

IEEE P802.3cp D3.0 BiDi 10, 25, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 1 SC 1 P21 L1 # I-1
 Byrd, William PRIVACOM VENTURES, INC.
 Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ
 Where is the Introduction??? It is completely missing from my document. The Introduction appears at the bottom of page 21, with zero words under that title
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the Introduction.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Move "1. Introduction" to the next page, keep it with the rest of Clause 1

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.27b.6 P35 L25 # I-2
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ
 Too many carriage returns between paragraphs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete line 25.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 108 SC 108.6 P59 L28 # I-3
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ
 Too many carriage returns between paragraphs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete line 28.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 158 SC 158.8.1.1 P78 L54 # I-4
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ
 Keep related text together.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert a non-breaking hyphen between "inverted" and "(i)".
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 158 SC 158.9.7 P89 L15 # I-5
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ
 Keep related text together.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make all hyphens in "10GBASE-BR10-D" non-breaking and make space between "e.g.," and "10GBASE-BR10-D" non-breaking.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 158 SC 158.11.2.1 P90 L43 # I-6
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ
 Keep related text together.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make hyphen in "10GBASE-BR20" non-breaking.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 159 SC 159.7.5.2 P106 L106 # I-7
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company
 Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ
 Keep related text together.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make hyphens in "25GBASE-BR20" non-breaking.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cp D3.0 BiDi 10, 25, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Sponsor ballot comments

CI 159 SC 159.8.7 P109 L36 # I-8

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

Keep related text together.

SuggestedRemedy

Make all hyphens in "25GBASE-BR10-D" non-breaking and make space between "e.g.," and "25GBASE-BR10-D" non-breaking.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 160 SC 160.8.7 P135 L28 # I-9

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

Keep related text together.

SuggestedRemedy

Make all hyphens in "50GBASE-BR10-D" non-breaking and make space between "e.g.," and "50GBASE-BR10-D" non-breaking.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 158 SC 158.8.1 P78 L44 # I-10

Stassar, Peter Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The wording "Test patterns are as in Table 158–11 for 10GBASE-BRx." can be improved

SuggestedRemedy

Modify to "Test patterns for 10GBASE-BRx are defined in Table 158–11. ."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use .3cu wording in 151.8.1 with editorial license, apply same changes to 159 and 160 if needed

CI 158 SC 158.8.1.1 P78 L49 # I-11

Stassar, Peter Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

There should be no hyphen in "Test-pattern definition". There are various instances in the draft mentioning "test-pattern", which all should be modified

SuggestedRemedy

Change heading to "Test pattern definition". Also for other instances of "test-pattern".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 158 SC 158.8.1.1 P78 L51 # I-12

Stassar, Peter Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type T Comment Status A

It is not clear what is meant by "Pattern 3 is optional."

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify the meaning of "Pattern 3 is optional.". Or alternatively remove this sentence,

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete "Pattern 3 is optional", in Table 158–10, add "Pattern 3 is optional" to the end of note a.

CI 160 SC 160.6.1 P125 L26 # I-13

Stassar, Peter Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The row for "Launch power in OMAouter minus TDECQ (min)" is an identical requirement as the previous row and should therefore be deleted

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the row for "Launch power in OMAouter minus TDECQ (min)"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cp D3.0 BiDi 10, 25, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 160 SC 160.6.1 P125 L22 # I-14

Stassar, Peter Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type T Comment Status A

The representation of the requirement for OMAmin is shown differently than in the equivalent specification in 139.6.1, where "Launch power in OMAouter minus TDECQ (min)". It could be useful to point that out in an extension to note b.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to Note b: even when the representation of the requirement OMAouter is different as used in a conventional way in Clause 139, it is completely consistent".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to Note b: Even though the representation of the OMAouter requirement is different from that in Clause 139, they are consistent".

Cl 108 SC 108.1.2 P43 L21 # I-15

Laubach, Mark IEEE member / Self Employed

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

"Figure 108-1" needs to be a cross reference link.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it so.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 108 SC 108.1.3 P45 L3 # I-16

Laubach, Mark IEEE member / Self Employed

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

"Figure 108-1a" needs to be a cross reference link.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it so.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 108 SC 108.1.3.2 P46 L3 # I-17

Laubach, Mark IEEE member / Self Employed

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

"Figure 108-1b" needs to be a cross reference link.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it so.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 157 SC 157.1.2 P64 L25 # I-18

Laubach, Mark IEEE member / Self Employed

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

Figure 157-1 should appear in the text before Table 157-1. Table 157-1 should appear after the reference to it in the first part of 157.1.3, and etc for the other tables in this clause. I know these are Framemaker anchoring issues, but should be fixed if there is a revision.

