

302.3cp D1.1 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs 2nd Task Force review cc

Cl 1 SC P1 L1 # 69

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The page numbers at the bottom of the page restart after page 16, and do not coincide with the actual page number in the pdf document.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Strongly recommend that you work to make the two page numbers match, so that the reviewers know what to enter into the tool.

In my comments, I always used the page number of the pdf document, and not what is on the page.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Mismatch between numbers is because of the table of contents. Editor will follow the 802.3 template.

Cl 1 SC P14 L0 # 68

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

On all even page headers from page 14 onward, it says "Draft 1.0, september"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Ensure that all the headers are correct for the draft in question.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Editor will fix this.

Cl 1 SC 3 P14 L1 # 66

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

A reference to the related ITU recommendation should be added

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the following in alphabetical order:

ITU-T Recommendation G.9806-Higher speed bidirectional, single fibre, point-to-point optical access system (HS-PtP)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

ITU-T G.9806 is not published yet. We can add it into reference as soon as it is available.

Cl 1 SC 4 P14 L10 # 65

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

The definitions section typically contains all the PHY names. So, we should add the bunch of names that we have created.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert the following after 1.4.128 (approx):

50GBASE-BR10: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 50 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 10km. The link includes two different specifications for 50GBASE-BR10-D and 50GBASE-BR10-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 160.)

50GBASE-BR20: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 50 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 20km. The link includes two different specifications for 50GBASE-BR20-D and 50GBASE-BR20-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 160.)

50GBASE-BR40: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 50 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 40km. The link includes two different specifications for 50GBASE-BR40-D and 50GBASE-BR40-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 160.)

50GBASE-BR40+: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 50 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 40km with a larger loss budget. The link includes two different specifications for 50GBASE-BR40+-D and 50GBASE-B40+-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 160.)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 4 P14 L10 # 64

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

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

The definitions section typically contains all the PHY names. So, we should add the bunch of names that we have created.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert the following after 1.4.91:

25GBASE-BR10: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 25 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 10km. The link includes two different specifications for 25GBASE-BR10-D and 25GBASE-BR10-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 159.)

25GBASE-BR20: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 25 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 20km. The link includes two different specifications for 25GBASE-BR20-D and 25GBASE-BR20-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 159.)

25GBASE-BR40: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 25 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 40km. The link includes two different specifications for 25GBASE-BR40-D and 25GBASE-BR40-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 159.)

25GBASE-BR40+: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 25 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 40km with a larger loss budget. The link includes two different specifications for 25GBASE-BR40+-D and 25GBASE-B40+-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 159.)

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 4 P14 L10 # 63

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

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

The definitions section typically contains all the PHY names. So, we should add the bunch of names that we have created.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert the following after 1.4.52:

10GBASE-BR10: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 10 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 10km. The link includes two different specifications for 10GBASE-BR10-D and 10GBASE-BR10-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 158.)

10GBASE-BR20: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 10 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 20km. The link includes two different specifications for 10GBASE-BR20-D and 10GBASE-BR20-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 158.)

10GBASE-BR40: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 10 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 40km. The link includes two different specifications for 10GBASE-BR40-D and 10GBASE-BR40-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 158.)

10GBASE-BR40+: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 10 Gb/s bidirectional link over one single-mode fiber with reach up to at least 40km with a larger loss budget. The link includes two different specifications for 10GBASE-BR40+-D and 10GBASE-B40+-U. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 158.)

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 5 P14 L14 # 67

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

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

Our clauses do not create any new abbreviations, so we can remove this subclause.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove section 1.5 from our draft.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 157 SC 8 P47 L1 # 70

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

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

Because it is introductory, clause 157 does not need a PICS pro-forma. An example of the usual treatment is found in clause 56, the introduction to EFM.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the clause

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 158 SC 6 P53 L42 # 71

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

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

The table 158-5 header says "Minimum range", but the table entries give distance ranges. Also, the wavelength doesn't make sense to list here.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Minimum range" to "Required operating range"  
Remove "wavelength" column.

In other words, make this look like table 159-5

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 158 SC 7 P57 L50 # 72

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

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

Many of these clauses are basically an exact replica of an existing clause. For instance:  
158.7 is the same as 52.8.  
158.8 is the same as 52.9.  
158.9 is a combination of 52.10, .11, and .12.  
There are similar cases in clauses 159 and 160 as well.

