

```

1  +-----+
2  |                                     |
3  |                                     |
4  | DATE:                               |
5  | NAME: Adee Ran                      |
6  | COMPANY/AFFILIATION: Cisco Systems  |
7  | E-MAIL: aran@cisco.com             |
8  |                                     |
9  | REQUESTED REVISION:                 |
10 |   STANDARD: IEEE Std 802.3ck-2022   |
11 |   CLAUSE NUMBER: 116.4              |
12 |   CLAUSE TITLE: Delay constraints    |
13 |                                     |
14 | PROPOSED REVISION TEXT:             |
15 | In Table 116-7, change the values  |
16 | in the rows inserted by 802.3ck for |
17 | 400GBASE-KR4 and 400GBASE-CR4 to 16384 bit times, 32 pause_quanta, and  |
18 | 40.96 ns.                           |
19 |                                     |
20 | RATIONALE FOR REVISION:             |
21 | Table 116-7 is a summary of delay  |
22 | constraints for 400GBASE PHYs in the |
23 | referenced PMD subclauses (163.5 and |
24 | 162.5), but the values in the table |
25 | do not match the values in these    |
26 | references.                           |
27 |                                     |
28 | The values in bits and pause_quanta |
29 | in this table are equal to those in |
30 | Table 116-6 (for 200GBASE), while   |
31 | the value in ns is halved. This is  |
32 | an error; the value in ns should be |
33 | the same (since the PMDs differ only |
34 | in the number of lanes) and the     |
35 | number of bit times and pause_quanta |
36 | should be doubled (since the bit    |
37 | time for 400G is half of the bit    |
38 | time for 200G).                       |
39 |                                     |
40 | The proposed change would make the  |
41 | values in the table equal to the    |
42 | values in the referenced PMD         |
43 | subclauses.                          |
44 |                                     |
45 | IMPACT ON EXISTING NETWORKS:        |
46 | None; the change is fixing a        |
47 | discrepancy between the table and   |
48 | sublayer clause, in which the       |
49 | sublayer clause prevails.           |
50 |                                     |
51 | +-----+
52 | |Please attach supporting material,  |
53 | |if any                               |
54 | |Submit to:- David Law, Chair IEEE  |
55 | |802.3                               |
56 | |and copy:- Adam Healey, Vice-Chair |
57 | |IEEE 802.3                           |
58 | |                                     |
59 | |At:- E-Mail: stds-802-3-maint-req@ |
60 | |ieee.org                             |
61 | |                                     |
62 | |   +----- For official use -----+ |
63 | |   | REV REQ NUMBER: 1420           | |
64 | |   | DATE RECEIVED: 29 September 2023 | |
65 | |   | EDITORIAL/TECHNICAL           | |
66 | |   | ACCEPTED/DENIED               | |
67 | |   | BALLOT REQ'D YES/NO           | |
68 | |   | COMMENTS:                     | |
69 | |   +-----+                       | |
70 | |                                     | |
71 | | For information about this Revision |
72 | | Request see -                       |
73 | | http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/revision\_history.html#REQ1420 |
74 | |                                     |
75 | +-----+

```