destination markers, but 82-11 just has plain letters.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make the figure style consistant.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 82 SC 2.4.4 P 155 L 22 # 289  
Szczepanek, Andre Texas Instruments

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
FIGURE 82-5

The Payload encoding for Ordered Sets : OoD1D2D3D4D5D6D7 as D1-D2-D3-Oo-C4-C5-C6-C7 is confusing and imprecise.

Although Table 82-1 indicates "control codes are set to 0x00", defining this fixed 28 bit zero field in terms of control characters is confusing as there are no coresponding control characters on the MII, no definition of what happens on decode if non-zero control fields are received, what happens if D4-D5-D6-D7 are non-zero from the MII, or how D4-D7 are generated on decode.

Note that the definition of valid and invalid blocks in 82.2.4.5 only requires "Any control character contains a value not in Table 82-1". This is insufficient to invalidate Ordered set control field values of 0x1e.

Clearly what we intend is that the C4-C7 payload bits be zero and the D4-D7 MII characters be zero data bytes, anything else should be invalid.

So state this explicitly in the figure - don't pretend these fields are equivalent to the data or control fields in other block types, they aren't !.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Define the payload field bits corresponding to C4-C5-C6-C7 explicitly as zero in Figure 82-5. Show these 28 bits as a single 0x000\_0000 field. There are hex values in the figure already - just merge the C4-C7 cells and put 0x000\_0000 in the merged cell.

Define the Input "data block format" for ordered sets as OoD1D2D3Z4Z5Z6Z7 where Zn is a zero value data character.

These 2 changes will explicitly define the encoding and decoding process for ordered sets.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
Make the proposed changes.

Cl 82 SC 2.4.9 P 156 L 42 # 290  
 Szczepanek, Andre Texas Instruments  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Ordered sets consist of a control character followed by seven data characters on the MII.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Ordered sets consist of a control character followed by three data characters followed by 4 zero data characters on the MII.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 82 SC 82.1.1 P 147 L 12 # 645  
 Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 The PCS connects to the PMD via the PMA and possibly FEC, not "directly"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete the word "directly"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 82 SC 82.1.12 P 161 L 4 # 431  
 Abbott, John Corning Incorporated  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 (skew definition)  
 This definition (a) needs to be located in subclause 80.4 and (b) needs to be modified to include definitions for multimode and single mode fiber if necessary. For the definition of dynamic skew the definition of "time that the link is operational" needs to be more specific.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 (a) move to subclause 80.4 and refer to 80.4 at this point in text.  
 (b) make sure definition is consistent for all link types.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Move to 80.4 and refer to 80.4 in this subclause.

Cl 82 SC 82.1.2 P 147 L 27 # 198  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Two instances of "Clause 49" which is an external link  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 show as dark blue  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 82 SC 82.1.3.1 P 149 L 1 # 100  
 Bergmann, Ernie Circulant/JDSU  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 makes not sense: "...entity via when..."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to:  
 "... entity via the MDIO when ..." (matching other sections)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 82 SC 82.2.10 P 160 L 28 # 461  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D tpat  
 It is not clear whether the test pattern is at the bit rate or whether the test pattern is generated separately for each lane. It needs to be at the bit rate as having the same pattern sent out on all lanes at the same time will result in 11 00 etc patterns on the lanes after bit interleaving. Note that a property of a PRBS is that when taking every n bits of the PRBS the resulting data stream is the same PRBS with a time shift so each stream will still have the same PRBS, but they will be offset in time such that when interleaved the 11 00 problem doesn't occur.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "sends the test pattern in 4 separate data streams(for 40GBASE-R) or 20 separate data streams (for 100GBASE-R) to "sends the serial test pattern distributed in the normal manner over the 4 separate data streams(for 40GBASE-R) or 20 separate data streams (for 100GBASE-R)."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Already covered by comment #318.

Cl 82 SC 82.2.10 P 160 L 32 # 199  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The term used for the PCS generated test pattern is "pseudo-random". This name, however, is easily confused with two of the PMA generated patterns PRBS31 and (likely) PRBS9. It would be better to change the name in line with that used in Tables 87-10 and 88-14 "Scrambled idle"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to:  
 "There is a single type of required PCS transmit test pattern: scrambled idle. The scrambled idle test-pattern mode is ..."  
 and "When scrambled idle pattern is selected, the test pattern..."

Also in 82.2.17 change "pseudo-random" to "scrambled idle" in 6 places

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 82 SC 82.2.10 P 160 L 36 # 603  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It's not desirable to test a DTE receiver's sensitivity by sending it scrambled idle, because if the DTE is not explicitly put into test mode it will start sending frames to the tester. Better to send it scrambled RF. A network operator may wish to assess a signal received from another operator whose equipment it cannot put into test mode. That signal will be RF unless the other operator's receiver is receiving correctly, when it will be idle.

*SuggestedRemedy*

It would be helpful if the test-pattern generator and checker could generate and check scrambled RF as well as scrambled idle. I expect that a checker could be made that counts errors well enough without being told whether RF or idle is intended.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

This proposes essentially a new test pattern, I would like to see additional details on the proposal in a few slides and have that presented to the group to justify the request.

Cl 82 SC 82.2.10 P 160 L 36 # 535  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

figure 82-5

*SuggestedRemedy*

Figure 82-5 and make it a cross-reference.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 82 SC 82.2.12 P 161 L 4 # 282  
 Healey, Adam LSI Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Text does not make the relationship between Total Skew and Dynamic Skew clear. It Total Skew the average difference between the earliest PCS lane and the latest, or is it the maximum difference. In other words, is Dynamic Skew as subset of Total Skew, or is Dynamic Skew to be added to Total Skew?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Modify text to clarify the intended relationship.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change:

"Total Skew is defined as the difference between the times of the earliest PCS lane and latest PCS lane for the one to zero transition of the alignment marker sync bits. Dynamic Skew is defined as the change in Total Skew over the time that the link is operational."

To:

"Skew is defined as the difference between the times of the earliest PCS lane and latest PCS lane for the one to zero transition of the alignment marker sync bits. Skew Change is defined as the difference between the lowest value of Skew and the highest value of Skew over the entire time that the link is operational."

Note that this assumes that we rename the skew components which depends on the outcome of #622.

CI 82 SC 82.2.4.4 P 155 L 22 # 272  
Kim, Seung-Hwan ETRI

Comment Type T Comment Status D osets

"00D1D2D3D4D5D6D7" at the Data Block Format column is wrong description.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Should be changed from "00D1D2D3D4D5D6D7" to "00D1D2D3C4C5C6C7"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The commenter is correct, but this has been overtaken by comment #289.

CI 82 SC 82.2.4.7 P 156 L 29 # 271  
Kim, Seung-Hwan ETRI

Comment Type E Comment Status D

At the sentence " Receipt of an /S/ on any other octet of TxD indicates an error.", TxD is wrong spelling.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Spelling : TxD should be changed TXD.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 82 SC 82.2.4.9 P 156 L 42 # 273  
Kim, Seung-Hwan ETRI

Comment Type T Comment Status D osets

The sentence "Ordered sets consist of a control character followed by seven data characters on the MII." is wrong description. In Figure 82-5 line 22, Ordered sets consist of data and control characters.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Should be changed from : "Ordered sets consist of a control character followed by seven data characters on the MII." to : "Ordered sets consist of a Block Type Field followed by three data characters and four control characters on the MII." or The sentence should be changed properly.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment #273 also addresses this issue. The resolution is stated in that comment.5

CI 82 SC 82.2.4.9 P 156 L 43 # 274  
Kim, Seung-Hwan ETRI

Comment Type T Comment Status D osets

The sentence "Ordered sets always begin on the first octet of the MII." is wrong information. In Figure 82-5 line 22, Ordered sets located between data and control characters.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Should be changed from : "Ordered sets always begin on the first octet of the MII." to : "Ordered sets may be located between data and control characters." or The sentence should be changed properly.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This is talking about where the ordered set in on the MII, not in the 64b/66b encoding. It is correct as stated.

CI 82 SC 82.2.4.9 P 156 L 47 # 163  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Add a period at the end.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 82 SC 82.2.7 P 157 L 34 # 443  
Lee, Kyusang ICU

Comment Type E Comment Status D lane#

PCS distributes the 66-bit block to n lanes. Actually figure 82-6 shows (n+1) distributions.

*SuggestedRemedy*

66b Block distribution should end with '66b Block n-1', '66b Block 2(n-1)', and etc. Or, First 66b Block distribution should start with 66b Block 1, 66b Block n+2, and etc.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Change numbering to 0 to n-1 in figure 82-6.



CI 82 SC 82.2.8 P 158 L 12 # 442  
Lee, Kyusang ICU

Comment Type T Comment Status D lane#  
Actually figure 82-7 and 82-8 shows n lanes.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Lane start with Lane0 and finish Lane n. The number of Lane is n+1. Lane n should be (n-1) Lane n-1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. [Editor's note: Commenter has not indicated the comment type. Assigned comment type as Editorial to be consistent with #443 and #646 which are on the same topic]

Change to 0 to n-1 numbering in figures 82-7 and -8.

CI 82 SC 82.2.8 P 158 L 22 # 646  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D lane#  
Better to consider "n" to be the number of PCS lanes which are numbered 0 through n-1

**SuggestedRemedy**

Replace largest lane number by n-1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
Same as comment #442.

CI 82 SC 82.2.8 P 158 L 52 # 374  
Nicholl, Gary Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D bip  
Several customers have commented that while counting sync header errors (nicholl\_02\_0508 and implemented in D1.1) is very useful for monitoring the long term bit error rate performance of a link, it does not provide a method to detect isolated and/or infrequent error events.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Modify the format of the alignment marker to include a BIP8 (Bit Interleaved Parity) error check for each PCS lane. Please see nichol\_01\_0109 for details of the proposal.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Change the document per the presentation, with editorial license.

CI 82 SC 82.2.8 P 159 L 4 # 169  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D bip  
Add BIP error detection to the pcs alignment markers per gustlin\_01\_0109.

**SuggestedRemedy**

As above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
Duplicate of #374, the presentation is nichol\_01\_0109.

CI 82 SC 82.3.1 P 166 L 6 # 543  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Layout

**SuggestedRemedy**

In Table 82-6, resize right column to contents. Make left two columns wider using the whole width (432 points for the whole table). Let 82.4 Loopback start anywhere.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
< note changed to editorial with the consent of Piers>

CI 82 SC 82.3.1 P 167 L 10 # 200  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
In Table 82-6 Row 2 (excluding heading) MDIO status variable column 10/40/100 has the /40/100 in underline font.  
In Table 82-6 Row 7 (excluding heading) PCS register name column has a "/" in underline font.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Remove underline from these two places in the table

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 1.4**                      **P 183**            **L 14**            # **320**  
 Ofelt, David                              Juniper Networks

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Figure 83-2

I think the text describing the MMD numbering would be clearer if the figure was labeled with the MMD register numbers.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Add MMD 1, 8, and 9 labels to the figure. If there are more example figures in an annex, then label them as well.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.1.1**                      **P 181**            **L 12**            # **399**  
 D'Ambrosia, John                              Force10 Networks

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The PMAs can support any of the respective PMDs

The 40GBASE-R PMA(s) can support one of the following PMDs: 40GBASE-SR4, 40GBASE-LR4, 40GBASE-CR4, or 40GBASE-KR4. The 100GBASE-R PMA(s) can support one of the following PMDs: 100GBASE-SR10, 100GBASE-LR4, 100GBASE-ER4, or 100GBASE-CR10.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 change "one" to "any"

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.1.2**                      **P 181**            **L 32**            # **164**  
 Gustlin, Mark                                      Cisco

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 This is the first time that PCSL is introduced, add the non abbreviation here, PCS Lane. Then remove PCS Lane from the following page (line 42).

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 as above.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.1.2**                      **P 181**            **L 32**            # **412**  
 D'Ambrosia, John                              Force10 Networks

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 First instance of PCSL should define what the acronym means.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 replace "PCSL" with "PCS Lane"

replace "PCS Lane (PCSL)" on Page 182, bullet A under 83.1.3

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.1.2**                      **P 181**            **L 35**            # **525**  
 Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Wasted space. In general, figures and tables should float.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Set Figure 83-1 to float, remove any blank line.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.1.3**                      **P 182**            **L 3749**        # **326**  
 CHANG, Frank                                      Vitesse

**Comment Type**    **TR**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Comment on PMA loopback modes, pattern generator and checkers. As indicated by nicholl\_01\_1108.pdf, every 10GbE PHY device supports some kinds of PMA Loopbacks. I would recommend 802.3ba adopt at least PMA line loopback as mandatory which is extremely usefully for RX SRS test.

Actually currently IC advances has enabled the implementation of much more test features such as embedded BER monitoring, waveform viewing etc. I plan to provide some slides for this.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Suggest to eliminate optional for g) and add the following after h)-  
 "The system and line loopback modes can be useful for both physical-layer test and debug purpose such as RX SRS test."

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT. Making loopback mandatory would require TF consensus. See comment #590 resolution for discussion of why line loopback may be burdensome in some cases.

CI 83 SC 83.1.3 P 182 L 47 # 201  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The terms "system loopback" and "line loopback" do not clearly convey what function they perform. Also, clause 45 uses the term "line-side loopback"  
A separate comment is submitted against clause 45 - these comments must be resolved together.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change all instances of "system loopback" to "local loopback" and all instances of "line loopback" to "remote loopback".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Align with resolution of clause 45 comment.

CI 83 SC 83.1.3 P 182 L 47 # 619  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

There seem to be more test pattern and loopback options than are needed.

*SuggestedRemedy*

See presentation.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. Could change based on presentation not yet seen. Same issue addressed in trowbridge\_02\_0109 with recommendation to stay with current approach.

CI 83 SC 83.1.3 P 182 L 49 # 633  
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Test Pattern generation / detection is optional. (see 83.5.9 - Where the output lanes of the PMA appear on a physically instantiated interface XLAUI/CAUI or the PMD service interface (whether or not it is physically instantiated), the PMA may optionally generate and detect test patterns)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Provide test pattern generation and detection" to "Optionally provide test pattern generation and detection"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83 SC 83.1.3 P 182 L 53 # 524  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Can you have a list with just one entry?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to  
In addition, the PMA provides receive link status information in the receive direction.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83 SC 83.1.4 P 181 L 6 # 654  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Add informative Annex and remove editor's note

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add informative Annex to be provided as contribution to January 2009 meeting

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83 SC 83.1.4 P 183 L 3 # 178  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Change:  
"An implementation may use one or more PMA sublayers to adapt from the PCS formatted lanes to the supported PMD."

To:  
"An implementation may use one or more PMA sublayers to adapt from the number and rate of the PCS lanes to the number and rate of PMD lanes."

*SuggestedRemedy*

As above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.1.4 P 183 L 4348 # 322  
CHANG, Frank Vitesse

Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
MDIO serial interface first appear for clause 83.

SuggestedRemedy

MDIO stands for the Management data input/output interface, specified in 802.3ae clause 45.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Since clause 45 has existed for some time, only need to reference clause 45 (no need to single out 802.3ae)

Cl 83 SC 83.1.4 P 183 L 49 # 180  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Change:  
"MMD 8 is the closest to the PMD and MMD 10 is the farthest from the PMD"  
to:  
"MMD 8 is the 2nd closest PMA to the PMD and MMD 10 is the farthest from the PMD"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.1.4 P 183 L 49 # 312  
Ofelt, David Juniper Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The text describes the MMD register numbering scheme.

" By default, the PMA sublayer that is closest to the PMD is addressed as MDIO Manageable Device (MMD) 1. More addressable instances of PMA sublayers, each one separated from lower addressable instances by chip-to-chip interfaces, may be implemented and addressed as MMD 8, 9 and 10, where MMD 8 is the closest to the PMD..."

The PMA closest to the PMD seems to be numbered both 1 and 8 in this part of the text, but it is clear later on that MMD 8 is for the second-closest PMA to the PMD.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text to read:

"where MMD 8 is the second closest to the PMD.."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. (also addressed in other comments) [Editor's note: The commenter did not indicate the comment type, hence added comment type as Technical]

Cl 83 SC 83.1.4 P 183 L 6 # 369  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Provide additional examples in an informative annex as per Editor's note and/or delete the Editors note.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.1.4 P 183 L 6 # 179  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove the editor's note and add in the informative annex.

SuggestedRemedy

as above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83 SC 83.1.4 P 184 L 17 # 327  
 CHANG, Frank Vitesse

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Referring to Fig. 83-2, {1,2,4} or {1,2,4,5,10,20} causes confusions for PMA input/output lanes.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Actually only one option {4} for 40G-R; while {4,10,20} for 100G-R.

Or to take the whole paragraph out.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. This was the compromise agreed in Dallas. The problem is how much to describe for what the PMA is architecturally capable of vs. what it actually does in this version of the standard.

CI 83 SC 83.2 P 186 L 32 # 628  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Text says all these pattern generators, checkers and loopbacks are optional. This diagram implies otherwise.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add new first note:  
 Loopbacks and test pattern generators and detectors are optional.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83 SC 83.2 P 186 L 35 # 655  
 Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Decide whether (a) System loopback should be optional anywhere there is an exposed interface above; and if so, (b) Can test pattern generation/detection be limited to generating in transmit path and detecting in receive path, combining with loopback? Tradeoff of extra complexity and more registers for finer granularity fault localization.

*SuggestedRemedy*

A presentation will be provided to illustrate the two options. A decision should be made based on the consensus.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83 SC 83.2 P 186 L 4 # 181  
 Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In figure 83-5, the indications and requests should have an x to indicate that they apply to multiple bits.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the italic x to each indication and request (except for the status).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83 SC 83.3 P 186 L 45 # 599  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

If the PMD uses Auto-negotiation, there is another primitive AN\_LINK.indication which think is passed without modification from PMD to PCS.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add conditional AN\_LINK.indication.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. AN is below the PMD, so the PMD should turn AN\_LINK.indication into PMD\_SIGNAL.indication

CI 83 SC 83.3.2.1 P 150 L 6 # 526  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Following D1.1 comment 335 through.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change  
 PMA\_UNITDATA.indicationx(rx\_bit)  
 to  
 PMA\_UNITDATA.indicationx(rx\_bit)  
 i.e. without the space. Same in following subclauses e.g. 83.3.3.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.3.3.2**    **P 188**    **L 17**    # **602**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

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

If we have PMAserver\_SIGNAL.indication(SIGNAL\_OK) it would be better to:

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change Signal Indicate Logic to Signal Indication Logic, throughout.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.4**    **P 188**    **L 28**    # **370**  
 Ganga, Ilango    Intel

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

Other PMD clauses refer back to this subclause regarding the effect of receipt of this primitive etc. So organize the description of PMA server service interface similar to be consistent with other service interface definitions in Clause 83 and other Clauses.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Organize the description with the following outline as example.

83.4 PMA server service interface:  
 List all the server interface primitives and provide any overview

83.4.1 PMAserver\_UNITDATA.requestx  
 Move the definition of this primitive under this subclause  
 83.4.1.1 Semantics of the service primitive  
 83.4.1.2 When generated  
 83.4.1.3 Effect of receipt

Similarly structure for descriptions of other server interface primitives.

In Figure 83-5 name the primitives as per the exact definition of the primitives, as follows:

PMAserver\_UNIDATA.requestx  
 PMAserver\_UNIDATA.indicationx  
 PMAserver\_SIGNAL.indication

and

PMA\_UNITDATA.requestx  
 PMA\_UNITDATA.indicationx  
 PMA\_SIGNAL.indication

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5**    **P 189**    **L 10**    # **591**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

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

The PMA has no concern with the 'bit-rate'; that's what the MAC uses and the rate is modified by the line coding in the PCS before the PMA sees a signal.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change 'nominal bit-rate' to 'nominal signaling rate', twice in this paragraph.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5**    **P 189**    **L 724**    # **323**  
 CHANG, Frank    Vitesse

**Comment Type ER**    **Comment Status D**

Depending CDR or serdes implementation, PMA don't have to recover clock from the received signal if for CDR.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 "...optionally to recover clock from the received signal, and to provide test signals...."

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.3.2**    **P 190**    **L 44**    # **616**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

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

Tracking the last little bit of skew costs power in high speed analog circuitry. The PCS and PMA implemented as a silicon chip in a package on a PCB have no need to generate as much as 200 ps of Dynamic Skew. There could be several x 10 ps gate delay, most of which is correlated lane to lane (giving maybe 5 ps Dynamic Skew) plus perhaps 2" or 400 ps mismatched lane lengths on the PCBs, which might change by 5% over temperature and humidity: that's 20 ps. Total 25 ps. 50 ps should be adequate. Because the last fraction of a bit must be tracked in an analog way, rounding up to the next UI is not helpful. After padding, CEI chose a 1.5 UI limit for 'Relative Wander' (their term for Dynamic Skew).

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change SP1 Dynamic Skew output and tolerance limits to 150 ps or less, e.g. 100 ps. Similarly, reduce SP2 Dynamic Skew output and tolerance limits to 300 ps or less, e.g. 200 ps.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT. SP1 is defined at the "lowest" CAUI, which could include dynamic skew accrued through up to 3 PMA sublayers and FEC. Any change here needs to be aligned with clause 80.4

Cl 83 SC 83.5.3.4 P 190 L 39 # 400  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

the PMA adjacent to SP5 shall tolerate at least 3.6ns of Dynamic Skew seems incorrect, as the point was to limit dynamic skew to keep the channel to the same physical channel. The current wording does not put an upper bound on the amount of dynamic skew.

SuggestedRemedy

suggest rewording.

change "shall tolerate at least"  
to  
"shall tolerate a maximum of"

This sentence is repeated throughout Clause 83, and suggested remedy should be used throughout it.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.4 P 191 L 9 # 395  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

It is unclear that for physical instantiations XLAUI / CAUI that retiming is required and no apparent PIC for it.

SuggestedRemedy

Presentation with proposed remedy to be provided.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. TBD based on presentation.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.5 P 191 L 3139 # 324  
CHANG, Frank Vitesse

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Assume 87.2 will also specify PMD service interface (for 40G-LR4), expecting 40G-LR4 will likely implement the similar limiting interface based on 4xLR.

SuggestedRemedy

Should add 87.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. 40G-LR4 is patterned after 100G-LR4, and we are not specifying a physical instantiation for the PMD service interface in that case. Could change based on clause 87 evolution.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.7 P 191 L 10 # 136  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Fix the TBDs

SuggestedRemedy

Replace: TBD control register TBD

with: the PMA/PMD control 1 register (register 1.0.0, see 45.2.1.1.4)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Actual comment applies to p192? (Double check)

Cl 83 SC 83.5.7 P 191 L 52 # 533  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

this Clause (83.5.7).

SuggestedRemedy

this subclause (83.5.7). Also for 83.5.8.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. Awaiting guidance from Ilango on appropriate use of clause/subclause.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.7 P 192 L 1 # 182  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Make system side loopbacks optional for any PMA sublayer, not just the umppermost. Many devices will implement them, so it would be good to have the management information to be consistent.

SuggestedRemedy

As above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Align with discussion of trowbridge\_02\_0109. Whether this is explicit or not, there is probably not an issue with the management interface as MDIO 1, 8, 9, 10 could each be the uppermost PMA and would have a control bit for system side loopback.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.7 P 192 L 1 # 590  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Having the PMA system loopback at the top of the PMA stack (i.e. inside the same chip as the PCS) means that doesn't test most of the PMA, and is not the way loopback is usually done. For example, 51.8 says NOTE-Loopback mode may be implemented either in the parallel or the serial circuitry of a device. and 50.3.9 says NOTE-The signal path through the WIS that is exercised in the Loopback mode of operation is implementation specific, but it is recommended that this signal path encompass as much of the WIS circuitry as is practical.

Three uses of system loopback - exercising the sublayers above, verifying correct operation of most of the PMA, and identifying a faulty part are achieved by this. If sometimes the lanes are re-ordered, so much the better for exercising the sublayers above. Diagnosing one bad lane is a specialist situation that this loopback need not cover - the lane by lane pattern checkers may be useful for this (although not in D1.1 where the checkers are below the loopback point).

The system loopback should be in the lowest PMA above any connector.

#### SuggestedRemedy

##### Change

At the PMA service interface, the uppermost PMA sublayer (the one closest to the PCS) may provide a system loopback function. The function involves looping back each input lane to the corresponding output lane. Each bit received from the PMA\_UNITDATA.requestx(tx\_bit) primitive is looped back in the direction of the PCS using the PMA\_UNITDATA.indicationx(rx\_bit) primitive.

to

The PMA sublayer directly above the higher of any demountable electrical connectors between sublayers (if there is no such connector, the lowest PMA) may provide a system loopback function. The function involves looping back each input lane to an output lane.

NOTE-The signal path through the PMA that is exercised in the Loopback mode of operation is implementation specific, but it is recommended that this signal path encompass as much of the PMA circuitry as is practical.

Adjust Fig 83-5 and change note 3 to 'See 83.5.7'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. Other comments cover possible adjustments to the loopbacks offered. There are several issues with the proposed change: we have referred to the loopback provided by the lowest PMA of input lanes to output lanes as "line loopback" rather than "system loopback". The purpose of a line loopback is to verify the link, so you really want to do this at the lowest PMA and not at the lowest exposed connector. For example, you wouldn't want to loop back a 10-lane CAUI module interface instead of the 4-lane PMD for 100GBASE-LR4.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.7 P 192 L 11 # 593  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In Clause 45, the MDIO bits are not 'logic one' and 'logic zero', they are just one and zero.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Delete 'logic', four times on this page.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.7 P 192 L 9 # 135  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

This paragraph should point to the Clause 45 ability & control bits

#### SuggestedRemedy

Replace the first sentence

If a Clause 45 MDIO is implemented, then this function maps to the PMA loopback function as specified in TBD.

with

If a Clause 45 MDIO is implemented, then the ability to perform this function is indicated in register 1.8.0 (45.2.1.7.15).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.8 P 192 L 14 # 328  
CHANG, Frank Vitesse

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Recommend 802.3ba adopt at least PMA line loopback as mandatory which is extremely usefully for RX SRS test.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Take out (optional)??

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. Needs consensus of TF to make this mandatory. See comment 624 about why line loopback may be difficult for some implementations.



CI 83 SC 83.5.8 P 192 L 19 # 624  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Line loopback is something you should not expect of the module. In particular, small 100G modules are likely to use a double decker construction with the separate transmit and receive planes and no cheap and satisfactory way of making a high speed connection between them.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change  
Line loopback is only applicable for the lowermost PMA (the one closest to the PMD) at the PMD service interface. When line loopback is enabled, each bit received over the PMD service interface via the x=0 to q-1. Note that "PMA server" can represent the FEC, PMD, or another PMA sublayer. PMAserver\_UNITDATA.indicationx(rx\_bit) primitive is sent back toward the PMD via the PMAserver\_UNITDATA.requestx(tx\_bit) primitive.  
to  
If the PMD can be removed, line loopback is only applicable for the PMA directly above the demountable electrical connector closest to the PMD at the PMD service interface. If the PMD cannot be removed, line loopback is only applicable for the lowermost PMA (the one closest to the PMD) at the PMD service interface.  
Adjust Fig 83-5 and change note 4 to 'See 83.5.7'

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. Line loopback is only meaningful if you can loop back the lanes of the PMD. If there are compelling reasons not to provide it for a particular implementation, loopback is optional.

CI 83 SC 83.5.8 P 192 L 20 # 202  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The text says: "When line loopback is enabled, each bit received over the PMD service interface via the x=0 to q-1. Note that "PMA server" can represent the FEC, PMD, or another PMA sublayer. PMAserver\_UNITDATA.indicationx(rx\_bit) primitive is sent back toward the PMD via the PMAserver\_UNITDATA.requestx(tx\_bit) primitive." which doesn't make sense.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "When line loopback is enabled, each bit received over the PMD service interface via the PMAserver\_UNITDATA.indicationx(rx\_bit) primitive is sent back toward the PMD via the PMAserver\_UNITDATA.requestx(tx\_bit) primitive."

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83 SC 83.5.8 P 192 L 20 # 532  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

via the x=0 to q- ?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Correct the paragraph.