There is a danger that the text will become misaligned, so we should work to reduce it.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest two possible fixes for this:

1: Add a sentence at the very beginning of each repetitive clause that says "This clause is meant to replicate the material in clause X [and Y]. In the case of any discrepancy, the original clause takes precedence over this clause."

2: We could replace the contents of these clauses with just a reference to the older clause. This would make our draft tighter (much less text to review), albeit at the cost of readability.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Remedy #2 is preferred.

Cl 158 SC 8.10 P63 L9 # 74

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

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

The conditions of the stressed Rx test should ensure the diplexer isolation is sufficient.

SuggestedRemedy

At the end of the section, add the following:

"The transmitted optical signal and the reflectance of the optical link should be at their maximum levels."

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 158 SC 158.1 P33 L8 # 55

Tartaglia, Antonio Ericsson

Comment Type T Comment Status D

There is evidence of development activities going on in the optical transceiver industry to support "mobile-optimized" 25G BiDi solutions, using cheaper laser sources and with shorter reach (<2km).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Adding a new "mobile-optimized" BiDi distance class, <2km.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This outside of the scope. See Frank's email to the .3cp group on 1/3 with David Law's feedback on this proposal.

CI 158 SC Figure 158-1 P50 L14 # 61

Luo, Yuanqiu Futurewei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

10G BiDi BER reference level is  $1e-12$  (Clause 158.1.1). There is no FEC function block in PHY. The Editor's note on FEC sublayer can be removed from Figure 158-1

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the Editor's note from Figure 158-1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 158 SC Table 158-6Table 158 P54 L10 # 56

Luo, Yuanqiu Futurewei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Tables 158-6 and 158-7 share almost all parameters except the downstream and upstream wavelengths. We should merge transmit characteristics into one table.

Same merging should be implemented to Tables 159-6/159-7, Tables 160-6/160-7

*SuggestedRemedy*

Propose to merge Table 158-7 into Table 158-6, change row "Center wavelength (range)" into "BRx-D Center wavelength (range)", add a new row "BRx-U Center wavelength (range)" to capture the upstream wavelengths.

Change table title into "10GBASE-BRx transmit characteristics". Remove "-D" from cells in the first row.

Do the same merging to Tables 159-6/159-7, Tables 160-6/160-7

Refer to December conference call contribution "D1.1 Optical table spreadsheet" for details.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 158 SC Table 158-8Table 158 P56 L4 # 57

Luo, Yuanqiu Futurewei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Tables 158-8 and 158-9 share almost all parameters except the downstream and upstream wavelengths. We should merge receiver characteristics into one table.

Same merging should be implemented to Tables 159-8/159-9, Tables 160-8/160-9

*SuggestedRemedy*

Propose to merge Table 158-9 into Table 158-8, change row "Center wavelength (range)" into "BRx-D Center wavelength (range)", add a new row "BRx-U Center wavelength (range)" to capture the upstream wavelengths.

Change table title into "10GBASE-BRx receive characteristics". Remove "-D" from cells in the first row.

Do the same merging to Tables 159-8/159-9, Tables 160-8/160-9

Refer to December conference call contribution "D1.1 Optical table spreadsheet" for details.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

302.3cp D1.1 Bidirectional 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs 2nd Task Force review cc

Cl 158 SC Table 158-8 Table 158 P56 L19 # 62

Luo, Yuanqiu Futurewei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Both mW and dBm values are specified in Row "Receiver sensitivity (max) in OMA" and Row "Stressed receiver sensitivity (max) in OMA". This is redundant. In similar tables of Clauses 159 and 160, only dBm values are specified. We should make them consistent.

Suggested Remedy

Remove mW units and mW values from Tables 158-8 and 158-9

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 159 SC 7.10 P84 L28 # 75

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The conditions of the stressed Rx test should ensure the diplexer isolation is sufficient.

Suggested Remedy

At the end of the lettered list, add the following:  
 "h) The transmitted optical signal and the reflectance of the optical link should be at their maximum levels."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 159 SC 159.10 P70 L5 # 52

Geng, Limin Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The nominal wavelength of the upstream is 1288 in Table 159-15. With  $\pm 8$ nm spacing, the wavelength upper limit is only 1296nm, which does not fully cover the standard LWDM wavelength range from 1294.53 to 1296.59 defined in 802.3bs and cn. Meanwhile, the non-standard wavelength range would also impacts the yield and cost, and we will follow up with a presentation slide.

