IEEE P802.3cy D2.21 10G+ Auto Task Force 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments


This boxed paragraph is part of the published standard, so the self reference should be IEEE Std, not a project designation
SuggestedRemedy
$\quad$ Replace "P802.3cy" with "IEEE Std 802.3cy-202x"

Proposed Response Response Status 0

| Cl 1 | SC 1.4.128a | P22 | $L 7$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grow, Robert | RMG Consulting | \# 823 |  |

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status X
Grammar, "a" should have been deleted in editing out "network".
SuggestedRemedy
"...specification for $25 \mathrm{~Gb} / \mathrm{s}$ Ethernet ..."
Proposed Response Response Status 0

| Cl $165 \quad$ SC 165.1 | P36 | L11 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grow, Robert | RMG Consulting | \# 824 |

Comment Type E Comment Status X
PHY is not the acronym for Physical Layer, the cited sublayers are appropriately a Physical Layer device. (See Figure 165-1.)
SuggestedRemedy
25GBASE-T1 Physical Layer device (PHY)
Proposed Response Response Status 0

Comment Type E Comment Status X
tx_group130x65B - as it's 65 bits, lower case b would avoid ambiguity
SuggestedRemedy
Change tx_group130x65B to tx_group130x65b (6 instances)
Proposed Response Response Status 0

| Cl 165 | SC 165.1.3.1 | P38 | L48 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dawe, Piers | Nvidia |  | \# 821 |

Comment Type T Comment Status X
"In the training mode (see 165.4.2.4), the PCS transmits and receives PAM2 training frames to synchronize to the PHY frame..." but "PHY frame" is not defined.
SuggestedRemedy
Change to "synchronize to the PHY frame..." to "synchronize to the RS-FEC superframes that follow, ..."
Proposed Response Response Status 0

| Cl $165 \quad$ SC 165.2.2.2 | P45 | L3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grow, Robert | RMG Consulting | \# 825 |

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
Comment Type E Comment Status X
The defined terms master PHY and slave PHY are lower case in 1.4.389 and 1.4.535 definitions. This amendment should follow that precident. Reconsider if MASTER and SLAVE should be all caps.
SuggestedRemedy
Change MASTER PHY and SLAVE PHY to master PHY and SLAVE PHY throughout. (Pages 45, 63, 65, 81, 91, 97, 117.)
Proposed Response Response Status 0

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

| Cl 165 | SC 165.2.2.4.3 | P46 | L26 | \# 819 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dawe, |  | Nvidia |  |  |
| is unspecified. That's not correct. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| SuggestedRemedy |  |  |  |  |
| Change "is unspecified" to "is specified in 165.3.2.3.1". |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Response Response Status 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Cl 165 SC 165.3.2.2.16 |  | 6 P57 | L34 | \# 810 |
| Dawe, Piers Nvidia |  |  |  |  |
| Comment Type$\mathrm{pL}, 33$$\quad$ Comment Status X |  |  |  |  |
| SuggestedRemedy |  |  |  |  |
| Propos | esponse R | Response Status 0 |  |  |




| $C l 165$ | $S C$ | 165.3.2.2.17 | P58 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dawe, Piers | Nvidia | L39 | \# 812 |

Comment Type E Comment Status X
Need to define all the items in the equation (except well-known functions and operators, and $j$ here which is just a counter). Also, "alpha is a primitive element of the finite field defined by the primitive polynomial $0 x 409=x^{\wedge} 10+x^{\wedge} 3+1^{\prime \prime}$ is too vague; it's not clear if it defined by the primitive polynomial $0 \times 409=x^{\wedge} 10+x^{\wedge} 3+1$ is too vague; it's not clear if it
means that alpha is defined by $0 \times 409$ (how), or that the finite field is defined by $0 \times 409$, or that alpha is $0 \times 409$, or what.

## SuggestedRemedy

Add: "In this subclause, $x$ is the indeterminate variable."
Change "In Equation (165-1), alpha is a primitive element of the finite field defined by the primitive polynomial $0 \times 409=x^{\wedge} 10+x^{\wedge} 3+1$."
to an unambiguous definition, e.g.
"In Equation (165-1), alpha, a primitive element of the finite Galois field GF(2^10), is the primitive polynomial $0 x 409=x^{\wedge} 10+x^{\wedge} 3+1 . "$
Proposed Response Response Status 0

| Cl $165 \quad$ SC 165.3.2.2.17 | P58 | L49 | \# 809 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dawe, Piers |  | Nvidia |  |  |
| Comment Type E | Comment Status |  |  |  |