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Replace "When line loopback is enabled, each bit received over the PMD service interface via the x=0 to q-1." with "When line loopback is enabled, each bit received over a lane of the PMD service interface via PMD\_UNITDATA.indicationx is looped back to the corresponding output lane via PMD\_UNITDATA.requestx". Delete the sentence about PMAserver because it is only relevant when PMAserver=PMD.

CI 83 SC 83.5.8 P 192 L 21 # 2  
Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Line 21 seems to be out of place, the paragraph makes no sense

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove line 21 and/or rephrase paragraph

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Repaired by other comments (532,202)

CI 83 SC 83.5.8 P 192 L 31 # 137  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The reference to Clause 45 should be fixed - it should also match the one in the previous subclause.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the first sentence in the paragraph from

If a Clause 45 MDIO is implemented, then this function maps to the PMA line loopback function as specified in 45.2.1.1.4.

to

If a Clause 45 MDIO is implemented, then the ability to perform this function is indicated in register 1.13.15 (45.2.1.12a.1).

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.8**    **P 192**    **L 33**    # **138**  
 Barrass, Hugh    Cisco

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**  
 Control register bit reference needs fixing

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 After "PMA/PMD Control register 1"  
 Add "(register 1.0.1, see 45.2.1.1.4a)"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**    **P 192**    **L 35**    # **293**  
 Cole, Chris    Finisar

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**  
 PMA test patterns sub-clause states in the text that PMA test patterns maybe optionally generated (line 38). However, the title of the sub-clause does not state that it is optional, which may lead to confusion that PMA test patterns have to be supported in a PMD.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 The title of the sub-clause should be changed to:  
 PMA test patterns (optional)  
 Similar for example to sub-clause 83.5.7 title (PMA system loopback mode (optional)).  
 Further clarification should be added that if the PMA contains a SerDes function (for example 10:4 as in 100GBASE-LR4 and 100GBASE-ER4) then test pattern support is not optional, and test patterns have to be supported.  
 Further clarification should be added that if the PMA does not support test patterns, then sub-clause 83.5.7 is not optional, and PMA system loopback mode must be supported. In other words, either PMA test patterns are optional or PMA PMA system loopback is optional, but not both. This is to permit verification of nAUI functionality by the host.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Adding (optional) to the titles as requested is OK. But test patterns remain optional without task force consensus to change this.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**    **P 192**    **L 3546**    # **325**  
 CHANG, Frank    Vitesse

**Comment Type ER**    **Comment Status D**  
 to define various test patterns.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Suggestto add the following paragraph:  
 PMA test patterns can be the square wave, PRBS31, and mixed-frequency test patterns as described in section 50.3.8 of IEEE Standard 802.3ae as well as the Test Signal Structure (TSS) and continuous identical digits (CID) pattern....

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT. Agreed test patterns are square 8, PRBS31, PRBS9 (based on other comments), and scrambled idles from the PCS, which are all described in the text.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**    **P 192**    **L 40**    # **594**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**  
 Draft says  
 These test patterns are not intended to traverse more than one sublayer or to be carried over an end-to-end Ethernet link. The test patterns may not be recoverable if they are rearranged through the bit multiplexing operations described in 83.5.2. I expect they may be used for e.g. stressed sensitivity or TDP testing where they will traverse at least a whole PMD sublayer plus part of a PMA. I believe that PRBS9 and PRBS31 are always recoverable even if rearranged through the bit multiplexing operations described in 83.5.2.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete both sentences. If you want some text, say what is intended not what is not. E.g. 'These test patterns are intended for testing an individual sublayer.'

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Accept the substitute text in the remedy rather than just deleting the sentences.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.9 P 192 L 42 # 436  
king, jonathan finisar

Comment Type T Comment Status D

If the PMA doesn't generate test patterns it should at least support them (ie, allow them to be transmitted through the PMA)

SuggestedRemedy

Add after "...operations described in 83.5.2.": If the PMA does not generate the test patterns, it should at least support them.

(or words to that effect)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. The only test pattern supported (in general) through the PMA is scrambled idles from the PCS. You can't gearbox a PRBS31, PRBS9, or square 8 and get a recognizable signal from a PMA(m:n) where m<>n.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.9 P 192 L 44 # 139  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Much more description is needed to map the functions to Clause 45.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "If a Clause 45 MDIO is supported, then these functions map to the PMA test pattern functions as specified in TBD."

With

If a Clause 45 MDIO is implemented, then the ability to perform this function is indicated in PRBS pattern testing control and status (register 1.19.15, see 45.2.1.1.12b). Support for PRBS31 is indicated by bit 1.19.14, support for PRBS9 is indicated by bit 1.19.13.

Support for transmit direction generation is indicated by 1.19.11 and checking by 1.19.10; support for receive direction generation is indicated by 1.19.9 and checking by 1.19.8.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.9 P 192 L 47 # 140  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Ditch the TBD!

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "(see TBD) is enabled"

With "is enabled by register 1.19.3 (see 45.2.1.1.12b)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.9 P 192 L 50 # 470  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

There is no requirement stated for the relative positions of the prbs sequences on the various lanes.

SuggestedRemedy

Add at the end of the paragraph. There shall be at least 31 bits delay between the PRBS31 patterns generated on one lane and any other lane.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. This is likely implementation specific whether to stagger alternate lanes or "any other lane", which could require 310 bits for a 10-lane interface. I don't know of other requirements like this in 802.3.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.9 P 192 L 52 # 141  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Ditch the TBD!

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "(see TBD) is enabled"

With "is enabled by register 1.19.1 (see 45.2.1.1.12b)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**                      **L 12**                      # **144**  
 Barrass, Hugh                                      Cisco

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Need a reference for Clause 45 register.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 After "is enabled" add "by register 1.19.0 (see 45.2.1.1.12b)"

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**                      **L 14**                      # **145**  
 Barrass, Hugh                                      Cisco

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Ditch the TBD!

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Replace TBD with "registers 1.30 through 1.39 (see 45.2.1.1.12d)"

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**                      **L 16**                      # **595**  
 Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 I believe that 'does not indicate a valid signal since the test pattern cannot, in general, transit the PMA and still be recognized.' is not correct. If the input is PRBS31 on all lanes, the output will be PRBS31 on all lanes. However, the PCS won't know what to do with it.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to 'does not indicate a valid signal since the test pattern is not meaningful to the PCS.'  
 Same at line 46.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT. You only get PRBS31 out of a PMA(m:n) when m=n.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**                      **L 20**                      # **146**  
 Barrass, Hugh                                      Cisco

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Editor's note suggests a choice between PRBS7 and PRBS9.

Choose PRBS9

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete the editor's note.

Replace the TBD's on line 23 and 28 with: "PRS9" "(see 68.6.1)" and "PRBS9"  
 Replace the TBD on line 25 and 31 with "PRBS9"

Replace both the TBDs on line 34 and 42 with "PRBS9"  
 Replace the second TBD on line 36 and 44 with "PRBS9"  
 Replace the TBD on line 34, 39, 45 and 47 with "PRBS9"

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**                      **L 20**                      # **165**  
 Gustlin, Mark                                      Cisco

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Make the short PRBS pattern PRBS9.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete the editor's notes, and anywhere that there is a TBD for the short PRBS pattern replace that with PRBS9 as appropriate. We had a meeting of interested parties (as solicited via the reflector) to discuss PRBS9 vs. other short patterns and the consensus was PRBS9 is the right choice.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**                      **L 20**                      # **101**  
 Bergmann, Ernie                                      Circadiant/JDSU

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Editor's note asking for resolution on choice of shorter test pattern

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 use PRBS9 here and elsewhere as it is already the choice in the LRM and SFP+ 10G documents.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**    **L 23**    # **447**  
 Dudek, Mike                                      JDSU

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

The most useful short pattern is the PRBS9, the same as the pattern used in Clause 68.  
 This is needed for measuring DDPWS as used in Clause 86

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change TBD to PRBS9 18 places. Remove if PRBS9

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**    **L 23**    # **147**  
 Barrass, Hugh                                      Cisco

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

Need a reference for Clause 45 register.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 After "is enabled" add "by register 1.19.3 (see 45.2.1.1.12b)"

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**    **L 26**    # **596**  
 Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

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

The only use for checking PRBS9 is if one can e.g. have most lanes carrying PRBS9 and one lane carrying PRBS31 for lane-by-lane diagnostics when the lanes may have been re-ordered. But I suspect this would need too much little-used PMA circuitry.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Consider deleting the check Tx TBD test pattern mode and check Rx TBD test pattern mode.

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT. There seems to be consensus to add PRBS9. All test patterns are optional.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**    **L 28**    # **148**  
 Barrass, Hugh                                      Cisco

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

Need a reference for Clause 45 register.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 After "is enabled" add "by register 1.19.1 (see 45.2.1.1.12b)"

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**    **L 34**    # **149**  
 Barrass, Hugh                                      Cisco

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

Need a reference for Clause 45 register.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 After "is enabled" add "by register 1.19.2 (see 45.2.1.1.12b)"

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**                      **P 193**    **L 36**    # **151**  
 Barrass, Hugh                                      Cisco

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

Ditch the TBD!

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Replace "TBD count" with "registers 1.20 through 1.29 (see 45.2.1.1.12c)"

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.9 P 193 L 38 # 656  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Note other comment on decision between test pattern generation/detection in both directions or only generate in Tx path and detect in Rx path combined with loopback.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In the event that it is decided to only generate test patterns in the Tx path and detect in the Rx path combined with loopback, the editors note can be removed since the case in question does not occur. If the decision is to generate and detect test patterns in both directions, one possibility is to send a test pattern downward in the Tx direction when in check test pattern mode for the Tx path from above. But this could be problematic if the interface below is not physically instantiated.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See presentation trowbridge\_02\_0109. If it is decided to only generate test patterns in Tx path and detect in Rx path, the problem goes away. Per presentation, if there is a decision to retain detection in Tx path, just gearbox test pattern even though garbage is sent downstream.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.9 P 193 L 38 # 627  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Expecting the analog-oriented power-challenged semiconductors in a module to generate and check all these test patterns. It is much easier done in a bigger more digitally oriented IC in the host.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change  
Where the output lanes of the PMA appear on a physically instantiated interface XLAUI/CAUI or the PMD service interface (whether or not it is physically instantiated), the PMA may optionally generate and detect test patterns.  
to  
Where the connection to the sublayer below uses a demountable connector, the PMA may optionally generate and detect test patterns.  
Change Figure 83-5 notes 1 and 2 to one note 'See 83.5.9'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. The concern is covered by the fact that test patterns are optional.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.9 P 193 L 4 # 604  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

D1.1 comment 89 expresses concern at the burden of counting at 10 GHz. If this was a concern for one lane at 10G, it will be a concern for 4 or 10 lanes wide here.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Investigate. We may wish to allow counting errored 66-bit blocks, which would be quite adequate if the errors are not bursty.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. No specific proposal for change to PMA. Counting errored 66B blocks is done at PCS and not at PMA.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.9 P 193 L 4 # 142  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Need a reference for Clause 45 register.

*SuggestedRemedy*

After "is enabled" add "by register 1.19.2 (see 45.2.1.1.12b)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.9 P 193 L 42 # 150  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Need a reference for Clause 45 register.

*SuggestedRemedy*

After "is enabled" add "by register 1.19.0 (see 45.2.1.1.12b)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**    **P 193**    **L 44**    # **152**  
 Barrass, Hugh    Cisco

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**  
 Ditch the TBD!

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Replace "TBD count" with "registers 1.30 through 1.39 (see 45.2.1.1.12d)"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**    **P 193**    **L 50**    # **544**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**  
 Editor's note says: Per comment #485, RIN testing involves transmitting a square wave on one lane only and another pattern (PRBS31) on the other lanes. Actually, it's one lane not modulated and a mixed-frequency pattern on the other lanes, and separately, square wave on one lane and don't care on the others.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Make RIN spec informative and don't provide pattern support for it. This works for Clause 86. However, 87 and 88 have RIN specs and there might be other reasons to have one lane with a different pattern. Will try to provide more info.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See presentation trowbridge\_02\_0109 and decide whether to support square 8 per lane.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**    **P 193**    **L 6**    # **143**  
 Barrass, Hugh    Cisco

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**  
 Ditch the TBD!

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Replace TBD with "registers 1.20 through 1.29 (see 45.2.1.1.12c)"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**    **P 194**    **L 1**    # **657**  
 Trowbridge, Stephen    Alcatel-Lucent

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**  
 Reconcile Tx square wave pattern with optical interface comment resolution. Is it necessary to have separate Tx square wave for each lane, with lanes not under test sending PRBS31?

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Align per consensus to be reached in January 2009. If separate Tx square wave per lane, also need clause 45 registers for enabling per lane.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See presentation trowbridge\_02\_0109 and resolve per discussion consensus

**Cl 83**    **SC 83.5.9**    **P 194**    **L 3**    # **448**  
 Dudek, Mike    JDSU

**Comment Type TR**    **Comment Status D**  
 We do need to be able to generate square wave pattern on one lane and typical data on the other lanes to measure RIN or QSQ with crosstalk effects included. There is no need to generate the square wave pattern on all lanes at the same time.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 At this sentence change "on each of the lanes" to "on the specified lane". Add per lane enabling of the square wave pattern, here and in clause 45. Note that if the PMA is set to transmit PRBS31 and any lanes are set to transmit square wave, then the square wave will be transmitted on those lanes and all other lanes will transmit PRBS31.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 [Editor's note: corrected clause number to Clause 83 from Clause 80]

See trowbridge\_02\_0109. Suggest that the specified lane transmit Square 8 and the other lanes transmit PRBS31. There is no point to transmitting a normal signal on the other (non square wave) lanes since a normal signal is meaningless without all of the lanes.

Cl 83 SC 83.5.9 P 194 L 5 # 597  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

When transmit test pattern is disabled

*SuggestedRemedy*

When transmit square wave test pattern is disabled  
These sentences 'When ... is disabled, the PMA returns to normal operation' need reworking or removal anyway, as another bit may divert the PMA from normal operation.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. Seems like overkill to try to spell out interaction and priorities between modes that are intended for use one at a time.

Cl 83 SC 83.6 P 194 L 13 # 598  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

four addressable instances for each possible PMA sublayer.

*SuggestedRemedy*

four addressable instances, one for each possible PMA sublayer.  
or  
four addressable instances for each port.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.6 P 194 L 16 # 153  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Ditch the TBD!

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace "as described in 45.TBD" with "at identical locations in MMD 8, 9 and 10."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.6 P 194 L 28 # 154  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 83-1.

Register names & locations to be filled in.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Each lane...

Name = Lane n PRBS Tx pattern testing error counter

Locations = 1.20..1.29

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83 SC 83.6 P 194 L 7 # 167  
Gustlin, Mark Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Add in the PMA round trip delay constraints, and make it consistent with the summary of constraints in clause 80. Also add in an appropriate PICS for this.

*SuggestedRemedy*

as above

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Seems to be asking for a missing requirement - may be better to put near the skew requirements rather than in the indicated location.

Cl 83 SC 83.6 P 195 L 5 # 155  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 83-1.

Register names & locations to be filled in.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Each lane...

Name = Lane n PRBS Rx pattern testing error counter

Locations = 1.30..1.39

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.



CI 83 SC 83.6.4 P 191 L 10 # 401  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This should be a requirement

A PMA with m input lanes and n output lanes must clock the output lanes at m/n times the rate of the input lanes. This applies in both the Tx and Rx directions of transmission.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change sentence to

A PMA with m input lanes and n output lanes shall clock the output lanes at m/n times the rate of the input lanes. This applies in both the Tx and Rx directions of transmission.

generate respective PIC

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83 SC 83.7.3 P 197 L 5 # 508  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

PICS overlooks some of the basics

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add major options:

40G or 100G

Number of lanes above this PMA (would be better done as a field to enter a number in like 'Date of Statement' on the previous page, rather than a yes/no multiple choice)

Number of lanes below this PMA

SP1SP6 needs to be split in two: nAUI above and nAUI below

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Add to PICS for lanes above and below and split SP1SP6 for XLAUI/CAUI above or below.

CI 83 SC 83.7.5 P 198 L 24 # 446  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

We should use PRBS9

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace "TBD short pattern" with "PRBS9" 4 places.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83A SC 83A.1 P 281 L 16 # 549  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Isn't it quite feasible to interoperate between a nAUI lane and an XFI spec part? Even to comply to both at once? Response to D1.1 comment 360 said 'Although this is feasible, there may be risks in explicitly stating it is interoperable with XFI. XFI loss budget including connector at 5.5GHz is 6dB. nAUI is looking at a 10dB budget.' This sounds like a yes.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Say that this spec is similar to XFI (part of XFP), add informative reference for XFP document, state to what extent they are interoperable. Is it when the loss is 6 dB or less at 5.5 GHz?

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Concern that adding information on how these interfaces can be considered interoperable will clutter the document

CI 83A SC 83A.1 P 349 L 29 # 414  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

XLAUI / CAUI are optional, but not noted that way in Fig 83A-1.I

*SuggestedRemedy*

note that xlaui / caui are optional in figure

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Add 1 superscript to XLAUI / CAUI

CI 83A SC 83A.1 P 350 L 26 # 510  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

What does 'Shared functionality with other 40 Gb/s or 100 Gb/s ethernet blocks' mean? It looks like a copy from Clause 47. As nAUI doesn't do its own coding, I don't see what functional blocks are shared.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete. If kept, correct 'ethernet' to 'Ethernet'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Delete

**Cl 83A**    **SC 83A.1**                    **P 350**        **L 26**                    # **509**  
 Dawe, Piers                                    Avago Technologies

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

What does 'Self-timed interface allows timing control at higher layers' mean?

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete 'allows timing control at higher layers'

**Proposed Response**                    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Intended to highlight that timing for XLAUI / CAUI interface is derived from higher layer clock domain

**Cl 83A**    **SC 83A.1.1**                    **P 350**        **L 21**                    # **480**  
 Dudek, Mike                                    JDSU

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

XLAUI/CAUI is the physical instantiation of the PMA to PMA interface. For correct operation XLAUI/CAUI requires the CDR of the PMA and the scrambling, and MLD coding of the PCS it therefore cannot be used for chip to chip communication other than from PMA to PMA.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete bullet a).

**Proposed Response**                    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 A presentation with respect to this may be forthcoming

**Cl 83A**    **SC 83A.1.1**                    **P 350**        **L 26**                    # **516**  
 Dawe, Piers                                    Avago Technologies

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

The project objective is 10<sup>-12</sup> BER. This draft says '[Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - condition for total jitter error rate at 1E-15 is proposed]' which is not consistent with the objective.  
 For those who want a very low BER nAUI-like non-Ethernet interface, when we have a spec for nAUI with module connector, they will have an ideal basis for a 10<sup>-15</sup> link without connector. Alternatively, we have FEC available. So there is no need to divert this project.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete the editor's note.

**Proposed Response**                    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83A**    **SC 83A.1.1**                    **P 350**        **L 27**                    # **244**  
 Latchman, Ryan                                    Gennum Corp

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

Remove Editors Note:

[Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - condition for total jitter error rate at 1E-15 is proposed]

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove

**Proposed Response**                    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83A**    **SC 83A.1.3**                    **P 350**        **L 26**                    # **511**  
 Dawe, Piers                                    Avago Technologies

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

'the data stream is converted into four lanes at the chip interface' - not. The conversion is done well inside an IC, not necessarily the IC with the nAUI interface.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to 'For 40 Gb/s applications, the data stream is presented in four lanes as described in Clause 83, and for 100 Gb/s applications, it is presented in ten lanes.'

**Proposed Response**                    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 83A**    **SC 83A.2**                            **P 350**        **L 49**                    # **245**  
 Latchman, Ryan                                    Gennum Corp

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

Remove Editor's note:  
 Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - Include definition of XLAUI, CAUI link block diagram, test points and channel boundaries in this section]

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove

**Proposed Response**                    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83A SC 83A.2 P 350 L 51 # 617
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D module

The primary purpose of the nAUI spec is the same as the XFI spec at 10G: to provide a standardised and interoperable spec for plugging retimed transceiver modules into line cards or similar.

As the reflector thread said, having this incomplete spec would be worse than no spec in 802.3ba at all.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the six TP compliance points and the compliance card transfer characteristics defined in 86.7.1, relegate the points in Fig 83A-2 to informative reference points like A and D in SFP+.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Proposal to include in Annex 83B

Cl 83A SC 83A.2.1 P 351 L 1 # 638
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type T Comment Status D compliance point

KR felt it sufficient to state that the path between the transmitter to testpoint be "carefully designed". To ensure future flexibility, perhaps we should do the same for the following TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

change: Any interconnect which has a loss less than (SDD21(dB) (TBD) ) f is given in GHz) between the XLAUI/ CAUI transmit pin and Transmit Compliance Point may be used as long as transmitter parameters of Table 83A-1 are met. to Any interconnect which minimizes the loss between the XLAUI/ CAUI transmit pin and Transmit Compliance Point may be used as long as transmitter parameters of Table 83A-1 are met.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Too many "Therefore" in last line. Change last line to: It is therefore recommended that this path be carefully designed.

Cl 83A SC 83A.2.1 P 351 L 5 # 246
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Remove Editor's Note:

[Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - Insert or change, to include definition of transmit test points]

SuggestedRemedy

Remove

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83A SC 83A.2.2 P 351 L 12 # 49
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D compliance point

XLAUI/CAUI in addition to loss definition it also require min return loss definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Per ghiasi\_01\_0708 page 16 SDD11= -12.5 dB from 0.01 to 5 Ghz SDD11=-12.5 + 27.5\*log10(f/5) f is from 0.01 to 5 to 11.1 GHz

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. Already defined in 83A-2

CI 83A SC 83A.2.2 P 351 L 12 # 631  
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type T Comment Status D compliance point

KR felt it sufficient to state that the path between the receiver to testpoint be "carefully designed". To ensure future flexibility, perhaps we should do the same for the following TBD. "Any interconnect which has a loss less than (SDD21(dB) (TBD) ) f is given in GHz"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change  
Any interconnect which has a loss less than (SDD21(dB) (TBD) ) f is given in GHz) between the XLAUI/ CAUI receive pin and Receive Compliance Point may be used as long as receiver parameters of Table 83A- 2 are met.

to

Any interconnect which minimizes the loss between the XLAUI/ CAUI receive pin and Receive Compliance Point may be used as long as receiver parameters of Table 83A-2 are met. The electrical path from the receiver block to receiver compliance point will affect link performance and the measured values of electrical parameters used to verify conformance to this standard.

Therefore, it is therefore recommended that this path be carefully designed.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Too many "Therefore" in last line. Change last line to:

It is therefore recommended that this path be carefully designed.

CI 83A SC 83A.2.2 P 351 L 12 # 48  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D compliance point

sdd21 MASK was defined in ghiasi\_01\_0708 but is TBD in the draft

*SuggestedRemedy*

please use the mask per definition of ghiasi\_01\_0708  
SDD21= -0.108 - 0.845\*sqrt(f) - 0.802\*f from 0.01 to 7 GHz  
SDD21=20-4\*f from 7 to 8 GHz  
SDD21=-21 dB from 8 to 11.1 GHz

Also see ghiasi\_01\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

6.5dB sounds significant given the channel loss budget is 10dB at 5.5GHz.

CI 83A SC 83A.2.2 P 351 L 15 # 247  
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Remove: [Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - Insert or change, to include definition of receive test points]

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83A SC 83A.2.2 P 351 L 21 # 517  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Diagram lacks the connector.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Show the connector. The transmit compliance points are looking upstream into the connector through a compliance board. The receive compliance points are looking upstream into the connector through a compliance board (for the compliance signal) and looking downstream into the connector through a compliance board (for S-parameters). If there is no connector, the implementer can slice the channel at a point of his choosing to create a point of observation. This might be at the same point in the channel for both directions but I don't think this is necessary. In other words, the implementer gets to choose the mix of transmit and receive emphasis when there is no connector.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Connector in path is optional

CI 83A SC 83A.2.2 P 351 L 24 # 51  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D compliance points

I submitted a comment to add lable on the transmit and receive compliance points

*SuggestedRemedy*

I suggest we use lable A and B

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

If we require lables, consider using TP style

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3** P **352** L **11** # **102**  
 Bergmann, Ernie Circadiant/JDSU

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

"eyemask as defined in Figure 83A-5" appears to contain a bad reference.

*SuggestedRemedy*

replace the reference 83A-5 -----> 83A-6

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Remove Editors Note

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3** P **352** L **11** # **248**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

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

Delete Editor Comments:  
 [Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - transmitter eyemask as defined in figure 83A-5 is not considered a sufficient description to guarantee performance; additional test methods are required]  
 Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - proposals for jitter methodology to be submitted against D1.1 for completion of TBDs]

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3** P **352** L **11** # **518**  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** *jitter*

Draft says 'transmitter eyemask as defined in figure 83A-5 is not considered a sufficient description to guarantee performance; additional test methods are required'.

When you have proper test points - a combination of a somewhat tighter absolute eye mask, jitter specs and either, relative eye mask, or, Qsq spec and control over baseline wander, should be adequate.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Reduce X2. Add a relative eye mask. Delete the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment was originally intended to highlight the lack of a de-emphasis spec, which is required to meet the Rx mask requirements. Additional presentation material required to justify reduction in X2

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3** P **352** L **14** # **52**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** *Jitter*

Jitter methodology need to be updated

*SuggestedRemedy*

In both SFP+ and CL 86 we have moved away from dual dirac DJ definition since DJ amount can go down as RJ is increased. Instead of breaking down the jitter componnets these group have just defined TJ at BER1E-2 as replacement for DJ and J12 as the TJ at 1E-12. Please see ghiasi\_01\_0109 for more details

Base on the above definition  
 then TJ(J12)=0.3 UI (to support BER 1E-15) otherwise it would be 0.32  
 J2=0.19 UI replacing DJ  
 Add DDPWS=0.1 UI when measured with PRBS9

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 DJ / RJ continues to be used through out the document (CL84, CL85, CL87, CL88) and has served more than adqately as a jitter methodology for many years.

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3** P **352** L **20** # **368**  
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**

Add an additional column to Table 83A-1 and provide reference to appropriate subclause where the transmit parameters are specified (See tables in Clause 84 or 85 for reference).

Same comment applies to Table 83A-3 Receiver characteristics

SuggestedRemedy  
 As per comment

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3** P **352** L **27** # **50**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** *de-emphasis*

To guarantee interoperability min transmitter pre-emphasis must be defined

SuggestedRemedy  
 xAU transmitter at compliance point near end must have 3.5 dB of de-emphasis see ghiasi\_01\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Additional de-emphasis would provide more margin in high loss case

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3** P **352** L **28** # **54**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** *de-emphasis*

Min receiver eye opening can not be guaranteed with min transmitter level and slow rise time and fall time

SuggestedRemedy  
 $Y2 = -16 + 9 * [\min(tr, tf)]$ , tr/ tf are 20-80% in ps see ghiasi\_01\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Updated equation required

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3** P **352** L **30** # **53**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** *de-emphasis*

To guarantee min eye opening at the receiver the transmitter output VMA or eye opening with de-emphasis must be defined

SuggestedRemedy  
 Propose to define min vertical eye opening=280 mV diff p-p with de-emphasis see ghiasi\_01\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Y1 value should be used to specify the minimum vertical eye opening

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3** P **352** L **38** # **481**  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** *jitter*

The specifications in this clause are for a transmitter without pre-emphasis (low Tx jitter) and a receiver with equalization (separate spec for non-equalizable jitter). It is intended that this transmitter will have pre-emphasis and the receiver will not require equalization. A transmitter with pre-emphasis is unlikely to meet these specs. Note it is unacceptable in a standard to say measure with pre-emphasis turned off and then turn on pre-emphasis with an assumption that this doesn't degrade the effective jitter as a solution to this.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Either  
 A. Specify the Tx output with low present jitter and eye mask specs at the output of a specified compliance channel of intermediate length, such that shorter and longer channels will achieve the Rx input jitter and eye mask specs.  
 B. Specify the Tx output with the same jitter and eye mask as the Rx input at both the Tx (no trace length) and at the end of a worst case specified compliance channel.  
 C. Specify the Tx output with a pulse mask. However this is likely to be difficult to control jitter without being very restrictive.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The methodology of turning off emphasis for output jitter measurements has been used in the past (KR)

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3** P **352** L **46** # **249**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** De-emphasis  
 XLAUI / CAUI Receive Eye mask can only be met by specifying a minimum level of de-emphasis.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add De-emphasis Specification to table  
 Parameter: Minimum De-emphasis  
 Value: 3.5dB  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment 50

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3** P **352** L **47** # **513**  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 defined in where?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change '83A.4.4' to a proper cross-reference to 86.7.4.3.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Rise/Fall time with de-emphasis is being defined in 83A.3.3.2

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.3.1** P **353** L **2** # **250**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** de-emphasis  
 Output Amplitude definition does not include de-emphasis which is needed to meet Rx compliant point  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Modify Text to:  
 Driver differential output amplitude shall be less than 760 mVp-p and greater than 380mVppd including transmit equalization. DC referenced logic levels are not defined since the receiver is AC-coupled. Single-ended output voltage range shall be between -0.4 V and 4.0 V with respect to ground.  
 De-emphasis shall be the ratio between the amplitude following a transition and the amplitude during a non-transition bit as seen in equation EEE. Amplitude measurements are taken using an averaged waveform and taken at the center of the respective UI. See Figure 83A-3 for an illustration of absolute driver output voltage limits, definition of differential peak-to-peak amplitude, and definition of pre-emphasis.

