Motions and Straw Polls

IEEE P802.3cw, IEEE P802.3df and P802.3dj Task Force Joint Meeting

January 2024 Interim

Kent Lusted, Intel

John D’Ambrosia, Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei

Foreword

- Straw polls related to resolving comments may be found in the associated comment response files.
- This contribution summarizes motions and straw polls not related to comments.
- This contribution is not the official minutes of the meeting.

If there is any discrepancy between this contribution and the meeting minutes, then the minutes take precedence.

22 January 2024

Straw Poll #1

I would support adopting the COM Die/Device model parameter values in lim_3dj_01_2401 slide 8 for 200G/Lane KR, CR, AUI chip-to-chip and chip-to-module

Results (all): Y: 49, N: 0, A: 23

Straw Poll #2

I would support adopting the updated parameter values for Class B packages per benartsi_3dj_01_2401 slide 7

Results (all): Y: 44 , N: 1 , A: 39

Straw Poll #3

I would support adopting the 200G/lane electrical baseline proposals summarized on ran_3dj_01a_2401 slide 29, with the addition that test fixtures for the CR PHYs are TBD.

Results (all): Y: 59 , N: 0 , A: 23

Straw Poll #4

I would support adopting link training based on IEEE Std. 802.3ck-2022, Cl 162.8.11 as the baseline for 200G/lane Backplane and Copper Cable PMDs (with max_wait_timer = TBD) and in-band training based on the clause 136 training frame structure (Figure 136-3) for all PMAs with physically instantiated interfaces (AUIs) at 200 Gb/s per lane ~~(within type 1/2 PHYs and extenders)~~

Results (all): Y: N: A:

Straw Poll #5

I would support adopting the AN73 baseline proposal in lusted_3dj_04_2401, slides 6-14

Results (all) Y: 53 , N: 2 , A: 28

Straw Poll #6

I would support the proposed reference receiver framework in healey_3dj_01_2401.pdf, slides 5-15

Results (all): Y: 65 , N: 0 , A: 21

Straw Poll #7

For the 200G/lane electrical interfaces or PMDs having MLSE capability, the MLSE solution approach that I prefer is:

A. Include MLSE COM calculations based on equation U1.a in shakiba_3dj_01b_2401 slide 9

B. Include MLSE COM calculations based on equation U1.b in shakiba_3dj_01b_2401 slide 10

C. Include MLSE COM calculations based on equation U1.c in shakiba_3dj_01b_2401 slide 11

D. Need more information

E. None of the above

(choose one)

Results (all): A: 0 , B: 1 , C: 47 , D: 16 , E: 7

23 January 2024

Straw Poll #8

I would support adopting a PMD control function based on 162.8.11 (IEEE Std. 802.3ck-2022) for 200G/lane Backplane and Copper Cable PMDs, with max_wait_timer = TBD

Results (all): Y: 64, N: 0, A: 22

Straw Poll #9

I would support adopting in-band training for PMAs with physically instantiated chip-to-module interfaces (AUI-C2M) at 200 Gb/s per lane, based on 162.8.11 (IEEE Std. 802.3ck-2022) with training frame bit assignments and state diagrams TBD

Results (all): Y: 49 , N: 8 , A: 27

Straw Poll #10

I would support adopting in-band training for PMAs with physically instantiated chip-to-chip interfaces (AUI-C2C) at 200 Gb/s per lane, based on 162.8.11 (IEEE Std. 802.3ck-2022) with training frame bit assignments and state diagrams TBD

Results (all): Y: 49, N: 2, A: 29

Straw Poll #11

I would support the adoption of the 800GBASE-FR4-500 baseline as shown in welch_3dj_01a_2401 pages 10-16

Results (all): Y: 53 , N: 22 , A: 13

Straw Poll #12

I would support removing the convolutional interleaver from the inner FEC sublayer for the following PHYs:

- 200GBASE-FR1, 400GBASE-DR2-2, 800GBASE-DR4-2, 800GBASE-FR4, 1.6TBASE-DR8-2

Results (all): Y: 38 , N: 11 , NMI: 33 , A: 17

Straw Poll #13

I support the adoption of a target SER limit of 9.6E-3 for TECQ/TDECQ/SECQ for the 2km FECi based PMDs

Results (all): Y: , N: , NMI: , A: