

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P18 L14 # 47
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 incorrect call out 1.6Gb/s
 SuggestedRemedy
 change Gb/s to Tb/s two places line 14 and line 18
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P20 L15 # 49
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 typo 200BASE-MR1 should be 200GBASE-MR1
 SuggestedRemedy
 change 200BASE-MR1 to 200GBASE-MR1. similar 200G needs to be edited for line 21 and 24
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.92ha P18 L15 # 48
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 checking the use of term eight pairs of multimode fiber vs eight lanes
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to lanes if necessary
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See response to comment 1.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P20 L30 # 2
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 for 400GBASE-MR2, "400GBASE-R PCS/PMA over 2-lane multimode fiber PMD ". While, in 802.3df, 400GBASE-R PCS/PMA over 4 single-mode fibers in each direction □ PMD" and "800GBASE-R PCS/PMA over 8 multimode fibers in each direction □ PMD" were used. It is better make the language consistent.
 SuggestedRemedy
 related to my previous comment about SC1.4. The choice should be consistent. Use the language decided in the comment of SC 1.4. either " n pairs of multimode fiber" or all use " n multimode fibers in each direction". There are multiple instances in this subclause.

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P18 L41 # 1
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 "lanes" is not commonly used as the unit of fiber. previously in 1.6TBASE-MR8, this draft used "eight pairs of multimode fiber". and for 800GBASE-SR4-30 it used "lanes" of fiber. In dj, "over eight single-mode fibers in each direction" was used. In df, previous instances of "lanes of multimode fibers" for x00GBASE-SRn were updated to "over n multimode fibers in each direction". The language should be made consistent within this project.
 later on in P30 of this draft, all PMDs defined in this draft are referred to as "using 400GBASE-R encoding over two multimode fibers in each direction, with reach up to at least 50 m"
 SuggestedRemedy
 either all use " n pairs of multimode fiber" or all use " n multimode fibers in each direction". The latter one is preferred because it is consistent with the recent x00GBASE-SRn PMDs, and it is clear that this is duplex operation not bidi. There are multiple instances in this subclause.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Use "n multimode fibers in each direction" where n is two, four, and eight for 200G, 400G and 1.6T PMDs, respectively, consistent with 802.3df.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Proposed change:
 Replace:
 "400GBASE-R PCS/PMA over 2-lane multimode fiber PMD"
 With:
 "400GBASE-R PCS/PMA over 2 multimode fibers in each direction PMD"
 Similar replacement in the description of 4-lane and 8-lane PMDs.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 45 SC Table 45-58g P28 L7 # 50
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 typo 200GTBASE-SR1-30
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to 200GBASE-SR1-30
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.60g.1 P28 L15 # 51
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 typo 200GBASE-MR10
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to 200GBASE-MR1
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.60g.2 P28 L19 # 52
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 heading 200GTBASE-SR1-50 does not match prose of 200GBASE-SR1-50. Typo?
 SuggestedRemedy
 change heading to 200GBASE-SR1-50
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 116 SC 116.1.2 P29 L17 # 53
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 double check the clause call for MDIs KR1/2 and CR1/2. This calls KR1 cls 179 and KR2
 cls 178 while CR1 is 178 and CR2 179
 SuggestedRemedy
 correct clause reference if necessary
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In 116.1.2 item I), change
 "Clause 178 for 200GBASE-CR1
 Clause 179 for 200GBASE-KR1"
 to
 "Clause 178 for 200GBASE-KR1
 Clause 179 for 200GBASE-CR1".

Cl 116 SC 116.1.4 P31 L18 # 54
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 Table 116-4a third column is titled 20GMII
 SuggestedRemedy
 change the typo to 200GMII
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 116 SC 116.1.4 P32 L26 # 55
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 Note under table 116-5a defines O=Optical. I think O=optional as on prior table
 SuggestedRemedy
 change O=Optional
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 116 SC 116.2.5 P32 L38 # 3 [REDACTED]
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 missing comma before and
 SuggestedRemedy
 add comma before "and"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add the Oxford comma after "Clause 193" on lines 36 and 38.