SuggestedRemedy

Try to make it visually flow better than it is now.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 158 SC 158.13.4.3 P95 L7 # I-19

Laubach, Mark IEEE member / Self Employed

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

"Table 158-6" and "Table 158-7" (line 10) need to be cross reference links. Same for all other Table references on this page.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it so.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cp D3.0 BiDi 10, 25, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 158 SC 158.13.4.6 P96 L7 # I-20

Laubach, Mark IEEE member / Self Employed

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

In other Value/Comment text in 158.13 PICS as well as throughout the draft, there is mixed convention to use "Clause 158.x". (e.g. page 93 line 47) versus omitting the word "Clause" (and just have the clause number). Consistency is needed.

SuggestedRemedy

Make subclause cross references consistent throughout the draft.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 159 SC 159.12.4.3 P116 L10 # I-21

Laubach, Mark IEEE member / Self Employed

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

need spaces

SuggestedRemedy

Change "inTable 159-7" to "in Table 159-7" on line 10 and "inTable 159-6" to "in Table 159-6" on line 21

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 160 SC 160.12.3.3 P141 L7 # I-22

Laubach, Mark IEEE member / Self Employed

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

"Table 160-6" needs to be a cross reference link. Same for all the "Table 160-x"s on this page.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it so.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 108 SC 108.1.3.1 P45 L23 # I-23

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

Tidy up the block diagram

SuggestedRemedy

Move the paths rx_data-group<15:0> and rx_data-group<15:0> to the right to line up with the PCS Receive paths above. Move the right hand end of the FEC Decoder & Block Synchronization box to line up with the boxes above.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 108 SC 108.5.1.1 P51 L16 # I-24

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA

Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ

"will" is deprecated

SuggestedRemedy

Change "It will form" to "It forms"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Apply same change to 158.8.9.1.1, 158.8.9.1.3, 158.8.9.1.4

IEEE P802.3cp D3.0 BiDi 10, 25, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Sponsor ballot comments

CI 108 SC 108.2.1.2.3 P49 L9 # I-25

Dawe, Piers J G

NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**

"The effect of receipt of this primitive by the FEC client is unspecified by the FEC sublayer": gratuitously unhelpful.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
The effect of receipt of this primitive by the FEC client (the PCS) is specified in Clause 49; see 49.2.
I think you will need to change Clause 49 to mention the FEC_UNITDATA.indication primitive, too.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change into "The effect of receipt of this primitive by the FEC client is unspecified by the FEC sublayer. See 49.2."

Change 49.2.2 Functions within the PCS: add "or FEC" to places with "PMA or WIS", add "or FEC_UNITDATA.request" to places with "PMA_UNITDATA.request or WIS_UNITDATA.request", add "or FEC_SIGNAL.indication(SIGNAL_OK)" to places with "or WIS_SIGNAL.indication(SIGNAL_OK)", add "or the FEC_UNITDATA.indication primitive" to places with "WIS_UNITDATA.indication primitive "

Investigate test pattern generation with FEC on with editorial license to address any issue.

CI 108 SC 108.2.1.3.3 P49 L36 # I-26

Dawe, Piers J G

NVIDIA

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A**

"The effect of receipt of this primitive by the FEC client is unspecified by the FEC sublayer": gratuitously unhelpful.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
The effect of receipt of this primitive by the FEC client (the PCS) is specified in Clause 107; see 107.1.4.2.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to "The effect of receipt of this primitive by the FEC client is unspecified by the FEC sublayer. See 107.1.4.2."

CI 108 SC 108.6.3 P59 L37 # I-27

Dawe, Piers J G

NVIDIA

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**

This statement "the transmit and receive functions are disabled" is misleading.

SuggestedRemedy

Please change as P802.3ck has it for 91.6.2f: "the RS-FEC transmit and receive functions are disabled"

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

CI 108 SC 108.6.4 P59 L47 # I-28

Dawe, Piers J G

NVIDIA

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **A**

This variable is set to one to indicate that the decoder has the ability to bypass error correction. The variable is set to zero if this ability is not supported.

