Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.3.1**　　　*P* **94**　　　*L* **18**　　# 1

Marris, Arthur　　　　　　　　Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　*(bucket)*

PCS control 1 register speed selection bits need to be updated for 1.6 Tb/s. Similar issue for PHY and DTE XS control 1 registers

SuggestedRemedy

Bring Tables 45–234, 45-315, and 45-340 and update as necessary. Also after maintenance request https://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1437.pdf is considered include 800 Gb/s selection also.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.4**　　　*P* **97**　　　*L* **37**　　# 3

Marris, Arthur　　　　　　　　Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　*(bucket)*

A control bit needs to be added for the variable "PHY_XS_enhanced_ptp_accuracy_enable" listed in "Table 171–2—MDIO PHY 800GXS to Clause 172 control variable mapping"

SuggestedRemedy

Create a new "TimeSync PHY XS configuration" register at location 4.1813 with a "PHY XS enhanced PTP accuracy enable" bit. Add an ability bit for for enhanced PTP accuracy in "TimeSync PHY XS capability (Register 4.1800)".

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.1.213g**　　*P* **93**　　　*L* **44**　　# 4

Bruckman, Leon　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type　**TR**　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　*(bucket)*

In Table 45–177g bins 2 and 3 shall also be described

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 45–177g show registers 1.2416, 1.2417, 1.2418 and 1.2419 for lane 0 error bins 2 and 3 (same structure as for error bin 1)

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **116**　　*SC* **116.3.3.3**　　*P* **134**　　　*L* **51**　　# 5

Bruckman, Leon　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　*(editorial)*

Text can be improved

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "and, for physical layer implementations that use the ILT function defined in Annex 178B, to indicate the ILT status."
to: "and, to indicate the ILT status for physical layer implementations that use the ILT function defined in Annex 178B."

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **116**　　*SC* **116.3.3.4**　　*P* **135**　　　*L* **42**　　# 6

Bruckman, Leon　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　*(editorial)*

Text can be improved

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "and, for physical layer implementations that use the ILT function defined in Annex 178B, to indicate the ILT status."
to: "and, to indicate the ILT status for physical layer implementations that use the ILT function defined in Annex 178B."

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **116**　　*SC* **116.3.3.4.1**　　*P* **136**　　　*L* **11**　　# 7

Bruckman, Leon　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type　**TR**　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　*(bucket)*

Typo: "the lower higher sublayer"

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "the lower higher sublayer"
to: "the next lower sublayer"

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **7**　　　Page 1 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **170** *SC* **170.1** *P***168** *L***13** # 8

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *(editorial)*

Missing "the"

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "and 1.6 Tb/s Media Independent"
to: "and the 1.6 Tb/s Media Independent"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **186** *SC* **186.2.3.4** *P***552** *L***19** # 9

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *(editorial)*

In Figure 186-5, the frames are contigous, but they are shown with spaces between them

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 186-5 make the frames contigous, without space between them

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **186** *SC* **186.2.3.6** *P***553** *L***52** # 11

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

We should also define what does the receiver do with the unused bits.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the end of the first paragraph in the section: "and ignored by the receiver"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **186** *SC* **186.2.3.10** *P***558** *L***26** # 13

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

ITU-T refers to a OFBGkj frame. It will be usefull to specify the relationship between the FEC frame and the ITU-T OFBGkj

SuggestedRemedy

Add the folowing text at the end of the section: "The FEC frame in this standard corresponds to the OFBGkj structure defined in ITU-T G.709.6"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The specific frame that is used by 800GBASE-ER1 is OFBG84. It would be better to include this detail in 186.2.3.9, where the FEC frame is initially descirbed, rather than in the clause about the scrambler.

Add "The FEC frame in this standard corresponds to the OFBG84 structure define in ITU-T G.709.6." Implement with editorial license.

Cl **186** *SC* **186.2.4.6.3** *P***562** *L***51** # 14

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

The sentence: "If either…" is repeated in 186.2.4.7. No need (and may be confusing) to have the same requirement twice

SuggestedRemedy

Delete last sentence of 186.2.4.6.3

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **186** *SC* **186.2.3.9** *P***557** *L***32** # 15

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

Four times in the clause the CRC32 is written as CRC-32

SuggestedRemedy

Change four times CRC-32 to CRC32 in the whole clause.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **15** Page 2 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **186**   *SC* **186.2.3.9**   *P* **557**   *L* **32**   # 16

Bruckman, Leon   Nvidia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **A**   *(bucket)*

The sentence: "extended by 29 CRC-32 and an additional 64 pad bits after the 29th CRC-32 (total 992 bits)," is hard to parse

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: "extended by 29 CRC32 values with an additional 64 pad bits after the 29th CRC32 (total 992 bits),"

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Rewrite the first sentence as three sentence to be more clear.

Change:
Using the 512-row representation of the 800GBASE-ER1 PCS frame, groups of 116 rows (1 192 480 bits), extended by 29 CRC-32 and an additional 64 pad bits after the 29th CRC-32 (total 992 bits), form the set of 1 193 472 bits that will be input to the FEC encoder (denoted as the FEC frame in this clause).

To:
The FEC frame is formed from 116 rows of the 512-row representation of the 800GBASE-ER1 PCS frame (1 192 480 bits). Each group of four rows is extended with the CRC32 (see 186.2.3.8). The 29th group of four rows is further extended with a 64 bit pad. The FEC frame consists of 1 193 472 bits.

Cl **186**   *SC* **186.3.3.1.2**   *P* **568**   *L* **50**   # 18

Bruckman, Leon   Nvidia

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **A**   *(bucket)*

A frame carries 7296 symbols not 175 104

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "for a total of 175 104 symbols per frame"
To: "for a total of 175 104 symbols per multi-frame"

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **187**   *SC* **187.5.1**   *P* **599**   *L* **32**   # 21

Bruckman, Leon   Nvidia

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **A**   *(bucketp)*

The naming of the analog signals in Figure 187-5 is wrong

SuggestedRemedy

In Fugure 187-5 change the second occurrence of RX_AI to RX_BI and the second occurrence of RX_AQ to RX_BQ

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #421.

Cl **187**   *SC* **187.5.3**   *P* **600**   *L* **25**   # 22

Bruckman, Leon   Nvidia

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **A**   *(bucketp)*

The naming of the analog signals is wrong

SuggestedRemedy

In the first sentence of the paragraph change the second occurrence of RX_AI to RX_BI and the second occurrence of RX_AQ to RX_BQ

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #421.

Cl **178B**   *SC* **178B.5.3**   *P* **745**   *L* **26**   # 24

Bruckman, Leon   Nvidia

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **A**   *(bucket)*

PRBS13 is mentioned twice, while PRBS31 is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "and for free-running PRBS13 and free-running PRBS13 these two symbols"
To: "and for free-running PRBS13 and free-running PRBS31 these two symbols"

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **24**

Page 3 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **178B**　　*SC* **178B.5.3.3**　　　　*P***747**　　　　*L***48**　　　　# 25

Bruckman, Leon　　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type　**TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*(bucket)*

This section defined the PRBS31 behavior, but in many places (including the title) it indicates PRBS13 instead

SuggestedRemedy

In section 178B.5.3.3 change 6 occurences of PRBS13 to PRBS31

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **176**　　*SC* **176.1.4**　　　　*P***255**　　　　*L***1**　　　　# 26

Bruckman, Leon　　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type　**TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*(bucket)*

ILT does not require the clock to be passed through the PMA. The mission data requires it. ILT operates with local clock.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete: "In order to support the inter-sublayer link training (ILT) function,"

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **184**　　*SC* **184.4.9**　　　　*P***506**　　　　*L***21**　　　　# 27

Huang, Kechao　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*(bucket)*

In Figure 184-6, the bit "0" after "Seed X:" (and "Seed Y:") is not necessary.

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 184-6, delete "0" after "Seed X:"; delete "0" after "Seed Y:"

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **186**　　*SC* **186.3.3.1.1**　　　　*P***568**　　　　*L***1**　　　　# 28

Huang, Kechao　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*(bucket)*

The FEC codeword with 1376256 bits are mapped to 172032 DP-16QAM symbols, not 173032

SuggestedRemedy

Change "173032" to "172032" in Line 1;
Change "173031" to "172031" in Line 2

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "173032" to "172 032" in Line 1
Change "173031" to "172 031" in Line 2

Cl **186**　　*SC* **186.3.3.1.2**　　　　*P***569**　　　　*L***17**　　　　# 29

Huang, Kechao　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*(bucket)*

In Figure 186-12, the indexes of payload symbols should be modified such that the total number of payload symbols are 172032

SuggestedRemedy

In Frame 0: "S<0:29>", "S<30:92>", "S<93:155>" should be changed to "S<0:19>", "S<20:82>", "S<83:145>"
In Frame 1: "S<14195:14257>" should be changed to "S<14185:14247>"
In Frame 23: "S<164870:164922>", "S<164923:164985>", "S<171979:172041>" should be changed to "S<164860:164912>", "S<164913:164975>", "S<171969:172031>"

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **186**　　*SC* **186.3.3.1.3**　　　　*P***570**　　　　*L***51**　　　　# 30

Huang, Kechao　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*(bucket)*

In Table 186-4, there are 4 pilot symbols should be modified to aligned with that in OIF 800ZR.

SuggestedRemedy

Index 91 YQ: "-3" should be changed to "3"
Index 35 XQ: "-3" should be changed to "3"
Index 41 YI: "3" should be changed to "-3"
Index 71 XI: "-3" should be changed to "3"

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **30**　　　　Page 4 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **186**   *SC* **186.3.3.1.7**   *P* **574**   *L* **15**   # 31

Huang, Kechao   Huawei

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

In Figure 186-14, "Insert Reserved field" should be included

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Insert Reserved field (X)" function below the "Insert TS field (X)"
Add "Insert Reserved field (Y)" function below the "Insert TS field (Y)"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **177**   *SC* **177.5.2**   *P* **298**   *L* **45**   # 32

Huang, Kechao   Huawei

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

"FS" should be changed to "FAS", as it is the shortened form of "Frame Alignment Sequence", see subclause 177.4.7.1.

SuggestedRemedy

In page 298, change "FS" to "FAS" in Lines 45, 46, 48, 49, 51;
In page 298, change "FSs" to "FASs" in Line 47;
In page 302, change "FS" to "FAS" in Line 12

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement with editorial license and discretion.

[Editor's note: CommentType changed from T to E per request from commenter.]

Cl **177**   *SC* **177.6.2.1**   *P* **301**   *L* **8**   # 33

Huang, Kechao   Huawei

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

"fs" should be changed to "fas", as it is the shortened form of "Frame Alignment Sequence", see subclause 177.4.7.1. Suggest to apply similar changes in subclause 177.6

SuggestedRemedy

Change "fs" to "fas" in subclause 177.6.2.1, 177.6.2.3, and figures 177-9 and 177-10

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

[Editor's note: CommentType changed from T to E per request from commenter.]

Cl **177**   *SC* **177.6.2.1**   *P* **301**   *L* **15**   # 34

Huang, Kechao   Huawei

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

"frame sequence" should be changed to "frame alignment sequence"

SuggestedRemedy

In page 301, change "frame sequence" to "frame alignment sequence" in Lines 15,16,19.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement with editorial license and discretion.

[Editor's note: CommentType changed from T to E per request from commenter.]