Cl 169 SC 169.1.4 P39 L19 # 56 [REDACTED]
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 typo on 4th column entry 800MII
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to "800GMII Extender"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169-3ab P40 L16 # 57 [REDACTED]
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 typo on 4th column entry 800MII
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to "800GMII Extender"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 193 SC 193.1 P47 L24 # 116 [REDACTED]
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 Table 193-1 and Table 193-2, Physical Layer clauses associated with... are clones of each other, and they don't fit on a single page. Each really has three columns. The status (optional, required or conditional) is the same in each. But the presentation obscures the very high level of commonality. Also it is inaccurate: there is no "Clause 117--200 Gb/s RS" for example; Clause 117 is for both 200 Gb/s and 400 Gb/s operation, and 117 appears twice in each table. Really, we are indicating what is relevant in the clause, not which clause we mean, so the sort-of title / description should be in a separate column from the clause number.

SuggestedRemedy
 Present these two tables as a single table with four columns: Clause number, 200GBASE-SR1-30 and 200GBASE-SR1-50 (with the abbreviated ~titles from Table 193-1), 400GBASE-SR2-30 and 400GBASE-SR2-50 (with the abbreviated titles from Table 193-2), Status. Combine footnotes c and e from Table 193-1 and Table 193-2. Follow Table 167-2, not Table 122-1 which inefficiently interleaves rows from two tables.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement with editorial license.

Combine Table 193-1 and Table 193-2 into a single table, generally following Table 167-2, to reduce duplication and improve readability. Use separate columns for clause number, relevant function or sublayer, PHY applicability, and status. Combine applicable footnotes as appropriate.

Apply a corresponding change to Table 194-1 and Table 194-2.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 193 SC 193.1 P47 L48 # 118

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket

These tables of what makes up a particular Physical Layer are not so useful for teaching beginners because they leave out the elephant in the room: the PMD clause. Beginners don't read everything all at once: they have to start somewhere. I know we have omitted this before.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a row:
 | 193 | 200GBASE-SR1-30 and
 200GBASE-SR1-50 PMDs | 400GBASE-SR2-30 and
 400GBASE-SR2-50 PMDs | Required |
 So the table can stand by itself.
 And similarly for other similar tables.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
 The proposed change is not consistent with the traditional format used in IEEE 802.3 tables identifying the Physical Layer clauses associated with a PHY.

These tables identify the associated sublayers and supporting clauses outside the PMD clause itself. Adding the PMD clause as a row in its own associated-clauses table would be inconsistent with existing IEEE 802.3 practice.

Cl 193 SC Table 193-3 P49 L5 # 58

Simms, William

NVIDIA

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket

typo in table 193-3 first row, 1.6TBase....

SuggestedRemedy

should change to 800TBASE to align with other column

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 193 SC 193.1 P49 L6 # 117

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket

Table 193-3 and Table 193-4, Physical Layer clauses associated with... are not quite clones of each other, and they don't fit on a single page. Each really has three columns. The status (optional, required or conditional) is the same in each. But the presentation obscures the very high level of commonality and makes it hard to spot the differences (PCS and PMA). Also it is inaccurate: there is no "120F--800GAUI-8 C2C" for example; Annex 120F is for many MAC rates. Really, we are indicating what is relevant in the clause, not which clause we mean, so the sort-of title / description should be in a separate column from the clause number.

SuggestedRemedy

Present these two tables as a single table with four columns: Clause number, 800GBASE-SR4-30 and 800GBASE-SR4-50 (with the abbreviated ~titles from Table 193-3), 1.6TBASE-SR8-30 and 1.6TBASE-SR8-50 (with the abbreviated titles from Table 193-4), Status. There will be one more row than in Table 193-3.
 Combine footnote d.
 Follow Table 167-2, not Table 122-1 which inefficiently interleaves rows from two tables.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement with editorial license.

Combine Table 193-3 and Table 193-4 into a single table, generally following Table 167-2, to reduce duplication and improve readability. Use separate columns for clause number, relevant function or sublayer, PHY applicability, and status. Combine applicable footnotes as appropriate.

Apply a corresponding change to Table 194-3 and Table 194-4.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 193 SC 193.2 P51 L41 # 119

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

174A, particularly Table 174A-1, lays out the standard error allocations for the sublayers in a PHY. This paragraph 193.2 "a PMD receiver is expected" is applicable to pluggable modules where the decisions are made in the module, errors can be counted at its PMA, and some error budget is reserved for the following AUIs in the receive path. But it is not correct for RTLR, LPO, NPO and CPO where there is no C2M AUI. For some of these, a different BERadded should be used, and for others, the PCS method at line 45 is more relevant.