Modify Diagram to de-emphasis levels as seen in latchman\_xlc\_01\_1208.pdf  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Modify Text to:  
 Driver differential output amplitude shall be less than Y2 and greater than Y1 including transmit equalization. DC referenced logic levels are not defined since the receiver is AC-coupled. Single-ended output voltage range shall be between -0.4 V and 4.0 V with respect to ground.  
 De-emphasis shall be the ratio between the amplitude following a transition and the amplitude during a non-transition bit as seen in equation EEE. Amplitude measurements are taken using an averaged waveform and taken at the center of the respective UI. See Figure 83A-3 for an illustration of absolute driver output voltage limits, definition of differential peak-to-peak amplitude, and definition of pre-emphasis.

Modify Diagram to de-emphasis levels as seen in latchman\_xlc\_01\_1208.pdf

CI 83A SC 83A.3.3.2 P 353 L 31 # 251  
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type T Comment Status D rise fall

Rise/fall definition does not take into account de-emphasis

*SuggestedRemedy*

Modify text to:

Rise and fall times are measured from the 20% to the 80% levels of the differential voltage level. Note that, with de-emphasis, the voltage thresholds corresponding to 20% and 80% vary depending on the voltage level of the previous UI. Only those transitions crossing the zero threshold need to meet TR/TF limits defined in Table 83A-1. In Figure YYY, there are three distinct thresholds corresponding to deemphasized transitions from high to low, low to high, and full swing transitions in either direction. Rise / Fall Time must be validated for all four possible cases.

Include diagram from latchman\_xlc\_01\_1208.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83A SC 83A.3.3.2 P 353 L 32 # 367  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D rise fall

Include the Rise/fall time requirements in a shall statement and add corresponding PICS entry.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change sentence as follows and add a corresponding PICS entry.

Differential rise/fall times shall be greater than 24 ps, as measured between the 20% and 80% levels.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use shall statement to comment 251

CI 83A SC 83A.3.3.3 P 354 L 22 # 521  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

GRATUITOUS capitals: the huge majority of 802.3 figures in new clauses use mixed upper and lower case (as do the axes here).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 'PASS REGION' to 'Pass region' in several figures

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83A SC 83a.3.3.3 P 354 L 26 # 408  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

typo - Returnloss

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to "Return Loss"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 83A SC 83A.3.3.3 P 354 L 31 # 632  
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type T Comment Status D

following editor note has been addressed:

[Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - The Return Loss limits in Figure 83A-5 and Figure 83A-9 may have to be plotted in log linear scale with loss being positive. The definition or formatting to be reconciled similar to the definition or plots in base spec 802.3-2008 Annex 69B]

*SuggestedRemedy*

remove editors comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.



CI **83A** SC **83A.3.3.3** P **354** L **32** # **507**  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 Obsolete editor's note

SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **83A** SC **83A.3.3.5** P **355** L **31** # **261**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** *de-emphasis*  
 Transmitter jitter specification should be measured with de-emphasis off since this will unnecessarily contribute to the transmitter DJ

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change text to:

The eye templates are given in Figure 83A-6 and Table 83A-1. The template measurement requirements are specified in 83A.5.1. The jitter requirements at the transmitter are for a maximum total jitter of 0.32 UI peak-to-peak and a maximum deterministic component of 0.17 UI peak-to-peak. The maximum random jitter is equal to the maximum total jitter minus the actual deterministic jitter. Jitter measurement requirements are described in 83A.5.2, and are conducted with de-emphasis off.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **83A** SC **83A.3.3.5** P **355** L **34** # **482**  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 Incorrect reference

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change Table 83A-1 to 83A-7

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Table 83A-1 Describes Transmitter Characteristics

CI **83A** SC **83A.3.3.5** P **355** L **35** # **55**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** *jitter*  
 Jitter methodology need to be updated

SuggestedRemedy  
 In both SFP+ and CL 86 we have moved away from dual dirac DJ definition since DJ amount can go down as RJ is increased. Instead of breaking down the jitter components these group have just defined TJ at BER1E-2 as replacement for DJ and J12 as the TJ at 1E-12. Please see ghiasi\_01\_0109 for more details

Base on the above definition then TJ(J12)=0.3 UI (to support BER 1E-15) otherwise it would be 0.32 J2=0.19 UI replacing DJ Add DDPWS=0.1 UI when measured with PRBS9

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment 52

CI **83A** SC **83A.3.3.5** P **355** L **40** # **252**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 Remove Editor's Note  
 Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - Presentations needed with respect to corresponding BER for Jitter measurements]

SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **83A** SC **83A.3.4** P **356** L **26** # **253**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

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

Remove Editor's Note:  
 Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - proposals for jitter methodology to be submitted against D1.1 for completion of TBDs]

SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **83A** SC **83A.3.4** P **356** L **37** # **254**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

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

Minimum Differential Input Voltage Parameter is not useful in the table since it points to another area in the table (See receiver eye mask definition).

SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove Minimum Differential Input Voltage Parameter

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **83A** SC **83A.3.4** P **357** L **13** # **514**  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** jitter

Need something as well as TJ. Other comment objects to Maximum non-EQ Jitter (TJ - ISI)

SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace Maximum non-EQ Jitter (TJ - ISI) with a J2 spec. Refer to Clause 86 for definition.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment 52

CI **83A** SC **83A.3.4** P **357** L **13** # **552**  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** jitter

'non-EQ Jitter (TJ - ISI)' There's no definition of what 'non-EQ Jitter' means in this document, nor this usage of 'ISI'. I suspect if I saw one I would not agree with it ;-)

SuggestedRemedy  
 Find a better metric, or explain these terms.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment 255

CI **83A** SC **83A.3.4** P **357** L **13** # **56**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** jitter

Sine xAUI has defined mandatory de-emphasis there is little benefit to define non-EQJ which is difficult parameter to test or verify

SuggestedRemedy  
 Repalce non-EQJ with J2=0.48 UI  
 J12=0.62 UI this will result in J15 of 0.65 UI.  
 To to increase the test time the transmitter and receiver can be tested at J12 but the jitter tolerance defined at J15, see ghiasi\_01\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Instead of J2 and J12, use DJ and RJ terms

CI **83A** SC **83A.3.4** P **357** L **13** # **255**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** jitter

Maximum non-EQ Jitter is not well defined.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change Parameter to Maximum Deterministic Jitter

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83A SC 83A.3.4 P 357 L 18 # 515  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
Receiver eye mask definition Y1 45 mV is radically different to the similar thing in Table 86-11 (150 mV). While some difference is expected, this makes me think someone has miscalculated

SuggestedRemedy  
Review.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED REJECT.  
Simulation results verify that after the channel, 45mV is an appropriate spec

Cl 83A SC 83A.3.4.1 P 357 L 26 # 256  
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type T Comment Status D ber  
BER Target BER 1E-12. Section for lower BER values to be added

SuggestedRemedy  
Change TBD to 1E-12

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83A SC 83A.3.4.1 P 357 L 2633 # 495  
Li, Mike Altera

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ber  
BER for XLAUI/CAUI is still not settled in D1.1. The current consensus is that the normative specification will be set at a BER=10^-12, while BER=10^-15 will still be allowed for those who want to meet it. Current specification in D1.1 is thus considered to be for BER=10^-12, and specifications for 10^-15 are yet to be defined.

SuggestedRemedy  
Specification text for meeting BER=10^-15 for XLAUI/CAUI is needed.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Input on section which defines how to achieve lower BER required

Cl 83A SC 83A.3.4.2 P 357 L 38 # 483  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
To test the receiver the worst case input should be used.

SuggestedRemedy  
Replace "does not exceed" with "equals"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED REJECT. Lower jitter values are acceptable as an XLAUI / CAUI input

Cl 83A SC 83A.3.4.2 P 357 L 41 # 257  
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
No input has been received from Statistical Eye Adhoc. Remove:  
Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - Receiver Eye Mask may change as an outcome of the Statistical eye adhoc]

SuggestedRemedy  
Remove  
Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - Receiver Eye Mask may change as an outcome of the Statistical eye adhoc]

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83A SC 83A.3.4.3 P 358 L 23 # 258  
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
No input has been received on Rx input amplitude. This is covered by the Receiver template and therefore unnecessary

SuggestedRemedy  
Remove section 83A.3.4.3

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.4.4** P **359** L **4** # **551**  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

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

Figure 83A-8 Differential input return loss is the same as Figure 83A-4 Differential Output Returnloss. The file for D1.1 is already nearly as big as 802.3 Section 5 (3 projects, 19 clauses).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove Figure 83A-8 and refer to Figure 83A-4. Change the title of Figure 83A-4 to Differential input or output return loss.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Keeping input and output separate makes the document cleaner

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.4.8** P **289** L **14** # **618**  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

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

It's not clear that these jitter specs allow the two concatenated CDRs and an optical link, XFP style, that will be wanted when connecting e.g. a 40GBASE-LR4 module.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Modify the jitter specifications to be sure they do. This may mean that the specs on the transmit side and receive side differ - I think the single-tone sinusoidal jitter masks (Fig. 83A-10) have to differ. See dawe\_03\_1108.pdf.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 XLAUI / CAUI specs ensure retimed interface interoperability

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.4.8** P **360** L **50** # **57**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** jitter

no-EQJ require definition of channel s-parameter response too much complications when xAUI defines transmit de-emphasis

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace non-EQJ with TJ(J2) value of 0.48 UI and TJ(J12)=0.62 UI and J15=0.65 UI

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Modify non-EQJ to DJ. Additional input on E-15 operation required (additional section).

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.4.8** P **360** L **51** # **259**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** jitter

non-EQ jitter is no longer specified. Replace with DJ / RJ terms

*SuggestedRemedy*

The XLAUI/CAUI receiver shall have a peak-to-peak total jitter amplitude tolerance of at least 0.62 UI. This total jitter is composed of two components: Deterministic Jitter and Random Jitter. Deterministic jitter tolerance shall be at least 0.42 UIp-p. The XLAUI/CAUI receiver shall tolerate sinusoidal jitter with any frequency and amplitude defined by the mask of Figure 83A-10. This sub-component of deterministic is intended to ensure margin for low-frequency jitter, wander, noise, crosstalk and other variable system effects.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **83A** SC **83A.3.4.8** P **52** L # **58**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** ber

Optional operation at BER 1E-15

*SuggestedRemedy*

A receiver capable of operating at stress jitter tolerance of TJ(J12)=0.65 UI would have sufficient margin for operation at BER 1E-15 since the max TJ(J12) from the worst case channel is TJ(J12)=0.62 UI see ghiasi\_01\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Proposed addition to section on 1E-15 section.

Use TJ at a given BER instead of (J12), (J15) terms

State that additional jitter would be comprised of RJ as per jitter tolerance test requirement

Cl **83A** SC **83A.4** P **361** L **24** # **260**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** channel

Replace Editor's comments with text from latchman\_xlc\_01\_1208.pdf

*SuggestedRemedy*

This section describes informative characteristics which are used to describe an XLAUI / CAUI channel.

- The informative values for insertion loss are summarized in table YYY and equation ZZZ. Other impairments such as crosstalk can have a material impact on the link performance and should be minimized

Where tables are found in latchman\_xlc\_01\_1208.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **83A** SC **83A.4** P **361** L **26** # **59**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** channel

XLAUI/CAUI in addition to loss definition it also require min return loss definition.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Per ghiasi\_01\_0708 page 16

SDD11= -12.5 dB from 0.01 to 5 Ghz

SDD11=-12.5 + 27.5\*log10(f/5) f is from 0.01 to 5 to 11.1 GHz

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **83A** SC **83A.4.1** P **361** L **32** # **262**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** channel

Replace editorial (Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - Insert or change, to include interconnect definition]) comment with loss discription found in latchman\_xlc\_01\_1208.pdf

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the following text:

Interconnect loss limit is discribed by the following equation:  
 (equation from latchman\_xlc\_01\_1208.pdf)

where b1, b2, b3, b4, f1, f2, fmax are given in the following table  
 (table from latchman\_xlc\_01\_1208.pdf)

Insert plot from latchman\_xlc\_01\_1208.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **83A** SC **83A.4.1** P **361** L **36** # **60**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** channel

sdd21 MASK was defined in ghiasi\_01\_0708 but is TBD in the draft

*SuggestedRemedy*

please use the mask per definition of ghiasi\_01\_0708

SDD21= -0.108 - 0.845\*sqrt(f) - 0.802\*f from 0.01 to 7 GHz

SDD21=20-4\*f from 7 to 8 GHZ

SDD21=-21 dB from 8 to 11.1 GHz

Also see ghiasi\_01\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

At 5.5GHz, this corresponds to -6.5dB. XLAUI / CAUI channel should support -10dB

CI **83A** SC **83A.4.1** P **362** L **30** # **409**  
 D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** channel  
 longer reaches for nAUI interconnects are possible via use of better board materials

SuggestedRemedy  
 change first paragraph on 362 to read

The XLAUI/CAUI is primarily intended as a point-to-point interface of up to approximately 25 cm between integrated circuits using controlled impedance traces on low-cost printed circuit boards (PCBs). Longer reaches for the XLAUI / CAUI may be achieved by the use of better PCB materials, as the performance of an actual XLAUI/CAUI interconnect is highly dependent on the implementation.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **83A** SC **83A.4.1.1** P **362** L **31** # **263**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 No material received with respect to characteristic impedance

SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove section and comment

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **83A** SC **83A.5** P **362** L **39** # **264**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 Replace editor's comment with actual text

SuggestedRemedy  
 This section describes the measurement methodology which is to be used to verify XLAUI / CAUI compliance

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **83A** SC **83A.5.1** P **362** L **45** # **266**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 No input on eye template measurements. Remove section.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Also remove reference in 83A.3.4.2

"The template measurement requirements are specified in 83A.5.1."

CI **83A** SC **83A.5.2** P **363** L **19** # **267**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 Editor's comments replace with text. Remove:  
 [Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - Insert or change, to include jitter test requirement]  
 [Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - need a proposal to use a reference clock recovery unit]  
 [Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - This section should include at what BER the eye mask has to be met]

SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace with:

The following sections describe how to measure transmit jitter compliance and receive jitter compliance

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83A SC 83A.5.2.1 P 362 L 43 # 265  
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Incomplete transmit jitter measurement methodology. Replace following text: The clock recovery unit (CRU) used in the transmit jitter measurement has a corner frequency of less than or equal to 4 MHz and a slope of -20 dB/decade (need figure consistent with text). When using a CRU as a clock for jitter measurements.

[Editor's note: (to be removed prior to publication) - Insert or change, to include transmit jitter]

With below

#### SuggestedRemedy

Include the following text:

Transmit jitter is defined with respect to a test procedure resulting in a BER bathtub curve such as that described in Annex 48B.3. For the purpose of jitter measurement, the effect of a singlepole high-pass filter with a 3 dB point at 4 MHz is applied to the jitter. The data pattern for jitter measurements shall be test patterns YYY or WWW as defined in CCCCC. Crossing times are defined with respect to the mid-point (0 V) of the AC-coupled differential signal. Equalization shall be off during jitter testing.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 83A SC 83A.5.2.2 P 363 L 38 # 268  
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type T Comment Status D Interference Test

Formal text on jitter tolerance / stressed test required

#### SuggestedRemedy

See presentation

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See latchman\_02\_0109

Cl 83A SC 83A.5.2.2 P 363 L 38 # 279  
SUZUKI, Toshihiro Anritsu Company

Comment Type T Comment Status D Interference Test

There are two Editor's Notes on 83A 5.2.2.  
One is "interference tolerance test" and the other is "test pattern".  
This proposal compensates these two items.

#### SuggestedRemedy

No.1 Interference test  
For the interference test of the high speed backplanes, at least three synchronized-pattern streams are required;  
one stream is a victim under the test and two adjacent streams are as aggressors.  
To maximize the interference, aggressors' amplitude should be set at the maxim. And switching timing among aggressors and victim pattern should be same.  
But the pattern should be different aggressors and victim to increase the simultaneous switching effect.  
Victim's amplitude should be set at the minimum.

No.2 Test pattern of the jitter tolerance  
PRBS31 is good for testing the jitter tolerance of the optical modules, which simply requires the physical characterizations.  
But for the equipments, the test pattern should include the "Alignment Marker" to drive the alignment circuit.  
In the large scale of the FPGA / ASIC, the higher percentage usage of the circuit makes the internal power level drifting due to the simultaneous switching.  
The switching reduces the jitter tolerance margin of the chips in the asynchronous clocks. Inside of FPGA / ASIC, there are two different clocks to drive 66bit logic block and 64bit logic block.  
Between these asynchronous clocks, the amount of jitter is difference. So this makes jitter tolerance worse.  
To test the switching affects of the equipment the test pattern of the jitter tolerance test should include the "Alignment Marker".

For more detail about test system and test pattern, please refer to presentation.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Work with comment 268

Cl **83A** SC **83A.5.3** P **363** L **47** # **512**  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** rise fall

Rise/fall time is defined in 86.7.4.3 Transition time. No need to do it again.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Either,  
 Replace editor's note with  
 Rise/fall time is defined as transition time in 86.7.4.3.  
 Change title to  
 Rise/Fall time  
 OR  
 Replace editor's note with  
 Transition time is defined as transition time in 86.7.4.3.  
 Change title to  
 Transition time  
 In Table 83A-1, change 'Output Rise and Fall time' to 'output transition time', and similarly  
 in Table 83A-2 and in 83A.7.4. In the footnote, change 'Rise/Fall time' to 'Transition time'.  
 In 83A.3.3.2, change Rise/fall to Transition.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Rise fall time with de-emphasis is being defined in: 83A.3.3.2  
 see comment 269

Cl **83A** SC **83A.5.3** P **363** L **48** # **269**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** rise fall

Remove section (rise/fall time measurement is described in rise / fall time section)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove 83A.5.3

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **83A** SC **83A.6** P **363** L **51** # **623**  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

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

Like a PMA or PCS clause, nAUI is completely on a single line card or similar, so the draft  
 doesn't need environmental specifications for it. Compare 14.7: the only part that might  
 apply is  
 14.7.1 General safety  
 All equipment meeting this standard shall conform to IEC 60950:1991.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the subclause or replace the editor's note with 'All equipment subject to this clause  
 shall conform to IEC 60950-1.'

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This was discussed at the last meeting and it was felt that environmental specifications  
 were needed

Cl **83A** SC **83A.6** P **363** L **53** # **410**  
 D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

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

environmental specifications are missing.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Copy environmental specifications from 84.10

83A.6.1 General safety  
 All equipment subject to this clause shall conform to applicable sections (including isolation  
 requirements) of IEC 60950-1.  
 83A.6.2 Network safety  
 The designer is urged to consult the relevant local, national, and international safety  
 regulations to ensure compliance with the appropriate requirements.  
 83A.6.3 Installation and maintenance guidelines  
 It is recommended that sound installation practice, as defined by applicable local codes  
 and regulations, be followed in every instance in which such practice is applicable.  
 83A.6.4 Electromagnetic compatibility  
 A system integrating the 40GBASE-KR4 PHY shall comply with applicable local and  
 national codes for the limitation of electromagnetic interference.  
 83A.6.5 Temperature and humidity  
 A system integrating the 40GBASE-KR4 PHY is expected to operate over a reasonable  
 range of environmental conditions related to temperature, humidity, and physical handling  
 (such as shock and vibration). Specific requirements and values for these parameters are  
 considered to be beyond the scope of  
 this standard.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.



CI **83A** SC **83A.7** P **364** L **1** # **270**  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 Ensure all PICS have corresponding Shall statement  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 modify text to include shall statements as per the PICS  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Text proposals needed

CI **83A** SC **83A1.2** P **350** L **31** # **661**  
 Palkert, Thomas Luxtera  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** module  
 The XLAUI/CAUI should include specifications to guarantee operation with a connectorized module.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change from 'The application of the optional XLAUI/CAUI is primarily intended as a chip-to-chip (integrated circuit to integrated circuit) interface implemented with traces and potentially one connector on a printed circuit board. The XLAUI/CAUI allows interconnect distances of approximately 25 cm over printed circuit board, see 83A.4.1.'  
 To: 'The application of the optional XLAUI/CAUI is intended as:  
 1) a chip-to-chip (integrated circuit to integrated circuit) interface implemented with traces on a printed circuit board.  
 or  
 2) a chip-to-module (integrated circuit to connector) interface implemented with traces on a printed circuit board and one connector.  
 The XLAUI/CAUI allows interconnect distances of approximately 25 cm over printed circuit board, see 83A.4.1.'  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Propose separate section for chip to module application

CI **83A** SC **83A2.2** P **351** L **21** # **662**  
 Palkert, Thomas Luxtera  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** module  
 Fig. 83A-2 does not include a connectorized module interface  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Modify Fig. 83A-2 to include a connectorized module interface or add an additional diagram.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See 661

CI **83A** SC **Annex 83A** P **349** L **4** # **295**  
 Cole, Chris Finisar

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** module

Annex 83A (XLAUI and CAUI) only specifies a chip to chip (i.e. component to component) interface and does not specify a chip to module (i.e. component to module) interface.

The optical interfaces specified in sub-clause 87 (40GBASE-LR4) and sub-clause 88 (100GBASE-LR4 and 100GBASE-ER4) require a chip (component) to module XLAUI and Caui interface, respectively. Unfortunately, the nAUI terminating component test points inside the module are not available as compliance or test points. They are permanently mounted inside the module, and the only available compliance and test points are at the module pins. This means that for sub-clause 87 and sub-clause 88, the electrical interface is not specified. The chip to chip specifications are not usable.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Annex 83B 40Gb/s Attachment Unit Interface (XLAUI) and 100Gb/s Attachment Unit Interface (CAUI) should be added, which mirrors all the specifications in Annex 83A but with different values. While it is preferable for Annex 83B to be Normative, it can be discussed if Annex 83B could be Informative.

Block diagram, 83A.2.2 becomes block diagram 83B.2.2 with the right side box name changed from XLAUI/CAUI component to XLAUI/CAUI module.

All the specification in 83B then only apply to right side (module) test points The left hand side, or component or chip test points, are still specified in Annex 83A.

The updated specifications for the module test points can be based on the following channel parameters, which can be further discussed to get general agreement as to the appropriate values:

Max module trace length 3"  
 Max module vias: 2  
 Max host trace length 8" (or 6")  
 Max host vias: 2

Connector limits (similar to XFP connector):

Max connector insertion loss: 0.5dB at 5GHz  
 Max connector return loss: 21dB at 5GHz  
 Max crosstalk: 36dB at 5GHz

Compliance curves can be generated based on these limiting values.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Concensus required for 83B

CI **84** SC **84.2.1.1** P **201** L **10** # **499**  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

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

spurious space in "PMD\_UNITDATA.request0 (tx\_bit)" to "PMD\_UNITDATA.request3 (tx\_bit)"  
 Also applies to 84.2.2

#### SuggestedRemedy

Remove the space. ie change "PMD\_UNITDATA.request0 (tx\_bit)" to "PMD\_UNITDATA.request0(tx\_bit)" etc.

Do the equivalent in 84.2.2

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **84** SC **84.2.1.4** P **201** L **29** # **500**  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

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

84.2.1.4 PMD\_UNITDATA.indication should be a heading 3 i.e. 84.2.2 and the next heading (currently 84.2.2) should be a heading 4 i.e. 84.2.2.1

#### SuggestedRemedy

change the current 84.2.1.4 to heading 3 and change the current 84.2.2 to heading 4

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

also see comment 86

CI **84** SC **84.2.1.4** P **201** L **29** # **86**  
 Marris, Arthur Cadence

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

Renumber subcluse 84.2.1.4 to 84.2.2

#### SuggestedRemedy

As above

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

also see comment 500

CI 84 SC 84.3 P 202 L 26 # 629  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This clause can't tell the PCS what to do. That's what the PCS clause is for - and it already does so in 82.6

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 'shall' to 'must', delete 84.11.4.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

also need to remove reference to Clause 49.

Change to

"The PCS associated with this PMD is required to support the AN service interface primitive AN\_LINK.indication defined in 73.9. (See 82.6.)"

and delete 84.11.4.1.

CI 84 SC 84.4 P 202 L 38 # 87  
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove TBDs for the delay constraints

*SuggestedRemedy*

It is OK to make these the same as Clause 72 as the delays will be equivalent to 10GBASE-KR.

Change TBD (1024) to 1024 and TBD (160) to 160.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

For pause control we are interested in the amount of data in flight not the transit time. Given the same channel/phy/pcs characteristics, 40G has 4x, and 100G 10x the data in flight as 10G.

Therefore the numbers need to be four times those of Clause 72.

Change TBD (1024) to 4096 and TBD (160) to 640.

CI 84 SC 84.4 P 202 L 39 # 281  
Healey, Adam LSI Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Delay constraints are marked TBD. There is no clear reason why the 40GBASE-KR requirements should differ significantly from 10GBASE-KR requirements.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove "(TBD)" and text highlighting to set the PMD plus medium delay to 1024 bit times. Also remove the TBD and highlighting to indicate that the assumed delay through the medium is 160 bit times.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The numbers need to be four times those of Clause 72.

Change TBD (1024) to 4096 and TBD (160) to 640.

See comment 87

CI 84 SC 84.4 P 202 L 39 # 354  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Update the Transmit and Receive delay contributed by 40GBASE-KR4 PMD to 1024 BT and round trip medium delay to 160BT and remove the TBDs.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In 84.4 Delay constraints change the delay requirements as follows and also update corresponding entry in Table 80-2:

The sum of the transmit and the receive delays contributed by the 40GBASE-KR4 PMD and medium shall be no more than 1024 bit times. It is assumed that the round-trip delay through the medium is 160 bit times.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The numbers need to be four times those of Clause 72.

Change TBD (1024) to 4096 and TBD (160) to 640.

See comment 87

**Cl 84**    **SC 84.5**                      **P 202**            **L 48**            # **283**  
 Healey, Adam                              LSI Corporation

**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Figure 80-3 does not apply to 40GBASE-KR4.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove reference.

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Yes it does for the case with a separate FEC chip.

**Cl 84**    **SC 84.5**                      **P 203**            **L 7**            # **355**  
 Ganga, Ilango                              Intel

**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Measurement total skew and dynamic skew for 40GBASE-KR4 is not defined and is left to the implementors to comply with the skew requirements.

Hence delete the last sentence of 84.5.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete the following sentence at the end of 84.5

The measurements of Total Skew and Dynamic Skew are defined in 84.xx.xx.

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 84**    **SC 84.6**                      **P 203**            **L 18**            # **88**  
 Marris, Arthur                              Cadence

**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Table number is wrong

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change Table 84-1 on page 203 to 84-2 and similarly for Table 84-2 on page 204

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 84**    **SC 84.7**                      **P 205**            **L 18**            # **89**  
 Marris, Arthur                              Cadence

**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Add lane by lane signal detect function similar to the one described in Clause 85.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 As above

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 360

**Cl 84**    **SC 84.7**                      **P 205**            **L 32**            # **90**  
 Marris, Arthur                              Cadence

**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Add lane by lane transmit disable similar to the one defined in Clause 85

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 As above

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 361

**Cl 84**    **SC 84.7.10**                      **P 206**            **L 22**            # **364**  
 Ganga, Ilango                              Intel

**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Update the text in 84.7.10 to indicate the PMD control function requirement by including a shall statement.

