

IEEE 802.3db D1.0 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

CI **FM** SC **FM** P11 L54 # 11
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 There are more amendments, ahead of this one but not yet published
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add IEEE Std 802.3cp-202x and possibly more
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add 802.3cp-202x and others

CI **00** SC **0** P L # 6
 Anslow, Pete Independent
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 All external cross-references should be "Forest green" by using the "External" character tag as per the 802.3 FrameMaker template.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make all external cross-references "Forest green" by applying the "External" character tag as per the 802.3 FrameMaker template.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **30** SC **30.5.1.1.2** P7 L25 # 9
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 200GBASE-SR, 200GBASE-VR, 400GBASE-SR, 400GBASE-VR
 SuggestedRemedy
 200GBASE-SR2, 200GBASE-VR2, 400GBASE-SR4, 400GBASE-VR4
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **45** SC **45.2.1.6** P9 L21 # 10
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 Shouldn't you show the modified reserved rows?
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **45** SC **45.2.1.6** P21 L21 # 1
 Anslow, Pete Independent
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 The draft shows :
 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 = 400GBASE-SR4 PMA/PMD
 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 = 400GBASE-VR4 PMA/PMD
 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 = 200GBASE-SR2 PMA/PMD
 1 1 0 0 1 0 1 = 200GBASE-VR2 PMA/PMD
 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 = 100GBASE-SR PMA/PMD
 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 = 100GBASE-VR PMA/PMD
 but four of these choices are already allocated to other PMD types:
 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 is 10GBASE-BR20-D in P802.3cp
 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 is 10GBASE-BR10-D in P802.3cp
 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 is not currently allocated
 1 1 0 0 1 0 1 is not currently allocated
 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 is 400GBASE-ZR in P802.3cw
 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 is 400GBASE-ER8 in IEEE Std 802.3cn-2019
 It seems that a better solution would be to put all six new PMDs together above the block used by P802.3cp
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the allocation to:
 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 = 400GBASE-SR4 PMA/PMD
 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 = 400GBASE-VR4 PMA/PMD
 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 = 200GBASE-SR2 PMA/PMD
 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 = 200GBASE-VR2 PMA/PMD
 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 = 100GBASE-SR PMA/PMD
 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 = 100GBASE-VR PMA/PMD
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE 802.3db D1.0 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.20 P22 L38 # 2

Anslow, Pete Independent

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

The draft shows :
 1.23.8 200GBASE-SR2 ability
 1.23.7 200GBASE-VR2 ability
 But these bits are already allocated in P802.3ck to:
 1.23.8 200GBASE-CR2 ability
 1.23.7 200GBASE-KR2 ability

SuggestedRemedy

Change the allocation to:
 1.23.10 200GBASE-SR2 ability
 1.23.9 200GBASE-VR2 ability

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.21 P23 L23 # 3

Anslow, Pete Independent

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

The draft shows :
 1.24.11 400GBASE-VR4 ability
 But this bit is already allocated in P802.3cw to:
 1.24.11 400GBASE-ZR ability

SuggestedRemedy

To maintain the usual increasing reach with bit number, change the allocations to:
 1.24.13 400GBASE-SR4 ability
 1.24.12 400GBASE-VR4 ability

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.21a P24 L9 # 4

Anslow, Pete Independent

Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket

The draft shows :
 1.26.11 100GBASE-SR ability
 However, a gap in the allocations was previously made for 100GBASE-SR ability as 1.26.2

SuggestedRemedy

Change the allocation to:
 1.26.2 100GBASE-SR ability

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 78 SC 78.1.4 P13 L13 # 13

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

This is too hard to follow

SuggestedRemedy

Please show at least one existing row before and after each new one, as 802.3cd did

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 80 SC 80.1.4 P15 L18 # 14

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Please show the changes in context

SuggestedRemedy

Please show one existing row before and after each new one, as 802.3ck does. Also for Table 80-5.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE 802.3db D1.0 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 91 SC 91.7.4.1 P21 L12 # 15
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 Inconsistent font size
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 116 SC 116.1.3 P23 L41 # 16
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 after 400GBASE-SR4.2
 SuggestedRemedy
 Before, going by reach
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 116 SC 116.1.4 P25 L29 # 17
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 400GBASE-SR4 should come before 400GBASE-SR4.2, and I think it goes after 400GBASE-SR8
 SuggestedRemedy
 Swap 400GBASE-SR4 and 400GBASE-SR4.2, both row and column
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 167 SC 167.1 P31 L7 # 19
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 Empty line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 167 SC 167.1.1 P31 L50 # 20
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket
 FEC (Clause 134 or Clause 91) and PCS (Clause 133 or Clause 82).
 SuggestedRemedy
 FEC (Clause 91) and PCS (Clause 82).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Remove references to Clause 134 and Clause 133. Will read: "FEC (Clause 91) and PCS (Clause 82)".

Cl 167 SC 167.2 P32 L20 # 21
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket
 116.3
 SuggestedRemedy
 80.3?
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Correct reference to Clause 80.3.

Cl 167 SC 167.8.10 P45 L18 # 27
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 This sentence (and one in 167.8.13) is too long and hard to understand. It should be divided in two, as in 167.8.5 and 167.8.6.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "response to at least 1.3 x 53.125 GHz and at frequencies above 1.3 x 53.125 GHz the response should not exceed -24 dB." to "response to at least 1.3 x 53.125 GHz. At frequencies above 1.3 x 53.125 GHz the response should not exceed -24 dB." Similarly in 167.8.13.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE 802.3db D1.0 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

Cl **167** *SC* **167.10.1** *P***49** *L***25** # **28**

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

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

and400GBASE-SR4.

SuggestedRemedy
insert a space

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **167** *SC* **167.11.3** *P***54** *L***6** # **29**

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

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

PICS needs work

SuggestedRemedy
Revise PICS

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.