SuggestedRemedy

Either:
 Change the second paragraph to:
 With a compliant input signal, a PMD receiver is expected to meet the block error ratio (BLER) of 1.45×10^{-11} (see 174A.6), measured at the PMA adjacent to the PMD using the method described in 174A.9, with the appropriate BERadded. For a receiver in a module with an AUI C2M, BERadded is 6.4×10^{-5} . For a receiver where the PMA adjacent to the PMD is the final PMA in the receiver (e.g. in a host ASIC), BERadded is 3.2×10^{-5} . For a receiver where the PMA adjacent to the PMD is followed by an AUI C2C then the final PMA in the receiver, BERadded is 5×10^{-5} .
 Or,
 Add this information in 193.9.14 (see another comment) and refer to it here.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement with editorial license.

Align the receiver performance expectation text in 193.2 with the text currently used in the IEEE 802.3dj draft.

Apply the same change to 194.2.

CI 193 SC 193.2 P52 L41 # 120

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket

The logic of this subclause is obscured. The idea is that we have an FLR expectation, which is translated to a PHY receiver BLER expectation, which is further translated to a PMD receiver BLER expectation using the BERadded method. But the second and third paragraphs in this subclause are out of order.

SuggestedRemedy

Swap the second and third paragraphs so that the logic behind these requirements is more apparent.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement with editorial license.

The comment identifies a valid issue. The remedy is addressed by the resolution of comment 119, which aligns the text with the corresponding text currently used in the IEEE 802.3dj draft.

No additional change is required.

CI 193 SC 193.4.1 P53 L18 # 4

Mi, Guangcan

Huawei

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket

reference to 116.4 should be a real cross reference, within this document.

SuggestedRemedy

fix the cross reference.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Update 193.4.1 and 194.4.1 for consistency.

CI 193 SC 193.4.1 P53 L19 # 60

Simms, William

NVIDIA

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket

duplicate 800GBASE-SR4-50

SuggestedRemedy

remove duplicate and replace with 800GBASE-SR4-30

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 The first instance of 800GBASE-SR4-50 should be modified to 800GBASE-SR4-30.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 193 SC 193.4.2.1 P53 L49 # 59
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 duplicate 400GBASE-SR2-50
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove duplicate and replace with 400GBASE-SR2-30. similar instance on line 31
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 193 SC 193.4.2.1 P53 L49 # 5
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 the first 400GBASE_SR2-50 is wrong.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to 400GBASE-SR2-30
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 193 SC 193.5.1 P55 L5 # 124
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 This shows the signal detect after the usual AND gate at the bottom of the diagram, but an unconnected SIGNAL_OK at the top of the diagram. But these are connected; the ILT/RTS functions will be asleep until signal detect reports that there is light coming in and it is worth waking up. A consideration of squelch shows that getting this right can be important. Optical signal detect protects the DSP from processing crosstalk (successfully or not) when there is no input, and it definitively keeps the receiver from getting confused if the light has disappeared and confusing those debugging the network. For these purposes it does not matter that SD is slow, nor that it doesn't identify a good signal; it unambiguously identifies a too-weak or absent optical signal. Every optical clause has had a meaningful SD for many generations. But there might be implementations where delivering the signal detect information to the right place in RTS is impractical.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Show signal detect as a recommended input to "ILT/RTS functions".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 The proposed change is not aligned with the current Figure 180-2 in IEEE 802.3dj.
 The same issue also applies to Figure 194-2. P802.3ds should remain aligned with IEEE 802.3dj for the ILT/RTS architecture. No change is made.

CI 193 SC 193.5.1 P55 L26 # 6
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 missing SL_i and DL_i in the figure, and notes SL_i is source lane_i, DL_i is destination lane_i, as in Table 180-2.
 SuggestedRemedy
 edit the figure similar to Figure 180-2, add SLi and DLi at the output of transmit function and input to receiver function boxes. Add "SLi = source lane i" and "DLi = destination lane i" to figure legends.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Simple change and adds information over 802.3 db.
 Update 194.5.1 for consistency.
 Implement with editorial license.

