IEEE P802.3cd 50 Gb/s, 100 Gb/s, 200 Gb/s Ethernet 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

C/ 135 SC 135.5.5 P178 L 30 # r02-1

Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation

Ε

<bu >bucket> Comme

r02-33

Comment r01-33 against the revision project D3.1 has slightly re-worded the note added to 120.5.5. See:

http://www.ieee802.org/3/cj/comments/P8023-D3p1-Comments-Final-byID-r1.pdf#page=12

As the same note is being added to 135.5.5 it would be a good idea to use the same wording here as in the revision.

SuggestedRemedy

Change

Comment Type

"where the output signaling rate is higher than the input signaling rate." to:

Comment Status D

"where the signaling rate on each output lane is higher than the signaling rate on each input lane."

Proposed Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 135 SC 135.5.5 P 178 L 31

Dawe, Piers J G Mellanox Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status D <bucket>

The wording here and in 120.5.5 are slightly different. The 120.5.5 version came later and was preferred by the 802.3cj meeting.

SuggestedRemedy

Change

Note--For a PMA where the output signaling rate is higher than the input signaling rate, any low-frequency jitter on the input lanes may result in more jitter relative to the UI on the output lanes.

NOTE--For a PMA where the signaling rate on each output lane is higher than the signaling rate on each input lane, any low frequency jitter on the input lanes may result in more jitter relative to the UI on the output lanes.

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 135G SC 135G.1 P 379 L 4 # [r02-13

Dudek, Michael Cavium

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

<br/

OIF defined CEI-56G-VSR in OIF-CEI-4.0 not OIF-CEI-3.2 and the reference has become B56 in 802.3cj

SuggestedRemedy

Change OIF-CEI-3.2[B55] to OIF-CEI-4.0 [B56]

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 135G SC 135G.3.1 P 379 L 21 # r02-6

Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D total Comment Type T Comment Type T Comment Status D total Comment Type T Comment Type

120E to include a VEC requirement. See:

http://www.ieee802.org/3/cj/comments/P8023-D3p1-Comments-Final-byID-r1.pdf#page=11 http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/public/anslow_2_0318.pdf

As 135G.3.1 references 120E.3.1, which now includes a requirement for the vertical eye closure to be less than 12 dB, there is no longer any need to repeat this requirement in 135G.3.1.

Similarly, as 135G.3.4 references 120E.3.4, which now includes a requirement for the input vertical eye closure in the module stressed input test to be less than 12 dB, there is no longer any need to repeat this requirement in 135G.3.4.

The vertical eye closure definition in 135G.4.1 is also now not needed as it has been added to Annex 120E as 120E.4.3.

In 135G.5.4.4, PICS item RM1 contains: ", with the exception that input vertical eye closure is less than 12 dB for stressed input test", which is no longer needed.

SuggestedRemedy

In 135G.3.1, delete "and vertical eye closure, determined according to 135G.4.1, shall be less than 12 dB".

In 135G.3.4, delete ", with the modification that for the module stressed input test in 120E.3.1 the input vertical eye closure, determined according to 135G.4.1, is required to be less than 12 dB".

Delete the whole of 135G.4.1.

In 135G.5.4.4, item RM1, delete ", with the exception that input vertical eye closure is less than 12 dB for stressed input test".

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cd 50 Gb/s, 100 Gb/s, 200 Gb/s Ethernet 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

C/ 135G SC 135G.3.1 P 379 L 22 # r02-12 C/ 136 SC 136.11.8 P 234 L 15 # r02-4 Ciena Corporation Dudek, Michael Cavium Anslow, Peter Comment Status D Comment Status D Comment Type Ε <bucket> Comment Type Т <bucket> 802.3cj has added the VEC specification to 120E In Table 136-18, "Decision feedback equalizer (DFE) length" has units of "--", but specifying a length without units does not make sense. SuggestedRemedy Table 93A-1, which lists the COM parameters, however, has units for "Decision feedback Delete "and vertical eye closure, determined according to 135G.4.1, shall be less than 12 equalizer (DFE) length" of "UI". dB". Also delete section 135G.4.1 Same issue for Table 137-6. Proposed Response Response Status W SuggestedRemedy PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. In Tables 136-18 and 137-6, for the "Decision feedback equalizer (DFE) length" row, Resolve using the response to comment r02-6. change the units from "--" to "UI". Proposed Response Response Status W C/ 136 SC 136.9.3.4 P 226 L 16 # r02-2 PROPOSED ACCEPT. Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation Comment Type T Comment Status D <bucket> C/ 136 SC 136.14.4.5 P 241 L 44 # r02-5 In Table 136-13, "Length of the reflection signal" has units of "--", but specifying a length Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation without units does not make sense. Comment Status D <bucket> Comment Type Table 93A-4, which lists the ERL parameters, however, has units for "Length of the reflection signal" of "UI". PICS item CA4 for ERL has a Subclause entry of "136.11.5", which is "Differential to common-mode return loss". This should be "136.11.4". Same issue for Tables 136-17, 137-5, 137-7. SuggestedRemedy SuggestedRemedy Change the Subclause entry for PICS item CA4 from "136.11.5" to "136.11.4" In Tables 136-13, 136-17, 137-5, and 137-7, for the "Length of the reflection signal" row, Proposed Response Response Status W change the units from "--" to "UI". PROPOSED ACCEPT. Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT. C/ 137 SC 137.10.1 P 252 L 19 # r02-37 Dawe, Piers J G Mellanox Technologie Comment Type Comment Status D <bucket> Channel Insertion loss SuggestedRemedy Channel insertion loss

Proposed Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

C/ **137** SC **137.10.1**

Response Status W

Page 2 of 3 2018-05-19 8:33:03 AM

IEEE P802.3cd 50 Gb/s, 100 Gb/s, 200 Gb/s Ethernet 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

<bucket>

C/ 138 SC 138.7.1 P270 L22 # [r02-41

Dawe, Piers J G Mellanox Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status D

I suppose we should use the same description for TDECQ as in clauses 121, 122, 124.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "for PAM4". Make the left column wider and the others narrower.

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use TDECQ parameter nomenclature consistent with 121, 122, 124, 139 and 140