

Cl 1 SC 1.4.298 P 208 L 27 # 12

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

This says "DWDM channel: The transmission path from a transmitting DWDM PHY (TP2) to a receiving DWDM PHY (TP3)". But it is explicit in 154.5.1 that there is a "patch cord between 2 m and 5 m in length" between the MDI and TP2. This is the same as all optical clauses from 1000BASE-X. So "transmitting DWDM PHY (TP2)" is not correct.

It is important not to mislead test engineers in a definitions section that should be used by test engineers working on all optical PMD types.

*SuggestedRemedy*

As the 1.4 definitions should be brief rather than addressing all details, this can be simplified to:

The transmission path from a transmitting DWDM PHY to a receiving DWDM PHY or

The transmission path from TP2 to a receiving DWDM PHY (TP3) in a DWDM Physical Layer

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

The draft is consistent in defining the "DWDM channel" to be from TP2 to TP3. See: 1.4.216 black link approach

Figure 154-2-Block diagram for 100GBASE-ZR transmit/receive paths

154.6 DWDM channel over a DWDM black link

Annex 154A Examples of 100GBASE-ZR compliant DWDM black links

Consequently, the definition of DWDM channel in 1.4.298 makes it clear that this is the case by being explicit regarding the DWDM channel starting at TP2.

The first option in the suggested remedy loses the information that the channel starts at TP2.

The second option is not an improvement on the draft in that it is less clear that this is TP2 associated with the transmitting DWDM PHY.

Cl 120 SC 120.5.7.2 P 4905 L 22 # 15

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

In 802.3cd, this said: For PMA lanes connected to the PMD service interface of a \*200GBASE-CR4 or 200GBASE-KR4\* PMD, the PMA shall / may provide  $1/(1+D)$  mod 4 precoding /decoding capability. So I knew which the PMDs were. Now, it says "If the PMA is connected to the service interface of a PMD that uses the PMD control function (136.8.11)". 136.8.11 itself is short and does not provide that information. Its subclauses are very long, and I did not find the information there. 135.5.7.2 has the same problem.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Refer to a statement of which PMDs uses the PMD control function (which I did not find).

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the changes between Draft 2.1 and Draft 2.0 or an unresolved negative comment. It is not within the scope of this recirculation ballot.

The first paragraph of 120.5.7.2 states: "For PMA lanes connected to the PMD service interface of a 200GBASE-CR4 or 200GBASE-KR4 PMD, the PMA shall provide  $1/(1+D)$  mod 4 precoding capability on each transmit lane and may optionally provide  $1/(1+D)$  mod 4 decoding capability on each receive lane."

The first paragraph of 135.5.7.2 states: "A PMA shall provide  $1/(1+D)$  mod 4 precoding capability on each output lane that is part of a 50GAUI-1 C2C or 100GAUI-2 C2C link, or connected to the PMD service interface of a 50GBASE-CR, 50GBASE-KR, 100GBASE-CR2, or 100GBASE-KR2 PMD."

Therefore, a list of PMDs that require the precoding capability that is the subject of the referenced paragraph (and a similar paragraph in Clause 135) are included. Reference to the corresponding PMD clauses will clarify that they use the PMD control function.

## IEEE P802.3 (IEEE 802.3dc) D2.0 Maintenance #16 (Revision) Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 103 SC 103.3.5.1 P4334 L 41 # 35

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type TR Comment Status R hex

We should be consistent in use of separators for hexadecimal readability. Use of spaces would be consistent with decimal numbers, and has been recommended to IEEE editorial for inclusion in the next revision of the IEEE Standards Style Manual. Other separators should be reserved to indicate something else. For example hyphens indicate MAC address hexadecimal representation per IEEE Std 802.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Replace "." with space " " unless a MAC address. Some locations also have changes requested for case of hexadecimal digits and Clause 142 locations also have a another change related to a comment on a unique hexadecimal notation convention for that clause. (Attached file includes: Page, Sub-Clause and Line listing. Some locations )

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

The response to comment #33 did not include enforcement of the use of a specific separator.

There is no consensus in the comment resolution group to make this change.