Comment Type $\mathbf{E} \quad$ Comment Status $\mathbf{X}$
This says "mi, 0 is the first bit transmitted" while on the next page "c935 $=\mathrm{m} 845$ is transmitted first". Seems contradictory.
SuggestedRemedy
Maybe this means: For each 10 -bit message symbol mi, mi, 0 is the first bit transmitted.
Similarly for pi,0 on the next page.
Proposed Response Response Status

| Cl 165 | SC 165.3.2.2.17 | P59 | L34 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dawe, Piers | Nvidia |  | \# 814 |

## Comment Type E Comment Status X

GF add and GF multiply are not defined, although one can guess that GF means Galois field. Unfortunately, other clauses have used these terms without defining them, so we can't just point elsewhere in 802.3 .
SuggestedRemedy
Please define or give a reference for Galois field addition and Galois field multiplication
Proposed Response Response Status
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Comment Type E Comment Status X
"It obtains block lock to the PHY frames during PAM2 training using synchronization bits
provided in the training frames" but "PHY frame" is not defined. As we are in training, there will be training frames present.
SuggestedRemedy
Change "PHY frames" to "training frames"
Proposed Response Response Status 0

| CI 165 | SC 165.3.7.3 | P68 | L21 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dawe, Piers | Nvidia |  | \# 817 |

Comment Type E Comment Status $\mathbf{X}$
Following D2.1 comment 785, there are three more 65B blocks to be changed to 64B/5B blocks.
Names can be more consistent.
Also, "65B RS-FEC" is a confusing name, as the FEC doesn't really operate on 65 -bit
blocks but on a 9360-bit payload, and 165.3.2.2.17 says "the particular Reed-Solomon
code is denoted as RS-FEC(936,846)". There are two "64B/65B RS-FEC", three "65B RSFEC frame" and 4 other "65B RS-FEC"
SuggestedRemedy
Change "65B transmitted blocks" to "64B/65B transmit(ted) blocks", "65B transmit block" to
"64B/65B transmit(ted) block", "65B received blocks" to "64B/65B received blocks".
Here, "65B RS-FEC" can be changed to "RS-FEC"
Change the three "65B RS-FEC frame" to "RS-FEC frame"
Rename the remaining "65B RS-FEC" e.g. to RS-FEC $(936,846)$.
With editorial licence.
Proposed Response Response Status 0

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

| Cl 165 | SC 165.4 | P73 | L16 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dawe, Piers | Nvidia |  | \# 816 |

Comment Type E Comment Status X
802.3 specs define the sublayers in top-to-bottom order. Compare Clause 149, for example.
SuggestedRemedy
Swap 165.5 PMA electrical specifications and 165.4 Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer
Proposed Response Response Status 0

| $C l$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 165 | $S C$ | 165.4.2.4.10 | P79 | \# 83 |

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status X
After cleaning up "Partial PHY frame count" (D2.1 comment 786), the draft uses "partial frame" 27 times and "partial PHY frame" three times
SuggestedRemedy
Change the three remaining "partial PHY frame" to "partial frame"
Proposed Response Response Status

| $C l$ | 165 | SC 165.5.2 | P93 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dawe, Piers | Nvidia | L25 | \# 820 |

Comment Type E Comment Status $\mathbf{X}$
Do the wavy lines across the connectors represent other pairs in a multilane PHY as in
Figure 136-2, or provision for other "alien crosstalk" signals in a bigger connector? 165.8.1 says " 2 -pin connector with a shield". Figure $136-2$ shows Signal i shield and Link shield. Also, the diagonal line and "25GBASE-T1" don't help. The figure title says it's 25GBASE-
T1, pointers usually have arrowheads, and words such as "cable" or "bulk cable" would better represent the two signal lines.

## SuggestedRemedy

Delete the wavy lines, "25GBASE-T1" and diagonal line. Add the shield.
Proposed Response Response Status 0

| Cl $165 \quad$ SC 165.5.3.3 | P95 | L6 | \# 804 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dawe, Piers | Nvidia |  |  |
| Comment Type |  | Comment Status x |  |

In the explanation "this is equivalent...", "at least" should be deleted following the change to
make the bandwidth at line 5 a value rather than a one-sided limit.
SuggestedRemedy
Delete "at least"
Proposed Response Response Status 0

| CI 165 | $S C$ | 165.11.4.2.5 | P118 | \#10 806 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status X
PICS uses "frame" twice and "PHY frame" 4 times. The normative material it refers to in
165.3.6.1 uses "RS-FEC frame" 10 times or more, "frame" once.

SuggestedRemedy
Here, change all "frame" and "PHY frame" to "RS-FEC frame". In 165.3.6.1, change "four frames after" to "four RS-FEC frames after".
Proposed Response Response Status 0

| $C l 165$ | $S C$ | 165.11 .4 .5 | $P 128$ | $L 28$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status X
Maximum link delay in PICS is out of date
SuggestedRemedy
Change 94 to 60
Proposed Response Response Status 0

