

## IEEE P802.3ck D1.2 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 3rd Task Force review comments

CI 120F SC 120F.3.1 P205 L13 # 29

Wu, Mau-Lin

Mediatek

Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket3

The 'AC common-mode RMS voltage (max.)' is 30 mV, which is the same as that in 802.3cd. By combining this spec with P/N skew mismatch of backplane channel, it will induce crosstalk to differential signal at receiver. From 50G to 100G, it's difficult to improve the P/N skew mismatch to half. Based on that, we shall modify AC common-mode RMS voltage. We shall align this spec to that in C2M (120G).

SuggestedRemedy

Change 30 mV to 17.5 mV.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

!!! 2020/7/15 new response !!!

Resolve using the response to comment #28.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2 P224 L46 # 191

Ghiasi, Ali

Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket3

Near end EH are TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Near end EH=40 mV, see ghiasi\_3ck\_02\_0620

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: changed subclause/page/line from 120F.4.2/211/46]

Resolve using the response to comment #177.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2 P224 L48 # 192

Ghiasi, Ali

Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket3

Far end eye height is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Far end EH=20 mV, see ghiasi\_3ck\_02\_0620

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: change subclause/line/page from 120F.4.2/211/48.]

Resolve using the response to comment #177.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2 P224 L37 # 194

Ghiasi, Ali

Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket3

Far VEC is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Far end VEC=7.5 dB, see ghiasi\_3ck\_02\_0620

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

[Editor's note: SC/page/line changed from 120F.4.2/211/48.]

!!! 2020/7/15 new response !!!

Resolve using the response to comment #177.

## IEEE P802.3ck D1.2 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 3rd Task Force review comments

CI 120G	SC 120G.3.2	P224	L37	# 193
---------	-------------	------	-----	-------

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** bucket3

Near VEC is TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Near end VEC=7.5 dB, see ghiasi\_3ck\_02\_0620

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

[Editor's note: changed subclause/page/line from 120F.4.2/211/48.]

!!! 2020/7/15 new response !!!

Resolve using the response to comment #177.

CI 120G	SC 120G.3.2	P224	L43	# 11060
---------	-------------	------	-----	---------

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** bucket3

[Comment resubmitted from Draft 1.1. 120G.3.2, P224, L37]

Signal swing and Tx equalization are important in PAM4 since the receiver has a limited linear range. A large swing at the host input may prevent linear operation and detection of PAM4. Attenuation has been used in past Rx designs, but it is becoming harder to implement with the large bandwidth requirements for 100G.

The current module output specifications have limited information about output swing and ISI (only implicitly through far-end eye height and far-end precursor ISI ratio, which are defined with a single channel), and do not mention any control of the Tx setting. With the large range of C2M host channels, it is unlikely that a fixed Tx setting will be usable for all hosts.

Actual modules even in 50G have some control of equalization and swing. There are indications that this control is required for actual operation.

If we ignore this capability in the specifications, some hosts may not be able to operate with the settings used for module output compliance; this means the module compliance specs are useless and measuring them is a waste of time.

The standard should at least mention the module's Tx control capabilities (with reference to external documents) and preferably define requirements for them, with management variables and control registers. It will be beneficial if the Tx specifications include these capabilities.

*SuggestedRemedy*

A presentation is planned with further details.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The following presentation was reviewed by the task force at a previous task force meeting: [http://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/may27\\_20/ran\\_3ck\\_adhoc\\_01\\_052720.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/may27_20/ran_3ck_adhoc_01_052720.pdf)

The closed response to comment #238 adopts two module output (transmitter) settings, which addresses the configuration of the module output.

According to the closed response to comment #176, there is no consensus at this time to change the module output differential peak to peak voltage specification.

## IEEE P802.3ck D1.2 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 3rd Task Force review comments

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2 P224 L44 # 238

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket3

Unlike CR and KR, the host receiver can't choose what the module output should be like. The module output is supposed to be set to a compromise that's good enough for all hosts. But it may turn out that that's not feasible. Yet we want to avoid fussy tuning schemes that burden the simple module output and the management entity that may be controlling multiple modules.

#### SuggestedRemedy

First choice: continue with present plan.

Second choice: let the host receiver sort out its channel (if crosstalk or reflections are bad, use a better equalizer).

Third choice: host tells module to use one of just two sets of specs; for low loss host channels and for high loss host channels. Module must be capable of both. Host selects one, by a means we don't specify, based on knowledge of its own preference and channel loss. Eye parameters defined at TP4 and after loss 2 for the low loss setting, after loss 1 and loss 3 for the high loss setting. Generous overlap between the two loss ranges so the host can choose by very simple means. Consider reduced pk-pk V max for the low loss setting.

Don't try to micro-manage the module.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

!!! 2020/7/15 new response !!!

Resolve using the response to comment #175.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2 P224 L45 # 135

Hidaka, Yasuo

Credo Semiconductor

Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket3

Near-end eye height, differential (min) is TBD.  
See hidaka\_3ck\_01\_0720, slide 7.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change TBD to 50.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #177.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2 P224 L48 # 108

Hidaka, Yasuo

Credo Semiconductor

Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket3

Near-end VEC (max) should be specified.  
See hidaka\_3ck\_01\_0720, slide 6.

#### SuggestedRemedy

To table 120G-3, add a row of "Near-end vertical eye closure (max)" with a value of 7.5 dB and a reference to 120G.3.2.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #177.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2 P224 L49 # 107

Hidaka, Yasuo

Credo Semiconductor

Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket3

Far-end eye height, differential (min) is TBD.  
See hidaka\_3ck\_01\_0720, slide 7.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change TBD to 24.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #177.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2 P224 L51 # 109

Hidaka, Yasuo

Credo Semiconductor

Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket3

Far-end VEC (max) should be specified.  
See hidaka\_3ck\_01\_0720, slide 6.

#### SuggestedRemedy

To table 120G-3, add a row of "Far-end vertical eye closure (max)" with a value of 7.0 dB and a reference to 120G.3.2.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #177.

# IEEE P802.3ck D1.2 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 3rd Task Force review comments

---

**Cl 163**    **SC 163.9.1**    **P177**    **L38**    # **205**

Ghiasi, Ali    Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**    *bucket3*

30 mV AC common mode has significant amount of penalty given that RLCD ~RLDC or 12 dB depending on the loss of the channel the penalty can be 1-3 mV RMS

**SuggestedRemedy**

Consider reducing 30 mV RMS to 17.5 mV RMS

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

[Editor's note: changed page from 148.]

Resolve using the response to comment #28.

---



---

**Cl 163**    **SC 163.9.1**    **P177**    **L38**    # **54**

Mellitz, Richard    Samtec

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**    *bucket3*

30 mv of AC common-mode RMS voltage is too severe. Little work has been to justify this.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Set AC common-mode RMS voltage to TBD. Add a line to the table called AC common-mode deterministic voltage which essentially represents skew.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Resolve using the response to comment #28.

---