CI 142 SC 142.1.1.2 P5470 L 42 # 38

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type ER Comment Status R hex

This convention unique for Clause 142 is not justified by the six uses.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Delete the second subbullet. If hyphenation comments are accepted, then the entirety of 142.1.1.2 can be deleted. Expand the six occurrences on p. 5476, l. 32; PI 5490, l. 12 and 23; p. 5493, l. 14; p. 5499, l. 8; and p. 5502, l. 49.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

The convention is local to Clause 142 and aids in the understanding of structure of large hexadecimal values. There was no consensus in the comment resolution group to make the proposed change.

CI 113 SC 113.7.3.1 P4634 L 35 # 41

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type TR Comment Status A equations, bucket

Maintenance 1334 does not seem to be correctly implemented in the draft (e.g., "PSANEXT,f.", circle R and circle C and other odd characters)

#### SuggestedRemedy

Fix fonts or entry errors of equation symbols. Remove "." after dB

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve with comment #103.

CI 113 SC 113.7.4.3.9 P4639 L 10 # 42

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type TR Comment Status A equations, bucket

Maintenance 1335 does not seem to be correctly implemented in the draft (e.g., "PSANEXT,f.", circle R and circle C and other odd characters)

#### SuggestedRemedy

Fix fonts or entry errors of equation symbols. Remove "." after dB

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve with comment #103.

CI 142 SC 142.3.5.1 P5499 L 8 # 43

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type ER Comment Status R hex

Maintenance 1366 -- As noted on my comment to p. 5470, l. 42, the unique hexadecimal convention for repeating sequences should not be used. Similarly, my comment to p. 4334, l. 41 would replace hyphen separators with space separators.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Expand the hexadecimal string and replace hyphens with spaces per comments cited in this comment.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

See the response to comments #35 and #38.

## IEEE P802.3 (IEEE 802.3dc) D2.0 Maintenance #16 (Revision) Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 120D SC 120D.3.2.2 P 6642 L 35 # 104

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status R jtol

Case B at 0.4 MHz was added due to risk of scape and peaking in the band from 0.04 MHz to 1.333 MHz, but even after adding test case B the difference between test case A and B is a decade where PLL peaking may result in system failure. All other points in the table are separated by 3.3x with exception of point A to B which is a decade.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please add one additional point between A and B at 0.1333 MHz with amplitude of 1.5 UI.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

A similar proposal to add the (0.1333 MHz, 1.5 UI) test case to the PHYs and interfaces being defined by the P802.3ck Task Force was not accepted. See the response to comment #35 in  
<[https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/comments/draft2p0/8023ck\\_D2p0\\_final\\_closedcomments.pdf#page=46](https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/comments/draft2p0/8023ck_D2p0_final_closedcomments.pdf#page=46)>.

No data has been provided to demonstrate that a practical receiver that meets the jitter tolerance test conditions defined in the draft will not interoperate with a compliant transmitter and channel. No data has been provided to demonstrate that the addition of the proposed test case provides a higher assurance of interoperability.

No change to the draft.

CI 120E SC 120E.3.3.2.1 P 6660 L 38 # 105

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status R jtol

Case B at 0.4 MHz was added due to risk of scape and peaking in the band from 0.04 MHz to 1.333 MHz, but even after adding test case B the difference between test case A and B is a decade where PLL peaking may result in system failure. All other points in the table are separated by 3.3x with exception of point A to B which is a decade.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please add one additional point between A and B at 0.1333 MHz with amplitude of 1.5 UI.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

A similar proposal to add the (0.1333 MHz, 1.5 UI) test case to the PHYs and interfaces being defined by the P802.3ck Task Force was not accepted. See the response to comment #35 in  
<[https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/comments/draft2p0/8023ck\\_D2p0\\_final\\_closedcomments.pdf#page=46](https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/comments/draft2p0/8023ck_D2p0_final_closedcomments.pdf#page=46)>.

No data has been provided to demonstrate that a practical receiver that meets the jitter tolerance test conditions defined in the draft will not interoperate with a compliant transmitter and channel. No data has been provided to demonstrate that the addition of the proposed test case provides a higher assurance of interoperability.

No change to the draft.