

IEEE 802.3db D2.0 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force Initial Working Group ballot commen

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P18 L12 # 221

Grow, Bob RMG Consulting

Comment Type ER Comment Status A Bucket

With the merge of IEEE Std 802.3ct and IEEE Std 802.3cp into P802.3/D2.1, indeed subclause numbering has changed in P802.3/D2.1, but additionally, base text has also changed from that in this draft. With the expected (conditional) approval to advance the revision project to SA ballot, stability of both subclause numbers and base text should be significantly improved with P802.3/D2.1 and future drafts.

SuggestedRemedy

Review changed clauses against the then current draft of the P802.3 revision project. (I have also submitted individual comments for some specific noted differences found in review of P802.3/D2.1 changes.)

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Following are the assignments:

1.4.38a	100GBASE-SR1	100GBASE-R encoding
1.4.41a	100GBASE-VR1	100GBASE-R encoding
1.4.108a	200GBASE-SR2	200GBASE-R encoding
1.4.109a	200GBASE-VR2	200GBASE-R encoding
1.4.142a	400GBASE-SR4	400GBASE-R encoding
1.4.144a	400GBASE-VR4	400GBASE-R encoding

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.24 P23 L49 # 230

Grow, Bob RMG Consulting

Comment Type ER Comment Status A Bucket

The editing instructon is wrong. The words "Table" should not be in the parenthetical. Also all three subclause numbers are wrong.

SuggestedRemedy

There is already a 45.2.1.24.7 in P802.3/D2.1 so the final subclause numbers should be 8 and 9 here and on the inserted subclauses on page 24.

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

New subclauses and associated registers:

45.2.1.24.a	1.26.10
45.2.1.24.8	1.26.2

Cl 167 SC 167.7.1 P51 L28 # 195

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

As the channel or signal is relatively slower than for any other optical PMDs so far, we should expect higher Ceq, contributing to TDECQ, but we should not expect higher K because we have 9 taps rather than 5, and 2% threshold adjust rather than 1%. We expect that TDECQ, Ceq and K measurements with 2% threshold adjust will be more accurate than for previous specs, so we need less padding for measurement issues. We should re-optimize the spec considering these things, encouraging good equalisable signals both after and before the fibre. The K' limit can catch some bad transmitters that an overshoot limit intended to pass all good signals would miss - and K' is a free by-product of TECQ. The K' limit is similar to VEC in C2M and EVM in coherent: a screen for signals that are bad after equalisation.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert row for K'=TECQ-10.log10(Ceq'), limit 4 dB (where K' and Ceq' are the two parts of TECQ as K and Ceq are the two parts of TDECQ). For both VR and SR.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

Based on Straw Poll:

I favor including a limit on K' for

VR	2
SR	0
Both	1
Neither	5
Abstain	9

IEEE 802.3db D2.0 100G, 200G, 400G Short Reach Fiber Task Force Initial Working Group ballot commen

CI 167 SC 167.7.2 P53 L44 # 40

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

It was shown that TDECQ with MMSE is accurate and reduce test time and associated test cost.

[https://www.ieee802.org/3/db/public/September-09-September-29-2021/ghiasi\\_802.3db\\_01\\_092321.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/db/public/September-09-September-29-2021/ghiasi_802.3db_01_092321.pdf)

*SuggestedRemedy*

MMSE is representative of real receiver and a full grid search may produce results slightly better, as shown by in Ghiasi contribution there is excellent correlation for scope measurements. MMSE will reduce test time significantly given 802.3db reference receiver is 9 taps will longer to do full grid search and will increase test cost.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

No specific proposal was presented. A straw poll did not show consensus for a change.

Straw Poll:

I support replacing the existing method of optimizing TDECQ with an MMSE approach

Yes 4

No 5

Abstain 9

Need more information 3

CI 167 SC 167.9.1 P59 L54 # 69

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Should refer to Annex J. IEC 60950-1 is obsolete.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change: All equipment subject to this clause shall conform to IEC 60950-1.

To: All equipment meeting this standard shall conform to the general safety requirements as specified in J.2.

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See also comments #95 and 177

Change this sentence to "All equipment subject to this clause shall conform to J.2."