Also add a PICS entry for the requirements specified in 84.7.10 PMD control function.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change sentence as follows and add a corresponding PICS entry to 84.11.

Each lane of the 40GBASE-KR4 PMD shall use the same control function as 10GBASE-KR, as defined in 72.6.10.

**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Also see comment 91

**Cl 84**    **SC 84.7.10**    **P 206**    **L 22**    # **91**  
Marris, Arthur    Cadence

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**  
Missing shalls

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Line 22 change 'uses' to 'shall use'  
Line 37 change 'is' to 'shall be'  
Line 41 change 'are' to 'shall be'  
Page 207 line 3 change 'are' to 'shall be'

also change PICS as necessary

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

also line 32 change 'are' to 'shall be'

Also see comment 364 and 365

**Cl 84**    **SC 84.7.4**    **P 205**    **L 1**    # **360**  
Ganga, Ilango    Intel

**Comment Type TR**    **Comment Status D**  
Add a subclause below 84.7.4 for lane by lane signal detect function and renumber the subclauses accordingly.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Add 84.7.5 PMD lane-by-lane signla detect function

When the MDIO is implemented, each PMD\_signal\_detect\_n value, where n represents the lane number in the range 0:3, shall be continuously updated according to the requirements of 84.7.4.

Add description for lane by lane signal detect 0 to 3 in 84.7.5 (see 85.7.4 for reference or 84.7.4 last paragraph has description for PMD\_signal\_detect\_n).

Add corresponding register bit references to Table 84-1.

Add corresponding PICS entry

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 84**    **SC 84.7.5**    **P 205**    **L 19**    # **361**  
Ganga, Ilango    Intel

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**  
Add a subclause below 84.7.5 for lane by lane transmit disable function and renumber the subclauses accordingly.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Add 84.7.6 PMD lane-by-lane transmit disable function

See 85.7.7 for reference.

Corresponding register bit references are already added to Table 84-1.

Add corresponding PICS entry as appropriate

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 84 SC 84.8 P 206 L 28 # 615  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Submitted again with clarification as the response did not address the main point. 84.8 refers to 72.7, which says '...the PMD sublayer is standardized at test points TP1 and TP4 as shown in Figure 72-1. The electrical path from the transmitter block to TP1, and from TP4 to the receiver block, will affect link performance and the measured values of electrical parameters used to verify conformance to this standard. Therefore, it is recommended that this path be carefully designed.' In other words, there is no expectation that a board from vendor A, a backplane from B and another board from C can be expected to interoperate reliably, because each of them can spend as much of the shared channel budget as he pleases. This is not an interoperability spec, it's just an advertisement for some ICs. Is this what we want? An interoperability spec must have PMD electrical specs related to the connectors so that boards from different vendors can be interchanged. This true whether or not the channel is normative. For my part, I can't see why the backplane from one connector to the other should not be normative.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Discuss. Options are: make Clause 84 into a proper interoperability spec with PMD test points related to the connectors (Clause 86 will have to do much of that work anyway), delete the clause, move it to an annex, or accept that it's not a proper spec. Also consider giving a normative backplane spec from one connector to the other - Clause 85 has a normative cable spec.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Making any part of the backplane channel spec normative is in conflict with the adopted baseline proposal.

For reference this is the final accepted response to the comment made against the 1.0 draft:

"The 802.3ap project specified the backplane interconnect characteristics to be informative, with a normative description of receiver testing, which ensures interoperability.

The baseline proposal voted in by the task force for 40GBASE-KR4 adopted the 802.3ap informative channel. Making the channel normative as the commenter seems to request would be big change."

CI 84 SC 84.8 P 206 L 32 # 365  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Update the text in 84.8.1 and 84.8.2 to indicate the Transmit and receive requirements by including a shall statements.

Add corresponding shall statements for each requirement.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change the following sentences in 84.8 and add corresponding PICS entries to 84.11 to cover those requirements.

Transmitter electrical characteristics at TP1 for 40GBASE-KR4 shall be the same as 10GBASE-KR, as detailed in 72.7.1.1 through 72.7.1.11.

The same test fixture as 10GBASE-KR shall be used on all lanes as described in 72.7.1.1

The receiver interference tolerance tests shall be the same as those described for 10GBASE-KR in 72.7.2.1 and Annex 69A.

Receiver electrical characteristics at TP4 for 40GBASE-KR4 shall be the same as 10GBASE-KR, as detailed in 72.7.1.1 through 72.7.2.5.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Also see comment 91

CI 84 SC 84.9 P 207 L 14 # 366  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Include appropriate multilane cross talk for 40GBASE-KR4 per Editor's note and delete the Editor's note.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Need a more detailed remedy

CI 85 SC 10 P 233 L 48 # 667  
Balasubramanian, Vittal FCI USA, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The equations for generating the fit line for any data to test to the limit line as specified in equations 85-24 through 85-29 are faulty (See attached supporting document.)

The equation just extends what was accepted in IEEE 802.3ap as the equation. In light of the presented data, it is necessary to revisit the equation. The fit line, as it stands now, can cause some connectors which actually pass the requirements in raw data to fail the requirements with the fit line.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Need to come up with a new equation for the fit line which takes into account the low frequency data also when coming up with the fit line to test against the limit line.

Resolution will be provided in a supporting document.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

For sub-task force review. Although I generally agree that the least mean squares line fit can be improved for CR4 and CR10 ICR I had looked at this and observed that all of the line fit alternatives I utilized had issues with different channel structures (response shapes). I Recommend extending this effort into working group ballot and not replace current method without extensive review of a wider range of channel topologies and response shapes.

CI 85 SC 10.4 P 232 L 1 # 663  
Palkert, Thomas Luxtera

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The return loss spec needs to be modified to accept short cables with bad return loss and longer cables with good return loss.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Consider adding an Insertion loss to return loss ratio similar to the ICR curve. (Presentation will be provided)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace 85.10.4 Cable assembly return loss Equation (85-18) and Equation (85-19).

Return Loss(f) = 10  
for 100 MHz = f < 1250 MHz  
Return Loss(f) = 10 - 7 x log10(f/1250)  
for 1250 MHz = f = 10000 MHz

CI 85 SC 13 P 245 L 33 # 664  
Balasubramanian, Vittal FCI USA, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Row 2, column 2 in the Table in section 85.13.4.5 showing channel specifications has a spelling mistake.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Correct "insertion loss" to "Insertion loss"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 85 SC 85.1 P 171 L 30 # 630  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Direct attach links can be set up with the transmit emphasis appropriate to the lossiest rated cable and would be expected to be fine with all other cables. Or, the cable's I2C registers can be interrogated and transmit emphasis chosen accordingly. I don't yet see any evidence that Clause 73's handshaking Training is needed for 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10 as opposed to KR.

*SuggestedRemedy*

If there is evidence, present it. If not, define a fixed transmit emphasis and don't use Training.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT

40GBASE-KR4 will use the transmitter and receiver electrical characteristics of 10GBASE-KR as a baseline. Consistency with Clause 84 (KR4) will be maintained whenever possible. I2C are not specified in 802.3ba.

CI 85 SC 85.1 P 171 L 30 # 613  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Exchange of DME frames is an unnecessary burden on the host. It is not necessary for these copper links, and should not appear on front-panel ports. The choice of link types is 4 x 3.125 lanes, 4x10G lanes, and 4x10G lanes with FEC, and this can be managed with 'Parallel Detection' not DME frames.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add text in Clause 85 saying that 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10 use Parallel Detection.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Proposal insufficiently supported and lacking sufficient recommended changes to implement in the draft.

CI 85 SC 85.10 P 228 L 228 # 601  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The SFP+ direct attach cable specification includes DC blocking capacitors. Maybe this has grounding advantages.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Why doesn't this cable specification?

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

AC-coupling is provided at the receiver, as defined in 85.8.4.3.

CI 85 SC 85.10 P 228 L 36 # 302  
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Remove TBDs- 85.10 Cable assembly characteristics  
85.10.2 Cable assembly insertion loss - equation (85-9)  
85.10.3 Cable assembly insertion loss deviation (ILD) - equation (85-16 and 85-17)  
85.10.8 Cable assembly insertion loss to crosstalk ratio (ICRCA) - equation (85-23)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove TBDs - 85.10 Cable assembly characteristics  
85.10.2 Cable assembly insertion loss - equation (85-9)  
85.10.3 Cable assembly insertion loss deviation (ILD) - equation (85-16 and 85-17)  
85.10.8 Cable assembly insertion loss to crosstalk ratio (ICRCA) - equation (85-23)

See diminico\_02\_1108.pdf.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 85 SC 85.10 P 229 L 10 # 70  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Cable missing pulse response or group delay, this is required for development of comprehensive stress generator as well as non compliant cables

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please add pulse response for the cable, for response see ghiasi\_03\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Pulse response provided is not sufficient i.e., it's not the pulse response of minimally compliant CR4/CR10 cable assembly.



CI 85 SC 85.10 P 229 L 10 # 300  
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
insertion loss deviation cell should be min=-1.73 dB and max=1.73 per equations (85-16) and (85-17).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Table 85.6 delete "Maximum" in "description" cell for insertion loss deviation at 5.15625 GHz and delete "8.89" in "value" cell. Replace deleted cell with min=-1.73 and max=1.73. The values were determined using equations (85-16) and (85-17).

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 85 SC 85.10 P 229 L 10 # 286  
Healey, Adam LSI Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
Reported insertion loss deviation at 5.15625 GHz does not appear to be consistent with 85.10.3.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please correct to be consistent.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Suggested remedy comment #300

CI 85 SC 85.10 P 229 L 13 # 71  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
Retrun loss missing

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add differential retrun loss=-12 + 2\*sqrt(f) f from 0.01 to 4.1 GHz  
= -6.3 + 13\*log10(f/5.5) from 4.1 to 11.1 GHz

Add common mode retrun loss = -7.51 + 1.1 \*f from 0.01 to 4.1 GHz and -3 dB from 4.1 to 11.1 GHz

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED REJECT.

Differential return loss specified. See remedy comment#663.

Common mode return loss proposal insufficiently supported or justified.

CI 85 SC 85.10 P 229 L 14 # 72  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
Output common mode voltage missing

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add output common mode voltage of 13.5 mV RMS when input driver to the cable has 12 mV of RMS common mode voaltage.

An acceptable method of generating common mode voltage if the driver does not have sufficient common mode is by adjusting P and N.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED REJECT

Proposal insufficiently supported and lacking sufficient recommended changes to implemet in the draft.

CI 85 SC 85.11.1.1 P 237 L 1 # 404  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
spelling error - receivr

*SuggestedRemedy*  
change to receiver

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 85 SC 85.11.2 P 238 L 36 # 308  
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
Remove TBDs for the SFF-8642 connector.

*SuggestedRemedy*

The connector for each end of the cable assembly shall be the SFF-8642 plug with the mechanical mating interface defined by IEC XXXXX-X-XX and illustrated in Figure 85-14.

The MDI connector shall be the SFF-8642 receptacle with the mechanical mating interface defined by IEC XXXXX-X-XX and illustrated in Figure 85-15.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

For sub-task force discussion.

Cl 85 SC 85.13.4 P 242 L # 359  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Add a separate PICS entry for the AN service interface primitive for the PCS associated with CR PMD. (See 84.11.4.1 for reference or Clause 72 in base standard)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert a separate subclause 85.13.4.1 PCS requirements for AN Service interface below and add the PICS entry named PR1 as shown below:

Item: PR1, Feature: AN service interface primitive, Subclause: 85.3, Value/Comment: The PCS associated with this PMD supports the AN service interface primitive AN\_LINK.indication defined in 73.9, Status: M, Support: Yes []

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.13.4 P 242 L 32 # 358  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Missing status field in the PICS for AN. Add "M" to the status field. Also change subclause reference to 85.1 that specifies this requirement for AN.

*SuggestedRemedy*

As per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.2 P 215 L 47 # 647  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Could parameterize description of primitives.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Describe as PMD\_UNITDATA.request/indication0 through PMD\_UNITDATA.request/indication n-1 for an n-lane interface (n=4 or 10)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

For sub-task force discussion

Cl 85 SC 85.2.1.1 P 215 L 22 # 498  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

spurious space in "PMD\_UNITDATA.request0 (tx\_bit)" to "PMD\_UNITDATA.request9 (tx\_bit)" excluding "PMD\_UNITDATA.request3(tx\_bit)"  
Also applies to 85.2.2.1

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the space. ie change "PMD\_UNITDATA.request0 (tx\_bit)" to "PMD\_UNITDATA.request0(tx\_bit)" etc.

Do the equivalent in 85.2.2.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.2.2.3 P 216 L 29 # 506  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

This says "The effect of receipt of this primitive by the client (the PMA) is described in 83.3.1.3", however that clause describes receipt of data from the layer above the PMA.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to "The effect of receipt of this primitive by the client (the PMA) is described in 83.4"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.4 P 217 L 14 # 303  
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Remove TBDs; The sum of the transmit and the receive delays contributed by the 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10 PMDs and medium shall be no more than TBD (2560) bit times. It is assumed that the round-trip delay through the medium is TBD (1135) bit times.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text line 14-17 to: The sum of the transmit and the receive delays contributed by the 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10 PMDs and medium shall be no more than (2560) bit times. It is assumed that the round-trip delay through the medium is (1135) bit times.

See supporting material in presentation to be submitted in support of Clause 85 Draft 1.1. comment resolutions.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.4 P 217 L 16 # 357  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Update the Transmit and Receive delay contributed by the 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10 PMDs to 2560 BT and round trip medium delay to 1135 BT and remove the TBDs.

SuggestedRemedy

In 84.4 Delay constraints change the delay requirements as follows and also update corresponding entry in Table 80-2:

"The sum of the transmit and the receive delays contributed by the 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10 PMDs and medium shall be no more than 2560 bit times. It is assumed that the round-trip delay through the medium is 1135 bit times."

Also add the missing "period" at the end of the sentence.

In corresponding PICS "DC" in 85.13.4, do not add absolute delay number in PICS entry instead refer back to the requirements in 85.4. "Value/Comment: Device conforms to Delay constraints specified in 85.4"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Also add the missing "period" at the end of the sentence.

Suggested remedy comment #300

And, in corresponding PICS "DC" in 85.13.4, do not add absolute delay number in PICS entry instead refer back to the requirements in 85.4. "Value/Comment: Device conforms to Delay constraints specified in 85.4"

Cl 85 SC 85.4 P 217 L 39 # 304  
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The measurements of Total Skew and Dynamic Skew are outside the scope of an interoperability standard i.e., 802.3ba.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete sentence: The measurements of Total Skew and Dynamic Skew are defined in 85.xx.xx.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.5 P 217 L 40 # 356  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Measurement total skew and dynamic skew for 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10 is not defined and is left to the implementors to comply with the skew requirements.

Hence delete the last sentence of 85.5.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the following sentence at the end of 84.5

The measurements of Total Skew and Dynamic Skew are defined in 85.xx.xx.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Suggested remedy comment #304

Cl 85 SC 85.7.1 P L # 296  
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove editors note: [Editors note (to be removed prior to publication) - Transmitter and receiver testing and definitions need to be addressed; e.g., transmitter testing from TP2 and TP2 definition. ]

Consider removing any other editors notes in this subclause that are not addressed by specific comment(s) proposal(s) against draft 1.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove editors note: [Editors note (to be removed prior to publication) - Transmitter and receiver testing and definitions need to be addressed; e.g., transmitter testing from TP2 and TP2 definition. ]

Consider removing any other editors notes in this subclause that are not addressed by specific comment(s) proposal(s) against draft 1.1.

See presentation material to be submitted in support of Clause 85 Draft 1.1. comment resolutions.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Sub-task force to consider on implementation of test point comments.

Cl 85 SC 85.7.1 P 220 L 12 # 61  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Editor note on the location of the AC coupling

SuggestedRemedy

All cable assembly shall incorporate ac coupling between TP3 and MDI on the receive function with 0.1 uf capacitor.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See remedy in comment#285.

Cl 85 SC 85.7.1 P 220 L 25 # 203  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In figure 85-2 on the left and right edges are shown "tx\_bit<0:3> or x\_bit<0:9>". However the latest service primitives all have the same parameter "tx\_bit".

SuggestedRemedy

change figure 85-2 to use the same labelling as Figure 86-2 (and 87-2 and 88-2) "PMD\_UNITDATA.request0 to PMD\_UNITDATA.requestn"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.7.1 P 220 L 9 # 62  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

TP2 test method missing

SuggestedRemedy

PPI test method of the CL 86 can be used to test CR4/CR10 please see ghiasi\_02\_0109 for the PPI detail proposal

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TP2 test method for sub-task force discussion see supporting presentations ghiasi\_02\_0109 and diminico\_04\_0109.pdf.

Cl 85 SC 85.7.12 P 223 L 3 # 362  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Add a PICS entry for the requirements specified in 85.7.12 PMD control function. Also update the text in 85.7.12 to indicate the requirement by including a shall statement.

SuggestedRemedy

Change sentence as follows and add a corresponding PICS entry to 85.13.

Each lane of the 40GBASE-CR4 or 100GBASE-CR10 PMD shall use the same control function as 10GBASE-KR, as defined in 72.6.10.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.7.5 P 221 L 40 # 298  
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove editors note. Subclause 85.7.5 text is sufficient to describe lane-by-lane signal detect function.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove editors note line 40-41.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.7.5 P 221 L 40 # 363  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Provide description of lane by lane signal detect function in 85.7.5 and delete the Editor's note.

The description for lane by lane PMD\_signal\_detect\_n function is provided in the last paragraph of 85.7.4

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Suggested remedy in comment#298.

Cl 85 SC 85.8 P 223 L 11 # 299  
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove editors note as unnecessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete editors note line 223 lines 11-13.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.8.2 P 223 L 41 # 64  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Proposal for jitter methodology needed

SuggestedRemedy

In SFP+ and CL86 we have moved away from dual dirac jitter to J2=0.26 UI, J9=0.18 UI and DDPWS=0.07 UI, please anslow\_04\_0109\_draft4.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Proposal insufficiently supported and lacking sufficient recommended changes to implement in the draft.

Cl 85 SC 85.8.3 P 223 L 38 # 3  
Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Data dependent pulse width shrinkage is due to ISI and can be dealt with using equalization in either RX or TX side. Adaptive equalization is assumed in KR and should also be assumed in CR4, CR10. Therefore, only DCD in 1010 pattern (which is not solved by equalization) should be specified.

SuggestedRemedy

remove editor's note and do not address data dependent pulse width.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See remedy in comment#284.

**Cl 85**    **SC 85.8.3**    **P 223**    **L 38**    # **63**  
 Ghiasi, Ali    Broadcom

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 DDPWS not included in current DCD value

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Copy 86.7.4.4 for definition and test method of DDPWS and with value of 0.07 UI

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment#284 for rationale.

**Cl 85**    **SC 85.8.3**    **P 223**    **L 38**    # **284**  
 Healey, Adam    LSI Corporation

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Data dependent pulse width shrinkage (DDPWS) does not need to be addressed for 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10.

1. DDPWS measured at TP2 will be a function of the equalization state of the transmitter. Since 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10 intend to use the 10GBASE-KR start-up protocol to automatically optimize the equalization state for the channel and receiver, the DDPWS required at this point will also be a function of the channel and receiver.

2. The copper cable assembly is a linear and passive medium. DDPWS measured at each point in the link is a function inter-symbol interference which can be readily mitigated with an appropriate combination of transmitter and receiver equalization. In contrast, optical link designs control the DDPWS at the input to, and output of, non-linear functions such as laser drivers and limiting amplifiers whose outputs in turn drive channels of limited bandwidth. The DDPWS at the output of the non-linear function cannot be completely equalized and furthermore these narrow pulses are most severely impacted by the channel that follows.

3. Duty cycle distortion (DCD) at the transceiver output for linear passive is analogous to DDPWS for optical links and is the appropriate parameter for this clause.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove editor's note.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 85**    **SC 85.8.3**    **P 223-224**    **L 32**    # **305**  
 DiMinico, Christopher    MC Communications

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Remove TBDs Table 85-4-Transmitter characteristics' summary.  
 Remove editors note line 32-36 page 223. Consider removing any other editors notes in this subclause that are not addressed by specific comment(s) proposal(s) against draft 1.1.

CR4 and CR10 channel characteristics consistent with 10GBASE-KR. Table 85-4 Transmitter characteristics to be met at TP0 for consistent test/reference point consistent with 10GBASE-KR channel.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove TBDs in Table 85-4-Transmitter characteristics summary.

Remove editors note line 32-36 page 223. Consider removing any other editors notes in this subclause that are not addressed by specific comment(s) proposal(s) against draft 1.1.

See presentation material to be submitted in support of Clause 85 Draft 1.1. comment resolutions.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

For sub-task force review of supporting presentation diminico\_04\_0109.pdf

**Cl 85**    **SC 85.8.3**    **P 224**    **L 1**    # **66**  
 Ghiasi, Ali    Broadcom

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 TP0 specifications are missing

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Duplicate table 85-4 at TP0 with following row  
 signaling speed - same  
 Unit interval -same  
 Differential output voltage -same  
 Common mode volatage limit - same  
 Differential Output return loss - see ghiasi\_03\_0109  
 Common mode retrun loss - see ghiasi\_03\_0109  
 transition time - 24 ps min  
 common mode output voltage - 12 mV RMS

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See suggested remedy comment#307.

Cl 85 SC 85.8.3 P 224 L 11 # 65  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Table is missing vertical eye opening or Qsq per CL68 definition, since there is channel and connector there could be several dB of penalty

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add Qsq to table 85-4 with linear value of 63.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Proposal insufficiently supported with justification for recommended change.

Cl 85 SC 85.8.3 P 224 L 11 # 550  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

If you have stated the signalling rate there is no need to give the unit interval, and writing down a recurring decimal is a nuisance. The other clauses don't have this.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the row 'Unit interval nominal 85.8.3.3 96.969697 ps'. In 85.8.3.3, delete 'The corresponding unit interval is nominally 96.969697 ps.'. Similarly in 85.8.4 and 85.8.4.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Other 802.3 clauses include UI. Providing UI and signalling speed in a look-up table of the Transmitter characteristics' summary helps users of the standards quickly view relevant transmitter parameters.

Cl 85 SC 85.8.3 P 224 L 11 # 74  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ; and 86. Clone the comment

Table 85-4 is missing common mode output voltage limit, since the connector and the cable are guided differential mode excess common mode from the driver may result in unacceptable BER and EMI

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add row to table 85-4  
Output AC common mode voltage with max value of 15 mV RMS

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Committee to decide the limit value.

[Editor's note: this comment was submitted against 86.8.3.]

Cl 85 SC 85.8.3 P 224 L 13 # 307  
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Define Table 85-4 Transmitter characteristics to be met at TP0 for consistent test/reference point consistent with 10GBASE-KR.

In addition, to maintain test/reference point at TP2, specify transmitter characteristics to be met at TP2 to account for Tx\_PCB, mated connector, and test fixture insertion loss between TP1 and TP2.

*SuggestedRemedy*

(1)Page 223 line 1 replace TP2 with TP0.

Transmitter characteristics in Table 85-4 shall meet specifications at TP0, unless otherwise noted.

(2)Page 225 line 6-7 replace 85.8.3 with new reference for TP2 transmitter characteristics including TP2 transmitter characteristics. See supporting presentation for recommended transmitter characteristics at TP2.

(3)Update resultant changes in PICs.

(4)Page 219 line 46-54 revise text in subclause 85.7.1 Link block diagram..add reference to TP0.

(5)Add TP0>>>The electrical transmit signal is defined at (TP0) and TP2.

(6)Replace current reference to TP2 with TP0 in sentence>> Unless specified otherwise, all transmitter measurements and tests defined in Table 85-4 are made at TP0.

(7)Add sentence to link TP2 with adjusted transmitt characteristics>>Unless specified otherwise, all transmitter measurements and tests defined in Table 85-X are made at TP2.

(8)Revise 85.8.3.1 Test fixtures and 85.8.3.2 Test-fixture impedance to reference 10GBASE-KR including the return loss TBD and add additional text for testing at TP2.

See presentation material to be submitted in support of Clause 85 Draft 1.1. comment resolutions.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See suggested remedy comment#307.

and supporting presentation diminico\_04\_0109.pdf

CI 85 SC 85.8.3.1 P 225 L 17 # 614  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

It is very good that TP1, TP2, TP3, TP4 are positioned in relation to the connector, but not clear enough where they are exactly with respect to the connector. While for some measurements like S-parameter measurements on a passive cable, de-embedding can be used to infer the performance right next to the connector, For measurements of nonlinear active elements like transmitters and receivers, in general this cannot be done.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the same defined reference losses (HCB losses) between MDI and TP2 and between MDI and TP3 as Clause 86 has between MDI and TP1a and between MDI and TP4a. See presentation by Ali.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Consistent with CX4, all cable assembly measurements are to be made between TP1 and TP4 as illustrated in Figure 85-2. Two mated connector pairs have been included in the cable assembly specifications defined in 85.9.

TP1 and TP4 are not test points for the measurements of nonlinear active elements like transmitters and receivers.

PCB trace loss at TP0 defined (Tx\_pcb) and at TP5 (Rx\_pcb.).

CI 85 SC 85.8.4 P 225 L 49 # 306  
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Remove TBDs Table 85-5-Receiver characteristics' summary. Remove editors note lines 49-54 page 225.

CR4 and CR10 transmitter and channel characteristics consistent with 10GBASE-KR therefore 10GBASE-KR receiver is sufficiently specified.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove TBDs Table 85-5-Receiver characteristics' summary. Remove editors note line 32-36 page 223.

See presentation material to be submitted in support of Clause 85 Draft 1.1. comment resolutions.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See presentation material to be submitted in support of Clause 85 Draft 1.1. comment resolutions. diminico\_04\_0109.pdf

CI 85 SC 85.8.4 P 226 L 19 # 67  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Table 85-5 is missing Differential to common mode conversion

SuggestedRemedy

Add row to table 85-5 for SCD11 with value of -10 dB max from 0.01 to 11.1 GHz

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Proposal insufficiently supported with justification for recommended change.

CI 85 SC 85.8.4 P 226 L 50 # 73  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Comprehensive stress receiver is required for both TP0 and TP3

SuggestedRemedy

Please see ghiasi\_03\_0109 for block diagram and test method for comprehensive receiver test method

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See presentation material to be submitted in support of Clause 85 Draft 1.1. comment resolutions and ghiasi\_03\_0109.pdf.

CI 85 SC 85.8.4.1 P 226 L 29 # 449  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It is not clear that the BER has to be met in the complete worst case condition (not just worst case attenuation).

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the end of the sentence "the maximum insertion loss deviation of 85.10.3 and the maximum cable assembly loss to crosstalk ratio of 85.10.8"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Simultaneous worse case of all impairments in a single cable assembly is not tractable e.g., worse case ILD and worse case IL and worse case crosstalk.



**Cl 85**    **SC 85.8.4.1**    **P 226**    **L 30**    # **297**  
 DiMinico, Christopher    MC Communications

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

Remove editors note.

**SuggestedRemedy**

[Editor's note (to be removed prior to publication) - The ambiguity between the requirements of 85.8.4.1 and subclause 71.7.2.1, receiver interference tolerance, which references Annex 69A, needs to be resolved.]

See presentation material to be submitted in support of Clause 85 Draft 1.1. comment resolutions.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See presentation material to be submitted in support of Clause 85 Draft 1.1. comment resolutions and ghiasi\_03\_0109.pdf.

**Cl 85**    **SC 85.8.4.3**    **P**    **L 40**    # **309**  
 DiMinico, Christopher    MC Communications

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

Remove editors notes and provide value for coupling capacitor TBD.

**SuggestedRemedy**

- (1)Remove editors note Page 220 line 11-12.
- (2)Remove editors note page 226 line 42-43.
- (3)provide TBD capacitor value.