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.3.1**   *P* **94**   *L* **17**   # 35

KABRA, LOKESH   SYNOPSYS

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Include update to 3.0.5:2 "Speed Selection" values corresponding to 800 Gb/s and 1.6 Tb/s in Table 45-211-- PCS control 1 register bit definitions

SuggestedRemedy

Modify 3.0.5:2 bit field "Speed selection" description

Existing
1 1 x x = Reserved

Proposed
1 1 1 x = Reserved
1 1 0 1 = 1.6 Tb/s
1 1 0 0 = 800 Gb/s

Similar changes to be done in 4.0.5:2 and 5.0.5:2 bit field descriptions.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #1.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **35**   Page 5 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.3.2.7**　　　　*P* **94**　　　*L* **17**　　　# 36

KABRA, LOKESH　　　　　　　　SYNOPSYS

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

Update "PCS receive link status (3.1.2)" description

SuggestedRemedy

Existing
When a 10/25/40/50/100/200/400GBASE-R,

Proposed
When a 10/25/40/50/100/200/400/800GBASE-R, 1.6TBASE-R,

Second change :
Two instances of "(3.7.3:0)" to be corrected to "(3.7.4:0)".

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.3.6.1**　　　　*P* **94**　　　*L* **44**　　　# 37

KABRA, LOKESH　　　　　　　　SYNOPSYS

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

Include update to "PCS type selection" values corresponding to 800 Gb/s and 1.6 Tb/s in Table 45-214-- PCS control 2 register bit definitions

SuggestedRemedy

Modify 3.7.4:0 bit field "PCS type selection" description

Existing
1 0 1 x x = Reserved

Proposed
1 0 1 1 x = Reserved
1 0 1 0 1 = Select 1.6TBASE-R PCS type
1 0 1 0 0 = Select 800GBASE-R PCS type

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Also add editor's note referencing maintenance request 1437 that addresses the 800G rate.
Implement with editorial licence.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.3.8**　　　　*P* **94**　　　*L* **45**　　　# 38

KABRA, LOKESH　　　　　　　　SYNOPSYS

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

Add capability field for 800GBASE-R & 1.6TBASE-R in this register

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 45-216-- PCS Status 3 register bit definitions,

Existing
3.9.15:8　　　Reserved　　　Value always 0

Proposed
3.9.15:10　　Reserved　　　　　　Value always 0
3.9.15:9　　　1.6TBASE-R capable　　1 = PCS is able to support 1.6TBASE-R PCS type
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　0 = PCS is not able to support 1.6TBASE-R PCS
type
3.9.15:8　　　800GBASE-R capable　　1 = PCS is able to support 800GBASE-R PCS type
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　0 = PCS is not able to support 800GBASE-R PCS
type

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
It is Table 45-239 that contains the ability bits, so modify Table 45-239.
Implement with editorial licence.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.3.8.1a**　　　*P* **94**　　　*L* **46**　　　# 39

KABRA, LOKESH　　　　　　　　SYNOPSYS

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

Add new subsection

SuggestedRemedy

45.2.3.8.1a 1.6TBASE-R capable (3.9.9)
When read as a one, bit 3.9.9 indicates that the PCS is able to support the 1.6TBASE-R PCS type. When read as a zero, bit 3.9.9 indicates that the PCS is not able to support 1.6TBASE-R PCS type

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **39**　　　Page 6 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.3.8.1b**　　　*P* **94**　　*L* **47**　　# 40

KABRA, LOKESH　　　　　　　　SYNOPSYS

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

Add new subsection

SuggestedRemedy

45.2.3.8.1b 800GBASE-R capable (3.9.8)
When read as a one, bit 3.9.8 indicates that the PCS is able to support the 800GBASE-R
PCS type. When read as a zero, bit 3.9.8 indicates that the PCS is not able to support
800GBASE-R PCS type

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Also add editor's note referencing maintenance request 1439 that addresses the 800G rate.
Implement with editorial licence.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.3.15.1**　　　*P* **94**　　*L* **48**　　# 41

KABRA, LOKESH　　　　　　　　SYNOPSYS

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

Update last line of 45.2.3.15.1

SuggestedRemedy

Existing
"100GBASE-R, and in 119.3 for 200G/400GBASE-R."

Proposed
"100GBASE-R, in 119.3 for 200G/400GBASE-R, in 172.3 for 800GBASE-R, and in 175.8
for 1.6TBASE-R.

Similar update required in 45.2.4.12.1, 45.2.5.12.1

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **175**　　*SC* **175.8**　　　*P* **245**　　*L* **9**　　# 43

KABRA, LOKESH　　　　　　　　SYNOPSYS

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(editorial)*

Incorrect Variable reference given in Table 175--3 for "loopback"

SuggestedRemedy

Change 175.3 to 175.4

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **174**　　*SC* **174.4**　　　*P* **219**　　*L* **28**　　# 44

Opsasnick, Eugene　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

Table 174-4 has an incorrect cross-reference to the PCS delay constraints

SuggestedRemedy

Change the cross-reference from "175.4" to be "175.5".

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **176**　　*SC* **176.1.4**　　　*P* **254**　　*L* **47**　　# 45

Opsasnick, Eugene　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

To convert from a AUI-2 to a AUI-1, a xBASE-R BM-PMA must be placed next to a xBASE-
R SM-PMA.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "… placed next to a 200GAUI-1 8:1 PMA."
To: "… placed next to a 200GBASE-R 8:1 PMA."

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **176**　　*SC* **176.1.5**　　　*P* **255**　　*L* **50**　　# 46

Opsasnick, Eugene　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

Footnote (e) to Table 176-2 mentions the PMA to connect to a 800GBASE-LR1 Inner FEC
is "For 800GBASE-R 8:16 only". But this looks like the wrong ratio of lanes for the
800GBASE-R PMA.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "For 800GBASE-R 8:16 only"
To: "For 800GBASE-R 4:32 only."

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **46**　　Page 7 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **176** 　　*SC* **176.2** 　　　　*P* **257** 　　*L* **30** 　　　# 47

Opsasnick, Eugene 　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **T** 　　*Comment Status* **A** 　　　　　　*(bucket)*

In Table 176-5, the middle column for the value of align_status_mux or all_locked_demux is listed as "N/A" for three of the rows. "N/A", not-applicable, implies there is no value or the status variable does not exist in this case. But the status variables are always there and in these cases, when the SIGNAL_OK input value is (not OK), they would have the value 'false'. But when the input SIGNAL_OK has a value of (not OK), the output does not really depend on the status variable, and it is a "don't care" for the calculation of the output IS_SIGNAL.indication.

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 176-5, Change the three entries of "N/A" for align_status_mux or all_locked_demux to "don't care" (or "false"). The same change from "N/A" to "don't care" should be applied to Table 176-6 on page 258.

Response 　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "N/A" in Tables 176-5 and 176-6 to "don't care".
Apply this same change in Table 177-1 and Table 177-2.
Implement with editorial license.
[Editor's note: CC 177]

Cl **176** 　　*SC* **176.4.4.2.1** 　　*P* **271** 　　*L* **10** 　　　# 48

Opsasnick, Eugene 　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** 　　*Comment Status* **A** 　　　　　*(bucket)*

The definition of the variable "reset" refers to another variable "PMA_reset", but PMA_reset is not defined anywhere.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the definition of PMA_reset to the list of variables just prior to reset. PMA_reset = "Boolean variable that is true when set by a management entity and is false otherwise."

Response 　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **176** 　　*SC* **176.7.2** 　　　*P* **280** 　　*L* **33** 　　　# 50

Opsasnick, Eugene 　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** 　　*Comment Status* **A** 　　　　　*(bucket)*

It is stated that "During local loopback, the PMA continues to propagate data in the Tx direction and drives the Tx service interface below the PMA.". It is also stated in 176.7.3 on line 47 on the same page that "During remote loopback, the PMA continues to propagate data in the Rx direction and drives the Rx PMA service interface towards the PMA client." If both remote loopback and local loopbask are enabled, then these statements are contradictory. The service interfaces cannot transmit both loopback data and propoagated data.

SuggestedRemedy

The output data at each service interface should be defined when both local loopback and remore loopback are enabed (probably loopback data, not propagated data); or it must be stated that local loopback and remote loopback are mutually exclusive.

Response 　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

On page 280, line 33…
replace: "During local loopback, the PMA continues to propagate data in the Tx direction and drives the Tx service interface below the PMA."
with: "During local loopback, the PMA continues to propagate data in the Tx direction."

And at line 47…
Replace:
"During remote loopback, the PMA continues to propagate data in the Rx direction and drives the Rx PMA service interface towards the PMA client"
with: "During remote loopback, the PMA continues to propagate data in the Rx direction."

Cl **178B** 　*SC* **178B.4** 　　　*P* **741** 　　*L* **49** 　　　# 51

Opsasnick, Eugene 　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** 　　*Comment Status* **A** 　　　　　*(bucket)*

The cross-reference to the subclause with the definition of "tx_mode" is incorrect. This occurs three times in Annex 178B. On page 741, line 49, on page 742, line 16, and on page 743, line 4.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "(tx_mode = data, see 178B.13.2.1)"
To: "(tx_mode = data, see 178B.13.3.1)"
with update of the hyperlink to the correct subclause in all three places.

Response 　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **51**

Page 8 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **172**   *SC* **172.1.6**   *P* **204**   *L* **48**   # 52

Opsasnick, Eugene   Broadcom

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

In Figure 172-2 (the block diagram of the 800G PCS), the lower interface says "PMA", but should be "PCS".

SuggestedRemedy

Change:"Service Interface below the PMA"
To: "Service Interface below the PCS"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **171**   *SC* **171.6.1**   *P* **183**   *L* **48**   # 53

Opsasnick, Eugene   Broadcom

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

The cross-reference to the definition of FEC_degraded_SER and rx_local_degraded for DTE 1.6TXS is wrong. It should not be 175.2.6.2.2, rather it should be 175.2.5.3 and 175.2.5.5.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "… defined in 175.2.6.2.2 for DTE1.6TXS, …"
To: "… defined in 175.2.5.3 and 175.2.5.5 for DTE 1.6TXS, …"
with updates of the hyperlinks to the correct subclauses.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **176**   *SC* **176.4.1**   *P* **260**   *L* **4**   # 55

Opsasnick, Eugene   Broadcom

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

In figure 176-2 near line 4, there is an input called PMA:IS_SIGNAL.request. This input is required if the sublayer above the PMA is another PMA or an AUI. However, when the sublayer above the PMA is a PCS, this input is not present. All possbile PCS's, 200G/400G PCS (CL 119), 800G PCS (CL 172), and 1.6T PCS (CL 175) no not have this output at the service interface below the PCS.

SuggestedRemedy

A notation in Figure 176-2 should be added that PMA:IS_SIGNAL.request is not present when the sublayer above the PMA is a PCS or DTE XS.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **176**   *SC* **176.3**   *P* **258**   *L* **34**   # 56

Opsasnick, Eugene   Broadcom

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Table 176-6 specifies how to set the output inst:IS_SIGNAL.request(SINGAL_OK) based on the input PMA:IS_SIGNAL.request(SIGNAL_OK) and the variable align_status_mux or all_locked_demux. However, when the sublayer above the PMA is a PCS, there is no PMA:IS_SIGNAL.request input.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest adding two rows to Table 176-6 to account for the case where PMA:IS_SIGNAL.request input is not present. Add two rows with N/A for the IS_SIGNAL.request(SIGNAL_OK) input, and the output is based only on the internal variable being true or false. Something like:
New row 1: | N/A | true | OK |
              +----------+----------+------------+
New row 2: | N/A | false | READY |

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested but instead of N/A, use "no primitive".