CI 193 SC 193.5.4 P56 L21 # 7
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 the place holder reference 300.5 has not been updated
 SuggestedRemedy
 change it to 193.5
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 193 SC 193.5.4 P56 L21 # 125

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

D3.0 comment 436: global signal detect should gate RTS. It would be advisable for the lane-by-lane signal detect to gate ILT training (no light = nothing to train on): see another comment.

SuggestedRemedy

Add sentence that Global_PMD_signal_detect should (recommended) be used as an input to the RTS function of 178A.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

The comment identifies an issue that is being addressed in IEEE 802.3dj. P802.3ds will remain aligned with IEEE 802.3dj for the RTS and ILT functions.

Any changes adopted in IEEE 802.3dj for this issue will be applied to P802.3ds as appropriate.

CI 193 SC 193.5.5 P56 L49 # 9

Mi, Guangcan Huawei

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket

"signal detect" should not be capitalized in this sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

change to "signal detect"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Update both 193.5.5 and 194.5.5.

CI 193 SC 193.5.8 P57 L41 # 11

Mi, Guangcan Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

The method and definition of PMD lane by lane transmit disable function has been updated in 802.3dj. Align this draft with 802.3dj D3.1

SuggestedRemedy

refer to 802.3dj D3.1 180.5.8

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Apply the proposed change with editorial license.

Update 194.5.8 for consistency

Add the corresponding ILT-related text to this subclause so that the lane-by-lane transmit disable behavior is aligned with Clause 180, including the condition that either PMD_transmit_disable_i or tx_disable in lane i of the ILT function causes the associated optical transmitter to be turned off.

CI 193 SC 193.5.12 P57 L50 # 73

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

Add missing definition for local_pattern

SuggestedRemedy

Add: When tx_mode = local_pattern (see 178B.8.3.1) the PMD transmits PRBS31Q (see 176.7.4.2).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment 12.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 193 SC 193.5.12 P57 L51 # 12

Mi, Guangcan

Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

The method described in APSU function subclause has been updated in 802.3dj. Align this draft with 802.3dj D3.1. particularly about the local pattern path of the ILT function and state diagram.

SuggestedRemedy

delete the paragraph of "When mr_training_enable is false and tx_mode is local_pattern...."

add "When tx_mode = local_pattern (see 178B.8.3.1) the PMD transmits PRBS31Q (see 176.7.4.2).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

Update 194.5.12 for consistency.

The comment identifies an alignment issue with the APSU function text relative to IEEE 802.3dj D3.1. The same issue also occurs in 194.5.12. Update the affected APSU function subclauses consistently so that the local pattern path of the ILT function states: "When tx_mode = local_pattern (see 178B.8.3.1) the PMD transmits PRBS31Q (see 176.7.4.2)."

CI 193 SC 193.6 P58 L4 # 13

Mi, Guangcan

Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

lane assignment is indeed needed for PMDs in this subclause, because the use of ILT and APSU function.

SuggestedRemedy

align the method of lane assignment to that of 802.3dj D3.1 180.6, with appropriate update to PMD names and references.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Update 193.6 and 194.6 for consistency.

Implement with editorial license.

CI 193 SC 193.5.12 P58 L44 # 107

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

The way APSU is described doesn't make sense because a PMD is an unretimed thing as the base 802.3 make clear (it converts between electrical and optical and, for PAM2, provides a limiting / clipping function), while the PMA provides the retiming function. Transmitting particular patterns is a PMA function.

SuggestedRemedy

This should be fixed in P802.3dj, otherwise P802.3ds would need to write out an 802.3-compliant APSU.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The proposed remedy is not actionable for P802.3ds. The APSU text in P802.3ds is aligned with P802.3dj. No change is made.

CI 193 SC 193.7.2 P60 L42 # 14

Mi, Guangcan

Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

The mandatory error ratio requirement is using BLER and is specified in 193.2. "Measured with conformance test signal at TP3 (see 193.9.14) for the BER specified in 174A.6." is not correct.

SuggestedRemedy

change to "":
Measured with conformance test signal at TP3 (see 193.9.14) for the BLER specified in 193.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy in both Tables 193-8 and 194-8.

