

IEEE P802.3ck D1.0 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P30 L3 # 208
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 1.4.24 is not "100GBASE-X"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "100BASE-X" (without G)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 69 SC 69.1.2 P61 L14 # 210
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 In item l) there are now two MDIs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "MDI" to "MDIs".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.111.8 P40 L30 # 209
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 References to subclauses of new clause 161 are inserted out of order. Here and in other places in clause 45.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Resolve in the same way as comment #108

Cl 69 SC 69.2.3 P62 L4 # 211
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The comma after Table 69-3a and the "Table69-3c" are new text.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Apply underline.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.111.8 P40 L30 # 108
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Shouldn't 161 show up as the last entry in the list (listing clauses to look at in numerical order)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Update 45.2.1.111.8, 45.2.1.111.9, 45.2.1.112, 45.2.1.113, 45.2.1.115 lists that insert Cl161 to have Cl161 added at the end of the list.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 69 SC 69.2.3 P62 L10 # 212
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Underscores in editorial instruction should be spaces.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to spaces.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.0 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

CI 69 SC 69.2.3 P62 L18 # 213

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket

There is no column for AN in this table. AN is included in table 69.3 (the original 100G backplane table). It seems that 802.3cd omitted this column in the new tables (3a and 3b) it added here, although it is included in the tables that were added in clause 116.

May require maintenance approval but I assume it will be done in this project.

SuggestedRemedy

Add AN column and populate it - mandatory for all rows.

Also in tables 69-3b and 69-3c.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 69 SC 69.2.3 P63 L10 # 214

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket

The column for clause 78 is not required since EEE is not defined at all for 400GBASE-KR4 (clause 78 is not mentioned in the new PMD clauses, and EEE is not in scope...) and there is no other PHY in this table.

Clause 116 also leaves this column blank (not even optional) for the new 200G and 400G PMDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this column.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 73 SC 73.2 P64 L18 # 215

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

In the new figure 73-1, The label on the right of the arrow looks like two separate labels.

Also, in the label below "Medium", there is no space after "50 Gb/s", and there is no bottom-pointing brace above the list of PHYs (compare to Figure 69-5).

SuggestedRemedy

Add comma after XLGMII, and reduce line spacing (or delete the extra line break).

Add brace and add space after "50 Gb/s".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

For this figure, there is no brace in the base standard or any approved amendments thereof.

Implement the suggested remedy, except do not add the brace.

CI 73 SC 73.10.2 P67 L25 # 216

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Table 73-7 is shown with all rows, most of which are not changed, and is spread across two pages. Only one new row is inserted.

Using "some unchanged rows are not shown" here and keeping only the "link_fail_inhibit_timer" rows would make this change easier to understand.

SuggestedRemedy

Change table per comment with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.0 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 80 SC 80.5 P73 L36 # 107
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket
 New FEC needs to be referenced
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add 161.5.2.2 to FEC transmit row and 161.5.3.1 to the FEC receive row into both Table 80-6 and 80-7
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement the suggested remedy.
 Also, for both tables in the first column.
 Change "At RS-FEC transmit" to "At RS-FEC or RS-FEC-Int transmit"
 Change "At RS-FEC receive" to "At RS-FEC or RS-FEC-Int receive"

Cl 80 SC 80.5 P73 L36 # 112
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket
 Since 161.5.2.2 says that it's identical to 91.5.2.2, then "Table 80-6 -- Summary of Skew constraints" should contain a reference to 161.5.2.2
 SuggestedRemedy
 Propose to update Table 80-6 such that the Notes column for the "At RS-FEC transmit" row contains a reference to Clause 161. Proposed text for the table cell is:
 See 91.5.2.2, 161.5.2.2
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Resolve using the response to comment #107.

Cl 80 SC 80.5 P73 L38 # 113
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket
 Since 161.5.3.1 specifies the Rx deskew capabilities, then "Table 80-6 -- Summary of Skew constraints" should contain a reference to 161.5.3.1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Propose to update Table 80-6 such that the Notes column for the "At RS-FEC receive" row contains a reference to Clause 161. Proposed text for the table cell is:
 See 91.5.3.1, 161.5.3.1
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Resolve using the response to comment #107.

Cl 80 SC 80.5 P74 L32 # 114
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket
 Since 161.5.2.2 says that it's identical to 91.5.2.2, then "Table 80-7 -- Summary of Skew Variation constraints" should contain a reference to 161.5.2.2
 SuggestedRemedy
 Propose to update Table 80-7 such that the Notes column for the "At RS-FEC transmit" row contains a reference to Clause 161. Proposed text for the table cell is:
 See 91.5.2.2, 161.5.2.2
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Resolve using the response to comment #107.