In addition, add a table footnote to "no primitive" to explain that "no primitive" means that PMA:IS_SIGNAL.request input is not present, for example, when the sublayer above the PMA is a PCS or PHY XS.

Implement with editorial license.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **56**   Page 9 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **176**   *SC* **176.4.2.6**   *P* **268**   *L* **27**   # 58

Opsasnick, Eugene   Broadcom

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *(withdrawn)*

The PAM4 encode function should specify that PAM4 symbols be aligned to RS-FEC symbol boundaries. When the 2-bit PAM4 symbols are aligned to the 10-bit RS-FEC, there are exactly 5 PAM4 symbols within each RS-FEC symbol. However, if they are not aligned, then each RS-FEC symbol would contain the second bit of one PAM4 symbol, followed by the 8 bits of 4 PAM4 symbols, followed by the first bit of the next PAM4 symbol. The unaligned arrangement makes the RS-FEC error perfomance analysis more complicated since there is an unequal probability of the first and second bits of a PMA4 symbol being in error (RS-FEC performance for the symbol muxing 200G/lane interfaces has so far only been done for the "aligned case"). The aligned case should already be the norm for most or all implementations. Specifying it this way should just guarenteed the FEC performace is as already studied, and receiver implementations may also take advantage of this guarentee.

SuggestedRemedy

In subclause 176.4.2.6 "PAM4 encode" and 176.4.3.6 "PAM4 encode", add a requirement that the PAM4 symbols must align to the RS-FEC symbols such that each RS-FEC symbol contains 10 bits from exactly 5 full PAM4 symbols.

A similar requirement should be also be added to the PAM4 encoding description in 177.4.8. In this case, the PAM4 symbols should align with the start of a block of 8x Inner FEC codewords (see Fig. 177-6) after the circular shift.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **Z**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **169**   *SC* **169.3.2**   *P* **162**   *L* **34**   # 59

Opsasnick, Eugene   Broadcom

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

In Figure 169-3, the block labeled "800GBASE-R n:32 PMA" immediately above the 800GBASE-R PMD should be a "32:n PMA" (not n:32).

SuggestedRemedy

Change "800GBASE-R n:32 PMA" to "800GBASE-R 32:n PMA" on line 34 of page 162. Note that the "n" should also be in italics.

Consider changing it to "800GBASE-R 32:p PMA" and add a definition of p under the figure to be consistent with Figure 174-3 on page 217.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
For the PMA immediately above the PMD, change "800GBASE-R n:32 PMA" to "800GBASE-R 32:p PMA", with "p" in italic font.Note that the "n" should also be in italics.
For the PMD service interface change "PMD:IS_UNITDATA_0:n-1" to "PMD:IS_UNITDATA_0:p-1" twice.
Add "p = NUMBER OF STREAMS OF DATA UNITS" to the legend.

Cl **174**   *SC* **174.3.2**   *P* **217**   *L* **31**   # 60

Opsasnick, Eugene   Broadcom

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

In Figure 174-3, the signal "PMA:IS_SIGNAL.request" from the 1.6TBASE-R PCS to the 1.6TBASE-R 16:p PMA should be removed. The PCS does not have this output - see Figure 175.2 on page 226. No relavant PCS has this output at the service interface below the PCS - see also Fig. 172-2 (on page 198 of 802.3df-2014) and Fig. 119-2 (on page 4837 of 802.3-2022). See also the similar extender figure 169-3 for 800GMII on page 162.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "PMA:IS_SIGNAL.request" out of the 1.6TBASE-R PCS in Figure 174-3.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **60**

Page 10 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **174**   *SC* **174.3.2**   *P* **218**   *L* **20**   # 61

Opsasnick, Eugene   Broadcom

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

In Figure 174-4 (1.6T Inter-sublayer interfaces with Inner FEC), there is no AUI. The Inner FEC will (almost) always be in an optical module below an AUI connection to a host. It would be better to show the Inner FEC below an AUI in this figure since the layer stack shown, while logically correct, will never actually be used.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a "1.6T BASE-R 8:8 PMA" between the "1.6T BASE-R 16:8 PMA" on line 14 and the "1.6TBASE-R Inner FEC" on line 20. And then add the necessary inter-layer signals on the AUI connection between the two PMAs.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.9.2.1.3**   *P* **314**   *L* **34**   # 63

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *TX fixture RLcc (bucket)*

Test fixture RLcc parameters are TBD.
In 163.9.2.1.3 the specification is >=6 dB up to 40 GHz.
The suggested remedy is the same minimum with the frequency range adopted for 802.3dj. Alternatively, this specification can be deleted, since RLcc of a bare TP0-TP0v test fixture (without a DUT attached to it) may be impractical to measure.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "6 dB at all frequencies between 0.2 GHz and 67 GHz".

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.9.2**   *P* **322**   *L* **46**   # 64

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *TX J4u_03*

In previous projects there were two different specifications, J3u_03 for PMDs and for J4u_03 for AUIs. This was based on the different BER allocations which translated to average FEC symbol error ratios. The limit values were based on the same dual-Dirac model, and the different maximum values are a constant source of confusion.

We now know that jitter creates correlated errors. Therefore, peak-to-peak jitter should be specified at probabilities lower than the expected average symbol error ratio. The probability allowed for jitter peaks should not be higher for PMDs.

With that in mind, having two specifications, J3u and J4u, is not justified anymore. J3u is faster to measure, but if J4u is measurable for an AUI it is also measurable for a PMD.

J4u should be used for PMD specs too. The maximum specs should be changed accordingly, including accounting for measurement degradation due to package or host channel loss.

SuggestedRemedy

For KR (Table 178–6), change J3u_03 to J4u_03 with the same maximum values as in C2C (Table 176C–1): 0.118 for class A and 0.12 for class B.

For CR (Table 179-7), change J3u_03 to J4u_03 with maximum values:
0.128, 0.126, and 0.143 for HL, HN, and HH, respectively.

Change the definitions accordingly, and in other places as necessary with editorial license.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The CRG reviewed the contribution
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_06a_2411.pdf.

Implement the changes on slide 8 of ran_3dj_06a_2411 with editorial license.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **64**   Page 11 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.9.2.1.1**   *P* **323**   *L* **35**   # 65

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *TF IL, ILdd*

TP0 to TP0v test fixture specifications has multiple TBDs.

As initial values, we can use the values from clause 163 scaled by a factor of 2.

SuggestedRemedy

Use:
ILdd between 3.4 dB and 10 dB at 53.125 GHz
ILD magnitude up to 0.4 dB from 0.05 GHz to 53.125 GHz
Tt is 0.005 ns

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comments #189 and #190 suggest a different ILdd range, different frequency range for
ILD, and additional restrictions.

The CRG reviewed slide #28 in
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_01_2411.pdf.

A wide range of IL for the test fixture makes ERL measurement results inconsistent. Thus,
there is preference to make the range narrower than what was used in 802.3ck.

The following straw poll was taken.
Straw poll #TF-1 (directional)
For the top of the frequency range for test fixture ILD in 178.9.2.1.1, I prefer:
A: 85 GHz
B: 67 GHz
A: 25 B: 40

Change from:
The insertion loss of the test fixture shall be between TBD dB and TBD dB at 53.125 GHz.
The magnitude of the insertion loss deviation of the test fixture shall be less than or equal
to TBD dB from TBD GHz to 53.125 GHz. Insertion loss deviation is calculated as specified
in 93A.4, where Tt is TBD ns, and fb and fr
values are taken from Table 178–12.

To:
The insertion loss of the test fixture shall be between 3.4 dB and 4.4 dB at 53.125 GHz.
The magnitude of the insertion loss deviation of the test fixture shall be less than or equal
to 0.2 dB from 0.05 GHz to 67 GHz. Insertion loss deviation is calculated as specified in
93A.4, where Tt is 0.005 ns, and fb and fr
values are taken from Table 178–12.

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.9.2.1.2**   *P* **324**   *L* **23**   # 66

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *ERL*

Multiple ERL limits are TBD.

Using 802.3ck as a reference:
For KR test fixture at Tp0v, in 163.9.2.1.2 the minimum is 15 dB.
For CR transmitter at TP2, in 162.9.4 the minimum is 7.3 dB.
For CR receiver at TP3, in 162.9.5 the minimum is 7.3 dB.
For copper cables, in 162.11.2 the minimum is 8.25 dB.
For C2C at Tp0v, in 120F.3.1 dERL is -3 dB (as it is in 802.3dj Table 178–6 for KR).
For C2C channel, in 120F.4.3 the minimum is 9.7 dB.
For C2M host, in 120G.3.1 and in 120G.3.3 the minimum is 7.3 dB.
For C2M module, in 120G.3.2 and in 120G.3.4 the minimum is 8.5 dB.
For mated test fixture, in 162B.4.2 the minimum is 10.3 dB.

Unless shown otherwise, the same ERL requirements are appropriate for this project.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the values in the comment to replace the corresponding TBDs in 178, 179, 176C,
176D, and 179B.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The CRG reviewed the presentation
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/mellitz_3dj_01_2411.pdf.

For KR test fixture at Tp0v, set minimum ERL to 15 dB.
For CR transmitter at TP2, set minimum ERL to 7.3 dB.
For CR receiver at TP3, set minimum ERL to 7.3 dB.
For copper cables, set minimum ERL to 8.25 dB.
For C2C at Tp0v, set minimum dERL to -3 dB.
For C2C channel, set minimum ERL to 9.7 dB.
For C2M host, set minimum ERL to 7.3 dB.
For C2M module, set minimum ERL to 8.5 dB.
For mated test fixture, set minimum ERL to 10.3 dB.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **66**   Page 12 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.10.2**   *P* **334**   *L* **35**   # 67

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Channel ILdd*

Channel insertion loss (recommended) is a TBD equation.
As the editor's note says, this recommendation was not included in the baseline proposal
and "Contributions in this area are encouraged".

SuggestedRemedy

A contribution providing a recommendation is solicited.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The normative channel specification is COM. The recommended maximum ILdd is
provided in Table 178–11.

There has been no proposal for the recommended channel ILdd equation.

Replace the content of subclause 178.10.2 with a statement that the recommended max.
ILdd at 53.125 GHz is 40 dB, with editorial license.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.11.7.2**   *P* **380**   *L* **17**   # 68

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**   (editorial)

"mated test fixture" - it is "fixtures" everywhere else.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "mated test fixtures"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.1**   *P* **389**   *L* **49**   # 69

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   (editorial)

The text in footnote b, "If one or two 200GAUI-n is implemented in a PHY", has a numeric
mismatch (two / is).

The fact that one or two AUIs can be included is mentioned in footnote c. Footnote b is a
condition for having additional PMAs, and does not need to repeat what footnote c states.

Also, footnote c uses "instantiated" instead of "implemented" when talking about the same
thing. We should be consistent.

In D1.2, for KR and CR PHYs (where only one AUI can be included in a PHY), this
statement was changed to "If a 200GAUI-n is implemented in a PHY <...>". This wording is
correct for all PHYs.

There are 11 instances of "if one or two" with 200GAUI-n, 400GAUI-n, 800GAUI-n, and
1.6TAUI-n.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "If one or two" to "If a" (in this instance, "If a 200GAUI-n is implemented in a
PHY"). Apply similarly for all instances.
Change "implemented in a PHY" to "instantiated in a PHY" (19 instances).