CI 193 SC 193.9.1 P68 L22 # 20

Mi, Guangcan

Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

footnote a of Table 193-12, the references to 180.9.15 and 180.9.16 are not appropriate here. References should be made to the Receiver sensitivity and stressed receiver sensitivity in this subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

change the last two references in foot note a to 193.9.14 and 193.9.15

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy in both Table 193-12 and Table 194-12.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 193 SC 193.9.5 P69 L49 # 22
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 the sentence is awkward "if measured as defined in 180.9.5"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to "if measured using the method as defined in 180.9.5."
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement suggested remedy in both clause 193 and 194.

Cl 193 SC 193.9.2 P69 L69 # 121
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 Sensitivity is based on BLER now, not BER.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "at the BER specified in 174A.6" to "at the frame loss ratio specified in 174A.6, which is defined by BLER as described in 193.2, 174A.9 and 174A.11"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 193 SC 193.9.5 P70 L19 # 25
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 This exception is unnecessary, since Nf is the same as the Nf defined in 180.9.6
 SuggestedRemedy
 delet the exception about N(f)
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement suggested remedy in both clause 193 and 194.

Cl 193 SC 193.9.7 P70 L37 # 62
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 it appears PMD types 800GBASE and 400GBASE are in swapped positions
 SuggestedRemedy
 correct to 400GBASE-SR2-30 and 800GBASE-SR4-30
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 193 SC 193.9.14 P72 L2 # 32
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 there is no need to list out the names of the PMDs, instead reference to table 193-7 is sufficient.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to "The conformance test signal at TP3 meets the requirements for a transmitter as specified in Table 180-7 followed by an attenuator."
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement suggested remedy in 193.9.14 and 194.9.14.

Cl 193 SC 193.9.12 P72 L33 # 30
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Bucket
 "measured through the reference receiver " is some what umbiguous.
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete "as measured through the reference receiver in 193.9.3"
 Add "The transmitter transition time is measured using waveforms captured at the output of the reference receiver defined in 193.9.3."
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement suggested remedy in both 193.9.12 and 194.9.12.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 193 SC 193.9.12 P72 L36 # 29
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 squarewave is no longer used as test pattern for any test in this subclause. Delete the exception.
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete "with the exception that the square wave test pattern may be used."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Remove the reference to square wave in both 193.9.12 and 194.9.12.
 Implement with editorial license.

CI 193 SC 193.9.13 P72 L46 # 68
 Murty, Ramana Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 Incorrect reference for RIN_OMA calculation.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 180.9.14 with 180.9.13.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 193 SC 193.9.14 P72 L49 # 33
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket
 precoding configuration is not considered for receiver sensitivity.
 SuggestedRemedy
 add "Precoding (see 176.7.1.2) is enabled if the receiver requests precoding using the ILT function."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement suggested remedy in both 193.9.14 and 194.9.14.

CI 193 SC 193.9.14 P73 L9 # 34
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket
 precoding configuration is not considered for stressed receiver sensitivity.
 SuggestedRemedy
 add "Precoding (see 176.7.1.2) is enabled if the receiver requests precoding using the ILT function."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement suggested remedy in both 193.9.15 and 194.9.15.

CI 194 SC 194 P83 L1 # 105
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 Many comments against 193 apply to 194, and possibly vice versa
 SuggestedRemedy
 Apply the resolutions to both clauses as appropriate
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 State the use of editorial license in comment responses where appropriate.

CI 194 SC 194.1 P83 L9 # 69
 Murty, Ramana Broadcom
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 Missing "and".
 SuggestedRemedy
 "... 800GBASE-MR4, and 1.6TBASE-MR8 PMDs ..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 194 SC 194.1 P83 L18 # 35

Lewis, David Speciphy / Lumentum

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

Table 194-1 should reference 200GBASE-MR1 throughout.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "200GBASE-SR1-30 and 200GBASE-SR1-50" with "200GBASE-MR1" in the heading for the 2nd column and in footnotes c and d.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

Table 194-1 should reference 200GBASE-MR1 throughout.

Replace "200GBASE-SR1-30 and 200GBASE-SR1-50" with "200GBASE-MR1" in the heading for the second column and in footnotes c and d.

Cl 194 SC 194.1 P83 L19 # 70

Murty, Ramana Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket

PMD names are incorrect in Tables 194-1 through 194-4.

SuggestedRemedy

Use correct PMD names.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comments 35 - 38.