See presentation material to be submitted in support of Clause 85 Draft 1.1. comment resolutions.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See remedy in comment#285

**Cl 85**    **SC 85.8.4.3**    **P 225**    **L 51**    # **68**  
 Ghiasi, Ali    Broadcom

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

Since TP2 include a connector with about 4" of PCB traces tabel 85-5 then specificaitons for TP0 are missing

**SuggestedRemedy**

Please duplicate section 85.8.4 for TP0 specificaitons, for detail return loss and testing see ghiasi\_03\_0109

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See suggested remedy comment#307.

**Cl 85**    **SC 85.8.4.3**    **P 226**    **L 46**    # **402**  
 D'Ambrosia, John    Force10 Networks

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

statement seems like a remnant from cut-n-paste

The 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10 receiver shall be AC-coupled to the cable assembly to allow for maximum interoperability between various 10 Gb/s components.

**SuggestedRemedy**

change to

The 40GBASE-CR4 and 100GBASE-CR10 receiver shall be AC-coupled to the cable assembly to allow for maximum interoperability.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.8.4.3 P 226 L 50 # 285  
Healey, Adam LSI Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Recommended coupling capacitor value is TBD. This value should be set to 100 nF in accordance with 10GBASE-KR and to avoid additional link penalties associated with baseline wander.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Recommended coupling capacitor value is TBD. This value should be set to 100 nF in accordance with 10GBASE-KR and to avoid additional link penalties associated with baseline wander.

Cl 85 SC 85.9 P 227 L 1 # 301  
DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Remove TBDs - 85.9 Channel characteristics  
85.9.1 Transmitter and receiver differential printed circuit board trace loss - equation (85-1)  
and 85.9.2 Channel insertion loss to crosstalk ratio (ICRch) - equation (85-8)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove TBDs - 85.9 Channel characteristics  
85.9.1 Transmitter and receiver differential printed circuit board trace loss - equation (85-1)  
and 85.9.2 Channel insertion loss to crosstalk ratio (ICRch) - equation (85-8)

See diminico\_02\_1108.pdf.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.9.1 P 227 L 13 # 69  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Current ILPCB limit Eq 85-1 only allow about 5" of PCB traces on FR-6 not meeting nicole\_01\_0708 objective of 4". Transmit and receive PCB loss each must be specified with max limit.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Propose to allocate 3.5 dB of loss for the TX and RX PCB loss to allow 4" on FR4-6 or 6" on FR4-13. Change 0.2032 to 0.15 then the loss for both TX and RX are given by EQ 85-1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Current PCB loss limit Eq 85-1 allows for 8" of PCB trace meeting nicole\_01\_0708 objective. ILpcbmax represents 8 inches (0.2032 m) of the maximum fitted attenuation Amax due to trace skin effect and dielectric properties as defined in Annex 69B.4.2.

Cl 85 SC 85.9.1 P 227 L 13 # 600  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

This maximum insertion loss allocation, halved if it covers the sum of transmit and receive PCB traces, is only 2.3 dB at Nyquist. Another opinion has 3.5 dB for 4 inches of PCB.

*SuggestedRemedy*

I think this would be a more useful standard if the allocation for PCB loss were increased and the allocation for cable loss reduced in step.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The copper length objective for 40 and 100 Gigabit Ethernet is at least 10 m over a copper cable assembly.

Cl 85 SC 85.9.1 P 227 L 15 # 620  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Specification range for cable insertion loss is not adequate at either end. SFP+ Annex E cable S-parameter specs go from 10 MHz to 11.1 GHz. This is not about 1G operation; a channel that is not controlled below 100 MHz WILL be expected to fail at 10G/lane.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Extend the range of Cable assembly insertion loss, Cable assembly return loss, Near-End Crosstalk, MDNEXT, FEXT and MDLFFEXT and maximum insertion loss allocation for the transmitter and receiver differential controlled impedance printed circuit boards to at least 10 MHz to 10 GHz.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Per baseline agreement channel parameters consistent with 10GBASE-KR in 802.3ap Annex 69B.

Cl 85 SC 85.9.1 P 227 L 25 # 403  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

units should be metric

represents 8 inches (0.2032 m)

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to

represents approximately 0.20 m

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 85 SC 85.9.2 P 228 L 14 # 413  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

font on fig 85-4 (and other channel related figures in clause 85) are very small and very difficult to read.

*SuggestedRemedy*

use larger font on figures

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Apply style guidelines.

Cl 85 SC 85.9.2 P 228 L 8 # 287  
Healey, Adam LSI Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Note states that "2.5 dB of the 3 dB signal-to-noise ratio penalty related to insertion loss deviation embodied in 802.3ap ICRmin is applied as 2.5 dB ICRchmin margin to account for reduction in ILD penalty for CR4 and CR10."

While the more stringent ILD limits for the cable assembly shown in 85.10.3 would imply a reduction of ILD penalty, it is not obvious that the ILD penalty for the \_channel\_ is reduced by 2.5 dB. The ILD penalty is a function of the cable assembly ILD, transmit and receive PCB trace impedances, and transmitter and receiver return loss.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Supply analysis that supports the assertion that the ILD penalty is reduced by 2.5 dB. A presentation that investigates this issue will be presented to the Task Force.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See presentation material to be submitted in support of Clause 85 Draft 1.1. comment resolutions. healey\_01\_0109.pdf and diminico\_04\_0109.pdf

Cl 85 SC 9 P 227 L 29 # 666  
Balasubramanian, Vittal FCI USA, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The equations for generating the fit line for any data to test to the limit line as specified in equations 85-3 through 85-8 are faulty (See attached supporting document.)

The equation just extends what was accepted in IEEE 802.3ap as the equation. In light of the presented data, it is necessary to revisit the equation. The fit line, as it stands now, can cause some connectors which actually pass the requirements in raw data to fail the requirements with the fit line.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Need to come up with a new equation for the fit line which takes into account the low frequency data also when coming up with the fit line to test against the limit line.

Resolution will be provided in a supporting document.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment#667 for rationale.

Cl 86 SC 86 P 247 L 1 # 502  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove TBDs in the power budget for clause 86 in Tables 86-6 to 86-12 and associated definitions.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Apply changes shown in anslow\_04\_0109.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accept with modifications as decided.

Cl 86 SC 86.1 P 247 L 21 # 276  
Chang, Sun Hyok ETRI

Comment Type T Comment Status D operating

'Minimum range' is written in Table 86-1.

In Draft 1.0 comments #78 - #81, it is decided to change 'Minimum range' to 'Required operating range'.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 'Minimum range' to 'Required operating range' in Table 86-1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make consistent with 278 and other comments.

Cl 86 SC 86.1 P 247 L 29 # 648  
Trowbridge, Stephen Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Letting n=3 or n=9 isn't intuitive since n doesn't correspond to any attribute of the implementation. Use n=4 or n=10 (the number of lanes), and number primitives and lanes throughout the clause as 0 through n-1

*SuggestedRemedy*

Let n=the number of lanes and number primitives and lanes throughout the clause as 0 through n-1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The root cause is that the lanes are numbered from 0, which isn't intuitive. In the format "PMD\_UNITDATA.requestn(tx\_bit)" we need a symbol for the last lane ID:

"PMD\_UNITDATA.requestn-1(tx\_bit)" isn't good.

Change the lane numbering throughout or make the lane ID a subscript (both need agreement across the task force) or define m=3 or 9, n=4 or 10, m+1=n.

It would be nice if other clauses then used i or x for an example lane rather than n (or m).

Cl 86 SC 86.1 P 247 L 33 # 519  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Reference material has moved.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 82.1.4 to 80.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.1**    **P 248**    **L 2**    # **536**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Waste of space

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change:  
 LAN  
 CSMA/CD  
 LAYERS  
 to: LAN CSMA/CD LAYERS  
 or better, LAN CSMA/CD layers  
 or even better, Ethernet layers

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Need to choose which.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.10.1**    **P 271**    **L 50**    # **555**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Point out that cabling does not have to preserve lane numbering.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Add: As the PCS is capable of receiving the lanes in any arrangement, the cabling is not required to preserve lane numbering.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 [Editor's note: page number was 71]

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.10.1**    **P 272**    **L 20**    # **471**  
 Dudek, Mike    JDSU

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**    *Skew*  
 100ns of skew is much more than is needed. A separate comment has been made to re-allocate 20ns of this skew to the PMD's.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change 100ns to 80ns.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See other comments

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.10.1**    **P 272**    **L 20**    # **582**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Need to reduce cabling skew and Dynamic Skew limits by the skew and Dynamic Skew that could be caused by wavelength changes, which are attributable to the transmitter not the channel. We aren't required to spend all the skew budget.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change Cabling skew Max from 100 to e.g. 99 ns. Change table title to:  
 Fiber optic cabling (channel) characteristics at 850 nm.  
 Change footnote b to:  
 These channel insertion loss values include cable, connectors, and splices.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change table title to:  
 Fiber optic cabling (channel) characteristics at 850 nm.  
 Change footnote b to:  
 These channel insertion loss values include cable, connectors, and splices.  
 See other comments for skew budget.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.10.1**    **P 272**    **L 31**    # **583**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Is the channel insertion loss going to receive further study?

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Review the 1.9 dB allocation and delete footnote c.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.10.2.1**    **P 272**    **L 11**    # **183**  
 Kolesar, Paul    CommScope

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The "Fiber cable attenuation (max)" description is incomplete. The wavelength must also be specified as the attenuation value changes with wavelength. The nominal operating wavelength of clause 86 is 850 nm.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change the description to "Fiber cable attenuation at 850 nm (max)"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The same point applies to skew. See response to 582.

Cl 86 SC 86.10.2.1 P 272 L 46 # 156  
 Chung, Hwan Seok ETRI

Comment Type E Comment Status D

At 86.10.2.1 optical fiber cable, line 46, correct typo. 'fulfil' to 'fulfill'.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.10.2.1 P 273 L 14 # 184  
 Kolesar, Paul CommScope

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The chromatic dispersion specifications were modified by comment to draft 1.0, but contain an error. The upper wavelength limit for the 0.105 value should be 1310 nm not 1305 nm to be consistent with the fiber specification standards in TIA and IEC. The existing value leaves a 5 nm range unspecified.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 1305 to 1310.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.10.2.1 P 273 L 17 # 584  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The effective modal bandwidth when measured with the launch conditions specified in Table 86-8 is irrelevant. Cable vendors and network operators will use the launch in the relevant standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'Table 86-8' to whatever the relevant IEC standard for effective modal bandwidth measurement for OM3 is.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Need a reference document number.

Cl 86 SC 86.10.2.1 P 273 L 18 # 472  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The fact that this new chromatic spec is met by the old spec would have had lasting value however the editor's note is technically incorrect and should be deleted. The correct note would have stated that fibers manufactured to the old specification in practice actually meet the new tighter specification.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the editors note

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Revert to the wording in D1.0.

Cl 86 SC 86.10.2.2.1 P 273 L 23 # 585  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

There is only one sort of maximum link distance, and only one maximum link distance, in this clause. 'calculated based on' seems like a mistake.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'The maximum link distances for multimode fiber are calculated based on' to 'The maximum link distance is based on'.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.10.2.3 P 273 L 33 # 185  
Kolesar, Paul CommScope

Comment Type T Comment Status D

A specific optical connector form should be selected within the subclause to provide users with unambiguous understanding of the standard physical hardware connectivity for patch cords. The selection of the connector form should be compatible with structured cabling practices for array connectivity defined in TIA-568 and draft ISO 24764.

*SuggestedRemedy*

See contribution kolesar\_01\_0109 for slides containing rationale and specific content in the form of text and figure. The slides within this contribution intended for subclause 86.10.2.3 are so entitled atop each slide. The proposed content is intended to be a replacement for the present text. Note: This contribution also contains proposed content for related subclauses 86.5.1 and 86.5.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Any connector form can connect to structured cabling as long as the fiber is the right kind (my computer's mains lead has two different connectors). See response to 186.

CI 86 SC 86.10.2.3 P 273 L 44 # 586  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

While I do not object to the MPO as an example connector, this is not the right document for defining optical connectors.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.11.4.1 P 276 L 25 # 587  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

As n is 3 or 9, there are not n optical signal streams.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 'n' to '4 or 10'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.2.2 P 251 L 14 # 621  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Skew

Dynamic Skew at SP2 (400 ps or 2 UI) is excessive; OIF has 1.5 UI at SP1(?) and that's after they sandbagged it. Because a group of 4 differential traces can be kept more equal in length than a group of 10, the Dynamic Skew for 40G should be lower than that for 100G. Removing an editor's note.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change limit for Dynamic Skew at SP2 to 300 ps (which is 3 UI). Remove the editor's note at line 28.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Needs coordination with comments 625 (against 80.4), 616 (against 83.5.3.2) and 504 (against 86.2.2).

CI 86 SC 86.2.2 P 251 L 28 # 504  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D Skew

The editor's note says "The Dynamic Skew limit at SP2 may be too high, further information is invited. The limits may be different for 40G and 100G" However, the skew limit at SP2 is independent of the PMD type and hence it is inappropriate to have this note here.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove editor's note

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

I'm sure we can remove the editor's note but for layout reasons one expects more Dynamic Skew for 100G than for 40G. Follow response to comments 625 (against 80.4), 616 (against 83.5.3.2) and 621 (against 86.2.2).

CI 86 SC 86.4.1 P 252 L 31 # 528  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Three cross-references to 86.7.1 in four lines is excessive.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete '(see 86.7.1)' twice.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**CI 86**    **SC 86.4.5**                      **P 254**            **L 19**            # **554**  
 Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

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

PMD lane by lane signal detect function would be implemented by the same methods (various implementations are permitted) as PMD global signal detect function. 'the magnitude of the optical signal' while suitably un-defined, might be read as denying this.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete 'the magnitude of '.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**CI 86**    **SC 86.5**                              **P 255**            **L 20**            # **545**  
 Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      *Lanes*

Changes to the last draft made things worse; electrical lanes should not get a special mention when optical lanes are in the same situation. The empty 86.5.1 and 86.5.2 are unnecessary. Stop digging a hole. But it's worth pointing out that e.g. optical receive lane and signal detect lanes should correspond.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change  
 There are no lane assignments for 40GBASE-SR4 and 100GBASE-SR10. While it is expected that a PMD will map electrical lane i to optical lane i and vice versa, there is no need to define where the electrical lanes are physically, as the PCS is capable of receiving the lanes in any arrangement.  
 to  
 A common lane numbering is used for optical transmitter and lane by lane transmit disable. A common lane numbering is used for optical receiver and lane by lane signal detect. As the PCS is capable of receiving the lanes in any arrangement, the PMD layer is not required to preserve lane numbering. This standard does not specify physical lane numbering at the PPI or MDI. A PMD may map electrical lane i to optical lane i and vice versa. MSA definitions of specific implementations of PPI or MDI, or connector specifications, distinguish transmit lanes from receive lanes.  
 Delete 86.5.1 and 86.5.2.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**CI 86**    **SC 86.5**                              **P 255**            **L 25**            # **75**  
 Ghiasi, Ali    Broadcom

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

Optical lane assignment are missing

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Please see ghiasi\_02\_010 for detail diagrams. Fibre # need to be added to figure 86-2 and a digram need to be created for connector lane and fiber number.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See response to 186.

**CI 86**    **SC 86.5**                              **P 255**            **L 29**            # **76**  
 Ghiasi, Ali    Broadcom

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

Optical lane assignment are missing

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Please see ghiasi\_02\_010 for detail diagrams. Fibre # need to be added to figure 86-2 and a digram need to be created for connector lane and fiber number.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See response to 186 and 75.

**CI 86**    **SC 86.5.1**                              **P 255**            **L 24**            # **405**  
 D'Ambrosia, John                                      Force10 Networks

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      *Lanes*

subclauses for optical lane assignments for 40 & 100G SR are blank.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 delete if no presentations are provided.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.



Cl 86 SC 86.5.1 P 255 L 25 # 186  
Kolesar, Paul CommScope

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Lanes

Optical lane assignments for 40GBASE-SR4 must be defined to provide an interoperable interface that provides proper connectivity over standard structured cabling infrastructures. The editor's note invites contributions proposing content for this subclause.

*SuggestedRemedy*

See contribution kolesar\_01\_0109 for slides containing rationale and specific content in the form of text and figure. The slides within this contribution intended for subclause 86.5.1 are so entitled atop each slide. Note: This contribution also contains proposed content for related subclauses 86.5.2 and 86.10.2.3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The commenter brings very useful information in his presentation. 802.3 does not standardize patch cords, or optical connectors away from the MDI, and does not specify optical connector format at the MDI. The PCS is capable of receiving the lanes in any arrangement, so lane numbering is not a concern. MSAs define transmit and receive sides, in a way compatible with the "installed" cabling, as commenter shows. If the present dominant connectors remain dominant in future, no further specification in the standard would be necessary. If new, better, perhaps higher lane count, connectors appear in future, further specification in the standard would be obstructive. The commenter's presentation will remain in the public record.

Cl 86 SC 86.5.2 P 255 L 30 # 187  
Kolesar, Paul CommScope

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Lanes

Optical lane assignments for 1000GBASE-SR10 must be defined to provide an interoperable interface that provides proper connectivity over standard structured cabling infrastructures. The editor's note invites contributions proposing content for this subclause.

*SuggestedRemedy*

See contribution kolesar\_01\_0109 for slides containing rationale and specific content in the form of text and figures. The slides within this contribution intended for subclause 86.5.2 are so entitled atop each slide. Note: This contribution also contains proposed content for related subclauses 86.5.1 and 86.10.2.3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

See response to 186.

Cl 86 SC 86.6 P 255 L 37 # 278  
Chang, Sun Hyok ETRI

Comment Type T Comment Status D operating

At line 37 'operational range requirement', and at line 38 'mimimum range requirement' are written.

In Draft 1.0 comments #78 and #81, it was decided to write it as 'operating range requirement'.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 'operational range requirement' to 'operating range requirement'.  
Change 'mimimum range requirement' to 'operating range requirement'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make consistent with 278 and other comments.

Cl 86 SC 86.6 P 255 L 37 # 277  
Chang, Sun Hyok ETRI

Comment Type T Comment Status D

At line 37, Table 86-18 is referred.

However, I think the specificaitons of multimode fibers is written in Table 86-19.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 'Table 86-18' to 'Table 86-19'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

I think it's correct but will check.

Cl 86 SC 86.6 P 256 L # 377  
O'Mathuna, Pdraig GigOptix

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 86-7

Single ended input voltage tolerance -0.3 4.0

This spec needs to be better defined. If it is for non-operational conditions, then it is fine.

If it is operational, then it needs to be defined with a swing size.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Preferred range would be from -0.3 to Vsupply + 0.3

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We don't specify Vsupply. Note AC coupling. This is the extreme of the waveform per Figure 83A-3. For discussion.

Cl 86 SC 86.6.1 P 255 L 45 # 546  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

As far as I can see, all the specifications in Table 86-6 will be appropriate and applicable to the electrical transmit signal.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete 'appropriate', twice. Also in 86.6.5.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.6.1 P 255 L 47 # 527  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Excessive cross-referencing. We have already told the reader at line 40 that test points are defined in 86.7.1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the second '(see 86.7.1)'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.6.1 P 256 L 1 # 494  
Li, Mike Altera

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

D1.0 jitter specifications in those tables were specified in terms of conventional TJ and DJ. However, in the D1.1 editor's notes, it is recorded that proposals were made to replace DJ with the so-called 99% jitter. 99% jitter is nothing but a TJ at higher probability (approx.  $10^{-4}$ ) that has a mixture of both Dj and RJ. In the case when the DJ pk-to-pk occurs at a smaller probability (e.g.,  $10^{-8}$ ), 99% jitter will not be able to bound the DJ, and much larger DJ exists in the link can break the link.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Keep the deterministic jitter since it has been used and worked well for many other standards (FC, GBE (e.g., 802.3ae, 802.3ap), PCI Express, CEI/OIF, SATA, etc.).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

DJ was found unsatisfactory for 802.3ae serial, and problematical in 8G Fibre Channel. When discussing DJ for with 64B/66B coding we descend into confusion. SFP+ spent a long time on this topic and rejected DJ.

[Editor's note: subclause was Tables 86-6, 86-7, 86-11, 86-12, line was 260 (a page number)]

Cl 86 SC 86.6.1 P 256 L 13 # 425  
Petrilla, John Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

In table 86-6, parameters TP1a TJ, DJ & DDPWS, contain TBDs and/or are noted for further study. It appears the 0.30 UI Max for TP1a TJ is unnecessarily high and can be reduced to 0.26 UI. Further, the eye mask coordinate, X1 & X2 do not appear to be consistent with eye mask coordinates proposed for TP2 and/or the requirements of the receiver at TP3.

The same issue holds for table 86-7.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Accept the changes in anslow\_04\_0109 for table 86-6 except, change the Eye Mask Coordinates X1 & X2 to 0.10 & 0.25 respectively to account for the shifts in TJ from 0.30 UI to 0.26 UI, the shift from TJ to J9 and the shift to the hit ratio of 5E-5 as well as be consistent with eye mask coordinates at TP2 and optical receiver requirements.

Repeat for table 86-7

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Note petrilla\_01\_0109

Cl 86 SC 86.6.1 P 256 L 14 # 450  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The system effects of jitter and better represented by the jitter probabilities at 1% jitter and  $1e^{-9}$ . A good value for DDPWS is 0.07

*SuggestedRemedy*

In both tables 86-6 and 86-7  
Replace Total Jitter (0.3) with J9 jitter (0.26 )  
Replace Deterministic Jitter (TBD) with J2 Jitter (0.18)  
Remove the reference to BER  $1e^{-12}$   
Replace the TBD for DDPWS with 0.07  
Remove the editors footnotes.

Note that these are the same as the proposed changes in Anslow\_04.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.6.1 P 256 L 15 # 556  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Filling the TBDs and other improvements.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Accept the changes proposed in anslow\_04\_0109 with exceptions as resolved.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.6.1 P 256 L 17 # 77  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

DDPWS and DJ are TBD, based on the value of DJ then TJ need to be adjusted

*SuggestedRemedy*

TJ(J9)=0.26 UI, J2=0.18 UI, DDPWS=0.07 UI please see anslow\_04\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
As decided for comment 78.  
[Editor's note: comment was entered against 226]

CI 86 SC 86.6.1 P 256 L 21 # 626  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The eye mask coordinates allow the host to generate a really large, slow, noisy eye. Reflections with a large eye will degrade the small opening specified in the eye. Slow and noisy edges will cause the transmitted optical signal to have excessive jitter. This same problem was observed and fixed in SFP+. Options for fixing are:  
Reduce X2 from 0.33;  
Introduce a relative mask;  
Introduce a Qsq limit of 50 or so, and require the host to keep its baseline wander in check (SFP+ is attempting this);  
Tighten the hit ratio.  
Because the measurement time can be used for a relative and absolute mask, the first and last options do not add test cost.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Reduce X2. Apply a relative mask with the same X1, X2, and Y1, Y2 of 0.25, 0.25.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Note dawex\_0x\_0109.

CI 86 SC 86.6.1 P 256 L 30 # 451  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Some of the specifications (return losses) in table 86-7 apply at TP1 while others apply at TP1a.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In the table title change "TP1a" to "TP1 and TP1a", or better split the table and references to it, into two tables  
"PPI electrical transmit signal input specifications at TP1" with the SDD11 and SCD11 specifications and  
"PPI electrical transmit signal input tolerance at TP1a" with all the other specifications.

Note this change is also needed in Anslow\_04

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
It's not worth having a separate table for just two rows.  
Editor to see if adding a column can be done conveniently.  
Delegate decision to editor.

CI 86 SC 86.6.1 P 256 L 4 # 329  
CHANG, Frank Vitesse

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Referring to Fig. 86-3, TP1a could be critical interface between module to host board. Taking into account of existing SFP+ implementation, pre-emphasis would be likely necessary for system robustness.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest to add a row into Table 86-6 for transmit pre-emphasis with optional pre-emphasis as 6dB (or TBD), plan to present one slide.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
We specify at the connector (actually, at the compliance board's output) not at the IC. Because there is only <3.5 dB PCB loss expected on the host side, and less on the module side, an additional spec is not needed.

Cl 86 SC 86.6.1 P 256 L 46 # 78  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
DDPWS and DJ are TBD, based on the value of DJ then TJ need to be adjusted

SuggestedRemedy  
TJ(J9)=0.26 UI, J2=0.18 UI, DDPWS=0.07 UI please see anslow\_04\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
[Editor's note: comment was entered against 226]

Cl 86 SC 86.6.1.1 P 257 L 13 # 79  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
It would be better to separate the equation in to two

SuggestedRemedy  
SDD11=-12 + 2\*SQRT(f) from 0.01 to 4.1 GHz  
SDD11=-6.3 + 13\*log10(f/5.5) from 4.1 to 11.1 GHz

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
The existing equation is in three sections not two; is a technical change intended?  
Assume not, will rewrite as three sections with break points as implied by existing equation.

Cl 86 SC 86.6.1.1 P 257 L 14 # 557  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
Illustrate the reflection specs.

SuggestedRemedy  
Show the reflection specs in a figure, delete '[To do: illustrate these specs]'

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.6.1.2 P 257 L 23 # 80  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
SCC22 at TP1a and TP4 is little too tight with some of the connectors

SuggestedRemedy  
Propose to slightly relax the mask  
SCC22=-7.51 + 1.1\*f from 0.01 to 4.1 GHz and -3 from 4.1 to 11.1 GHz

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Hope there will be a presentation to illustrate and justify this.  
[Editor's note: subclause changed from 86.1.2]

Cl 86 SC 86.6.2 P 257 L 30 # 558  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D RIN  
Expecting that we will have a normative TDP spec per anslow\_04\_0109, we don't need a normative RIN spec. We are asked not to mix normative and informative material.

SuggestedRemedy  
Delete the RIN12OMA row in Table 86-9. Here, add 'The transmitter's RIN12OMA should not exceed -128 dB/Hz.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Note other comments 420, 426 and 608 tagged "RIN".  
Follow response to 608.

CI 86 SC 86.6.2 P 257 L 38 # 432  
Abbott, John Corning Incorporated

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Lines 38-41

Table 86-8. RMS spectral width. The RMS spectral width is not a good way to characterize the spectral content of VCSEL lasers, whose spectra consists of two or more narrow lines separated by a gap in wavelength. The RMS spectral width pre-supposes a Gaussian character to the spectral power vs. wavelength which is incorrect.

This change is needed in order to have an accurate link budget and for accurate link models.

A simple suggestion is to include both RMS width and full width quarter max.

*SuggestedRemedy*

One solution is to include both RMS width and full width quarter max. Need to involve transceiver manufacturers

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Editor believes that the modal noise model is just as valid with discrete lines as it is with a Gaussian

CI 86 SC 86.6.2 P 257 L 43 # 415  
Petrilla, John Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In table 86-8, parameters Max & Min Average launch power and Aggregate signal parameter contain TBDs and/or are noted for further study.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Accept the changes in anslow\_04\_0109 for table 86-6.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.6.2 P 257 L 43 # 453  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

In order to reduce the overload requirements on the receiver the maximum OMA and the Peak Power from the transmitter should be specified. The values suggested assume that at the maximum average power the extinction ratio is  $\leq 9.4$ dB and at this extinction ratio the overshoot is  $< 13\%$ .

If the average power is not at it's max value then the extinction ratio can be higher and/or the overshoot can be larger. Similarly if the average power is at the maximum value but the extinction ratio is less than the overshoot can be larger.

It is expected that the vast majority of transmitters would be compliant to these requirements anyway.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add specifications to Table 86-8 for Maximum OMA per lane of 3dBm and Peak power per lance of 4dBm.

Also make equivalent changes to table 86-9

Note that this is as proposed in Anslow\_04

In addition add rows to table 86-10 (receiver specs) page 259 for Optical Modulation Amplitude max +3dBm and Peak Power max +4dBm. (These changes are not in Anslow\_04)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.6.2 P 257 L 50 # 608  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D RIN

With a normative TDP spec (see anslow\_04\_0109), we don't need a normative RIN spec. IEEE are tightening their request to not mix normative and informative material. Also, not having a normative RIN12OMA should simplify the lane-by-lane pattern generation requirements in the PMA.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please delete the RIN12OMA row in Table 86-9. At 86 86.6.2 p257 line 30 (just above this table), add 'The transmitter's RIN12OMA should not exceed -128 dB/Hz.'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Note other comments 420, 426 and 558 tagged "RIN". Just delete the row.