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.7.1**   *P* **399**   *L* **26**   # 70

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   (editorial)

The words "each lane" are not appropriate for "signaling rate", since it cannot be
aggregated (unlike power and bit rate).

This was corrected in D1.2 in most places in the electrical clauses, but these words still
appear in optical clauses (8 instances).

This comment is specific to the signaling rate parameter; other parameters are subject of
other comments.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "each lane" from "signaling rate in all optical Tx and Rx specifications tables.
Apply in all optical PMD clauses.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **70**   Page 13 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.7.1**   *P* **399**   *L* **32**   # 71

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tx optical parameter*

The words "each lane" appear in some Tx parameters but not in others. The distinction is not clear; it seems that all specifications in Table 180-7 apply to each lane separately - but the way it is written may be interpreted otherwise (e.g. Transmitter power excursion does not have "each lane" - is it an aggregate specification?)

In Table 181-5 (WDM) there is a similar situation, but there are specific parameters that apply for the sum of all lanes (total average power, and maybe others). These should be clearly marked as such, e.g., "(total of all lanes)".

The same concern exist in Rx characteristics in Table 180-8 and Table 181-6. All seem to be per lane.

Clauses 182 and 183 are similar. This should preferably be aligned across optical clauses.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "each lane" from the specific parameter names, and add a statement in the text above each table, stating that the transmit (or receiver) characteristics apply separately to each lane of a PMD unless specified otherwise.

Implement for both Tx and Rx across the multi-lane optical clauses (where appropriate), and also in references to the parameter names, with editorial license.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The inclusion of "each lane" is fundamental, stating specifically that for some parameters the value provides limits for each lane, such as optical power. Also the rate is per lane, otherwise there may be unequal rates leading to the same total rate. For some parameters the "each lane" is missing, such as TECQ, where it should be added.
Modify the table accordingly with editorial license.
Apply to similar tables in Clause 181, 182, and 183 as well.

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.7.1**   *P* **400**   *L* **10**   # 72

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

For RINxxOMA , it seems that the xx in this case should be 15.5 for 200G and 21.4 for other cases. But this is not clear that these are different parameters (and they have the same maximum value; does it make sense?)
Footnote c says "with "xx" referring to the value for Optical return loss tolerance.", but it should be the maximum value.
In previous PMD clauses the RIN parameter name included specific values. For example, in Table 167-7, RIN14OMA.

SuggestedRemedy

Either change footnote c to "Optical return loss tolerance (max)" and state clearly that this creates different parameters for 200G and for 400G/800G/1.6T, or preferably replace xx with numbers (separating to two rows).

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.7.2**   *P* **402**   *L* **3**   # 73

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Rx optical parameter*

Figure 180-4 does not show the pass and fail regions for receiver sensitivity vs. TECQ.
Also in Figure 181-4, Figure 182-4, and Figure 183-4.

SuggestedRemedy

Add labels (e.g. "pass region" and "fail region") in the figures to clarify.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The indication of pass and fail regions is not the intent of the figures, intended to show the limits versus TDECQ. It's clear from the Y-axis that the curve shows the maximum value of the parameter

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **73**

Page 14 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.9.11**   *P***415**   *L***3**   # 74

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

The dashed list item "N0 and N3 are to be measured <.>" is not part of the variable list for this equation; N0 and N3 are already defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the text of this item to a regular paragraph after the list.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **186**   *SC* **186.2.3.1**   *P***550**   *L***1**   # 76

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

"One 800GMII data transfer is encoded into one 66-bit block. Idle characters are removed from the stream of 66b blocks"
"66b" seems to refer to "66-bit block" in the previous sentence. This inconsistency is not helpful.

There are many similar instances of block sizes in this clause, such as 66B and 257B in 186.2.3.2, and 128B elsewhere. The "B" suffix is potentially confusing as it often denotes bytes. Although this format is common for the encoding/transcoding schemes, we should avoid using it for block sizes.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances of block sizes written as #b or #B to "#-bit" except in the transcoder labels (64B/66B to 256B/257B transcoder). Also in subclause headings.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **174A**   *SC* **174A.6.1.1**   *P***642**   *L***22**   # 77

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

The counter variable names tbecount and tbtcount are obscure and too similar to each other, making the text difficult to parse.
There is no need to use such abbreviated names. The text would be clearer with variable naming similar to the PCS counter names e.g. in 175.2.5.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Rename tbecount(k) to test_block_error_bin(k) and tbtcount to test_block_counter.

Apply elsewhere as necessary.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **174A**   *SC* **174A.6.1.4**   *P***643**   *L***31**   # 78

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

The description of the process can be simplified by initializing the distribution to that of BER_added (step c) and then iterating with i from 0 to p-1 (instead of treating i=0 as initial value). This would remove two steps (a and d) and yield the same result with fewer intermediate variables..

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite the process as suggested.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The suggested change is indeed an improvement to the draft. The method is simplified without changing the result.
For illustration, the method rewritten as suggested is shown on the slide for Comment 78 in the following file:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/brown_3dj_03_2411.pdf
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **78**   Page 15 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **174A**	*SC* **174A.8**		*P***645**		*L***35**		#	80	

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

In Table 174A–3 the last column has "in a PHY" but it is about an xMII extender.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "in an xMII Extender".

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176D**	*SC* **176D.5.3**		*P***700**		*L***22**		#	82	

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

The specification of "Differential peak-to-peak voltage (max)" in Table 176D–1 points to 176D.7.1. In addition, it has footnote a, saying that the measurement uses the method in 93.8.1.3 except that PRBS13Q test pattern is used.

The footnote is not required since there is a full description in 176D.7.1.

As noted in comment #416 against D1.1, the peak-to-peak of PRBS13Q is not indicative of the values that can occur in mission data, unless the channel+equalization attenuate low frequencies that are not present in PRBS13Q.

The specified max peak-to-peak voltage is intended to hold with any data pattern, not just PRBS13Q, and at any equalization setting. It is a clear design requirement that does not require a specific measurement method (the standard is not a measurement specification). Designers and testers know what peak-to-peak voltage is without the reference to 93.8.1.3 (which does not actually define it, it only specifies a test pattern which is inappropriate for this project).

This also applies to module output in Table 176D–2 and to CR and KR transmitter output specifications, although the loss to the measurement point for those is smaller.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete footnote a in this table.

Add a paragraph in 176D.7.1 stating that differential peak-to-peak requirements apply at any equalization setting and with any pattern presented at the service interface.

In Table 176C–1, Table 178–6, and Table 179–7, delete footnote a and replace the reference to 93.8.1.3 with a reference to 176D.7.1

A presentation with measurement results and a detailed suggested remedy is planned.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The CRG reviewed slide 9 of
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_01a_2411.pdf
and the related presetnation
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3d_05a_2411.pdf.

Implement the proposal on slide 8 of ran_3d_05a_2411 (in 176D.7.1), with the exceptions that the pattern for VCM_LF is PRBS13Q instead of a square wave, and the probability for differential peak-to-peak output voltage is 10^{-7}.

Implement with editorial license.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **82**   Page 16 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **179B**   *SC* **179B.4.1**   *P* **781**   *L* **47**   # 84

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

The signaling rate and reference receiver bandwidth have been adopted.
(This was addressed by comment #442 against D1.1, but the resolution was not fully implemented).

SuggestedRemedy

Replace TBDs: f_b=106.25 GBd and f_r=0.55*f_b.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
[Editor's note: Changed page from 747 to 781]

Cl **179A**   *SC* **179A.5**   *P* **774**   *L* **34**   # 85

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Equations 179A-1 and 179A-2 have "TP2d" and "TP3d" which should be TP2 and TP3 (there is no "d" version). Also in the parameter list.

SuggestedRemedy

Change TP2d to TP2, and TP3d to TP3, in the equation and parameter list.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **179A**   *SC* **179A.5**   *P* **775**   *L* **7**   # 86

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

In the "ILddCA,max (dB)" columns, the content should be numbers, and the cable assembly class should be in parentheses.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179A**   *SC* **179A.5**   *P* **776**   *L* **13**   # 88

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

The horizontal locations of TP0d and TP5d (still) appear almost aligned with those of TP1 and TP4, but these are very different test points. This could be improved.
Also, in the mated test fixture the test points should be annotated.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the TP0d line to the left and the TP5d line to the right, flush with the transmit and receive function, respectively. Extend the arrows appropriately.

In the mated test fixtures part of the diagram, add TP1 and TP2 labels on the top and TP4 and TP5 labels on the bottom, or in another way if preferred.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179B**   *SC* **179B.4.2**   *P* **783**   *L* **2**   # 89

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Test fixtures*

ERL is currently defined without a specified reference impedance. This means that the 100 Ohm specified for s-parameter measurements in 178A.1.3 is used.

But test fixtures transmission lines should be designed for impedance matching with the connectors which are practically lower impedance (92.5 Ohm it typical). Otherwise, when connected to boards or cables with 92.5 Ohms they will have a reflection, which will degrade all results (frequency and time domain)

Using a different reference impedance for measuring the test fixtures will encourage design with the correct impedance.

The suggested remedy is to specify a reference impedance of 92.5 Ohm differential for test fixture ERL. Optionally, this should apply to all test fixture S-parameter-based specifications.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an exception to the test fixture ERL calculation to use an impedance of 92.5 Ohm, with editorial license.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **89**   Page 17 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4.4**   *P* **361**   *L* **52**   # 93

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tx AC common mode*

The specification of AC-common mode voltage is "all but 1e-4 of the measured distribution". This does not prevent extreme spikes of common mode noise to occur in a transmitter output as long as they are not too frequent.

It is impossible to design a receiver that can handle unspecified levels of occasional common mode noise without creating errors. Therefore we should assume that the current specification can cause errors in the receiver, currently at a probability of 1e-4. These errors can occur in addition to ones that are currently modeled by COM. Additionally, they can be correlated and cause unexpected FEC failures.

We should not allow potential sources of errors that are not budgeted to have such high probability.

The suggested probably of 1e-7 is low enough to enable it to be used for all interfaces. This increases the measurement time, but the specification is not for specific points in the pattern, so measurement can use the whole pattern and be very fast.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the specification to be all but 1e-7 of the measured distribution, from 5e-6 to 1-5e-6 of the cumulative distribution.
Use the same definition for KR, C2C, and C2M.
Implement with editorial license.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #82.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4.4**   *P* **361**   *L* **53**   # 94

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tx AC common mode*

The common-mode measurement method is not specified in detail; It is unclear what the "measured distribution" represents. The distribution can depend on the measurement method, e.g., whether or not whether the sampling is synchronous with the clock, the number of samples per UI and the sampling phase.

For example, sampling once per PRBS13Q repetition at a fixed point (as in the measurement of differential noise used in SNDR) may miss common-mode that is correlated with the signal; conversely, capturing a test pattern with many times per UI can cause large enough population to create a distribution from only part of the test pattern, but may miss events at other parts in the test pattern.

We should protect against having excessive noise anywhere within a UI and anywhere in the test pattern. The suggested change ensures that, and allows either synchronous or asynchronous measurement.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a sentence that the distribution is created from measurements over the whole PRBS13Q test pattern, that include between 2 to 3 samples per UI.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #82.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **94**   Page 18 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.11**   *P* **372**   *L* **23**   # 100

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *CA specifications*

The four cable assembly classes are mentioned here and described as differing in only their maximum insertion loss, with reference to 179.11.2, but there is no indication of the classes there. The max Nyquist ILdd per class are listed in Table 179–13.