Cl 80 SC 80.5 P74 L34 # 115
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket
 Since 161.5.3.1 specifies the Rx deskew capabilities, then "Table 80-7 -- Summary of Skew Variation constraints" should contain a reference to 161.5.3.1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Propose to update Table 80-7 such that the Notes column for the "At RS-FEC receive" row contains a reference to Clause 161. Proposed text for the table cell is:
 See 91.5.3.1, 161.5.3.1
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Resolve using the response to comment #107.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.0 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 120 SC 120.1 P91 L6 # 218
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Label is "Overvie"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "Overview".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120 SC 120.5.11.2.4 P95 L32 # 148
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket
 This editor's note says "the assumption that the square wave test pattern will continue to be required for 200GAUI-2 and 400GAUI-4 testing". But the square wave is not used for AUI testing at all, nor is it required for anything except measuring the RIN of an optical transmitter (which is typically done on the optical module alone, not in a complete system, anyway). The text at line 21 says it's optional, not required. This project does not add or alter optical PMDs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete this editor's note, and the first part of the editor's note in 135.5.10.2.4.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 The commenter has clarified that the reason for supporting the square wave in the PMA is not for testing of an AUI transmitter but rather for testing of currently specified PMD transmitters.
 Regardless, the editor's notes were intended to be deleted in D1.1, per the included text.
 Remove the editor notes on page 95 and page 102.

Cl 120 SC 120.7.3 P97 L3 # 222
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Font size is inconsistent in this table (existing and new text).
 SuggestedRemedy
 use consistent font size
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120F SC 120F.1 P192 L22 # 48
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket
 The 100G Phys using RS544,514 are 100GBASE-P not 100GBASE-R
 SuggestedRemedy
 Chage 100GBASE-R to 100GBASE-P in figure 120F-1
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120F SC 120F.1 P194 L38 # 177
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket
 Missing informative channel loss
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add informative channel loss
 $Insertion_Loss(f)=1.083+1.25V??+0.47??\ 0.01=??=50\ ??????$
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 The informative channel insertion loss is specified in 120F.4.2.

Cl 120G SC 120G.1 P209 L43 # 53
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket
 The 100G Phys using RS544,514 are 100GBASE-P not 100GBASE-R
 SuggestedRemedy
 Chage 100GBASE-R to 100GBASE-P in figure 120G-1
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.0 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 120G SC 120G.1.1 P212 L27 # 55
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket
 Clause 120 does not apply to 100GAUI-1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "or clause 135 for 100GAUI-1"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Replace the paragraph in 120G.1.1 to the following..
 "The bit error ratio (BER) when processed according to Clause 135 for 100GAUI-1 C2M or Clause 120 for 200GAUI-2 or 400GAUI-4 C2M for shall be less than 10⁻⁵."

Cl 120G SC 120G.4.1 P224 L51 # 64
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 This section appears to be a direct copy of 120E.3.1 except that it only applies to the module and host Tx (not calibration of the stressed inputs)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the text in the section with "The signal levels are as defined in 120E.3.1"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120G SC 120G.4.2 P225 L38 # 160
 Li, Mike Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 3/4 is not a normal numerical representation
 SuggestedRemedy
 change it to 0.75
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 For consistency with Clause 162 and Clause 163 set the value to "0.75 x fb".

Cl 120G SC 120G.4.2 P226 L23 # 163
 Li, Mike Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "of p2(k)" does not read right
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete "of"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 135 SC 135.1.4 P98 L42 # 223
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 This phrasing "53.GBd by one-lane" is unnatural. It should be either by-1 or one-lane.
 Preferably the latter.
 This phrasing is used existing text, and is also awkward there. It should be changed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove "by" in items 2-4 (the result would be simply four-lane, two-lane, and one-lane).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Although the referenced text is not perfect, it communicates the intent correctly.
 The text of the first 3 bullets is established text in an approved amendment (IEEE Std 802.3-2018). Changes to this text is out of scope for this project.
 The new bullet (#4) was written in the same form as the first three bullets.