CI 86 SC 86.6.2 P 257 L 50 # 426  
 Petrilla, John Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D RIN

In table 86-8 the parameter RIN12OMA is noted for further study and becoming informative if its effects are included in an aggregate signal parameter. Such aggregate signal parameters, TDP & OMA-TDP, have been proposed. If TDP is accepted RIN12OMA can be noted as informative or deleted.

*SuggestedRemedy*

If TDP is accepted RIN12OMA, note as informative or delete.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Note other comments 558, 420 and 608 tagged "RIN".  
 Follow response to 608.

CI 86 SC 86.6.2 P 258 L 8 # 427  
 Petrilla, John Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

In table 86-8 eye mask coordinates, X1, X2, X3, Y1, Y2, Y3, shown as 0.25, 0.4, 0.45, 0.25, 0.28 0.4, respectively, are noted for further study. These values are just carried over from clause 52 and do not take into account the shift to a hit ratio of 5E-5 nor the requirements of the optical receiver for SRn. Further, since it has been shown, petrilla\_03\_1108, that a six-sided mask is sufficient, an eight-sided mask should be rejected due to the increase in test time or loss of yield due to the additional corners.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In table 86-8 change eye mask coordinates, X1, X2, X3, Y1, Y2, Y3, to 0.23, 0.34, 0.34, 0.17, 0.17 0.4, respectively.

A presentation, petrilla\_01\_0109, will be provided in support.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Consider presentation. Also daw\_0x\_0109 might shed some light.  
 [Subclause changed from 86.2.2]

CI 86 SC 86.6.2 P 258 L 9 # 609  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

To be clear, we should give the eye mask hit ratio spec in the table as we do for the other eye masks. Also this is preparation towards a common definition of eye mask.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert row in table under Transmitter eye mask definition, (indented) Eye hit ratio  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  hits per sample.

In 86.7.5.7.1, change

The transmitter shall achieve a hit ratio lower than  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  hits per sample, where "hits" are...

to

The transmitter shall achieve a hit ratio lower than the limit of hits per sample specified in the appropriate table e.g. Table 86-8 or  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  hits per sample if not otherwise specified. "Hits" are...

Revise PICS SOM8 to match.

Consider making similar changes in tables 87-7, 88-7 and 88-11 and clauses 86.7.3.2.1, 86.7.5.7, 86.7.5.7.1, 87.8.9 and 88.9.8.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.6.2-4 P 259 L 14 # 331  
 CHANG, Frank Vitesse

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Comment on Table 86-8 (TP2) and Table 86-10 (TP3). Suggest to reuse 802.3ae 10GBASE-SR Stress RX sensitivity for TP3 specs as in Table 86-10 by taking into account xtalk impacts.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Specify RX stressed sens. in OMA about -5.5dBm. (pls see slides to review 802.3ae 10GBASE-SR Stress RX sensitivity test/margin results.)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Page number was 257-9

Cl 86 SC 86.6.4 P 259 L 15 # 416  
Petrilla, John Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In table 86-10, the Stressed Rx sensitivity parameter and associated test conditions are TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In table 86-10, change the Stressed Rx sensitivity parameter and associated test conditions from TBD as follows:

Stressed Rx sensitivity to -5.4  
Vertical eye closure penalty to 2.0  
Stressed eye J2 jitter to 0.35

A presentation, petrilla\_01\_0109, will be provided in support.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.6.4 P 259 L 21 # 454  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Specifying the stressed receiver input signal as having minimal random jitter and noise for 10G was a bad idea as this was too difficult for test equipment vendors to produce resulting in over-stressful tests, also it is better to test with a signal that more accurately represents a worst case input signal.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a row to table 86-10. stressed eye J9 jitter. Value TBD Also include a definition of J9 jitter in the test section.

Note that these are changes proposed in Anslow\_04

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 86 SC 86.6.4 P 259 L 21 # 611  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D SRS\_SJ

For the same reasons as for LRM, sinusoidal jitter tolerance testing should be separated.

*SuggestedRemedy*

For the stressed receiver sensitivity, use just one SJ setting e.g. at 80 GHz.

Add rows to Table 86-8:

Conditions of receiver jitter tolerance test:

Jitter frequency and peak to peak amplitude (75, 5) (kHz, UI)

Jitter frequency and peak to peak amplitude (375, 1) (kHz, UI)

Add new subclause:

86.7.5.10 Receiver sinusoidal jitter tolerance

Receiver sinusoidal jitter tolerance for each lane is defined as in 68.6.11, with the following differences:

a) The pattern to be received is specified in Table 86-16;

b) The other receive lanes not being tested are receiving Pattern 1, 2, 3, 5, or portion(s) of a 10GBASE-R, 40GBASE-R4 or 100GBASE-R10 signal, and the transmitter is transmitting one of these signals using all lanes, and

c) The transmitter and the receiver are not synchronous.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to 579.

Note comment 333 proposes an alternative remedy.

Cl 86 SC 86.6.4 P 259 L 30 # 538  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Needless repetition; these similar footnotes are not coincidence.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change

Vertical eye closure penalty is a test condition for measuring stressed receiver sensitivity. It is not a required characteristic of the receiver.

Stressed eye jitter is a test condition for measuring stressed receiver sensitivity. It is not a required characteristic of the receiver.

to

Vertical eye closure penalty and stressed eye jitter are test conditions for measuring stressed receiver sensitivity. They are not characteristics of the receiver.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment 610.

CI 86 SC 86.6.4 P 259 L 30 # 610  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Needless repetition; the similar footnotes are not coincidence.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change

Vertical eye closure penalty is a test condition for measuring stressed receiver sensitivity. It is not a required characteristic of the receiver.

Stressed eye jitter is a test condition for measuring stressed receiver sensitivity. It is not a required characteristic of the receiver.

to

Vertical eye closure penalty and stressed eye jitter are test conditions for measuring stressed receiver sensitivity. They are not characteristics of the receiver.

And similarly in Clauses 87 and 88.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.6.4 P 260 L 27 # 457  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Some of the specifications (jitter and eye mask) in Table 86-12 should be calibrated after the connector while others (reflection coefficients) are tested before the connector.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Either change the title to "TP4 and TP4a" and add "at TP4" to the jitter and eye mask rows and "at TP4a" to the other rows or better split the table moving the jitter and eye mask rows into a new table labelled "PPI receiver electrical input tolerance specifications at TP4".

Note that this change is also required to Anslow\_04

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

As for the other pair of tables: two rows does not justify a third table. Editor to see if adding a column is practical, if not title table "at TP4", add "at TP4a" to S-parameters.

Also, does Table 86-12 need an AC common mode tolerance input voltage tolerance 7.5 mV RMS min?

CI 86 SC 86.6.5 P 260 L 10 # 418  
Petrilla, John Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In table 86-11, eye mask coordinate X1 = 0.35 is based on T.J. Anslow\_04\_0109 proposes shifting to a hit ratio of 1E-5 but doesn't take into account the reduced allocation at TP1.

The same issue holds for table 86-12.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Accept the hit ratio, 1E-5, proposed in anslow\_04\_0109, but change X1 to 0.27.

Repeat in table 86-12.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.6.5 P 260 L 11 # 455  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Eye mask tests are best specified at a reasonable hit rate to provide statistical significance in a reasonable test time. 5e-5 is an appropriate hit ratio. with this hit ratio and to reduce the stress on the electrical receiver the value of X1 should be reduced.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In Tables 86-11 and 86-12

Change X1 value to 0.29 and add "Hit Ratio = 5x10<sup>-5</sup> to the conditions for both tables.

Note that these are proposed changes in Anslow\_04

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

While this may not be the optimum hit ratio, it's a reasonable choice.

CI 86 SC 86.6.5 P 260 L 19 # 559  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Is this the best choice for AC blocking?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Consider having the AC coupling in the host receiver rather than the PMD receive side.

If not, Table 86-11 should say 'Single ended output voltage tolerance' and Table 86-12 should say 'Single ended output voltage'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Discuss.



CI 86 SC 86.6.5 P 260 L 34 # 83  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The total jitter and DJ at TP4 are at the same level as SFP+, 4x and 10x SerDes and host need some margin due to PCB degradation and crosstalk

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to use J9=0.63 and J2=0.46 UI per anslow\_04\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.6.5 P 260 L 5 # 417  
Petrilla, John Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In table 86-11, jitter parameters, TP4 TJ and DJ, are noted for further study.

SuggestedRemedy

Accept the changes in anslow\_04\_0109 for table 86-6. for table 86-11 jitter parameters.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.6.5 P 260 L 6 # 456  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

From a system standpoint J9 and J2 are better specification parameters than Dj and Tj. Also some relaxation in the requirements for the electrical receiver appears to be a better compromise

SuggestedRemedy

In tables 86-11 and 86-12  
Change total Jitter to J9 Jitter value 0.63 and Deterministic jitter to J2 jitter value 0.46

Note that these are changes proposed in Anslow\_04

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.6.5 P 260 L 6 # 82  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The total jitter and DJ at TP4 are at the same level as SFP+, 4x and 10x SerDes and host need some margin due to PCB degradation and crosstalk

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to use J9=0.63 and J2=0.46 UI per anslow\_04\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.6.5.1 P 261 L 6 # 560  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Repetition; notice that equation 86-3 is the same as 86-1. Also 'where where'.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:  
given by:  
 $20 \times \log_{10}(|SDD_{nn}|) \text{ LE } \max(-12, -12 + 2 \times \sqrt{f}), -6.3 + 13 \times \log_{10}(f/5.5)$  (86.3)  
where where SDD<sub>nn</sub> is SDD22 or SDD11 and f is the frequency in GHz.  
with  
given by Equation 86-1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.6.5.1 P 261 L 6 # 81  
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

It would be better to separate the equation in to two

SuggestedRemedy

SDD11=-12 + 2\*SQRT(f) from 0.01 to 4.1 GHz  
SDD11=-6.3 +13\*log10(f/5.5) from 4.1 to 11.1 GHz

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Equation is a duplicate: see response to 79 and 560.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.6.5.1**                      **P 261**                      **L 8**                      # **458**  
 Dudek, Mike                                      JDSU  
**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 two "where"s  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete one  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Deleted by 560.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.6.6**                      **P 261**                      **L 10**                      # **433**  
 Abbott, John                                      Corning Incorporated  
**Comment Type**    **TR**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 lines 10-37  
 Summarize link power budget and a link model in an informative annex with more detail. The link power budget in Table 86-13 should be incorporated into a link model spreadsheet similar to 10GEPBud3\_1\_16a.xls found at <http://ieee802.org/3/ae/public/index.html> (for 10GBASE).  
 However, the link model should be kept current with the 802.3ba project and summarized in annex 86A at the end of the project. Note that the spreadsheet 10GEPBud3\_1\_16a.xls does not accurately represent the 10GBASE link budget for all PMDs because it was a proposal early in the project. This has the potential to cause misunderstandings among users and also in subsequent standards.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Summarize link power budget and a link model in an informative annex 86A with more detail.  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Standards don't have to show their working; an annex in the standard is not the right place for such material, and would not be convenient for a spreadsheet. 802.3ae partly moved away from the spreadsheet.  
 Editor can respin 10GEPBud3\_1\_16a.xls with numbers from this project (for Clause 86, anyway) when they are stable enough and make it available on the tool page, but it may not be very helpful (jitter discussion...).

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.6.6**                      **P 261**                      **L 22**                      # **330**  
 CHANG, Frank                                      Vitesse  
**Comment Type**    **TR**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Referring to baseline proposal pepeljugoski\_01\_0508.pdf, in slide#13 PMD will with PMA as a CDR, possibly with simple EDC.  
 The allocation for penalties (6.4dB) and power budget (8.3dB) could be too pessimistic.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Plan to address this from the slides for SRS test.  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Line number was 1630

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.6.6**                      **P 261**                      **L 22**                      # **459**  
 Dudek, Mike                                      JDSU  
**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The link budget is with the largest TDP  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Add "for max TDP" to the Power budget and allocation for penalties rows.  
 this is proposed in Anslow\_04  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 maximum

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.6.6**                      **P 261**                      **L 22**                      # **561**  
 Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies  
**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Power budget may change as a consequence of other changes.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Revise entries in power budget table 86-13 following other changes.  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.6.6**                      **P 261**    **L 32**                      # **204**  
 Anslow, Peter                              Nortel Networks

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

In Table 86-13 notes b and d say:  
 b [Editor's note (to be removed prior to publication) - For further study]  
 d [Editor's note (to be removed prior to publication) - Connector loss under study]  
 These values seem to be as stable as any others in this clause, so these notes are no longer needed.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove editor's notes    b and d

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.7.1**                      **P 262**    **L 10**                      # **210**  
 Anslow, Peter                              Nortel Networks

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      *Skew*

In Figure 86-3 SP5 is shown as the same as TP4. However, in Figures 80-2 and 80-3 SP5 is shown as the input to the PMA and therefore includes all skew due to the interconnect between the PMD and the PMA

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Move SP5 to be at TP5 in the figure.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 In the PPI and (I hope) nAUI with connector, the PMA extends to the connector from one side and the PMD extends to the connector from the other side. This clause and others say "If the PMD service interface is physically instantiated so that the skew at SP5 can be measured, ...". The only suitable measurement point is as shown.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.7.1**                      **P 262**    **L 23**                      # **84**  
 Ghiasi, Ali                                      Broadcom

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

MCB and HCB compliance board are used to measure TP1a, TP4a, TP1, and TP4 but the response of these are board are not included

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Add SDD11/SDD22, SDD21/SDD12, SCC11/SCC22, SCD21/SCD12, and NEXT/FEXT for the mated HCB-MCB boards. In addition MCB and HCB PCB loss less the connector need to be defined. For detail description see ghiasi\_02\_0109

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.7.1**                      **P 262**    **L 35**                      # **547**  
 Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      **CB**

Need to define the compliance board losses.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Add new 86.7.1.1 Compliance board transfer characteristics. Add equations for nominal S21 of HCB and MCB, from instrumentation connectors to just before module connector. Use the SFP+ equations scaled up by 0.2 to 0.3 dB at Nyquist.  
 Add new 86.7.1.2 Transfer characteristics of mated HCB and MCB, consistent with above.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.7.1**                      **P 262**    **L 6**                      # **214**  
 Anslow, Peter                              Nortel Networks

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

The symbol used in Figure 86-3 for the optical connector to the modules is not consistent with that used in Figure 86-2 (or 87-2 or 88-2)

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change the optical connector symbol to the modules to be consistent with that used in Figure 86-2

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 It's a multiway module connector, unlike in 87 and 88.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.7.2**                      **P 262**    **L 42**                      # **211**  
 Anslow, Peter                              Nortel Networks

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      *Patterns*

This says "NOTE-The longer test patterns are designed to emulate system operation; however, they do not form valid 10GBASE-R, 40GBASE-R4 or 100GBASE-R10 frames." This is not correct for test pattern 5 in Table 86-15. This is scrambled idles and is a valid signal. Also the use of the term "frame" is not helpful here.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Cghange to: "NOTE-Test patterns 3 and 4 are designed to emulate system operation; however, they do not form valid 40GBASE-R4 or 100GBASE-R10 signals."

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Pattern 4 (PRBS9) is not like system operation.  
 The term "frame" is helpful for those used to Gigabit Ethernet.  
 Could delete the note altogether.

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 263 L 28 # 505  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns

Table 86-15 lists pattern types that are appropriate for 10GBASE-R PHYs rather than 40/100GBASE-SR and is in a different format from Tables 87-10 and 88-14. Patterns 1 and 2 could never be seen in 40/100GBASE-SR and could only be generated by test gear. In this case there is a huge variety of test patterns that could be used. Why not add SONET/SDH or CEI test patterns?

Also, it is poor practice to define the test pattern in two places. This is done in 83.5.9 with a reference to 49.2.8 for PRBS31, it should not be done again here.

Why are there two square patterns?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace Table 86-15 with the same table as 87-10

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 263 L 30 # 562  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns

Pattern 1 is a suitable test pattern and it may be convenient for factories and others to use the same patterns for 10G, 40G and 100G production.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Turn the row for Pattern 1 from italic to upright. Move or remove the footnote depending on decision for Pattern 2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf.

See response to comment 505.

See also comments 473, 563, 564, 205, 463, 460, 634, 462, 565, 332.

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 263 L 32 # 473  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns

Test pattern 2 in clause 52 was generated to stress CDR circuits. It includes pattern transitions that are considered likely to be more stressful than PRBS31. There is no provision in the PMA to generate a pattern like this. Is it necessary?

*SuggestedRemedy*

If necessary add this test pattern to the PMA on a per lane basis.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf.

See response to comment 505.

See also comments 562, 563, 564, 205, 463, 460, 634, 462, 565, 332.

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 263 L 32 # 563  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns

Pattern 2 is as suitable for 40G and 100G as it is for 10G, and it may be convenient for factories and others to use the same patterns for 10G, 40G and 100G production.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Turn the row for Pattern 2 from italic to upright. Remove footnote a.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf.

See response to comment 505.

See also comments 562, 473, 564, 205, 463, 460, 634, 462, 565, 332.

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 263 L 36 # 564  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D PRBS9

Adopt PRBS9.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 'Short TBD' to 'PRBS9', change '[PRBS9 (if chosen) is defined in 68.6.1]' to '68.6.1' (upright text).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf.

See response to comment 505.

See also comments 562, 473, 563, 205, 463, 460, 634, 462, 565, 332.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.7.2**                      **P 263**                      **L 36**                      # **205**  
 Anslow, Peter                                      Nortel Networks

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                                      **PRBS9**

Table 86-15 pattern 4  
 Since the DDPWS measurement is specified to use PRBS9, make this the short TBD

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change "Short TBD" to "PRBS9"

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf.  
 See response to comment 505.  
 See also comments 562, 473, 563, 564, 463, 460, 634, 462, 565, 332.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.7.2**                      **P 263**                      **L 37**                      # **463**  
 Dudek, Mike                                      JDSU

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                                      **PRBS9**

We should use the PRBS9 pattern as the short pattern

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 replace "short TBD" with PRBS9. Pattern defined in 68.6.1

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf.  
 See response to comment 505.  
 See also comments 562, 473, 563, 564, 205, 460, 634, 462, 565, 332.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.7.2**                      **P 263**                      **L 37**                      # **460**  
 Dudek, Mike                                      JDSU

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                                      **Patterns**

The 40G and 100Gb/s pseudo-random pattern is at the PCS. This isn't useful for testing the PMD. Also as there is a PMA PRBS as well it's confusing to have this.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Either delete pattern no 5 or add PCS between Gb/s and pseudo

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Perhaps we should have been clearer that we meant what comes out of (one lane of) the PMA stack if the PCS puts its test pattern into it.  
 To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf.  
 See response to comments 199, 603, 505.  
 See also comments 562, 473, 563, 564, 205, 463, 634, 462, 565, 332.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.7.2**                      **P 263**                      **L 41**                      # **565**  
 Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                                      **Patterns**

The information about alternative square waves should not be in a normative table. One could move the information to the NOTE on the previous page, or...

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete the row 'Square'.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf.  
 See response to comment 505.  
 See also comments 562, 473, 563, 564, 205, 463, 460, 634, 462, 332.

**Cl 86**    **SC 86.7.2**                      **P 263**                      **L 41**                      # **634**  
 Latchman, Ryan                                      Gennum Corp

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                                      **Patterns PRBS9**

Many potential test patterns are listed. Suggest that square wave patterns are not necessary especially if short (PRBS9) patterns is included

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 remove square wave patterns from test pattern list (also change transmitter OMA test pattern to PRBS9)

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf.  
 See response to comment 505.  
 See also comments 562, 473, 563, 564, 205, 463, 460, 462, 565, 332.

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 263 L 41 # 462
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns

The Clause 52 square wave isn't helpful because it had variable run length. Clause 68 improved the definition by standardizing on a single run length making measurements more reproducible.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the clause 52 square pattern row in table 86-15. In talbe 86-16 change all the square pattern references to Square, eight one's and eight zero's.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf. See response to comment 505. See also comments 562, 473, 563, 564, 205, 463, 460, 634, 565, 332.

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 264 L 16 # 420
Petrilla, John Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D RIN

Table 86-16 contains a parameter, RIN12OMA, that was included until an aggregate Tx metric was defined. Anslow\_04\_0109 proposes TDP and OMA-TDP as aggregate metrics permitting RIN12OMA to be deleted or declared informative.

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 86-16 delete parameter, RIN12OMA, if TDP or OMA-TDP is included.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Note other comments 558, 426 and 608 tagged "RIN". Follow response to 608.

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 264 L 3 # 566
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns

Completing table of test patterns. Remove rows for TJ and DJ, add rows for J2 and J9. Replace 'Aggregate TP2 metric' with 'TDP, OMA-TDP'. For rows that say '1 or 3' and for J2, allow Pattern 1, 2 or 3, the appropriate portion of a valid 40GBASE-R4 or 100GBASE-R10 signal (this includes Pattern 5), or a valid 10GBASE-R signal. For Tx eye, don't allow Pattern 2. For TDP, stressed sensitivity and J9, don't allow Pattern 1. For J9, don't allow Pattern 2 or PRBS9 (this last needs review). For DDPWS, PRBS9 only. For OMA and transition time, square 8+8 or PRBS9. Delete the RIN12OMA row as RIN12OMA should not be a normative spec and the test procedure in 52.9.6 is not appropriate for a system level test.

SuggestedRemedy

See separate file to follow.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 11 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf. Response to be captured here. See also comments 206, 437, 464, 635.

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 264 L 35 # 464
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns

footnote b isn't helpful. Using a portion of a 40Gbase-R4 signal to measure spectral width isn't easy.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete footnote b

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. It is helpful, it is easy. The other three portions go through the other three transmit lanes.

To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 11 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf. See response to comment 566. See also comments 206, 437, 635.

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 264 L 5 # 206  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns

In Table 86-16 most of the test patterns are undefined.  
Also, alternative patterns should not be shown with footnotes.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Leave "Transmitter OMA (modulated optical power)" as "Square"  
Set "RIN12OMA" to "Square"  
Set "Calibration of OMA for receiver tests" to "Square"  
Set "Data Dependent Pulse Width Shrinkage (DDPWS)" to "4"  
Set "Transition time" to "Square"  
Set the pattern for all other rows to: "3, 5 or valid 40/100GBASE-R signal"  
Remove all three footnotes

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 11 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf  
See response to comment 566.  
See also comments 437, 464, 635.

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 264 L 9 # 437  
king, jonathan finisar

Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns

Table 86-16  
Some CDRs will not support a square wave test pattern because the transition density is too low for clock rate acquisition. An equivalent measurement can be made using PRBS9 (pattern 4).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "or 4" after Square on lines 9, 20, 31 in table 86-16  
Add "or 68.6.2" to the 'Related subclause' column on lines 9, 20

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 11 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf  
See response to comment 566.  
See also comments 206, 464, 635.

CI 86 SC 86.7.2 P 264 L 15 # 419  
Petrilla, John Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 86-16 contains a parameter, Aggregate TP2 metric. Anslow\_04\_0109 proposes TDP and OMA-TDP as aggregate metrics.

*SuggestedRemedy*

If the TDP or OMA-TDP proposal in anslow\_04\_0109, is accepted, replace the term, 'aggregate TP2 metric' with TDP and/or OMA-TDP.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.7.3.1 P 262 L 44 # 429  
Abbott, John Corning Incorporated

Comment Type T Comment Status D

lines 44-54 (total skew, dynamic skew for MM fibers)

Need to be sure MM definitions of skew are correct and correctly references in subclauses 80.4 and 82.2.12

*SuggestedRemedy*

make sure the definitions of total skew and dynamic skew are correct and functional for MM fiber. Make sure the values of the parameters are consistent with those definitions. Cross-reference to subclauses 82.2.12 and 80.4

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: Commenter has not indicated the comment type. Assigned comment type as Technical]

CI 86 SC 86.7.3.1 P 262 L 49 # 424  
Petrilla, John Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Clause 86.7.3.1 only refers to 82.2.12 without defining measurement methods. Unfortunately, the definitions of clause 82.2.12 do not lend themselves to pragmatic test implementation as they refer to timing changes or differences over the extent of time the link is operational.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Accept the relevant change proposed in anslow\_04\_0109, except add appropriate time durations for these measurements, e.g. 24 hrs for dynamic skew & 7 days for total skew at SP1 and SP4 to capture effect of equipment power-up and daily cycles. Durations at SP2, SP3 and SP5 may be substantially shorter as only the PMA and PMD are involved.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "Total Skew and Dynamic Skew are defined in 82.2.12" to "Total Skew and Dynamic Skew are defined in 82.2.12 and are required to remain within the limits given in 86.2.2 over the time that the link is operational. Skew points as they relate to the PPI are shown in Figure 86-3."

Add additional text per response to comment 502 (anslow\_04\_0109.pdf). See comment 622 for proposed change of skew terminology.

CI 86 SC 86.7.3.1 P 263 L 36 # 332  
CHANG, Frank Vitesse

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PRBS9

From the experience of LRM and SFP+, PRBS9 should be the short pattern

*SuggestedRemedy*

PRBS9 in Table 86-15.

Same in Table 87-10.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf.

See response to comment 505.

See also comments 562, 473, 563, 564, 205, 463, 460, 634, 462, 565.

CI 86 SC 86.7.3.2 P 264 L 38 # 567  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Editor's note may not be needed after this round: the eye mask measurement is pretty much there although the exact levels of statistical significance need review.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Consider deleting the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.7.3.2 P 264 L 40 # 428  
Petrilla, John Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Clause 86.7.3.2, defining eye mask measurements, makes no mention of minimum test equipment requirements or de-embedding for the effects of the test equipment. To avoid over rejection of otherwise acceptable product and for consistent results this should be explicitly addressed and applied consistently at the various interfaces. Since it is difficult to de-embed the test equipment from eye mask results, setting minimum test equipment requirement should be considered first.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a statement to 86.7.3.2 declaring that the equipment for measuring and displaying eye mask results meet minimum requirements for sensitivity (e.g. 3 dB better than the downstream receiver requirement), timing uncertainty (e.g. < 300 fs), and bandwidth (e.g. 7.5 GHz for optical interfaces and 12 GHz for electrical interfaces). After the approach is decided, then all eye mask coordinates should be evaluated for fit with this approach.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Timing uncertainty is made more consistent by removing ambiguity about clock recovery unit (comment 568).

Insert in 86.7.4.5 before the last sentence "The reference measuring instrument has a bandwidth of 12 GHz and noise of ?? mV RMS for a 10.3125 GBd signal. Implementors should consider whether a correction is needed for actual instrument properties."

No need for similar in 87, 88 because they don't specify electrical eyes.

Insert in 86.7.5.7 before the last sentence "For 40GBASE-SR4 and 100GBASE-SR10, the reference measuring instrument has noise of ?? mW RMS of light. Implementors should consider whether a correction is needed for actual instrument properties."

Add similar sentences in 87.8.9 and 88.9.8.



CI 86 SC 86.7.3.2 P 264 L 42 # 568  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In eye mask testing, if use of CRU makes a difference we must specify whether it is used or not. If it doesn't make a difference, the test implementer can take short cuts whatever we say. We cannot fail a transmitter for wander that the receiver is specified to tolerate, or credit it for low jitter or noise that will be overwritten by any receiver that can tolerate the wander.

Note Clauses 87 and 88 rely on this text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change  
A clock recovery unit (CRU) should be used to trigger the oscilloscope for mask measurements, as shown in Figure 52-9. It should have a high frequency corner bandwidth as specified in Table 86-17 and a slope of -20 dB/decade.

to  
A clock recovery unit (CRU) shall be used to trigger the oscilloscope for mask measurements, as shown in Figure 52-9. It has a high frequency corner bandwidth as specified in Table 86-17 and a slope of -20 dB/decade.  
And add a PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.7.3.2.1 P 265 L 12 # 321  
CHANG, Frank Vitesse

Comment Type E Comment Status D

SuggestedRemedy

Center the Eq.86-4.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Find out what the house style is and follow it.