Also, there is nothing in this draft about cable reach. In previous standards there was some indication of the reach provided by the cable.

It would be helpful for readers to have in this subclause a table that lists the maximum reach and Nyquist ILdd for each cable assembly class. This is more important than the existing dashed list of CR1/CR2/CR4/CR8; the cable types per width are described in detail in Annex 179C and Annex 179D.

The suggested remedy is based on slide 5 in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/23_07/tracy_3dj_01a_2307.pdf with lengths interpolated between 1 m and 2 m.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference from 179.11.2 to Table 179-13.
In Table 179-13, create four columns for CA-A through CA-D. Move the "Insertion loss at 53.125 GHz, ILdd (max)" values to these columns.
Add a row with expected reach in meters: CA-A: 1, CA-B: 1.33, CA-C: 1.66, CA-D: 2.
Make other parameters common to all classes (straddled cells).

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The CRG reviewed slide #37 in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_01a_2411.pdf.

There was no consensus to implement the changes shown on the slide.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.11.3**   *P* **374**   *L* **47**   # 101

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *CA specifications*

Cable assembly ERL parameters N and Nbx are TBD.
In 162.11.3 the values were 4500 and 0 respectively. In 802.3dj, the UI is halved and the maximum length is assumed to be the same (2 m for CA-D class).

SuggestedRemedy

Use N=9000 and Nbx=0.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.11.5**   *P* **375**   *L* **15**   # 102

Ran, Adee   Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *CA specifications*

Differential-mode to common-mode insertion loss equation is TBD. The reference in the text is to an equation in clause 162.

The parameter name in 178.10.5 was changed to "mode conversion insertion loss" to cover both ILcd and ILdc. It should be applied here too.

In 802.3ck the specification of this parameter are the same in KR (163.10.5) and CR (162.11.5). Therefore we can use the same equation and figure as in KR (178.10.5).

SuggestedRemedy

Rename the parameter to "mode conversion insertion loss" and use the same equation and figure as in 178.10.5. Implement with editorial license.
Change the reference in the text to point to the correct equation and figure.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.7.1**   *P* **452**   *L* **43**   # 103

Welch, Brian   Cisco

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *SER+TDECQ*

Current TDECQ (max) value is "TBD"

SuggestedRemedy

Update TDECQ (max) and Target PAM4 symbol error ratio to 3.4 dB and 4.8 x 10^-4 (both must be changed), respectively per welch_3dj_01_1124

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.7.1**   *P* **452**   *L* **45**   # 104

Welch, Brian   Cisco

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *SER+TDECQ*

Current TECQ (max) value is "TBD"

SuggestedRemedy

Update TECQ (max) and Target PAM4 symbol error ratio to 3.4 dB and 4.8 x 10^-4 (both must be changed), respectively per welch_3dj_01_1125

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **104**   Page 19 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **182**　　*SC* **182.7.1**　　　　*P***452**　　　　*L***47**　　　# 105

Welch, Brian　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*SER+TDECQ*

Current |TDECQ - TECQ| (max) value is "TBD"

SuggestedRemedy

Update |TDECQ-TECQ| (max) and Target PAM4 symbol error ratio to2.5 dB and 4.8 x 10^-4 (both must be changed), respectively per welch_3dj_01_1125

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **182**　　*SC* **182.7.2**　　　　*P***454**　　　　*L***27**　　　# 106

Welch, Brian　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*SER+TDECQ*

Current SECQ value is "TBD"

SuggestedRemedy

Update SECQ and Target PAM4 symbol error ratio to 3.4 dB and 4.8 x 10^-4 (both must be changed), respectively per welch_3dj_01_1125

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **182**　　*SC* **182.9.5**　　　　*P***465**　　　　*L***9**　　　# 107

Welch, Brian　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*SER+TDECQ*

Current Target PAM4 symbol error ratio is 9.6 x 10^-3

SuggestedRemedy

Update Target PAM4 symbol error ratio to 4.8 x 10^-4 per welch_3dj_01_1124

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **183**　　*SC* **183.7.1**　　　　*P***480**　　　　*L***34**　　　# 108

Welch, Brian　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*SER+TDECQ*

Current TDECQ (max) value is "TBD"

SuggestedRemedy

Update TDECQ (max) and Target PAM4 symbol error ratio to 3.4 dB and 4.8 x 10^-4 (both must be changed), respectively per welch_3dj_01_1124

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **183**　　*SC* **183.7.1**　　　　*P***480**　　　　*L***37**　　　# 109

Welch, Brian　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*SER+TDECQ*

Current TECQ (max) value is "TBD"

SuggestedRemedy

Update TECQ (max) and Target PAM4 symbol error ratio to 3.4 dB and 4.8 x 10^-4 (both must be changed), respectively per welch_3dj_01_1125

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **183**　　*SC* **183.7.1**　　　　*P***480**　　　　*L***38**　　　# 110

Welch, Brian　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*SER+TDECQ*

Current |TDECQ - TECQ| (max) value is "TBD"

SuggestedRemedy

Update |TDECQ-TECQ| (max) and Target PAM4 symbol error ratio to2.5 dB and 4.8 x 10^-4 (both must be changed), respectively per welch_3dj_01_1125

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **110**

Page 20 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.7.2**   *P***482**   *L***30**   # 111

Welch, Brian   Cisco

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *SER+TDECQ*

Current SECQ value is "TBD"

SuggestedRemedy

Update SECQ and Target PAM4 symbol error ratio to 3.4 dB and 4.8 x 10^-4 (both must be changed), respectively per welch_3dj_01_1125

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.9.5**   *P***489**   *L***48**   # 112

Welch, Brian   Cisco

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *SER+TDECQ*

Current Target PAM4 symbol error ratio is 9.6 x 10^-3

SuggestedRemedy

Update Target PAM4 symbol error ratio to 4.8 x 10^-4 per welch_3dj_01_1124

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **176C**   *SC* **176C.2**   *P***677**   *L***22**   # 113

Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Figure 178-2. The signals SLi and DLi are never defined in Annex 176C.

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 176C-2, add a note similar to the note in Figure 179-2.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **178B**   *SC* **178B.5.4**   *P***748**   *L***27**   # 114

Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Mode "PAM4" is ambiguous compared with "PAM4 with precoding".

SuggestedRemedy

When referencing the test pattern mode change mode "PAM4" to "PAM4 without precoding". Propagate this change throughout Annex 178B as necessary.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.8.4**   *P***244**   *L***4**   # 115

Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

Use of possessive "PMD's" not appropriate or necessary in a technical document. Since this clause is about the PMD, it is implicit that ILT here is for the PMD.

SuggestedRemedy

Either change "PMD's" to "PMD" or delete "PMD's"
Do the same in 179.9.4.1.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **175**   *SC* **175.5**   *P***244**   *L***4**   # 116

Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

Several instances of acronym "BT" with defining this acronym. Typically, in this draft the it "bit times (BT)".

SuggestedRemedy

change "BT" to "bit times (BT)"
also, in 184.7 and 186.5

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **116**

Page 21 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **178B**   *SC* **178B.5**   *P* **744**   *L* **16**   # 117

Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

Figure 178B-3. Use of apostrophe <'>followed by "s" is for possession, which is not the case here.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "3's" to "3s" and "0's" to "0s"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **186**   *SC* **186.4.2.1**   *P* **578**   *L* **18**   # 118

Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

PCS_reset and PMA_reset definition refers to MDIO, rather than management in general.

SuggestedRemedy

Define reset, PCS_reset, and PMA_reset as done for the 1.6TBASE-R PCS in 175.2.6.2.2.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Define the state variables as suggested. Implement with editorial license.

Cl **176C**   *SC* **176C.3.1**   *P* **679**   *L* **29**   # 119

Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

For consistency with PMD clauses, the error allocation subclause should be 2nd level heading right after the introduction.

SuggestedRemedy

Move 176C.3.1 to be immediately after 176C.1, with new heading number 176C.2.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.4**   *P* **698**   *L* **42**   # 120

Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

For consistency with PMD clauses, the error allocation subclause should be 2nd level heading right after the introduction.

SuggestedRemedy

Move 176D.4 to be immediately after 176D.1, with new heading number 176D.2.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.9.1**   *P* **463**   *L* **9**   # 121

Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Table 182-16. The Inner FEC is specifically called 200GBASE-R Inner FEC, 400GBASE-R Inner, etc. Reference it by name.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Scrambled idle test pattern encoded by the Inner FEC used by 200GBASE-R, 400GBASE-R, 800GBASE-R, or 1.6TBASE-R"
To "Scrambled idle test pattern encoded by the 200GBASE-R, 400GBASE-R, 800GBASE-R, or 1.6TBASE-R Inner FEC"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.213c**   *P* **91**   *L* **31**   # 122

Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

Use of possessive, e.g., lane 0's Inner FEC total bits register, is not necessary or appropriate for a technical document. It is sufficient and appropriate to use "lane 0 Inner FEC total bits registers".

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "lane 0's" with "lane 0" here and 4 other places in Clause 45.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **122**   Page 22 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **183** *SC* **183.9.5.1** *P* **491** *L* **21** # 123

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

In Table 183-5 footnote a the is reference to an annex describing statistical link design methodology. However, this annex does not exist. Also, it seems that all of the necessary background is provided in the reference to G.652 Appendix I.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete ", and the optical channel characteristics methodology described in Annex TBD"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license

Cl **181** *SC* **181.1** *P* **420** *L* **9** # 130

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *(editorial)*

Acronym WDM is first introduced here in the clause but is not defined. Use same wording as provided for WDM in subclause 1.5 (base standard).

SuggestedRemedy

Change "WDM" to "Wavelength division multiplexing (WDM)"
Do the same in 183.1.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176C** *SC* **176C.3.1** *P* **679** *L* **27** # 133

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *(editorial)*

The "Error ratio allocation" sublclause should not be a level 3 heading under service interfaces.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the heading number from "177C.3.1" to "176C.4" and renumber the subsequent level 3 headers.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176C** *SC* **176C.3.1** *P* **679** *L* **27** # 134

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *(editorial)*

To be consistent with the various PMD clauses the error allocation subclause should be a level 2 heading immediately after the overeiw subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Move "176C.3.1" to just before 176C.2 and change to a level 2 heading "176C.2".
Similarly, move 176D.4 to just before 176C.2.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **119** *SC* **119.2.6.2.1** *P* **148** *L* **17** # 136

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

SIGNAL_OK parameter is now defined with four parameters {OK, IN_PROGRESS, READY, FAIL} rather than two {OK, FAIL}. The signal_ok variable value is not defined for the two new values, only for OK and FAIL.

SuggestedRemedy

In 119.2.6.2.1 in the definition of the signal_ok variable…
Replace "It is true if the value was OK and false if the value was FAIL."
With: "It is true if the value was OK and
false otherwise."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **136**

Page 23 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **178B**　　*SC* **178B**　　　　　　*P* **740**　　　*L* **8**　　　　# 137

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　　Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **T**　　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*(bucket)*

ILT as defined in Annex 178B is relevant only to Physical Layer implementations that include physically instantiated links with 200 Gb/s or higher per lane. This should be clarified.

SuggestedRemedy

Add new subclause 178A.1 with title "Scope" and text as follows:
"This clause defines inter-sublayer link training (ILT) for Physical Layer implementations that include one or more inter-sublayer links (ISLs) (see 178B.2) with data rate of 200 Gb/s or higher per lane."

