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## Restricted PCS lane muxing by the PMA



This was implemented in D1.0 as part of the PMA sublayer, Clause 173:
173.4.2.1 32:8 PMA bit-level multiplexing

In the transmit direction, the function is performed among the PCSLs received from the PMA client via the PMA:IS_UNITDATA_ $i$ request primitives (for PMA client lanes $i=0$ to 31) with the result sent to the service interface below the PMA using the inst:IS_UNITDATA_i.request primitives (for service interface lanes $i=0$ to 7), referencing the functional block diagram shown in Figure 173-3. The bit-level multiplexing function is identical to that specified in 120.5.2, with the following exceptions:

- The number of PCSLs is 32 .
- The multiplexing function has an additional constraint that each of the 8 output lanes contain two unique PCSLs from PMA client lanes $i=0$ to 15 and two unique PCSLs from PMA client lanes $i=16$ to 31
- The purpose of the constraint is to have bits from all four codewords on each PMA lane
- But... there is more than one way to do it
- Comments \#166, \#167 suggest that this constraint become only a recommendation
- Below I compare three options A, B, and X
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## Option A (constrained muxing)

## Specific example of muxing lanes per the diagram in slide 3

| Ul\Lane | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | B81A81 | B91A91 | B101A101 | B111A111 | B121A121 | B131A131 | B141A141 | B151A151 |
| 21 | D80C80 | D90C90 | D100C100 | D110C110 | D120C120 | D130C130 | D140C140 | D150C150 |
| 20 | B80A80 | B90A90 | B100A100 | B110A110 | B120A120 | B130A130 | B140A140 | B150A150 |
| 19 | C9D9 | C19D19 | C29D29 | C39D39 | C49D49 | C59D59 | C69D69 | C79D79 |
| 18 | A9B9 | A19B19 | A29B29 | A39B39 | A49B49 | A59B59 | A69B69 | A79B79 |
| 17 | C8D8 | C18D18 | C28D28 | C38D38 | C48D48 | C58D58 | C68D68 | C78D78 |
| 16 | A8B8 | A18B18 | A28B28 | A38B38 | A48B48 | A58B58 | A68B68 | A78B78 |
| 15 | C7D7 | C17D17 | C27D27 | C37D37 | C47D47 | C57D57 | C67D67 | C77D77 |
| 14 | A7B7 | A17B17 | A27B27 | A37B37 | A47B47 | A57B57 | A67B67 | A77B77 |
| 13 | C6D6 | C16D16 | C26D26 | C36D36 | C46D46 | C56D56 | C66D66 | C76D76 |
| 12 | A6B6 | A16B16 | A26B26 | A36B36 | A46B46 | A56B56 | A66B66 | A76B76 |
| 11 | C5D5 | C15D15 | C25D25 | C35D35 | C45D45 | C55D55 | C65D65 | C75D75 |
| 10 | A5B5 | A15B15 | A25B25 | A35B35 | A45B45 | A55B55 | A65B65 | A75B75 |
| 9 | C4D4 | C14D14 | C24D24 | C34D34 | C44D44 | C54D54 | C64D64 | C74D74 |
| 8 | A4B4 | A14B14 | A24B24 | A34B34 | A44B44 | A54B54 | A64B64 | A74B74 |
| 7 | C3D3 | C13D13 | C23D23 | C33D33 | C43D43 | C53D53 | C63D63 | C73D73 |
| 6 | A3B3 | A13B13 | A23B23 | A33B33 | A43B43 | A53B53 | A63B63 | A73B73 |
| 5 | C2D2 | C12D12 | C22D22 | C32D32 | C42D42 | C52D52 | C62D62 | C72D72 |
| 4 | A2B2 | A12B12 | A22B22 | A32B32 | A42B42 | A52B52 | A62B62 | A72B72 |
| 3 | C1D1 | C11D11 | C21D21 | C31D31 | C41D41 | C51D51 | C61D61 | C71D71 |
| 2 | A1B1 | A11B11 | A21B21 | A31B31 | A41B41 | A51B51 | A61B61 | A71B71 |
| 1 | CODO | C10D10 | C20D20 | C30D30 | C40D40 | C50D50 | C60D60 | C70D70 |
| 0 | AOBO | A10B10 | A20B20 | A30B30 | A40B40 | A50B50 | A60B60 | A70B70 |



Each PAM4 symbol contains two bits from the same flow (either flow 0 - with codewords $A$ and $B$, or flow 1

- with codewords C and D)