SuggestedRemedy

This variable is set to one if the decoder has the ability to bypass error correction. The variable is set to zero if this ability is not supported.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

CI 108 SC 108.7.3 P61 L32 # I-29

Dawe, Piers J G

NVIDIA

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**

Has the capability to disable the RS-FEC function
But 108.5.3.2 "This option shall not be used when the RS-FEC sublayer is used to form part of a 10GBASE-BR20, 25GBASE-SR, 25GBASE-LR, or 25GBASE-ER PHY."

SuggestedRemedy

The status should be conditional, not always mandatory

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In 108.7.3, change status of EF into "(KR or CR): M"

IEEE P802.3cp D3.0 BiDi 10, 25, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 158 SC 158.5.4 P74 L37 # I-30

Dawe, Piers J G

NVIDIA

Comment Type T Comment Status A

This has a new/different requirement to all other signal detect definitions: "Implementations shall provide adequate margin between the input optical power level at which the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter is set to OK, and the inherent noise level of the PMD due to crosstalk, power supply noise, etc.". The original text was guidance for the designer, not a spec item. Implementers will expect to use existing 10G receiver designs for these PMDs

SuggestedRemedy

Change back to ""As an unavoidable consequence of the requirements for the setting of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter, implementations must provide adequate margin between the input optical power level at which the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter is set to OK, and the inherent noise level of the PMD due to crosstalk, power supply noise, etc.". If necessary, change "must" to "should".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Same comment as D2.3, #26.

Change "shall" to "should", change "due to" to "including the effects of".

Last two paragraphs of 158.5.4 become:

Implementations should provide adequate margin between the input optical power level at which the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter is set to OK, and the inherent noise level of the PMD including the effects of crosstalk, power supply noise, etc.

Various implementations of the Signal Detect function are permitted by this standard, including implementations that generate the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter values in response to the amplitude of the modulation of the optical signal and implementations that respond to the average optical power of the modulated optical signal.

Cl 158 SC 158.5.4 P74 L Response Status C # I-31

Dawe, Piers J G

NVIDIA

Comment Type T Comment Status A

The SD limit of >=-30 dBm is too near to the Average receive power (min) for 10GBASE-BR20, -27.2 dBm. 1000BASE-LX10 has -45 dBm.

SuggestedRemedy

Change -30 to a lower number. Preferably, put the limit in Table 158-7.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Follow the margin in Table 114-4 (SIGNAL_DETECT value definition), reserve about 5 dB. In Table 158-4, after "Input_optical_power <= -30 dBm average power", add " for 10GBASE-BR10 and 10GBASE-BR40, input_optical_power <= -33 dBm average power for 10GBASE-BR20."

Cl 158 SC 158.8.9.1 P81 L25 # I-32

Dawe, Piers J G

NVIDIA

Comment Type T Comment Status A

"The transmitted optical signal of the device under test and the reflectance of the optical link should be at their maximum levels.": First, 802.3 defines behaviour at interfaces, it does not define devices. Second, there is no expectation that the transmitted signal be adjustable; the standards has provision for it to be on or off, only. The previous sentences say that the transmitter is on.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The reflectance of the optical link should be at its maximum level". Similarly in 158.8.9.2 (h), 159.7.10 (h) and 160.7.11

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 158 SC 158.8.10.2 P87 L34 # I-33

Dawe, Piers J G

NVIDIA

Comment Type T Comment Status A

ANSI/TIA/EIA-455-175A-92 (for chromatic dispersion measurement)

SuggestedRemedy

Update to IEC 60793-1-42, as in 160.7.5.2

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 158 SC 158.8.10.3 P88 L5 # I-34

Dawe, Piers J G

NVIDIA

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"corner frequency of less than or equal to 4 MHz": This is a definition, not a test procedure. It has to be unambiguous. Setting the CRU corner frequency far too low will fail acceptable transmitters.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "less than or equal to"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cp D3.0 BiDi 10, 25, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 158 SC 158.10 P89 L39 # I-35

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 ANSI/TIA/EIA-526-14A/method B

SuggestedRemedy

This is for multimode? If so, delete, also from 159.9

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Delete "ANSI/TIA/EIA-526-14A/method B, and", apply same change to 159.9

Cl 158 SC 158.13.1 P92 L7 # I-36

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ
 Clause 158,Physical Medium

SuggestedRemedy

Insert space

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 159 SC 159.12.4.4 P116 L15 # I-37

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ
 blank lines? and following tables

SuggestedRemedy

Remove. Also 159.12.4.6 and following

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 159 SC 159.12.4.4 P116 L21 # I-38

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ
 inTable 159-6

SuggestedRemedy

Insert space

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 160 SC 160.7.5.2 P129 L54 # I-39

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status A EZ
 Notes detached from table

SuggestedRemedy

Remove blank line 41. Make the notes stay with the table.
 Similar issue with Table 16-8.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Table 160-8 has the same format issue.