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
In the suggested remedy there is a typo, it should say: "subclause 178B.1"
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **176**　　　*SC* **176.7.4**　　　　　*P* **281**　　　*L* **8**　　　　# 138

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　　Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **T**　　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*(withdrawn)*

In 174A.6, a set of test methods are defined to measure the block error ratio for inter-sublayer links (ISLs). These test methods require the PRBS31Q error check to be enhanced to include block error checkers and block error bin counters as defined in 174A.6.1.1 and 174A.6.1.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Define block error counting and related counters. A contribution on this topic will be provided.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **Z**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **178**　　　*SC* **178.8.1**　　　　　*P* **320**　　　*L* **50**　　　# 140

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　　Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **T**　　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*(bucket)*

Figure 178-2. The signals SLi and DLi are never defined in Clause 178.

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 178-2, add a note similar to the note in Figure 179-2. Do the same for Figure 176C-2.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **178A**　　*SC* **178A.1.10.2**　　　*P* **737**　　　*L* **5**　　　　# 141

Banas, David　　　　　　　　　　Keysight Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type **T**　　　*Comment Status* **R**　　　　　　*(bucket)*

The current definition of Ani yields an effective DER0 twice that intended, because it considers only the left tail of the distribution, while both left and right tails contribute to DER0.

SuggestedRemedy

P(-Ani) = DER0/2

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
DER is (and always has been) defined to be the area under the left (or negative) tail of the noise and interference distribution function. DER is not equivalent to a PAM-L symbol error ratio. The conversion between DER and a PAM-L symbol error ratio (SER) is clarified in NOTE 2 under 178A.1.10.2.The factor of (2L-2)/L in this conversion accounts for all of the possible ways the distribution of noise and interference amplitude can cross a PAM-L decision threshold.

Cl **180**　　　*SC* **180.7.2**　　　　　*P* **401**　　　*L* **29**　　　# 145

Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　　　　Marvell

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*Rx optical parameter*

There is no requirement to have the OMA of all the Tx lanes within a given limit and there is no restriction on the difference in losses between the lanes in the optical channel. Therefore the value of Max OMA of the aggressor lanes should match the MaxOMA of the Tx. This is similar to comment 169 against Clause 181 in D1.2 which was rejected with the comment "The proposed value is incorrect for DR-2/4/8 and would only apply to multiple DR1s in a single module. " What is the justification for saying the proposed value is incorrect?

SuggestedRemedy

Change the OMA outer of each aggresor lane from 2.9dB to 4.2dB. Change this from TBD to 4.2dB in Table 181-6. Add a footnote to this row in Table 181-6 that is smilar to the one in Table 180-8 " No aggressors needed for 200GBASE-DR1-2 in a single lane device. "

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #228

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **145**　　　　Page 24 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.7.1**   *P* **430**   *L* **43**   # 146

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *TDECQ*

The value of TDECQ is TBD.   Other specifications are related to this. Having a value that can be confirmed later moves the project forward.   A presentation in support of this will be provided.

SuggestedRemedy

ChangeTDECQ(max) TBD to 3.4dB to match DR spec. Also Change TECQ(max) to 3.4dB, TDECQ-TECQ to 2.5dB, Stessed eye closure in table 182-8 to 3.4dB and stressed receiver sensitivity to -1.5dBm, (or -2.2dBm if another comment that reduces the OMAouter is accepted) . In table 182-9 change the allocation for penalties to 3.8dB and the Power budget (for max TDECQ) to 7.8dB.   Note that the proposed value of 3.4dB is matching the value where the curves stop in figures 182-3 and 182-4. If a different value is chosen these figures would need to be modified. Add an editor's note below table 182-7 "Editor's note (to be removed by D2.0): The maximum value of TDECQ is 3.4 dB. This maximum value and related specifications may need adjustment if receivers have trouble with this value of TECQ calculated with the higher value of SER used in this clause. Further study of this area is encouraged.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The following presentations were reviewed by the CRG:
rodes_01
welch_01
dudek_01
ghiasi_03

Straw poll TF-3 (direction)
I support the following SER value to be used for TDECQ/TECQ for the 2km PMDs defined in Clause 182 and 183.
A: 9.6E-3
B: 4.8E-4
A: 45 B: 24

Straw poll TF-4 (direction)
I support setting the TDECQ and TECQ maximum values to 3.4 dB each for the 2km PMDs defined in Clause 182.
Yes: 50
No: 6

Straw poll TF-5 (direction)
I support setting the TDECQ and TECQ maximum values to 3.4 dB each for the 2km PMDs defined in Clause 183.
Yes: 49
No: 6

Per straw poll TF-3 there was consensus to leave the SER value for the 2km PMDs defined in clauses 182 and 183.

Implement the DR1-2 values in the proposed column of slide 10 of dudek_01 for all the PMDs defined in clause 182 with the exception of OMAouter of each aggressor lane to be addressed in another comment.

Implement the FR4 values in the proposed column of slide 10 of dudek_01 for 800GBASE-FR4.

With editorial license.

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.7.1**   *P* **480**   *L* **34**   # 147

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *TDECQ*

The value of TDECQ for FR4 is TBD.   Other specifications are related to this.   Having a value that can be confirmed later moves the project forward. A presentation in support of this comment will be provided.

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 183-6 ChangeTDECQ(max) TBD to 3.4dB. Also Change TECQ(max) to 3.4dB, and the inequality in the conditions on page480 line 29 from TBD to 3.4dB.   TDECQ-TECQ to 2.5dB, Stessed eye closure in table 183-7 to 3.4dB and stressed receiver sensitivity to -1.2dBm. In table 183-8 change the allocation for penalties to 3.9dB and the Power budget (for max TDECQ) to 7.9dB.   Delete the editor's notes on page 481 line 35 and page 483 line 26.   Add an editor's note below table 183-6 "Editor's note (to be removed by D2.0): The maximum value of TDECQ is 3.4 dB. This maximum value and related specifications may need adjustment if receivers have trouble with this value of TECQ calculated with the higher value of SER used in this clause. Further study of this area is encouraged.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #146.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **147**   Page 25 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **174A**   *SC* **174A.8**   *P***645**   *L***9**   # 152

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Error ratio budget*

The BER allocated per sublayer in the 200G C2C is 0.08e-4. However the allocation for the 100G or lower C2C AUI that can be part of the Phy is 0.1e-4.

SuggestedRemedy

Either change the allocation for the C2C AUI's to 0.1e-4 reducing the PMD allocation to 2.24e-4 for the optical PHYs and 2.72e-4 for the electrical PHYs and change the BER added in the optical clauses to 6.8e-5 for PMA to PMA and 3.4e-5 for the measurements at the PCS or Add a footnote to the use of clauses 120B and 120D and 120F in Table 180-1 and the equivalent tables in the other PMD clauses (178,179, 181,etc) Stating. "Useable without restriction in extenders. If 120B, 120D or 120F C2C links are used in the main link the DER0 used in the common calculation for the channel is reduced from 1e-5 to 0.67e-5.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the following with editorial license.

In the tables that define the sublayers that may be used for a PHY, e.g., Table 180-1 for all 200G PMD clauses, add a footnote to the use of clauses 120B, 120D, and 120F stating (with some rewording)...

"If 120B, 120D, or 120F C2C AUI are used in a PHY which also uses a C2M AUI as defined in Annex 176D, the DER0 used in the COM calculation for the channel is reduced from 1e-5 to 0.67e-5."

The editorial team is encouraged to consider other ways to implement this that does not proliferate a large number of footnotes.

[Editor's note: CC: many]

Cl **176C**   *SC* **176C.2**   *P***678**   *L***11**   # 153

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Figure 176D-2 is still confusing. The boxes around what are called components don't include the package, which is part of what is being called a component in the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from "C2C component transmitter" and "C2C component receiver" to "C2C transmitter" and "C2C receiver" or "C2C transmitter device" and "C2C receiver device" or less preferred "C2C transmit function" and "C2C receive function" (as used in figure 178-2)

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the text to "C2C transmitter' and 'C2C receiver'.

Cl **176C**   *SC* **176C.4.3.1**   *P***681**   *L***18**   # 154

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

The only references to a PMA management function in 802.3dj are in clause 186 which isn't relevant to this AUI interface. The correct control function to be used for this C2C interface is the same as the one used in Clauses 178 and 179. The reference to the description is blank.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence. "The transmitter output may be manipulated using the control function or PMA management
interface as described in ."
Add a new paragraph "The transmitter output may be manipulated using the Type E1 Inter Sublayer link training function as described in Annex 178B.10

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **154**   Page 26 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.6**   *P* **703**   *L* **10**   # 156

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *single-ended tolerance*

Having a single-ended voltage tolerance range of -0.4 to 3.3V and a DC common-mode tolerance range of only -0.05 to 1.05V seems incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the single ended voltage tolerance range to -0.4 to 1.4V

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **179A**   *SC* **179A.4**   *P* **774**   *L* **12**   # 161

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

TP5 should be TP5d in Table 179A-1 as stated in the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change TP5 to TP5d

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.1**   *P* **314**   *L* **36**   # 163

Dudek, Mike   Marvell

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *50 or 100 ppm*

The optional clause 120PMA is allowed to operate with a 100ppm clock frequency tolerance whereas the tolerance for the normative clause 176 PMA is only 50ppm.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a footnote to the clause 120PMA stating.   "Usable within an extender without restriction.   If used between PCSs the transmitter frequency tolerance is reduced to <=50ppm   Add the same footnote to all the equivalent tables in the other clauses.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The intent of the suggested remedy is to restrict the signaling frequency range of the transmitter.

With editorial license, implement the suggested remedy or an equivalent statement, with alignment to the response to comment #152, for this table and corresponding tables in all PMD clauses.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.213b**   *P* **90**   *L* **51**   # 164

He, Xiang   Huawei

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Add MDIO register for newly added "align_status" variable, see 177.4.1 and 177.11. It might be confusing to put it in 45.2.1.213b since the registers now in the table are for Inner FEC receive direction. We could

SuggestedRemedy

In 45.2.1.213b, add a new row above "Inner FEC lock 7" for the "align_status" in 177.4.1 and 177.11:
Bit(s) / Name / Description / R/W
1.2401.8 / align_status / alignment marker lock status for Inner FEC transmit direction / RO
And change "1.2401.15:8" to "1.2401.15:9" in the first row.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
There need to be bits for all 8 FEC lanes so use bits 1.2401.15 to 1.2401.8 for "Inner FEC alignment".

Add new bit definitions of the form: "1.2401.8 / Inner FEC alignment 0 / 1 = lane 0 is aligned / RO" etc.

Implement with editorial license.

Cl **171**   *SC* **171.1.1**   *P* **177**   *L* **9**   # 166

Huber, Thomas   Nokia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

The "can be" was changed to "may be" in D1.2, but the corresponding statement for 800G at the bottom of the preceding page is still "can be", making the wording inconsistent between the two rates.

SuggestedRemedy

Other similar extender sublayer clauses also use "can be". Change the "may be" back to "can be".