Consecutive PAM4 symbol are from alternate flows
This muxing adheres to the constraint
Combined with the checkerboard pattern, this muxing allocates LSBs and MSBs of the PAM4 symbols equally among the four codewords

## Option B (constrained muxing, alternative)

Another example of muxing lanes per the diagram in slide 3

| Ul\Lane | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | B81D81 | B91D91 | B101D101 | B111D111 | B121D121 | B131D131 | B141D141 | B151 D151 |
| 21 | A80C80 | A90C90 | A100C100 | A110C110 | A120C120 | A130C130 | A140C140 | A150C150 |
| 20 | B80D80 | B90 D90 | B100D100 | B110D110 | B120D120 | B130D130 | B140D140 | B150D150 |
| 19 | B9D9 | B19D19 | B29D29 | B39 D39 | B49D49 | B59 D59 | B69 D69 | B79 D79 |
| 18 | A9C9 | A19C19 | A29C29 | A39 C39 | A49 C49 | A59 C59 | A69 C69 | A79 C79 |
| 17 | B8D8 | B18D18 | B28D28 | B38D38 | B48D48 | B58 D58 | B68D68 | B78 D78 |
| 16 | A8C8 | A18C18 | A28C28 | A38C38 | A48C48 | A58C58 | A68C68 | A78C78 |
| 15 | B7D7 | B17D17 | B27D27 | B37 D37 | B47D47 | B57 D57 | B67 D67 | B77 D77 |
| 14 | A7C7 | A17C17 | A27C27 | A37 C37 | A47C47 | A57 C57 | A67 C67 | A77 C77 |
| 13 | B6D6 | B16D16 | B26D26 | B36D36 | B46D46 | B56D56 | B66D66 | B76D76 |
| 12 | A6C6 | A16C16 | A26C26 | A36C36 | A46C46 | A56C56 | A66C66 | A76C76 |
| 11 | B5D5 | B15D15 | B25D25 | B35 D35 | B45 D45 | B55 D55 | B65 D65 | B75 D75 |
| 10 | A5C5 | A15C15 | A25C25 | A35 C35 | A45 C45 | A55 C55 | A65 C65 | A75 C75 |
| 9 | B4D4 | B14D14 | B24D24 | B34 D34 | B44D44 | B54 D54 | B64 D64 | B74D74 |
| 8 | A4C4 | A14C14 | A24C24 | A34C34 | A44C44 | A54C54 | A64C64 | A74C74 |
| 7 | B3 D3 | B13D13 | B23 D23 | B33 D33 | B43 D43 | B53 D53 | B63 D63 | B73 D73 |
| 6 | A3C3 | A13C13 | A23C23 | A33C33 | A43C43 | A53C53 | A63 C63 | A73C73 |
| 5 | B2 D2 | B12 D12 | B22 D22 | B32 D32 | B42 D42 | B52 D52 | B62 D62 | B72 D72 |
| 4 | A2C2 | A12C12 | A22C22 | A32 C32 | A42C42 | A52C52 | A62 C62 | A72C72 |
| 3 | B1D1 | B11D11 | B21D21 | B31 D31 | B41 D41 | B51 D51 | B61 D61 | B71 D71 |
| 2 | A1C1 | A11C11 | A21C21 | A31 C31 | A41C41 | A51 C51 | A61 C61 | A71C71 |
| 1 | B0D0 | B10D10 | B20D20 | B30 D30 | B40D40 | B50 D50 | B60 D60 | B70 D70 |
| 0 | AOCO | A10C10 | A20C20 | A30C30 | A40C40 | A50C50 | A60 C60 | A70 C70 |



Each PAM4 symbol contains two bits not from the same flow (in this example, one PAM4 symbol has AC and the other has BD; AD+BC also possible)
This muxing still adheres to the constraint
However, despite the checkerboard pattern, this always allocates MSBs to two of the codewords (here A and B) and LSBs to the other codewords (here C and D)

## 2/3 of random errors occur in the LSB

## Burst error model 2

The second aspect of this table is that of the six possibilities giving bits in error, two have errors in the first bit while four have errors in the second bit.

| Correct level | Received level |  | Error pattern |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | One up | One down | One up | One down |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | $\checkmark, \checkmark$ | $\checkmark, x$ |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | $\checkmark, x$ | $\times, \checkmark$ |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | $\times, \checkmark$ | $\checkmark, x$ |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | $\checkmark, x$ | $\checkmark, \checkmark$ |

The analysis in the remainder of this contribution therefore assumes that if a given symbol is in error, the probability of a bit error in the first bit is $1 / 3$ and in the second bit is $2 / 3$.