CI 86 SC 86.7.4.2 P 265 L 45 # 212  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Equation 86-6 uses a mixture of "x" and "." for multiply

SuggestedRemedy

To be consistent with other equations in clause 86 change to "x"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.7.4.2 P 266 L 3 # 213  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Figure 86-4 uses the same symbol for an electrical connector as the previous figures used for an optical connector.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the symbol for the electrical connectors to be the same as was used in Figure 86-3 for an electrical connector.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.7.4.3 P 266 L 19 # 209  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
typo "w\lve"

SuggestedRemedy

change "w\lve" to "wave"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.7.4.3 P 266 L 19 # 635  
Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type T Comment Status D PRBS9

Transition time can be measured with PRBS9 pattern which is used in jitter measurements. Change transition time pattern to PRBS9

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to "The normative test pattern is the PRBS9 test pattern"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 11 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf  
See response to comment 566.  
See also comments 206, 437, 464.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.3 P 266 L 19 # 407  
 D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 spelling error - "w/ve"

SuggestedRemedy  
 replace with "wave"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.3 P 266 L 19 # 435  
 king, jonathan finisar

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 typo: square w/ve

SuggestedRemedy  
 square wave

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.3 P 266 L 19 # 529  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 w/ve

SuggestedRemedy  
 wave

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.3 P 266 L 19 # 569  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns  
 Having to use a pattern as unnatural as the 8+8 square wave is a pain, and is not necessary here.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Swap the normative and alternative procedures with editorial adjustments to make the text flow.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See slide 10 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf and other comments marked "Patterns" and "PRBS9".

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.3 P 266 L 19 # 465  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 typo

SuggestedRemedy  
 replace w/ve with wave.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.3 P 266 L 24 # 103  
 Bergmann, Ernie Circadian/JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 "In this case the 1% level and..."

SuggestedRemedy  
 change to:  
 "In this case the 0% level and..." (the ZeroLevel is 0%!)

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.3 P 266 L 27 # 570  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Unwanted question  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete '[TBC]'.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.4 P 266 L 34 # 577  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 J2 and J8 have optical application.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Define J2 and J9 at 86.7.3.3.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.4 P 266 L 34 # 466  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Jitter methodology should use J2 and J9 and define these test methodologies.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace 86.7.4.4 with appropriate text from Anslow-04.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.5 P 267 L 11 # 571  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Depending on the outcome of another comment, there may be both absolute and relative electrical masks.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise 86.7.4.5 as appropriate.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Depending on the other comment.

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 U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn  
 SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.6 P 267 L 18 # 421  
 Petrilla, John Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Shouldn't the reference impedance for common mode measurements be 25 Ohms?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 100 to 25.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.4.7 P 267 L 20 # 572  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Any more electrical parameter definitions to be added?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete this heading or add them.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.5.3 P 267 L 37 # 573  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 The OMA definition is the only thing that causes us to need square wave generators. We need a measure with low experimental scatter for the clean reference signal in the TDP definition, and for the compliance signal in the stressed receiver sensitivity - both these (after averaging) are very 'linear' signals. We don't need such a good measure for the OMA of the product transmitter.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Look again at deriving OMA from a captured PRBS9 waveform. If this method is accurate enough (as it will be for the first two cases above), make it normative and delete the square wave generators in the PMA.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.5.4 P 267 L 39 # 467  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 TDP should be used for the Aggregate TP2 signal  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace section 86.7.5.4 with TDP as proposed in Anslow\_04  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 [Editor's note: Commenter has not indicated the comment type. Assigned comment type as Technical]

Cl 86 SC 86.7.5.4 P 267 L 39 # 423  
 Petrilla, John Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 TDP & OMA-TDP hve been proposed in anslow\_04\_0109 as aggregate signal parameters. Unfortunately there seems to be a minor error in calculation of the bandwidth of the reference receiver/filter combination.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Accept the changes to 86.7.5.4 in anslow\_04\_0109, except in item e, change 6.0 to 6.2.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.5.4 P 267 L 45 # 612  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Clause 52 stressed sensitivity for 10GBASE-S uses a comparison of a sensitivity measurement of a good signal with a reference receiver without a transversal filter, and of the signal (transmitter) under test with the same reference receiver but with the transversal filter in place. This is disliked.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 I hope we can get to a TDP definition where the same reference receiver is used with both the reference signal and the signal under test.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.5.6 P 268 L 1 # 422  
 Petrilla, John Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D RIN  
 The parameter, RIN12OMA, was in lieu of or until an aggregate signal parameter was defined. TDP and OMA-TDP are now defined and RIN12OMA can be made informative or deleted.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete subclause 86.7.5.6, if TDP or OMA-TDP is included.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Note other comments marked "RIN".  
 Delete.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.5.6 P 268 L 3 # 574  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D RIN  
 Having to provide lane-by-lane square wave generators would be a nuisance, especially as RIN12OMA should be just informative.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change subclause to:  
 The RIN measurement methodology of 52.9.6 may be used with these exceptions:  
 a) All lanes are operational in both directions (transmit and receive);  
 b) Each lane is tested individually;  
 c) The signal on the lanes not under test should be Pattern 1, 2, 3 (PRBS31), 5 or parts of valid 10GBASE-R, 40GBASE-R or 100GBASE-R signals;  
 d) It may be more convenient to find the equivalent of P\_M with Pattern 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or parts of valid 10GBASE-R, 40GBASE-R or 100GBASE-R signals and apply a correction factor.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Note other comments marked "RIN".  
 Delete the subclause.

**CI 86**    **SC 86.7.5.7**    **P 268**    **L**    # **207**  
 Anslow, Peter    Nortel Networks

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Remove TBD

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 change ", such as TBD signal, are likely" to ", such as a 223-1 PRBS, are likely" where 223 is 2 raised to the power 23

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See response to comment 240.  
 See also comments 468 and 225.  
 See also comments 505, 562, 473, 563, 460.  
 [Editor's note: Commenter has not indicated the comment type. Assigned comment type as Technical. Subclause changed from 86.6.5.7.]

**CI 86**    **SC 86.7.5.7**    **P 268**    **L 12**    # **575**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 With TDP, TDP-OMA and the eye mask in the draft we have adequate TP2 specs, although with more study, the mask could be better optimised.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete the editor's note.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**CI 86**    **SC 86.7.5.7**    **P 268**    **L 22**    # **468**  
 Dudek, Mike    JDSU

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**    **Patterns**  
 We do not need an additional TBD test signal.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 delete "or with other patterns, such as TBD signal"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See response to comment 240.  
 See also comments 207 and 225.  
 See also comments 505, 562, 473, 563, 460.  
 [Editor's note: Commenter has not indicated the comment type. Assigned comment type as Technical. Subclause changed from 86.6.5.7.]

**CI 86**    **SC 86.7.5.7.1**    **P 268**    **L 37**    # **104**  
 Bergmann, Ernie    Circadian/JDSU

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 equation (86-9) appears "clipped" in that the leading symbol and trailing symbols are not clearly seen

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 make the leading symbol be "y"  
 make the trailing symbol be "GHz"  
 [now matches equation (52-3)]

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**CI 86**    **SC 86.7.5.7.1**    **P 268**    **L 37**    # **215**  
 Anslow, Peter    Nortel Networks

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 In equation 86-9 the "y" at the beginning is clipped off

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Highlight equation, Special, Equations, click on the equations button and select "Shrink-Wrap Equation"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**CI 86**    **SC 86.7.5.7.1**    **P 268**    **L 43**    # **576**  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Are the 0 and 1 amplitudes or levels? Gratuitous capitals; Clause 45 doesn't use capitals.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change 'amplitudes' to 'levels', ZERO to zero, ONE to one.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.5.7.1 P 269 L 17 # 530  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The distance between -Y3 and 0 should be the same as between 1 and 1+Y3.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move the -Y3 section lower down.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.5.8 P 269 L 24 # 531  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

There are no optical transmit jitter specs in this clause, although J2 and J9 are used for stressed receiver signal calibration.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete 86.7.5.8 Transmit jitter... and its Editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 86 SC 86.7.5.9 P 269 L 31 # 578  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Differences between this stressed receiver sensitivity procedure and 52.9.9 include:

Sinusoidal amplitude interferer is replaced by a Gaussian noise generator.  
The signal has the VECP, J2 and J9 given in Table 86-10.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Revise text per list.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

How much ISI from the filter and how much VECP from the Gaussian noise generator?  
Do we need a small amount of high frequency SJ?  
Anything else?

Cl 86 SC 86.7.5.9 P 269 L 32 # 579  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D SRS\_SJ

For the same reasons as for LRM, sinusoidal jitter tolerance testing should be separated.

*SuggestedRemedy*

For the stressed receiver sensitivity, use just one SJ setting e.g. at 80 GHz.

Delete Table 86-17. Add rows to Table 86-8:

Conditions of receiver jitter tolerance test:

Jitter frequency and peak to peak amplitude (75, 5) (kHz, UI)

Jitter frequency and peak to peak amplitude (375, 1) (kHz, UI)

Add new subclause:

86.7.5.10 Receiver jitter tolerance

Receiver jitter tolerance for each lane is defined as in 68.6.11, with the following differences:

- The pattern to be received is specified in Table 86-16;
- The other receive lanes not being tested are receiving Pattern 1, 2, 3, 5, or portion(s) of a 10GBASE-R, 40GBASE-R4 or 100GBASE-R10 signal, and the transmitter is transmitting one of these signals using all lanes, and
- The transmitter and the receiver are not synchronous.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

For the stressed receiver sensitivity, if any high frequency SJ is used, use just one SJ frequency, 80 MHz.

Delete the second Table 86-17 (on page 269). Add rows to Table 86-10:

Receiver jitter tolerance signal level in OMA, each lane

Conditions of receiver jitter tolerance test:

Jitter frequency and peak to peak amplitude (75, 5) (kHz, UI)

Jitter frequency and peak to peak amplitude (375, 1) (kHz, UI)

Add new subclause:

86.7.5.10 Receiver jitter tolerance

Receiver jitter tolerance for each lane is defined as in 68.6.11, with the following differences:

- The pattern to be received is specified in Table 86-16
- The parameters of the signal are specified in Table 86-10;
- The other receive lanes not being tested are receiving Pattern 1, 2, 3, 5, or portion(s) of a 10GBASE-R, 40GBASE-R4 or 100GBASE-R10 signal
- The transmitter is transmitting one of these signals using all lanes, and
- The transmitter and the receiver are not synchronous.

NOTE-Use of patterns ??? on the lane under test is expected to give similar results.

CI 86 SC 86.7.5.9 P 269 L 34 # 216  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 There are two tables numbered 86-17  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change Autonumber format of secind instance from "H:Table <n>\<=>< >< >< >< >< ><n>\m" to "H:Table <n>\<=>< >< >< >< >< ><n+>\m"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Another comment may delete the second one. If not, will do.

CI 86 SC 86.7.5.9 P 269 L 39 # 333  
 CHANG, Frank Vitesse  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D SRS\_SJ  
 Same argument to reuse 802.3ae 10GBASE-SR Stress RX sensitivity test for TP3 specs.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 To address two TBDs in Table 86-17 by refering 802.3qae 52.8.1.  
 same for Table 87-13.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Another pair of comments propose a separate low frequency SJ spec, like LRM.

CI 86 SC 86.7.5.9 P 269 L 48 # 469  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns  
 PRBS31 is a good pattern for stressed sensitivity  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 replace TBD with PRBS31.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 So is Pattern 5.

CI 86 SC 86.7.5.9 P 269 L 48 # 208  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns  
 Remove TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "TBD, or a valid 40GBASE-R4" to "Test patterns 3 or 5, or a valid 40GBASE-R4"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Note many other pattern comments

CI 86 SC 86.7.5.9 P 269 L 48 # 580  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Patterns  
 Patterns for transmit side for stressed sensitivity.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change  
 TBD, or a valid 40GBASE-R4 or 100GBASE-R10 signal  
 to  
 Pattern 1, 2, 3, 5, or portion(s) of a 10GBASE-R, 40GBASE-R4 or 100GBASE-R10 signal  
 Also add:  
 If multiple copies of a single-lane pattern are used, they are arranged with adequate phase differences so that the bits on the lanes at any instant are not correlated. If a multi-lane pattern such as Pattern 5 is used, no dephasing is necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Note many other comments on patterns. But is the dephasing requirement more important on the receive side? Make clear which side (or both) this applies to.

CI 86 SC 86.7.5.9 P 269 L 49 # 581  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 The bits or patterns in these tests are not data.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change  
 The data being transmitted is asynchronous to the received data.  
 to  
 The compliance signal is not synchronous to the transmitter of the receiver under test.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 86 SC 86.8 P 257 L 47 # 452
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

TDP is the best aggregate signal metric for this system. It also enables a trade off between minimum OMA and signal impairments.

SuggestedRemedy

In table 86-8 Replate Aggregate signal parameter tbd with Transmission and Dispersion Penalty (TDP) max value of 4dB. Change Optical Modulation Amplitude (OMA), each lane min from -3dBm to -6dBm Add a row "Optical Modulation Amplitude (OMA) minus TDP min -7dBm. Replace the TBD for Averagne launch power in with -8dBm

Also make equivalent changes to Table 86-9

Note that these are the proposed changes in Anslow\_04

Also (not in Anslow\_04) in table 86-16 page 264 change Aggregate TP2 metric to TDP.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. [Subclause chnaged from 86-8]

CI 86 SC 86.9 P 270 L 44 # 548
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Filling the TBDs in the channel S-parameter equation. This is for about 4 inches of PCB or 3.5 dB at Nyquist. The equations below are based on the SFP+ channel; the low loss limit is scaled by 0.6 and the high loss limit by 0.568, with a glitch around 250 MHz removed. Unlike the equation in the editor's note, it does not include the loss of the connector and the host compliance board, so it is more informative for IC and board designers (and it is 'informative').

SuggestedRemedy

20xlog10(|SDD21|) <= 0.3 -0.3xf 10^9 <= f <= 9.333x10^9
20xlog10(|SDD21|) <= -2.5 9.333x10^9 <= f <= 11.1x10^9
20xlog10(|SDD21|) >= -0.3 10^6 <= f <= 135x10^6
20xlog10(|SDD21|) >= -0.061 -0.48xsqrt(f) -0.456xf 135x10^6 <= f <= 7x10^9
20xlog10(|SDD21|) >= 11.36 -2.272xf 7x10^9 <= f <= 8x10^9
20xlog10(|SDD21|) >= -9 8x10^9 <= f <= 11.1x10^9
Revise figure 86-7 to illustrate this.

Change 'between the PMA IC and TP1 or TP4,' to 'between the PMA IC (TP0 or TP5) and the back of the module electrical connector (i.e. not including the module connector)'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.9 P 271 L 29 # 85
Ghiasi, Ali Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Max and min SDD21/12 need to defined based on meeting of 4" of PCB board and accounting for worst case HCB loss

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to use max loss of SDD21=-0.0929 -0.0.7267\*sqrt(f) - 0.6897\*f from 0.01 to 7 GHz
SDD21 = -29.39 - 5.16\* f from 7 to 8 GHz
SDD21 = -14 dB from 8 GHz to 11.1 GHz

Min loss of SDD21=0.5 -0.5\*f from 1 to 7 GHz
SDD21=-3 dB from 7 to 11.1 GHz
see ghiasi\_02\_0109

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 86 SC 86.9 P 271 L 44 # 589
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

If no crosstalk mask is ready,

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the whole of the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 87 SC 87.12.4.1 P 302 L 13 # 230
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

XLF2 is optional so there should be a No [ ] option

SuggestedRemedy

Add a No [ ] option

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.



CI 87 SC 87.12.4.5 P 304 L 33 # 217  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Value/comment says "Conforms to IEC 60950-1"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "Conforms to IEC 60950-1"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.2 P 281 L 3742 # 334  
 CHANG, Frank Vitesse  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 Baseline proposal cole\_01\_0908.pdf didnot indicate clearly module implementation (Slide#4). I feel it's quite likely 40GBASE-LR4 will be based on 4x10GBASE-LR with CDR in the host, similar to 40GBASE-SR4, using limiting interface instead of retimed interface like XLAUI. So there is possibility that PMD service interface may be the actual interface between module and host, so not in an abstract manner.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Go ahead to define Tp1 or Tp4 specs??  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 We don't define implementations.  
 No specific remedy to clause 87 suggested.  
 [Editors note: Proposals for discussion within the task force welcomed.]

CI 87 SC 87.3.1 P 284 L 7 # 218  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 The max round trip delay including 2m of fiber for 40GBASE-LR4 is TBD. The values for 40GBASE-SR4 have been set at 1024 bit-times, or 2 pause\_quanta and the delay for 40GBASE-LR4 should be similar.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "of not more than TBD (1536) bit-times, or TBD (3) pause\_quanta" to "of not more than 1024 bit-times, or 2 pause\_quanta"  
 Remove editor's note  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.3.2 P 284 L 25 # 474  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 A separate comment changes the skew value in Table 80-3. If that is accepted the skew values on lines 25 and 28 should change  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 SP3 skew changes from 44ns to 54ns and SP4 skew changes from 144ns to 134ns.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 follow decision for table 80-3

CI 87 SC 87.5 P L # 106  
 Bergmann, Ernie Circadian/JDSU  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 The PMD service interface in Figure 87-2 is similar to that of Figure 86-2 so why not have the PPI interface of section 86 (40G version) available as the physically instantiated PMD service interface for 40GBASE-LR4?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Copy where possible, sections of 86 relating to the PPI  
 or  
 Make references to those sections in 86 relating to PPI  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 No specific remedy to clause 87 suggested.  
 [Editors note: Proposals for discussion within the task force welcomed.]

CI 87 SC 87.5.1 P 284 L 51 # 105  
 Bergmann, Ernie Circadian/JDSU  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 nonsensical reference:  
 "The PMD block diagram is shown in Figure 87-1."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 replace with:  
 "The PMD block diagram is shown in Figure 87-2."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 87**    **SC 87.5.1**    **P 284**    **L 51**    # **229**  
 Anslow, Peter    Nortel Networks

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

This says "The PMD block diagram is shown in Figure 87-1." this should be Figure 87-2

**SuggestedRemedy**

Correct c ross reference to be Figure 87-2

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 87**    **SC 87.7.1**    **P 231**    **L 15**    # **94**  
 Cole, Chris    Finisar

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

Table 87-7 40GBASE-LR4 Transmit Characteristics specifies no limit on Difference in Launch power between any two lanes (max), to limit Receiver cross-talk requirements.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add a new Table 87-7 40GBASE-LR4 Transmit Characteristics table entry:

Difference in launch power between any two lanes (Average and OMA) (max) 6.5dB

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

see also comment 93

[Editor's note: Corrected clause number and page: This comment refers to Clause 87 and page number 290]

**Cl 87**    **SC 87.7.1**    **P 290**    **L 15**    # **92**  
 Cole, Chris    Finisar

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

40GBASE-LR4 Transmit Characteristics specifies:

Average Launch Power per Lane (max) 2.3dBm

However, there is no practical limit specified on Launch Power to limit Receiver TIA overload requirements.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add a new Table 87-7 40GBASE-LR4 Transmit Characteristics table entry:

Optical Modulation Amplitutde (OMA), each lane (max) 3.5dBm

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Optical Modulation Amplitude (OMA), each lane 3.5dBm.

Task force to decide between max OMA or max peak power spec.

[Editor's note: Changed clause number and page: This comment refers to Clause 87.7.1 and page number 290]

**Cl 87**    **SC 87.7.1**    **P 290**    **L 18**    # **484**  
 Dudek, Mike    JDSU

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

In order to not require the receiver to tolerate an OMA of 5.3dBm and a peak power of 6.7dBm the max OMA and max peak power should be restricted, particularly as it is unlikely that a transmitter will be operating simultaneously with max average power, max extinction ratio and max overshoot.  
 The suggested values are equivalent at max average power to an ER of <= 6.8dB and an overshoot of 25%.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add extra rows to tables 87-7 and 87-8.

Optical Modulation Amplitude (OMA) each lane (max) 3.5dBm

Peak Power per lane (max) 5.3dBm

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

task force to decide between max OMA or max peak power spec

CI 87 SC 87.7.1 P 290 L 19 # 607  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Footnote b, 'TDP is transmitter and dispersion penalty, see 87.8.6.' is anomalous. As we say right before the table, 'The 40GBASE-LR4 transmitter shall meet the specifications defined in Table 87-7 per the definitions in 87.8.' This footnote implies that the definitions of wavelength, OMA and the rest are not there. Footnoting each and every parameter would be silly.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete footnote b. If others think some footnote is needed, footnote the first parameter (wavelength in this table) with a general footnote such as 'Parameters and associated test patterns are defined in 87.8'. Also in Clause 88.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.7.1 P 290 L 19 # 606  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In this:  
Launch power per lane (min) in OMA minus TDP  
We don't sum the powers and divide by the number of lanes. TDP may differ across the lanes. Min and max are generally at the end.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to 'Launch power in OMA minus TDP, each lane (min). Change 'Average launch power per lane (max)' to 'Average launch power, each lane (max)'. Change 'Average launch power per lane (min)' to 'Average launch power, each lane (min)'. Also in Clause 88.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.7.1 P 290 L 22 # 108  
Bergmann, Ernie Circadian/JDSU

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"Transmitter and dispersion penalty, each lane(min)" is a variation in wording from elsewhere, leading to possible confusion.

*SuggestedRemedy*

replace with:  
"Transmitter and dispersion penalty (TDP), each lane(min)"  
["(TDP)" inserted]

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

replace with:  
"Transmitter and dispersion penalty (TDP), each lane (min)"

[Editor's note: Changed to subclause 87.7.1 from Table 87-7]

CI 87 SC 87.7.1 P 290 L 22 # 605  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table uses the abbreviation for OMA but not for TDP. This makes it easy to miss the TDP spec especially if using a string search.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 'Transmitter and dispersion penalty, each lane' to 'Transmitter and dispersion penalty (TDP), each lane'. Also in Clause 88.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.7.1 P 290 L 23 # 485  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

With the specification of OMA minus TDP there is little downside to allowing a larger value of TDP. 10Gbase-LR allowed 3.2dB and didn't have potential crosstalk issues, however such a large value is unlikely to be needed with present technology. The only consequent change would be to increase the stressed sensitivity and vertical eye closure penalty for testing the Rx.

SuggestedRemedy

In table 87-7  
 Change TDP max to 2.8dB  
 In table 87-8 change stressed sensitivity to max to -9.4 and increase the vertical eye closure penalty to 2.1 dB.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Allowing a larger than necessary TDP stresses other consequent specifications.  
 Justification for increased TDP invited.

CI 87 SC 87.7.1 P 290 L 7 # 107  
 Bergmann, Ernie Circadiant/JDSU

Comment Type E Comment Status D

It is good practice to not duplicate values in multiple places, in particular, there are multiple places where wavelength ranges are given.

SuggestedRemedy

instead of using 4 lines of wavelength ranges, simply replace with:  
 "see Table 87-5"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 existing format consistent with base standard (see tables 53-7 and 53-8)

[Editor's note: Changed to subclause 87.7.1 from Table 87-7]

CI 87 SC 87.7.2 P 291 L 1 # 378  
 O'Mathuna, Pdraig GigOptix

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 87-8  
 Should specify a maximum ER, otherwise the dynamic range is poorly defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Recommended value of <9dB

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 a maximum ER spec at the receiver input places an unnecessary constraint on transmitter ER, and doesn't significantly limit dynamic range seen by the receiver.

[Editor's note: Clause number changed from 87.7 to 87.7.2 and line number set to 1.]

CI 87 SC 87.7.2 P 291 L 11 # 95  
 Cole, Chris Finisar

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 87-8 40GBASE-LR4 Receive Characteristics specifies no limit on difference in launch power between any two lanes (max), to limit Receiver cross-talk requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a new Table 87-8 40GBASE-LR4 Receive Characteristics entry:

Difference in receive power between any two lanes (Average and OMA) (max) 7.5dB

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Difference in received OMA between any two lanes (max) 7.5dB

Limiting OMA difference makes sense; Limiting the average power difference doesn't.

[Editor's note: Corrected clause number: This comment refers to Clause 87]

CI 87 SC 87.7.2 P 291 L 11 # 93  
 Cole, Chris Finisar

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 87-8 40GBASE-LR4 Receive Characteristics specifies:

Average receive power, per lane (max) 2.3dBm

However, there is no practical limit specified to limit Receiver TIA overload requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a new Table 87-8 40GBASE-LR4 Receive Characteristics entry:

Receive Power per lane(OMA)(max) 3.5dBm

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: Changed the clause number to Clause 87]

CI 87 SC 87.7.2 P 291 L 28 # 219  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Stressed eye jitter, each lane is TBD.

Since each lane of 40GBASE-LR4 is similar to 10GBASE-LR, use the value from Table 52-13 of 0.3 UI pk-pk

SuggestedRemedy

set the Stressed eye jitter, each lane to 0.3 UI pk-pk

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.7.3 P 292 L 1 # 486  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

This link budget is for one particular value of TDP. It would be good to note this.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a footnote to the Power budget and allocation for penalties rows.

Footnote to say "This exmple power budget is with a TDP of 2.3dB.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In Table 87-9 change "Power budget" to "Power budget (for max TDP)" and "Allocation for penalties" to "Allocation for penalties (for max TDP)"

CI 87 SC 87.7.3 P 292 L 18 # 220  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In Table 87-9 footnote b contains an editor's note. This note is no longer needed as the value of 2.3 dB for penalties has been stable for some time.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove editor's note from footnote b

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.8.1 P 292 L 38 # 636  
 Latchman, Ryan Gennum Corp

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Square wave pattern is not a necessary pattern if a short PRBS (PRBS9) pattern is included in the test pattern list.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove square pattern from test pattern list. Replace square wave with short PRBS (in OMA evaluation section)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

see also comments 636 438 223

CI 87 SC 87.8.1 P 292 L 41 # 221  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Pattern 4 is TBD. Since PRBS9 is required for DDPWS in clause 86, change TBD to PRBS9

SuggestedRemedy

Change pattern 4 from "TBD" to PRBS9"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 87 SC 87.8.1 P 292 L 42 # 109  
Bergmann, Ernie Circadiant/JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The TBD should be removed

*SuggestedRemedy*

replace TBD with PRBS9 and do this elsewhere for the short test pattern such as commneted for page 193

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 87 SC 87.8.1 P 292 L 47 # 222  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove TBD.  
The square wave isn't really designed to emulate system operation and pattern 5 is a valid 40GBASE-R signal.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "TBD test patterns are designed" to "Test patterns 3 and 4 are designed". Also remove double ".."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 87 SC 87.8.1 P 292 L 48 # 371  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Delete the double period at the end of the NOTE- below Table 87-10.

*SuggestedRemedy*

As per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 87 SC 87.8.1 P 293 L 11 # 438  
king, jonathan finisar

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 87-11  
Some CDRs will not support a square wave test pattern because the transition density is too low for clock rate aquisition. An equivalent measurement can be made using PRBS9 (pattern 4).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "or 4" after Square on line 11 in table 87-11 and add "or 68.6.2" after "87.8.5" in the 'related subclause' column

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
see also comments 636 438 223

Cl 87 SC 87.8.1 P 293 L 5 # 223  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In Table 87-11 most of the test patterns are undefined.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Leave "Optical modulation amplitude (OMA)" as "Square"  
Change parameter name "RINxOMA" to "RIN20OMA" and leave as "Square"  
Set "Calibration of OMA for receiver tests" to "Square"  
Set the pattern for all other rows to: "3, 5 or valid 40GBASE-LR signal"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
must be consistent with 636 438 223

Cl 87 SC 87.8.1 P 293 L 6 # 475  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Of the available patterns PRBS31 or valid 40GBASE-LR Signal is appropriate for all the tests that have TBD except Calibration of OMA which should be square.

However Clause 52 deemed it necessary to create a more stressful pattern than PRBS31 for testing CDR's.

SuggestedRemedy

Make this change

Consider however whether a pattern such as pattern 2 in clause 52 should be used for stressed receiver sensitivity testing.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

No specific remedy to document suggested.

Proposals and contributions welcome.