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **166**   Page 27 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.9.1**   *P***410**   *L***9**   # 170

Huber, Thomas   Nokia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

In Table 180-16, the cross-references for the PRBS31Q, PRBS13Q, and SSPRQ patterns are incorrect; PRBS13Q is defined in 120.5.11.2.1, PRBS31Q in 120.5.11.2.2, SSPRQ in 120.5.11.2.4

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the references.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license

Cl **181**   *SC* **181.9.1**   *P***434**   *L***17**   # 171

Huber, Thomas   Nokia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

In Table 181-11, the cross-references for the PRBS31Q, PRBS13Q, and SSPRQ patterns are incorrect; PRBS13Q is defined in 120.5.11.2.1, PRBS31Q in 120.5.11.2.2, SSPRQ in 120.5.11.2.4

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the references.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.9.1**   *P***463**   *L***9**   # 172

Huber, Thomas   Nokia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

In Table 182-16, the cross-references for the PRBS31Q and PRBS13Q patterns are incorrect; PRBS13Q is defined in 120.5.11.2.1, PRBS31Q in 120.5.11.2.2

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the references.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.9.1**   *P***488**   *L***9**   # 173

Huber, Thomas   Nokia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

In Table 183-12, the cross-references for the PRBS31Q, PRBS13Q, and SSPRQ patterns are incorrect; PRBS13Q is defined in 120.5.11.2.1, PRBS31Q in 120.5.11.2.2, SSPRQ in 120.5.11.2.4

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the references.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license
[matt] implement what?
[tom] fixed wording

Cl **184**   *SC* **184.4.3**   *P***500**   *L***17**   # 174

Huber, Thomas   Nokia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

pcsla[q,i] is defined both here and in the first bullet at line 21, using slightly different words.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence at line 17.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **174**   Page 28 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:54 PM

Cl **184**   *SC* **184.4.9**   *P* **505**   *L* **15**   # 175

Huber, Thomas   Nokia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Table 184-2 and Table 184-4 (in 184.4.11.1) both show the entire pilot sequence. The first table shows it as bit pairs, the second as 4-level signal values as defined by the mapping in Table 184-3. It seems unncessary to duplicate the information in both formats. The concept of the pilot sequence needs to be introduced in 184.4.9, at least up thorugh Table 184-1 with the generator polynomial and seeds. Some of the information in 184.4.11.1 is also useful to understand, ie., that the values of the pilot sequence are chosen such that they will produce symbols that use the 'outer' points of the constellation, but otherwise the information in 184.4.11.1 seems unnecessary since 184.4.11 is about mapping bit pairs to symbols, and that mapping is itself the same for all bits in the DSP frame

SuggestedRemedy

Insert this text in 184.4.9, following table 184-1:
The bit-pairs that compose the pilot sequence are shown in table 184-2. They are selected such that they will produce symbols that use the outer 16QAM constellation points, as shown in figure 184-2.

Move figure 184-7 to be above table 184-2.

Delete clause 184.4.11.1.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **187**   *SC* **187.3.1.2.1**   *P* **597**   *L* **38**   # 176

Huber, Thomas   Nokia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucketp)*

The names of the receive components were changed from X and Y to A and B in the 800GBASE-ER1 PMA

SuggestedRemedy

Change X and Y to A and B

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #421.

Cl **187**   *SC* **187.5.1**   *P* **598**   *L* **47**   # 177

Huber, Thomas   Nokia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Missing a reference to the clause where the tests and measurements for the transmitter are defined.

SuggestedRemedy

In the text ". all transmitter measurements and tests defined in are made at TP2.", insert "187.8 and 187.9" between "in" and "are"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **187**   *SC* **187.5.1**   *P* **599**   *L* **33**   # 178

Huber, Thomas   Nokia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucketp)*

In figure 187-5, the receive signals show two sets of AI and AQ

SuggestedRemedy

Change the second set of signals to BI and BQ

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #421.

Cl **187**   *SC* **187.5.2**   *P* **600**   *L* **4**   # 179

Huber, Thomas   Nokia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

The title of Table 187-2 needs to be modified - the PMD only deals with analog signals, not DP16QAM symbols. The table is indicating how those analog signals received from the PMA can be mapped to the inputs to the modulator.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the title to "Allowed analog signal to moduator input mappings"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **179**   Page 29 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **187**　　*SC* **187.5.3**　　　　*P***600**　　　*L***25**　　　# 180

Huber, Thomas　　　　　　　　　　Nokia

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*(bucketp)*

In the parenthetical text, both polarizations are being identified as A

SuggestedRemedy

Change the second AI and AQ to BI and BQ

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #421.

Cl **179C**　　*SC* **179C.3.1**　　　　*P***802**　　　*L***8**　　　# 187

D'Ambrosia, John　　　　　　Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*(bucket)*

Looks like cut / paste error
Reference to Annex 162C is incorrect for Annex 179C.3.1
Wrong PMDs are referenced

SuggestedRemedy

Correct 1st sentence to
The supplier of a protocol implementation that is claimed to conform to Annex 179C, MDIs for
200GBASE-CR1, 400GBASE-CR2, 800GBASE-CR4, and 1.6TBASE-CR8 shall complete the following protocol
implementation conformance statement (PICS) proforma.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Most of the PICS items needs to be updated.
Implement suggested remedy and update the PICS items with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **178**　　*SC* **178.9.2.1.1**　　　　*P***323**　　　*L***35**　　　# 189

Mellitz, Richard　　　　　　　　　　Samtec

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*TF IL, delay*

The insertion loss and the delay for the test fixture needs to be tightly controlled to minimize the variability. That is because there will be load variability in the measurement equipment. The idea should be to add enough loss so as not to significantly signal degrade the signal but dampen the effects of test equipment load variability.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
The insertion loss of the test fixture shall be between 4 dB and 5 dB at 53.125 GHz. With a delay between 500 and 650 ps. (based on 1.2 dB /inch and 150 ps /inch and e_r approximately 3.2)

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #65.

Cl **178**　　*SC* **178.9.2.1.1**　　　　*P***323**　　　*L***36**　　　# 190

Mellitz, Richard　　　　　　　　　　Samtec

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　　*TF ILdd*

The fixture frequency content needs to extend beyond the Nyquist rate. S-parameter measurements are required for this test fixture for ERL. This fixture is also required for s-parameter measurements when computing COM for receiver compliance. A transition time of 5 ps is used for ERL computation and is trending to around 4 ps for COM. A frequency range needs to be chosen to minimize the Gibbs Phenomena. There can be significant error due to this for ERL or COM computation. Filtering can help, however, there is still an error. Consider the data has a sinc response, the loss difference of between 53 GHz and 85 GHz with a BT filter is about 10 dB which is just about amount of filtering need to minimize this error. The loss difference between 53 GHz and 67 GHz is about 4 dB which is likely to start showing this error.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
 The magnitude of the insertion loss deviation of the test fixture shall be less than or equal to 0.2 dB from 0.05 GHz to 85 GHz. Insertion loss deviation is calculated as specified in 93A.4, where Tt is 0.005 ns, and fb and fr values are taken from Table 178–12.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #65.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **190**　　　Page 30 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.9.2.1.2**   *P* **324**   *L* **23**   # 191

Mellitz, Richard   Samtec

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *TF ERL*

Consider ERL of 7 dB maybe minimal, 10 dB may be marginal, 15 dB may be good, and about 20 dB may be very good.   Since ERL was scaled with T_r then relative amount of reflection from the test fixture should be the same as in 803.3ck.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
The ERL at TP0v shall be greater than or equal to 15 dB.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #66.

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.9.2.1.2**   *P* **324**   *L* **17**   # 192

Mellitz, Richard   Samtec

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *TF Nbx*

N_bx in the Table 187A-7 should be 0 so test fixture will not interfere with measurement as in IEEE802.3ck.

SuggestedRemedy

Relace with the row 5 with:
Equalizer length associated with reflection signal: N_bx : 0

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The following straw poll was taken.
Straw poll #TF-2 (decision)
For N_bx of a test fixture in 178.9.2.1.2, I support:
A: 16
B: 0
A: 19 B: 33

In Table 178-7, change the value of N_bx from 16 to 0.

Cl **178**   *SC* **178.9.2.1.3**   *P* **324**   *L* **33**   # 193

Mellitz, Richard   Samtec

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *TF skew*

CD or DC are better quality indictor of line the quality of line imbalance because it will catch skew and should augment CC.

SuggestedRemedy

Add section:
 178.9.2.1.x Test fixture differential-mode to common-mode return loss
The differential-mode to common-mode return loss of the test fixture at either port shall be less than or than or equal to 10 dB at all frequencies between 0.2 GHz and 85 GHz.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The comment does not provide sufficient justification to support the suggested remedy.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.1**   *P* **696**   *L* **14**   # 195

Li, Tobey   MediaTek

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

Typo in "400 Gb/s two-lane Attachment Unit Interface (200GAUI-2 C2M)"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "200GAUI-2 C2M" to "400GAUI-2 C2M".

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.1**   *P* **696**   *L* **44**   # 196

Li, Tobey   MediaTek

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

Figure 176D-1,
200GAUI-1 shall be 200 Gb/s 1-LANE ATTACHMENT UNIT INTERFACE.
400GMII shall be 400 Gb/s MEDIA INDEPENDENT INTERFACE

SuggestedRemedy

Line 44, change "200GAUI-1 = 100 Gb/s 1-LANE ATTACHMENT UNIT INTERFACE" to "200GAUI-1 = 200 Gb/s 1-LANE ATTACHMENT UNIT INTERFACE"
Line 47, change "400GMII = 200 Gb/s MEDIA INDEPENDENT INTERFACE" to "400GMII = 400 Gb/s MEDIA INDEPENDENT INTERFACE"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **196**   Page 31 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **178A**   *SC* **178A.1.4.3**   *P* **727**   *L* **42**   # 197
Li, Tobey   MediaTek
Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*
Shaunt capacitance is defined in 93A.1.2.2
SuggestedRemedy
Change the reference of shunt capacitor C1 from 93A.1.2.2a to 93A.1.2.2
Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **178A**   *SC* **178A.1.6**   *P* **728**   *L* **24**   # 198
Li, Tobey   MediaTek
Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*
Transmitter equalizer is defined in 178A.1.6.1
SuggestedRemedy
Change the reference to transmitter equalizer transfer function from 178A.1.2 to 178A.1.6.1
Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.9.1**   *P* **463**   *L* **32**   # 199
Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi
Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*
In Table 182-17... The last pattern listed is "valid 200GBASE-R, 400GBASE-R, 800GBASE-R or 1.6TBASE-R signal". But this is not correct. It should be encoded by the Inner FEC, similar to test pattern 5. Given we repeated refer to this valid BASE-R signal, why not just define it as a test pattern.
SuggestedRemedy
In Table 182-16 add a new test pattern as follows:
Pattern: 7
Pattern description: "Valid 200GBASE-R, 400GBASE-R, 800GBASE-R, or 1.6TBASE-R signal encoded by the 200GBASE-R, 400GBASE-R, 800GBASE-R, or 1.6TBASE-R Inner FEC.
In Table 182-17 replace "valid 200GBASE-R, 400GBASE-R, 800GBASE-R or 1.6TBASE-R signal" with "7".
Similarly update Table 183-12 and Tabley 183-13.
Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license

Cl **186**   *SC* **186.3.1.3**   *P* **565**   *L* **47**   # 203
Brown, Matt   Alphawave Semi
Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*
Now that the receive signal names are sufficiently unique compared to the transmit signal names AND it is already explained in 187.5.3, the note at the bottom of Figure 186-11 is no longer required.
SuggestedRemedy
Delete the note at the bottom of Figure 186-11.
Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.
[Editor's note: Changed the Clause/Subclause from 00/0 to 186/186.3.1.3]

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4.9**   *P* **364**   *L* **4**   # 204
Healey, Adam   Broadcom Inc.
Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*
Equation (179-9) and Figure 179-4 do not agree.
SuggestedRemedy
In Equation (179-9), change "4 <= f < 40" to "4 <= f < 44".
Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The intended equation was with a breaking point at 44 GHz as written in the suggested remedy, consistent with the test fixture specifications.
Implement the suggested remedy and additionally change "40 <= f <= 60" to "44 <= f <= 60".