This means that, with option B:

- The two codewords that get the MSBs (A/B) have 2/3 of the average BER
- The two codewords that get the LSBs (C/D) have 4/3 of the average BER
- Uncorrectable errors occur more often in C and D
- Any uncorrectable error corrupts all four codewords

Note: if precoding is used, the decoding operation spreads errors equally across MSB and LSB, so this only applies to the non-precoded case

## FLR effect of option B with low error correlation (optics or C2M)

Factor of 34 (1.5 orders of magnitude) increase in FLR, or ${ }^{\sim} 0.15 \mathrm{~dB}$ penalty


Reduction of $25 \%$ in pre-FEC BER is required


## Notes

- The FLR penalty is almost constant (1.5 order of magnitude) regardless of error correlation, so only shown at two values of $a$
- Higher values of $a$ will likely cause precoding to be used anyway
- "Option B" does not exist in any 200G/400GBASE-R PHY or AUI
- The FLR effect $(\times 34)$ is worse than that of having 4 instead of 2 codewords $(\times 2)$
- Existing links will have a higher FLR at 800G (with option B) than at 200G/400G
- "Option B" may be susceptible to the "low clock content" issue because the LSBs always come from the same flow (and thus the same scrambler), as in clause 119
- In "Option A" the LSBs alternate between two flows, which seems to solve the issue (the probability of having correlated outputs from two separate scramblers is negligible).
- A PMA(8:8) should be prevented from permuting PCSLs such that "option A" at the input is converted to "option B " at the output.


## Suggested remedy (per comment \#6)

### 173.4.2.1 32:8 PMA bit-level multiplexing

Change the second list item as shown:

- The multiplexing function has an additional constraint that each of the 8 output lanes contain two unique PCSLs from PMA client lanes $i=0$ to 15 encoded as one PAM4 symbol, and two unique PCSLs from PMA client lanes $i=16$ to 31 encoded as the subsequent PAM4 symbol (see 173.4.7).


### 173.4.2.2 8:32 PMA bit-level multiplexing

Change the second list item as shown:

- The multiplexing function has an additional constraint that each of the 8 output lanes contain two unique PCSLs from service interface lanes $\mathrm{i}=0$ to 15 encoded as one PAM4 symbol, and two unique PCSLs from service interface lanes $\mathrm{i}=16$ to 31 encoded as the subsequent PAM4 symbol (see 173.4.7).


### 173.4.2.3 8:8 PMA bit-level multiplexing

Change the second list item as shown:

- The 4 PCSLs received on any input lane shall be mapped together to an output lane, maintaining the bit pairs encoded on each PAM4 symbol. Other than that, The order of PCSLs from an input lane does not have to be maintained on the output lane.


## Suggested remedy (modified) - part 1

### 173.4.2.1 32:8 PMA bit-level multiplexing

Change the second list item as shown:

- The multiplexing function has an additional constraint that each of the 8 output lanes contain two unique PCSLs from PMA client lanes $i=0$ to 15 and followed by two unique PCSLs from PMA client lanes $i=16$ to 31


### 173.4.2.2 8:32 PMA bit-level multiplexing

Change the second list item as shown:

- The multiplexing function has an additional constraint that each of the 8 output lanes contain two unique PCSLs from service interface lanes $i=0$ to 15 and followed by two unique PCSLs from service interface lanes $\mathrm{i}=16$ to 31 .


## Suggested remedy (modified) - part 2

### 173.4.2.3 8:8 PMA bit-level multiplexing

Change the second list item as shown:

- The 4 PCSLs received on any input lane shall be mapped together to an output lane such that the Gray-coded PAM4 symbol sequence on the output is identical to the Gray-coded PAM4 symbol sequence on the input (see 173.4.7.1). The order of PCSLs from an input lane does not have to be maintained on the output lane.


## Option X (unconstrained muxing)

## Specific example of muxing lanes not according to the diagram in slide 2



## Effect of option X

(Compare dashed lines to solid lines)

Large SNR penalty for any $\boldsymbol{a}>0$


Large minimum DER effect for any $a>0$


## Summary

- The constraints on lane muxing should be retained.
- Additional constraints are proposed to prevent degraded performance due to bad muxing choice.


[^0]:    Below, codewords of flow 0 are denoted A/B, those of flow 1 are denoted C/D