Cl 87 SC 87.8.10 P 296 L 1 # 226  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Clause 87.8.10 consists only of an editor's note. The PMD specifications for 10GBASE-LR and -ER in clause 52 do not have separate transmitter jitter requirements and 40GBASE-LR4 is very similar to this so remove this clause

SuggestedRemedy

Remove clause 87.8.10 entirely.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

see also comments 487 226

Cl 87 SC 87.8.10 P 296 L 1 # 487  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The transmitter jitter requirements in clause 53 are because jitter, rise/fall times, and RIN are individually specified rather than using the aggregate TDP metric. TDP is used in this clause so this section is unnecessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete subclause 87.8.10

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

see also comments 487 226

Cl 87 SC 87.8.12 P 296 L 18 # 114  
Bergmann, Ernie Circadiant/JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Several references are made to Clause 53 which is not applicable because Clause 53 assumes a transmission code that is 8B/10B

SuggestedRemedy

References instead to Clauses 49, 51, 52 or to LRM would be better.

Could call out specifically the test pattern: PRBS31 should be used.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

53.9.12 says that 'data shall be consistent with normal signal properties and content' It does not require 8B10B data encoding and the test methods described are consistent with any test pattern that may be called out in table 87-11

Cl 87 SC 87.8.12 P 296 L 26 # 227  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 87-13 for the applied sinusoidal jitter is TBD. Since each lane of 40GBASE-LR4 is similar to 10GBASE-LR, use the values from Table 52-19

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Table 87-13 and refer to Table 52-19 instead.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.8.12 P 296 L 34 # 478  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 PRBS31 is a suitable pattern for the lanes not under test  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace TBD with PRBS31.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.8.12 P 296 L 34 # 228  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Remove TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "TBD, or valid" to "Test patterns 3 or 5, or valid"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.8.2 P 292 L 51 # 503  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Clause 87.8.2 Total Skew and Dynamic Skew consists of only an editor's note.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace the editor's note with:  
 "Total Skew and Dynamic Skew are defined in 82.2.12. The measurement of Total Skew and Dynamic Skew is made by separating optical lanes with an optical de-multiplexer and then the acquiring the data on each lane using a clock and data recovery unit with a high frequency corner bandwidth as specified in Table 86-17 and a slope of -20 dB/decade. The arrival times of the one to zero transition of the alignment marker sync bits on each lane are then compared. This arrangement ensures that any high frequency jitter that is present on the signals is not included in the skew measurement."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.8.5 P 293 L 43 # 441  
 king, jonathan finisar  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 OMA measurement is defined in 52, for a square wave.  
 Definition of a test method using PRBS9 is needed.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 After "is as defined in 52.9.5" insert "or 68.6.2"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 87 SC 87.8.5 P 293 L 45 # 110  
 Bergmann, Ernie Circadiant/JDSU  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 The OMA measurement has become less variable than what is given in 52.9.5 with the LRM and SFP+ work.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Can add a sentence that the test pattern is to be a square wave consisting of 8 zeros and 8 ones. [NOT just N zeros and N ones where N is in the range of 4 to 11]  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Measurement uncertainty is not within scope of project.

CI 87 SC 87.8.6 P 294 L 3 # 476  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 Crosstalk within the PMD Tx needs to be part of this test.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add. The lanes not under test shall be operating with PRBS31 or valid 64/66B data.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add. The lanes not under test shall be operating with PRBS31 or valid 40GBASE-LR4 data.



CI 87 SC 87.8.6.1 P 294 L 10 # 224  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The rise/fall times and RIN requirements for the reference transmitter are TBD. Since each lane of 40GBASE-LR4 is similar to 10GBASE-LR, use the values from 52.9.10.1 of 30 ps and -136 dB/Hz

SuggestedRemedy

change "less than TBD ps at 20% to 80%" to "less than 30 ps at 20% to 80%"  
change "less than -TBD dB/Hz" to "less than -136 dB/Hz"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

25 or 30ps  
-135 or -136dB/Hz

see also comment 224 477

CI 87 SC 87.8.6.1 P 294 L 10 # 477  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

There are TBD's for the reference Tx rise/fall time and RIN. The exact values are not critical as their effect is to be calibrated out of the measurement, however they are specified so that the correction factor is not large (as it's calculation may not be that accurate)

SuggestedRemedy

use 25ps for the rise/fall times and 135dB/Hz for RIN.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
see also comment 224 477

CI 87 SC 87.8.6.1 P 294 L 12 # 111  
Bergmann, Ernie Circadiant/JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

reference to 52.9.9.3 is not in accord with 52.9.10.2

SuggestedRemedy

change reference to 52.9.9.2 [to align with 52.9.10.2]

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
also applies to clause 88

CI 87 SC 87.8.6.1 P 294 L 48 # 112  
Bergmann, Ernie Circadiant/JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The paragraph appears to be lifted from 52.9.10.3 but the reference to 52.9.7 was replaced by the reference to 87.8.9

SuggestedRemedy

revert reference back to 52.9.7 [detailed description of BT characteristic]

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
ref to 87.8.9 refers to a slightly different eye mask test method than described in 52.9.7

CI 87 SC 87.8.9 P 295 L 40 # 113  
Bergmann, Ernie Circadiant/JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 87-11 does not contain mask parameters

SuggestedRemedy

replace:  
"and 87-11 are"  
with  
"is"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Table 87-11 contains details pertinent to transmitter optical waveform measurement - the pattern to be used.

CI 87 SC 87.8.9 P 295 L 49 # 225  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove TBD

SuggestedRemedy

change ", such as TBD signal, are likely" to ", such as a 223-1 PRBS, are likely" where 223 is 2 raised to the power 23

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 88 SC 88.3.1 P 310 L 7 # 231  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The max round trip delay including 2m of fiber for 100GBASE-LR4 and ER4 is TBD. The values for 100GBASE-SR10 have been set at 2048 bit-times, or 4 pause\_quanta and the delay for 100GBASE-LR4 or ER4 should be similar.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "of not more than TBD (1536) bit-times, or TBD (3) pause\_quanta" to "of not more than 2048 bit-times, or 4 pause\_quanta"  
Remove editor's note

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 88 SC 88.3.2 P 310 L 25 # 479  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

A separate comment changes the skew value in Table 80-3. If that is accepted the skew values on lines 25 and 28 should change

SuggestedRemedy

SP3 skew changes from 44ns to 54ns and SP4 skew changes from 144ns to 134ns.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
[Editor's note: Missing comment type set to T]  
Different values have been proposed in comment 280. To be resolved by the Task Force  
See also comments 445, 471 and 474

Cl 88 SC 88.7.1 P 316 L 14 # 116  
Bergmann, Ernie Circadian/JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In analogy to Table 8-11, should there be an entry for "Difference in launch power between any tow lanes (max)" ?

SuggestedRemedy

Add such an entry with a value (3 dB?)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
[Editor's note: Subclause field changed from Table 88-7 to 88.7.1]  
See response to comment 96

Cl 88 SC 88.7.1 P 316 L 15 # 96  
Cole, Chris Finisar

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 88-7 100GBASE-LR4 Transmit Characteristics specifies no limit on Difference in Launch power between any two lanes (max), to limit Receiver cross-talk requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a new Table 88-7 100GBASE-LR4 Transmit Characteristics entry:

Difference in launch power between any two lanes (Average and OMA) (max) 5.0dB

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
[Editor's note: Clause number set to 88]  
A different value is proposed by comment 116. To be resolved by the Task Force

Cl 88 SC 88.7.1 P 316 L 17 # 492  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It is expected that external modulators with high extinction ratios could be used for this system and therefore specifying a minimum average power that is not equivalent to the minimum OMA at infinite extinction ratio is a significant restriction

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 88-7 Change Average power per lane min from -4.3dBm to -5.3dBm.  
In Table 88-8 Change Average receive power per lane (min) from -10.6dBm to -11.6dBm.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

The D 1.1 OMA per lane min is -1.3 dBm. At infinite extinction ratio this is -4.3 dBm

CI 88 SC 88.7.1 P 316 L 20 # 489  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

With the specified max average power and max OMA and maximum overshoot the peak power into the receiver can be 7.3dBm. It would be good to reduce this by including a peak power specification. This will only significantly restrict the over-shoot for transmitters that have maximum average power and simultaneously maximum OMA. The value specified is equivalent to 20% overshoot with maximum average power and maximum OMA

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert rows into Table 88-6 and 88-7.

"Peak Power (max) 6.8dBm.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

see also comments 92 and 484

[Editor's note: Clause number changed from 87 to 88 and sub clause from 87.7.1 to 88.7.1]

CI 88 SC 88.7.1 P 316 L 24 # 120  
 Bergmann, Ernie Circadian/JDSU

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"Transmitter and dispersion penalty, each lane (max)"

*SuggestedRemedy*

replace with:

"Transmitter and dispersion penalty (TDP), each lane (max)"

[inserted "(TDP)"]

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: Subclause field changed from Table 88-7 to 88.7.1]

See Response to comment 605

CI 88 SC 88.7.1 P 316 L 24 # 232  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In Table 88-7, the value 2.2 for "Transmitter and dispersion penalty, each lane (max)" has an associated editor's note. Since there have been no proposals to change this value, remove the editor's note.

Also applies to Allocation for penalties in Table 88-9

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove editor's note and show values of 2.2 in normal font in Tables 88-7 and 88-9

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See Response in comment 488

CI 88 SC 88.7.1 P 316 L 24 # 488  
 Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

With the specification of OMA minus TDP there is no need to have a tight specification on RIN or such a tight specification on TDP. Relaxations in these values allow implementers more possible trade-offs without degrading the link budget. There is no drawback to increasing RIN max. The only drawback to increasing the maximum value of TDP is that the receiver needs to be tested with somewhat larger VECP, but at a higher power.

Note that the LR TDP max was 3.2dB.

SuggestedRemedy

In table 88-7  
 Increase RIN specification to -130dB/Hz.  
 Increase TDP max to 2.8dB

In table 88-8  
 Increase stressed receiver sensitivity to -6.2dBm  
 Increase VECP to 2.4dB.

In table 88-9  
 Increase power budget to 9.1, increase the allocation for penalties to 2.8dB. Also add a footnote to these rows. Footnote to say "The link power budget is with the maximum TDP allowed.

delete the editors notes related to TDP value

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Values to be discussed by the Task Force and recorded here. See slides 4 and 5 of anslow\_05\_0105.pdf

In Table 88-9 change "Power budget" to "Power budget (for max TDP)" and "Allocation for penalties" to "Allocation for penalties (for max TDP)"

See also comment 232

CI 88 SC 88.7.1 P 316 L 47 # 233  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Beneath Tables 88-7 and 88-11 there are notes stating "a possible peak power specification is under consideration for 100GBASE-LR4 and ER4".

SuggestedRemedy

Either introduce such a specification and remove the editor's notes or just remove the editor's notes.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Comment 489 proposes a peak power specification.  
 See Response in comment 489

CI 88 SC 88.7.1 P 316 L 50 # 406  
 D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The Statistical Eye Ad hoc has not met in several months and is not providing any feedback into the task force.

[Editor's note (to be removed prior to publication) - Details of the transmit eye mask measurement are being studied by the Statistical Eye Ad Hoc and consequently the contents of clause 88.9.8 together with the mask parameters in Tables 88-7 and 88-11 are provisional.]

SuggestedRemedy

delete editor's notes related to Statistical Eye Ad Hoc throughout the document

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See also comments 257 and 567

CI 88 SC 88.7.1 P 316 L 7 # 115  
 Bergmann, Ernie Circadian/JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It is a bad practice to have variable values duplicated in several places

SuggestedRemedy

replace the 4 wavelength range values by:  
 "see Table 88-5"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 [Editor's note: Subclause field changed from Table 88-7 to 88.7.1]  
 The existing format is consistent with the base standard. See Tables 53-7 and 53-8

**Cl 88**    **SC 88.7.2**    **P 317**    **L 13**    # **117**  
 Bergmann, Ernie    Circadiant/JDSU

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

It is bad practice to have duplicate values for paramters in several places.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Replace the 4 wavelength ranges given by" "see Table 88-5"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 [Editor's note: Subclause field changed from Table 88-8 to 88.7.2]  
 The existing format is consistent with the base standard. See Tables 53-7 and 53-8

**Cl 88**    **SC 88.7.2**    **P 317**    **L 18**    # **118**  
 Bergmann, Ernie    Circadiant/JDSU

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

Shouldn't there be an entry: "Difference in receive power between any two lanes (max)" ?  
 [cf. Table 88-12]

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Add such an entry with value (4 dB?)

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 [Editor's note: Subclause field changed from Table 88-8 to 88.7.2]  
 See response to comment 97

**Cl 88**    **SC 88.7.2**    **P 317**    **L 19**    # **97**  
 Cole, Chris    Finisar

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

Table 88-8 100GBASE-LR4 Receive Characteristics specifies no limit on difference in launch power between any two lanes (max), to limit Receiver cross-talk requirements.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Add a new Table 88-8 100GBASE-LR4 Receive Characteristics entry:

Difference in receive power between any two lanes (Average and OMA) (max) 5.5dB

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 [Editor's note: Clause number set to 88]  
 A different value is proposed by comment 118. To be resolved by the Task Force

**Cl 88**    **SC 88.7.2**    **P 317**    **L 36**    # **234**  
 Anslow, Peter    Nortel Networks

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

Stressed eye jitter, each lane is TBD in Tables 88-8 and 88-12.  
 Since each lane of 100GBASE-LR4/ER4 is similar to 10GBASE-LR except for the higher lane rate, use the value from Table 52-13 of 0.3 UI pk-pk

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 set the Stressed eye jitter, each lane to 0.3 UI pk-pk in Tables 88-8 and 88-12

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

**Cl 88**    **SC 88.7.2**    **P 317**    **L 7**    # **375**  
 O'Mathuna, Padraig    GigOptix

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

Table 88-8 and Table 88-12: 3dB frequency is specified as max frequency (31 GHz). We believe the reason for this is that the device with higher BW should be not able to filter higher harmonics, but it should be important to have some specification about the minimum BW or, taking into account that we refer to limiting devices, at least a spec for jitter.

**SuggestedRemedy**

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 [Editor's note: Subclause field changed from 88.7 to 88.7.2 and Line set to 7]  
 None of the optical receiver specs in 802.3 have had a minimum bandwidth requirement. A receiver with too little bandwidth will fail the stressed receiver sensitivity as this is measured with degraded transmitter eye opening.

CI 88 SC 88.8 P 320 L 22 # 376  
O'Mathuna, Padraig GigOptix

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 88-12: the -21.4 dBm sensitivity needs to be better defined for the specification for both the PD and the TIA. We should have more information about the overall system:

- APD instead of PIN photodiode?
- Optical amplifier at the TIA input?

We should also consider that if APD or Optical amplifier comes into the picture, it will imply a tight constraint on the overload specification.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

[Editor's note: Subclause field changed from 88-8 to 88.8.2, Line set to 22]

The 802.3ba specification does not restrict the implementation. Even though the specifications have been generated with an SOA based pre-amplifier in mind, any implementation that meets the specifications is allowed.

Overload considerations were discussed in cole\_02\_0108.pdf

CI 88 SC 88.8.1 P 319 L # 121  
Bergmann, Ernie Circadian/JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

There is no TDP specification in this table, but one would expect one in analogy to Table 88-7 and the reference to a measurement for it in 88.9.5, page 322, line 46,

SuggestedRemedy

Add an entry:

"Transmitter and dispersion penalty (TDP), each lane (max)" with a value (2.2 dB?)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: Subclause field changed from Table 88-11 to 88.8.1]

See response to comment 491

CI 88 SC 88.8.1 P 319 L 15 # 98  
Cole, Chris Finisar

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 88-11 100GBASE-ER4 Transmit Characteristics specifies a limit on:

Difference in Launch power between any two lanes (max) 3.0dB

to limit SOA crosstalk requirements. This limit has been found difficult to support in practical transmitter implementations.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Table 88-11 100GBASE-ER4 Transmit Characteristics entry to:

Difference in launch power between any two lanes (Average and OMA) (max) 3.6dB

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: Clause number set to 88 and missing comment type set to T]

CI 88 SC 88.8.1 P 319 L 17 # 490  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Restricting the transmitter to a maximum OMA of only 4.0dBm when the receiver is specified to receive 4.5dBm OMA is unnecessary. It also seems surprising that the OMA max for the 40km part is less than for the 10km part. The same arguments hold for the maximum average power however there is no point in increasing this beyond 2.9dBm as the minimum ER allowed is 8dB

SuggestedRemedy

In table 88-11 change the maximum OMA from 4.0dBm to 4.5dBm Change the maximum average power from 2.4dB to 2.9dBm.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

To be discussed by the Task Force.

Cl 88 SC 88.8.1 P 319 L 23 # 491  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

There is no specification that requires good transmitter signal quality other than the eye diagram which is not a good predictor of system performance, also there is no restriction on chirp. By adding the TDP specification and using OMA minus TDP as the key specification metric (like LR4) the chirp specification hole is filled and trade-offs are allowed that don't impact the system budget but make it easier to make transmitters.

It is also then unnecessary to have such a tight RIN spec

*SuggestedRemedy*

In table 88-11  
Insert row Transmitter and Dispersion Penalty (max) 3.5dB.  
Insert row Optical Modulation Amplitude minus TDP each lane (min) -3.4dBm  
Row Optical Modulation Amplitude each lane min change 0.1dBm to -2.4dBm.  
Row Average launch power per lane min from -2.9dBm to -5.4dBm.  
Rin change from -132dB/Hz to -130dB/Hz.

In table 88-13  
Add footnote to the power budget and allocation for penalties. Footnote to say "This link budget is with the maximum TDP allowed"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Insert a row for TDP with value to be agreed. 3.5 dB seems too high as this is the maximum link penalty including polarization mode dispersion. 2.2 dB seems a better value.  
Change the RIN to -130 dB/Hz  
Modifying the budget to include OMA-TDP was discussed in the Denver meeting and was not agreed.  
Only modify Table 88-13 if OMA-TDP is introduced.

Cl 88 SC 88.8.1 P 319 L 7 # 119  
Bergmann, Ernie Circadiant/JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It is bad practice to duplicate values for parameters in several places.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace 4 entries of wavelength ranges with: "see Table 88-5".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
[Editor's note: Subclause field changed from Table 88-11 to 88.8.1]  
The existing format is consistent with the base standard. See Tables 53-7 and 53-8

Cl 88 SC 88.8.2 P 320 L 14 # 99  
Cole, Chris Finisar

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 88-12 100GBASE-ER4 Receive Characteristics specifies:

Difference in launch power between any two lanes (max) 4.0dB

to limit SOA cross-talk requirements. This limit has been found difficult to support in practical transmitter implementations.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change Table 88-12 100GBASE-ER4 Receive Characteristics entry to:

Difference in receive power between any two lanes (Average and OMA) (max) 4.5dB

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
[Editor's note: Clause number set to 88 and missing comment type set to T]

Cl 88 SC 88.8.2 P 320 L 15 # 493  
Dudek, Mike JDSU

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It would be good to explain the reason for the large maximum average receiver power

*SuggestedRemedy*

in table 88-12 Add a footnote to the Average receive power per lane (max). footnote to say "The Average receive power per lane (max) is larger than the transmitter value for compatibility with 100GBASE-LR4 units at short distances."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
In Table 88-12, add a footnote to the Average receive power, per lane (max) to say "The Average receive power per lane (max) is larger than the 100GBASE-ER4 transmitter value to allow compatibility with 100GBASE-LR4 units at short distances."

**Cl 88**    **SC 88.8.2**    **P 320**    **L 7**    # **122**  
 Bergmann, Ernie    Circadiant/JDSU

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

It is bad practice to have multiple locations where the same parametric value is specified.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Replace the 4 wavelength range entries with "see table 88-5".

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 [Editor's note: Subclause field changed from Table 88-12 to 88.8.2]  
 The existing format is consistent with the base standard. See Tables 53-7 and 53-8

**Cl 88**    **SC 88.9.1**    **P 321**    **L 36**    # **637**  
 Latchman, Ryan    Gennum Corp

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

Square wave pattern is not a necessary pattern if a short PRBS (PRBS9) pattern is included in the test pattern list.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove square pattern from test pattern list. Replace square wave with short PRBS (in OMA evaluation section)

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See Responses to comments 439 and 440  
 See also comments 636, 438 and 441

**Cl 88**    **SC 88.9.1**    **P 321**    **L 39**    # **235**  
 Anslow, Peter    Nortel Networks

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

Pattern 4 is TBD. Since PRBS9 is required for DDPWS in clause 86, change TBD to PRBS9

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change pattern 4 from "TBD" to PRBS9"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See also comments 221, 109, 123

**Cl 88**    **SC 88.9.1**    **P 321**    **L 40**    # **123**  
 Bergmann, Ernie    Circadiant/JDSU

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

Remove TBD for short test pattern

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 repalce TBD with PRBS9 to match other Standards work such as LRM and SFP+

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 [Editor's note: Subclause field changed from Table 88-14 to 88.9.1]  
 See also comments 221, 235, 109

**Cl 88**    **SC 88.9.1**    **P 321**    **L 44**    # **236**  
 Anslow, Peter    Nortel Networks

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

Remove TBD.  
 The square wave isn't really designed to emulate system operation and pattern 5 is a valid 40GBASE-R signal.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change "TBD test patterns are designed" to "Test patterns 3 and 4 are designed"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Task force to choose between:  
 "Test patterns 3 and 4 are designed" and  
 "Test patterns square, 3 and 4 are designed"  
 See also comment 222

**Cl 88**    **SC 88.9.1**    **P 322**    **L 1**    # **237**  
 Anslow, Peter    Nortel Networks

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

In Table 88-15 most of the test patterns are undefined.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Leave "Optical modulation amplitude (OMA)" as "Square"  
 Change parameter name "RINxOMA" to "RIN20OMA" and leave as "Square"  
 Set "Calibration of OMA for receiver tests" to "Square"  
 Set the pattern for all other rows to: "3, 5 or valid 100GBASE-R signal"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 To be discussed by the Task Force. See slide 8 of anslow\_05\_0109.pdf  
 See Response to comment 223  
 See also comment 475



CI 88 SC 88.9.1 P 322 L 11 # 439  
king, jonathan finisar

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 88-11  
Some CDRs will not support a square wave test pattern because the transition density is too low for clock rate acquisition. An equivalent measurement can be made using PRBS9 (pattern 4).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "or 4" to Square on line 11 in table 88-15 and add "or 68.6.2" after "88.9.4" in the 'related subclause' column

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
In the row for "Optical modulation amplitude (OMA)" in Table 88-15, change "Square" to "Square, 4"  
The "Related subclause" entry to remain as it is and clause 88.9.4 modified to refer to 68.6.2 as an alternative.  
See Response to comment 440.  
See also comments 636, 637, 438 and 441

CI 88 SC 88.9.11 P 325 L 18 # 242  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 88-17 for the applied sinusoidal jitter is TBD. Since each lane of 100GBASE-LR4/ER4 is similar to 10GBASE-LR except for the higher lane rate, use the values from Table 52-19 with the frequencies scaled by the relative lane rates.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Set the Jitter values according to the values in Table 52-19 with the three rows as:  
f < 100 kHz, Not specified  
100 kHz < f <= 10 MHz,  $2 \times 10^5 / f + S - 0.05$   
10 MHz < f < 10 LB,  $0.05 \leq S \leq 0.15$   
with a note for S "S is the magnitude of sine jitter actually used in the calibration of the stressed eye per the methods of 52.9.9.3"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 88 SC 88.9.11 P 325 L 30 # 243  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove TBD

*SuggestedRemedy*

change "TBD, or valid" to "Test patterns 3 or 5, or valid"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolution must be consistent with Table 88-15. See comment 223

CI 88 SC 88.9.4 P 322 L 38 # 440  
king, jonathan finisar

Comment Type T Comment Status D

OMA measurement is defined in 52, for a square wave.  
Definition of a test method using PRBS9 is needed.

*SuggestedRemedy*

After "is as defined in 52.9.5" insert "or 68.6.2"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Change "OMA is as defined in 52.9.5 with the exception that." to "OMA is as defined in 52.9.5 for use with a square test pattern or 68.6.2 for use with a PRBS9 test pattern with the exception that."  
See Response to comment 439.  
See also comments 636, 637, 438 and 441.

CI 88 SC 88.9.5.1 P 323 L 6 # 238  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The rise/fall times and RIN requirements for the reference transmitter are TBD. Since each lane of 100GBASE-LR4/ER4 is similar to 10GBASE-LR except for the higher lane rate, use the values from 52.9.10.1 of 30 ps and -136 dB/Hz scaled by the relative lane rates.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change "less than TBD ps at 20% to 80%" to "less than 12 ps at 20% to 80%"  
change "less than -TBD dB/Hz" to "less than -140 dB/Hz"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 88 SC 88.9.8 P 324 L 47 # 239  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The filter tolerances are TBD.  
The tolerances specified for STM-64 in G.691 are:  
+/- 0.85 dB for f/fr from 0.001 to 1  
and +/- 0.85 dB to +/- 4.0 dB for f/fr from 1 to 2

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "filter tolerances TBD" to "filter tolerances as specified for STM-64 in ITU-T G.691"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 88 SC 88.9.8 P 324 L 48 # 240  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Remove TBD

*SuggestedRemedy*

change ", such as TBD signal, are likely" to ", such as a 223-1 PRBS, are likely" where 223 is 2 raised to the power 23

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Either:

change ", such as TBD signal, are likely" to ", such as a 223-1 PRBS, are likely" where 223 is 2 raised to the power 23,

or delete "or with other patterns, such as TBD signal"

See also comments 468, 207 and 225

Cl 88 SC 88.9.9 P 324 L 51 # 241  
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Clause 88.9.9 consists only of an editor's note. The PMD specifications for 10GBASE-LR and -ER in clause 52 do not have separate transmitter jitter requirements and 100GBASE-LR4/ER4 is similar to this so remove this clause

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove clause 88.9.9 entirely.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See also comments 226 and 487

Cl 99 SC P 1 L 32 # 379  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Draft D1.1 is prepared by the IEEE 802.3ba 40Gb/s and 100Gb/s Ethernet Task Force....

Proper name for Task Force is IEEE P802.3.ba 40Gb/s and 100Gb/s Ethernet Task Force

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace part of sentence shown with:

Draft D1.1 is prepared by the IEEE 802.3ba 40Gb/s and 100Gb/s Ethernet Task Force

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace part of sentence shown with:

Draft D1.1 is prepared by the IEEE P802.3ba 40Gb/s and 100Gb/s Ethernet Task Force

Cl 99 SC P 11 L 21 # 381  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

wrap around error in TOC

*SuggestedRemedy*

correct TOC

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: Commenter did not indicate comment type, hence added comment type as Editorial]

This is a formatting issue with TOC template, try to obtain revised template for next draft revision

CI 99 SC P 11 L 38 # 380  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

TOC for Clause 73: Subclauses are shown indented under wrong top clauses. For example 73.5.1 is shown indented under 73.3.

This is also happening for TOC for clause 74

SuggestedRemedy

correct the subclauses so they are shown indented under the correct top clauses.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is Heading numbering issue in Clause 73 and Clause 74, check and fix the issue in Clause 73 and Clause 74

CI 99 SC P 20 L 1 # 382  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

83A.2 is not shown in TOC.  
Also, 83A.7.2.x is shown indented under 83A7.1.

SuggestedRemedy

correct properties of 83A.2 so it shows up in ToC.  
Make sure 83A.7.2 is included in ToC, and that subclauses 83A.7.2.x are indented under it.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is Heading numbering issue in Annex 83A check and fix the issue in Annex 83A

CI 99 SC P 4 L 17 # 385  
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Projects in development include a "P" in front of 802.3xx

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Std. 802.3at" with "Std. P802.3at"  
Replace "Std. 802.3av" with "Std. P802.3av"  
Replace "Std. 802.3az" with "Std. P802.3az"  
Replace "Std. 802.3ba" with "Std. P802.3ba"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This description is for the publication in the final version of the draft amendment. At that time these draft amendments would have been approved, if not then the unapproved entry(ies) will be removed from the front matter of this amendment

CI 99 SC P 5 L 27 # 335  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Check with 802.3 Chair and add new sections to the front matter regarding "Laws and regulations", "copyright" message and "revisions" to IEEE documents.

See 802.3av-D2.2 front matter for reference.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Check and update the front matter as per the comment

CI 99 SC 99 P 10 L 49 # 520  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

There is a newer version of this page.

SuggestedRemedy

Ask P802.3av for it.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Check if there is a new version of the special symbols page and update if appropriate