Cl 135 SC 135.1.4 P99 L15 # 224
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket
 In Figure 135-2, with the new variable p, PMAs above and below the 100GAUI-p should be PMA(4:p) and PMA(p:n) respectively.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change labels per comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.0 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 135 SC 135.1.4 P99 L15 # 30
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket
 There are errors in the MMD8 and MMD1 100G PMA's in figure 135-2
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the MMD8 100G PMA between 100GAUI-4 and 100GAUI-P from PMA(4:2) to PMA(4:p) and change the PMA (2:n) to PMA (p:n).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 135 SC 135.5.7.2 P101 L29 # 225
 Ran, Adee Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The bottom brace below the "MEDIUM" and the text "50GBASE-R or 100GBASE-P" don't seem to serve any purpose in this diagram. These are families of PHYs, not specific PMDs or media. Also these are all the families in which this clause is used, so it goes without saying.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the brace and the label.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

These braces are consistent with the original diagram in IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018 and thus removing them would be out of scope for this project.

This diagram has been updated only as required regarding addition of the new interfaces in P802.3ck.

Cl 135A SC 135A.2 P0 L0 # 111
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket
 We've added 100GAUI-1 so need to update Figure 135A-8 to indicate that
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change n = 2 or 4 to n = 1 or 2 or 4
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change "n = 2 or 4" to "n = 1, 2, or 4".

Cl 161 SC 161.3 P107 L3 # 226
 Ran, Adee Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 Missing period after the sentence
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a period.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 161 SC 161.5.2.4 P107 L35 # 228
 Ran, Adee Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 "EEE is unsupported" is only used here, similar text elsewhere in this draft uses "not supported".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "not supported".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 161 SC 161.5.2.6 P109 L20 # 105
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket
 The process of creating am_txmapped is not optional
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "may then be" to "is"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.0 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

CI 161 SC 161.5.2.6 P109 L46 # 229
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 The phrase "every 20 x 16 384 66-bit blocks" is hard to read with the space in the number 16384 (and possibly misleading, it can be interpreted as the number 1638466).
 This space does not appear in the similar text in clause 91. The separator convention is not helpful here, and it is not mandatory outside of tables.
 Also applies in some other similar phrases in this subclause and in 161.5.4.3.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "16 384" to "16384".
 Apply for other large numbers within the text in this clause.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 161 SC 161.5.2.6 P109 L47 # 230
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 The "x" in "81 920 x 257-bit blocks" is out of place - "257-bit" is not a number. This is also inconsistent with the text in the previous line, which does not have an "x" before "66-bit blocks".
 Also in the next sentence and in 161.5.3.5.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the "x" occurrences listed.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 161 SC 161.5.2.6 P110 L16 # 232
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket
 In figure 161-3, the labels A and B appear within the amp_tx blocks, but these blocks are not taken _from_ the codewords as the legend states - according to figure 161-5 they are inserted _into_ the stream of symbols that creates the codewords.
 Also, the labels do not appear in the tx_scrambled area which contains the real traffic.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the legend to have "to FEC codeword A" and "to FEC codeword B".
 Continue the labeling into symbol in columns 32 and 33.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 The current wording is confusing.
 Change to "FEC codeword A" and "FEC codeword B"
 Also add A/B into the 32/33 column.

CI 161 SC 161.5.2.9 P111 L16 # 234
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 Per style manual, in general text, isolated numbers less than 10 should be spelled out.
 Applies here and in several other places in this clause (where numbers are isolated, i.e. with no units following).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "4" to "four". Apply in other places in this clause.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Style manual is not as specific as the commenter states.
 The guideline is as follows:
 "In general text, isolated numbers less than 10 should be spelled out. However, in equations, tables, figures, and other display elements, Arabic numerals should be used. Numbers applicable to the same category should be treated alike throughout a paragraph; numerals should not be used in some cases and spelled out in others."
 Update numbers less than 10 to be consistent with the style manual.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.0 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 161 SC 161.5.2.10 P112 L13 # 235
 Ran, Adeel Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 The number "256" appears on the boundary of the block "tx_scrambled",
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move the number to the interior of the box.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 161 SC 161.5.3.1 P113 L7 # 106
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 FEC synchronization FSM is not Figure 161-6
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "161-6" to "91-8"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 161 SC 161.5.3.3 P113 L34 # 236
 Ran, Adeel Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 A cross-reference to the subclause which defines "bypass error indication" would be helpful.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert "(see 161.5.3.3.1)" between "If bypass error indication" and "is not supported".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 161 SC 161.5.3.3 P113 L36 # 81
 Koehler, Daniel MorethanIP
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Bucket
 Does not reflect that there are 2 codewords to perform error indication for.
 SuggestedRemedy
 replace 'the codeword' with 'the two associated codewords'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 161 SC 161.5.4.1 P115 L10 # 238
 Ran, Adeel Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket
 "Comprised on" is arguable language. 802.3bs used "composed of", other projects used "contains" or omitted this paragraph altogether (since 21.5 already states that state diagrams take precedence over text).
 I suggest "composed of".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "comprised" to "composed".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 161 SC 161.5.4.2.1 P115 L25 # 117
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Bucket
 Need to remove some editorial text related to cw_bad
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the text:
 No cw_bad variable, instead we have:
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change: "No cw_bad variable, instead we have:"
 To: "cw_bad -- This variable is not defined"