Cl 194 SC 194.1 P84 L3 # 36

Lewis, David Speciphy / Lumentum

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

Table 194-2 should reference 400GBASE-MR2 throughout.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "400GBASE-SR1-30 and 400GBASE-SR1-50" with "400GBASE-MR2" in the heading for the 2nd column and in footnotes c and d.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

Table 194-2 should reference 400GBASE-MR2 throughout.

Replace "400GBASE-SR1-30 and 400GBASE-SR1-50" with "400GBASE-MR2" in the heading for the second column and in footnotes c and d.

Cl 194 SC 194.1 P85 L3 # 37

Lewis, David Speciphy / Lumentum

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket

Table 194-3 should reference 800GBASE-MR4 throughout.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "1.6TGBASE-SR8-30 and 1.6TGBASE-SR8-50" with "800GBASE-MR4" in the heading for the 2nd column. Replace "800GBASE-SR4-30 or 800GBASE-SR4-50" with "800GBASE-MR4" in footnote a.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license.

Table 194-3 should reference 800GBASE-MR4 throughout.

Replace the incorrect PHY references in the heading for the second column with "800GBASE-MR4".

Replace "800GBASE-SR4-30 or 800GBASE-SR4-50" with "800GBASE-MR4" in footnote a.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 194 SC Tab;e 194-3 P85 L4 # 63
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 typo in table 194-3, column header on right should be 800GBASE...
 SuggestedRemedy
 change 1.6TBase to 800GBASE
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Similar to comments 35 to 38. The header should be: 800GBASE-MR4.

CI 194 SC 194.1 P86 L3 # 38
 Lewis, David Speciphy / Lumentum
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 Table 194-4 should reference 1.6TGBASE-MR8 throughout.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "1.6TGBASE-SR8-30 and 1.6TGBASE-SR8-50" with "1.6TGBASE-MR8" in the heading for the 2nd column. Replace "1.6TGBASE-SR8-30 or 1.6TGBASE-SR8-50" with "1.6TGBASE-MR8" in footnote a.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement with editorial license.

Table 194-4 should reference 1.6TBASE-MR8 throughout.

Replace "1.6TBASE-SR8-30 and 1.6TBASE-SR8-50" with "1.6TBASE-MR8" in the heading for the second column.

Replace "1.6TBASE-SR8-30 or 1.6TBASE-SR8-50" with "1.6TBASE-MR8" in footnote a.

CI 194 SC 194.4.2.1 P89 L25 # 39
 Lewis, David Speciphy / Lumentum
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 Heading included "200GBASE-MR1-30"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "200GBASE-MR1-30" to "200GBASE-MR1"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 193 SC 193.5.12 P93 L50 # 82
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 Add missing definition for local_pattern
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add: When tx_mode = local_pattern (see 178B.8.3.1) the PMD transmits PRBS31Q (see 176.7.4.2).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See response to comment 12.

CI 194 SC 194.7.2 P96 L19 # 41
 Lewis, David Speciphy / Lumentum
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 Average receive power (min) should be Tx average power min - channel insertion loss, or -3.4 -1.7 = -5.1 dBm
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change value from -5 to -5.1 for Average receive power, each lane (min) in Table 194-8.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 194 SC 194.7.2 P96 L28 # 42
 Lewis, David Speciphy / Lumentum
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 The breakpoint for receiver sensitivity should match the one for Tx OMA (min), i.e. a TDECQ value of 1.8 dB.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "for TECQ <= TBD" to "for TECQ <= 1.8"
 change "for TBD < TECQ <= TBD" for "for 1.8 < TECQ <= TBD"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement suggested remedy in both Table 193-8 and Tanle 194-8.

P802.3ds D1.1 200 Gb/s per Wavelength MMF PHYs Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl **194** *SC* **194.8.1** *P***100** *L***15** # 45
 Lewis, David Speciphy / Lumentum
Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Bucket*
 Effective modal bandwidth should be at 1060 nm.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change 850 nm to 1060 nm.
Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **194** *SC* **194.9.2** *P***105** *L***10** # 46
 Lewis, David Speciphy / Lumentum
Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Bucket*
 800GBASE-SR4-30 should be 800GBASE-MR4
SuggestedRemedy
 Change -SR4-30 to -MR4
Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **194** *SC* **194.9.13** *P***108** *L***43** # 72
 Murty, Ramana Broadcom
Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Bucket*
 Incorrect reference for RIN_OMA calculation.
SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 180.9.14 with 180.9.13.
Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.