Cl 160 SC 160.7.5.2 P130 L2 # I-40

Dawe, Piers J G NVIDIA
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 Similar to the change made to 158.8.10.2: The minimum and maximum chromatic dispersion for the compliance channel are calculated based on maximum length. For each PMD, if minimum and maximum CD are the same side of zero, a link with a shorter fibre and maybe some extra patch panel loss is not properly protected.

SuggestedRemedy

The same fix as for Table 158-13: add to note a:
 The link may be as short as 2 m, and the minimum or maximum dispersion may be 0.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cp D3.0 BiDi 10, 25, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 160 SC 160.6.1 P125 L28 # [REDACTED]

Dawe, Piers J G

NVIDIA

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

As noted before:

You want these new PMDs to be buildable with existing receiver ICs, designed and qualified to the earlier PAM4 specs (200GBASE-DR4, 200GBASE-FR4, 200GBASE-LR4, 200GBASE-ER4, 50GBASE-FR, 50GBASE-LR and/or 50GBASE-ER).

The link and receiver need protection from both a weak signal (OMA-TDECQ limit) and a very bad signal (K and overshoot limits) because real affordable receivers have finite resolution, dynamic range, linearity and optimisation algorithm, unlike the ideal reference receiver for TDECQ.

In dB, TDECQ = C + K. C = 10log10(Ceq) = noise enhancement. K is the measure of signal quality.

Recent 100 Gb/s/lane PAM4 receivers are protected by over/under-shoot and transmitter power excursion limits.

Each of the three specs (K, over/under-shoot, and transmitter power excursion) can catch undesirable signals that the others miss, and that TDECQ misses too.

There are no separate measurements for these; they are by-products of waveform captures for TDECQ and TECQ.

Avoiding these very bad signals will help avoid error floors.

SuggestedRemedy

Reinstate the limit on K = TDECQ - 10log10(Ceq) max 3.2 dB for all three PMDs. Then at least there will be consistent protection across the 50Gb/s/lane family.

Add over/under-shoot limits as in the latest 802.3cu, for all three PMDs.

Add transmitter power excursion limits to the PMD(s) that need that protection (it depends on the receive max power).

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In Table 160-6 reinstate the row for "TDECQ - 10log10(Ceq)c (max)" with value 3.2 dB for all columns with a note c, "Ceq is a coefficient defined in 121.8.5.3, which accounts for the reference equalizer noise enhancement."

In this way the specification for 50 Gb/s PMDs in Clause 160 remain consistent with those in Clause 139.

Cl 160 SC 160.6.1 P125 L26 # [REDACTED]

Wang, Ruoxu

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status A

"Launch power in OMAouter minus TDECQ (min)" is redundant. The OMAouter (min) for TDECQ from 1.4 to 3.2 dB is already determined by the "Outer Optical Modulation Amplitude (OMAouter) (min)".

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the "Launch power in OMAouter minus TDECQ (min)" line.

The proposed reference table is shown on page 11 in

https://www.ieee802.org/3/cp/public/2009/2009_3cp_Stassar_1.pdf for 100GBASE-FR1 and 100GBASE-LR1.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 160 SC 160.6.1 P125 L38 # [REDACTED]

Wang, Ruoxu

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status A

Table 160-6 suggests for 50GBASE-BR20 an optical return loss tolerance (max) of 15 dB, whereas Table 160-11 suggests that this is 15.3 dB, which is not consistent. It needs to be either 15 or 15.3 dB in both Tables 160-6 and 160-11.

SuggestedRemedy

In table 160-6 line 38, split the table into two columns and set "Optical return loss tolerance (max)" for 50GBASE-BR20 to 15.3dB.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In Table 160-11, Row 50GBASE-BR20, change ORL from 15.3 dB into 15 dB.

In 160.7.9, change "15.3" to "15".