Cl 161 SC 161.7.3 P122 L6 # 239
 Ran, Adeel Intel
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket
 Item "**KR1" is marked "optional", but there is no another option (this sublayer is only used for CR1/KR1 PHYs), and no PICS item is defined as conditional on this feature. I don't see the purpose of this item.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove item "**KR1".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.0 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

CI 161 SC 161.7.4.2 P124 L19 # 240

Ran, Adeel Intel
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket

The method of indicating errors has a "shall ensure" (161.5.3.3) but there is no corresponding PICS item.

Compare to item RF8 in clause 91 which states "Error indication function | 91.5.3.3 | Corrupts 66-bit block synchronization headers for uncorrected errored codewords (...)

SuggestedRemedy

Add PICS item based on the quoted RF8.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the feature name of RF4 to "Error indication function"

CI 162 SC 162.1 P125 L35 # 242

Ran, Adeel Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Table 162-1 is carried over into the next page, but the continuation is not marked as such, as required by the style manual.

Also in Table 162-3 and perhaps other tables will turn out to be broken in future drafts.

There is also a customary "thin line at bottom" rule. We can perhaps defer applying this one to the last draft or to publication (it is not required in the style manual).

SuggestedRemedy

Add the "continued table" option for all tables.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 162 SC 162.2 P127 L53 # 32

Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket

FEC is also used in "FEC symbol error rate" etc. where it also refers to the FEC within the 200 and 400G PCS.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the sentence "for 100GBASE-CR1 or the RS-FEC within the Clause 119 PCS for 200GBASE-CR2 and 400GBASE-CR4".

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 162 SC 162.8.1 P136 L2 # 33

Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

The cable assembly specifications are in 162.11 not 162.10

SuggestedRemedy

Change the clause cross-reference from 162.10 to 162.11. Also on line 3 and line 19

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 162 SC 162.9.3.1.1 P141 L50 # 34

Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket

There are three pre-cursors.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "-2 to 1" to "-3 to 1"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.0 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3.1.2 P142 L42 # 254
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Missing space after v_f
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add space.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3.1.3 P143 L5 # 255
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket
 The tolerances in Table 162-9 should correspond to the maximum step size of each coefficient in Table 162-8.
 Currently all should be +/-0.02 except c(1) which is 0.05 (but subject to another comment may also be 0.02).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change all values after the +/- signs per comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3.1.5 P143 L49 # 258
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket
 This paragraph specifies the maximum value of c(-3) when it is set to the minimum setting.
 But the text says
 "and c(-2) having received sufficient "increment" requests so that it is at its maximum value"
 which is incorrect.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to
 "and c(-3) having received sufficient "decrement" requests so that it is at its minimum value".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.4.3.5 P147 L1 # 259
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "per-lane FEC symbol error counters (see 91.6)"
 this refers to RS-FEC, but RS-FEC-Int can be used instead.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "per-lane FEC symbol error counters (see 91.6 or 161.6)".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162 SC 162.14.4.2 P159 L23 # 263
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket
 In Item PC4, The reference should be 162.8.11 and the value/comment should include the exceptions listed in 162.8.11 for including c(-3).
 Item PC5 has a reference to a subclause in 162 that does not exist 0 it should point to clause 136.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162 SC 162.14.4.5 P160 L50 # 264
 Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 In item CA3, spaces should be inserted between numbers and units.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.0 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 163 SC 163.1 P165 L11 # 42
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket
 This paragraph is for 400G as well.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "200GAUI-n" to "200GAUI-n or 400GAUI-n" (this is how this is done in clause 162)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 163 SC 163.10.1 P175 L52 # 46
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Equation should be a hot link. Also Equation 163-1 is for calculation of Add
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the equation to 163-3 and make it a hot link
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 163 SC 163.2 P165 L33 # 43
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket
 FEC is also used in "FEC symbol error rate" etc. where it also refers to the FEC within the 200 and 400G PCS.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add to the sentence "for 100GBASE-KR1 or the RS-FEC within the Clause 119 PCS for 200GBASE-KR2 and 400GBASE-KR4".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 163 SC 163.9.2 P170 L30 # 45
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket
 In footnote b "The loss of the host channel doesn't make sense as there is no "host" for the backplane.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Loss of host channel" to "loss of Transmitter package and TP0 to TP0a test fixture."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.