Suggested Remedy

The Nominal wavelength in Table 159-15 needs to be changed from 1288 to 1289. The nominal wavelength of 1289 together with  $\pm 8$ nm spacing would fully cover the standard LWDM wavelength range defined in 802.3bs and cn.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to the contribution, use the discussion agreement to resolve this comment

Cl 160 SC 7.5.2 P104 L44 # 73

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The coefficients for the fiber dispersion are wrong.  
 Also, the mean DGD is the same.

Suggested Remedy

The coefficient for 10km should be 0.2325  
 That for 20km should be 0.465  
 That for 40km should be 0.93

The mean DGD should be 0.8 ps for all distances.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Optical return loss in the same table should be fixed as 10km --- 15.6 dB, 20km --- 15.3 dB, 40/40+km --- 15 dB

Cl 160 SC 7.10.2 P108 L40 # 76

Frank, Effenberger Futurewei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The conditions of the stressed Rx test should ensure the diplexer isolation is sufficient.

Suggested Remedy

At the end of the bulleted list, add the following:  
 "-. The transmitted optical signal and the reflectance of the optical link should be at their maximum levels.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 160 SC 160.6.1 P82 L41 # 53

Geng, Limin Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

In Table 160-7, the wavelength range of 50GBASE-BR20-U/50GBASE-BR40-U/50GBASE-BR40+-U transmitter is 1280 to 1296nm. However, the wavelength upper limit is only 1296nm, which is not fully cover the standard LWDM wavelength upper limit of 1296.59nm defined in 802.3bs and cn. On the other hand, the non-standard wavelength range also impacts the yield and cost, and we will follow up with a presentation slide.

*SuggestedRemedy*

To fully cover the standard LWDM wavelength range defined in 802.3bs and cn, the Wavelength(range) of 50GBASE-BR20-U/50GBASE-BR40-U/50GBASE-BR40+-U transmitter in Table 160-7 needs to be changed to 1281-1297 nm.

If this comment is accepted, Table 159-15 and 160-9 would be affected.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See Comment #52

Cl 160 SC 160.6.2 P84 L41 # 54

Geng, Limin Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

In Table 160-9, the wavelength range of 50GBASE-BR20-U/50GBASE-BR40-U/50GBASE-BR40+-U receiver is 1280 to 1296nm. However, the wavelength upper limit is only 1296nm, which is not fully cover the standard LWDM upper wavelength limit of 1296.59nm defined in 802.3bs and cn. On the other hand, the non-standard wavelength range also impacts the yield and cost, and we will follow up with a presentation slide.

*SuggestedRemedy*

To fully cover the standard LWDM wavelength range defined in 802.3bs and cn, the Wavelength(range) of 50GBASE-BR20-U/50GBASE-BR40-U/50GBASE-BR40+-U receiver in Table 160-9 needs to be changed to 1281-1297 nm.

If this comment is accepted, Table 159-15 and 160-7 would be affected.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See Comment #52

Cl 160 SC Table 160-13 P104 L48 # 60

Luo, Yuanqiu Futurewei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

There are undetermined factors in 50GBASE-BR20 dispersion. 50GBASE-BR40/40+ dispersion formula is different from 802.3cn Table 139-11.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Reuse dispersion spec in 802.3cn Table 139-11 for Table 160-13 as follows:

- In Row "50GBASE-BR20", replace the first "@@" with "0.2325", replace the thrid "@@" with "15.6", replace the last "@@" with "0.8"
- In Row "50GBASE-BR40, 50GBASE-BR40+", replace both places of "0.2325" with "0.93", replace "15.6" with "15"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See Comment #73

Cl 160 SC Table 160-6 P97 L46 # 58

Luo, Yuanqiu Futurewei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Values of 50GBASE-BRx Tx "Average launch power (max)" should reuse those in the latest draft of 802.3cn Table 139-6.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Table 160-6, Row "Average launch power (max)", change 3.63 to 3.6, 6.63 to 6.6, and 11.63 to 11.6.

Value 6.6 is from 802.3cn Table 139-6, 3.6 and 11.6 are calculated from 6.6

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 160 SC Table 160-8 P99 L 52 # 59

Luo, Yuanqiu Futurewei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Values of 50GBASE-BRx Rx "Damage threshold" and "Average receive power (max)" should reuse those in the latest draft of 802.3cn Table 139-7. 50GBASE-BR20/BR40/BR40+ should share the same Rx

*SuggestedRemedy*

Table 160-8, Row "Damage threshold", change 4.63/2.63/2.63 to -2.4.

Table 160-8, Row "Average receive power (max)", change 3.63/1.63/1.63 to -3.4.

Values -2.4 and -3.4 are from 802.3cn Table 139-7

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.