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4.10**   *P* **364**   *L* **46**   # 205
Healey, Adam   Broadcom Inc.
Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*
Equation (179-10) and Figure 179-5 do not agree.
SuggestedRemedy
In Equation (179-10), change "6(f-12.89)/(35-12.89)" to "5(f-12.89)/(35-12.89)". Make the same change to Equation (179-20).
Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **205**   Page 32 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **176D**　　*SC* **176D.5.3**　　　　*P* **700**　　*L* **50**　　# 211

Rysin, Alexander　　　　　　　　　NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*Jitter*

J3u and JRMS measurements at TP1a are highly affected by the effects of slew rate and noise and do not reflect actual uncorrelated jitter. These effects are exacerbated by the characteristics of practical channels between TP0d and TP1a - loss and reflections, and are highly dependent on the transmitted signal amplitude. Accounting only for the faster edges does not work for practical channels at 106.25 Gbd rate and the currently proposed numbers cannot be met (and sometimes cannot be measured) even with commercial test equipment PPG. The issue was demonstrated in rysin_3dj_01a_2407.

SuggestedRemedy

Other method of uncorrelated jitter measurement should be considered.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #213.

Cl **176D**　　*SC* **176D.5.4**　　　　*P* **701**　　*L* **47**　　# 212

Rysin, Alexander　　　　　　　　　NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*Jitter*

J4u and JRMS measurements at TP4 are highly affected by the effects of slew rate and noise and do not reflect actual uncorrelated jitter. These effects are exacerbated by the characteristics of practical test fixtures - loss and reflections, and are highly dependent on the transmitted signal amplitude. Accounting only for the faster edges does not work for practical channels at 106.25 Gbd rate. The issue was demonstrated in rysin_3dj_01a_2407.

SuggestedRemedy

Other method of uncorrelated jitter measurement should be considered.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #213.

Cl **179**　　*SC* **179.9.4**　　　　*P* **357**　　*L* **22**　　# 213

Rysin, Alexander　　　　　　　　　NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*Jitter*

J3u and JRMS measurements at TP2 are highly affected by the effects of slew rate and noise and do not reflect actual uncorrelated jitter. These effects are exacerbated by the characteristics of practical channels between TP0d and TP2 - loss and reflections, and are highly dependent on the transmitted signal amplitude. Accounting only for the faster edges does not work for practical channels at 106.25 Gbd rate and the currently proposed numbers cannot be met (and sometimes cannot be measured) even with commercial test equipment PPG. The issue was demonstrated in rysin_3dj_01a_2407.

SuggestedRemedy

Other method of uncorrelated jitter measurement should be considered.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The referenced presentation is
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_07/rysin_3dj_01a_2407.pdf.

The CRG reviewed slide 25 of
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_01a_2411.pdf, and the contribution
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_06a_2411.pdf.

There was consensus on items 1 and 3 of the proposal on slide 7 of ran_3dj_06a_2411. There was a concern about turning off circuits in the lanes not under test. This may be addressed by an informative NOTE.
The commenter agreed to remove item 2. Further work on the related change is encouraged.

Implement items 1 and 3 of slide 7 of ran_3dj_06a_2411, with editorial license, for clauses 178 and 179, and annexes 176C and 176D.

Cl **180**　　*SC* **180.8.3.1.1**　　　　*P* **406**　　*L* **2**　　# 220

Johnson, John　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*(editorial)*

MDI nomenclature is inconsistent with Annex 180A here, as well as in 180.8.3.1.2 and 180.8.3.1.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "MDI pin" to "MDI position" in the text and tables to be consistent with nomenclature used in Annex 180A.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **220**

Page 33 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **180**	*SC* **180.9.5.1**	*P* **413**	*L* **20**	#	221

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

The nomencalture of footnote (c) in Table 180-19 should match the nomenclature in Table 180-7.

SuggestedRemedy

Change footnote (c) to read: "The optical return loss tolerance (max) from Table 180-7 is applied at TP2." as in footnote (c) of Table 182-19.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **181**	*SC* **181.7.2**	*P* **429**	*L* **27**	#	222

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

In "lanec", footnote "c" should be superscripted

SuggestedRemedy

Make "c" superscripted.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **182**	*SC* **182.8.3.1.1**	*P* **459**	*L* **25**	#	223

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

MDI nomenclature is inconsistent with Annex 180A here, as well as in 182.8.3.1.2 and 182.8.3.1.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "MDI pin" to "MDI position" in the text and tables to be consistent with nomenclature used in Annex 180A.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **183**	*SC* **183.9.5.1**	*P* **491**	*L* **4**	#	224

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

If no informative Annex is planned in D1.3, remove the reference in footnote (a)

SuggestedRemedy

Make footnote (a) consistent with other PMD clauses. Remove the phrase, "and the optical channel characteristics methodology described in Annex TBD".

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **185A**	*SC* **185A.2.2**	*P* **814**	*L* **51**	#	225

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

grammar: "comprises of"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "comprises of" to "comprises"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **185A**	*SC* **185A.2.2.1**	*P* **815**	*L* **15**	#	226

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

The text suggests that the residual spec values are given in Table 185A-2, but only the parameters are in this table. The specs are given in tables in the PMD clauses.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword this sentence along the lines of, "Post-calibration residual parameters for the calibrated coherent detector front-end are listed in Table 185A-2. The values assigned to these parameters are defined by the Physical Layer specification that invokes the method."

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **226**

Page 34 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **180**	*SC* **180.7.1**	*P* **399**	*L* **48**	#	227

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tx optical parameter*

Transmitter power excursion (max) is TBD in Table 180-7 for all DRn PMDs

SuggestedRemedy

In existing 100G PHYs from P803.2cu, TPE(max) was chosen to give approximately 8% reduction in overshoot at OMA(max), i.e. maximum allowable OS is reduced from 22% at low OMA to ~ 14% at OMA(max).
Change TBD to 2.3 dB in Table 180-7. This results in OS at OMA(max) = 14.6%, consistent with 100G PHYs.
A supporting presentation will be submitted for the Nov plenary.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Supporting presentation johnson_01
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/johnson_3dj_01a_2411.pdf
was heard by the CRG.

Change TPEmax from TBD to 2.3dBm per slide 4.

Cl **180**	*SC* **180.7.2**	*P* **401**	*L* **29**	#	228

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Rx optical parameter*

The value of Stressed receiver sensitivity (max) is nominally given by the minimum TX OMA at TDECQ(max), minus the maximum channel insertion loss and MPI+DGD penalties. Because the fibers in a DRn PHY (n>1) without breakout share the same parallel fiber cabling and connectors, the Aggressor lanes for SRS testing should be considered to have the same insertion loss as the lane under test.

SuggestedRemedy

For DRn PHYs in Table 180-8, change the value of OMAouter of each aggressor lane from 2.9 dBm to 0.9 dBm, which is equal to 4dBm TX OMA(max), minus 3dB max insertion loss, minus 0.1dB MPI+DGD penalty.
To cover the case of breakout, add text to footnote (e), "If the device is being used to breakout lower line rate PMDs as described in Annex 180A, OMAouter of each aggressor lane should be equal to the value of Outer Optical Modulation Amplitude (OMAouter), each lane (max) given in Table 180-7."
A supporting presentation will be submitted for the Nov plenary.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Supporting presentation johnson_01a
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/johnson_3dj_01a_2411.pdf
was heard by the CRG.

Straw poll O-1

I support

A: Using TX OMA max as the value of the aggressor OMAmax for parallel fiber PMDs which assumes maximum aggressor difference including maximum difference in insertion loss.
B: Using the alternate values in johnson_01a which assumes that the aggressors and the lane under test have the same insertion loss except in the case of breakout as noted in the footnote.

A: 17
B: 11

Change the Aggressor OMA (dBm) value to 4.2.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **228**   Page 35 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **180** *SC* **180.9.5.1** *P***413** *L***12** # 229

Johnson, John Broadcom

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

PMD types in Table 180-19 are wrong

SuggestedRemedy

Change PMD types from DRn-2 to DRn in Table 180-19

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement with editorial license

Cl **181** *SC* **181.7.1** *P***427** *L***31** # 230

Johnson, John Broadcom

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Tx optical parameter*

Transmitter power excursion (max) is TBD in Table 181-5 for 800GBASE-FR4-500

SuggestedRemedy

In existing 100G PHYs from P803.2cu, TPE(max) was chosen to give approximately 8% reduction in overshoot at OMA(max), i.e. maximum allowable OS is reduced from 22% at low OMA to ~ 14% at OMA(max).
Change TBD to 2.9 dB in Table 181-5. This results in OS at OMA(max) = 14.6%, consistent with 100G PHYs.
A supporting presentation will be submitted for the Nov plenary.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Supporting presentation johnson_01
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/johnson_3dj_01a_2411.pdf
was heard by the CRG.

Change TPEmax from TBD to 2.9dBm per slide 4.

Cl **181** *SC* **181.7.2** *P***429** *L***32** # 231

Johnson, John Broadcom

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Rx optical parameter*

In 100G/L FR4 and LR4 PHYs, OMAouter of each aggressor lane is equal to the Stressed receiver sensitivity (OMAouter) plus the Difference in receive power between any two lanes (OMAouter) (max), within ±0.1dB. The same methodology should be applied to 800GBASE-FR4-500.

SuggestedRemedy

For 800GBASE-FR4-500 in Table 181-6, change the value of OMAouter of each aggressor lane from 1.9 dBm to 3.4 dBm, which is equal to -0.7 dBm SRS(max) plus 4.1 dB maximum difference in receive power between lanes.
A supporting presentation will be submitted for the Nov plenary.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Supporting presentation johnson_01a
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/johnson_3dj_01a_2411.pdf
was heard by the CRG.

Change the Aggressor OMA (dBm) value to 1.3.

Cl **182** *SC* **182.7.1** *P***452** *L***50** # 233

Johnson, John Broadcom

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Tx optical parameter*

Transmitter power excursion (max) is 2 dB in Table 182-7 for all DRn-2 PMDs. This value results in overshoot at OMA(max) being restricted to only 10.3%, which is less than existing 100G PHYs.

SuggestedRemedy

In existing 100G PHYs from P803.2cu, TPE(max) was chosen to give approximately 8% reduction in overshoot at OMA(max), i.e. maximum allowable OS is reduced from 22% at low OMA to ~ 14% at OMA(max).
Change 2 dB to 2.3 dB in Table 182-7. This results in OS at OMA(max) = 14.6%, consistent with 100G PHYs.
A supporting presentation will be submitted for the Nov plenary.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Supporting presentation johnson_01
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/johnson_3dj_01a_2411.pdf
was heard by the CRG.

Change TPEmax from 2 to 2.3dBm per slide 4.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **233**

Page 36 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.7.2**   *P* **454**   *L* **29**   # 234

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Rx optical parameter*

The value of Stressed receiver sensitivity (max) is nominally given by the minimum TX OMA at TDECQ(max), minus the maximum channel insertion loss and MPI+DGD penalties. Because the fibers in a DRn-2 PHY (n>1) without breakout share the same parallel fiber cabling and connectors, the Aggressor lanes for SRS testing should be considered to have the same insertion loss as the lane under test.

SuggestedRemedy

For DRn-2 PHYs in Table 182-8, change the value of OMAouter of each aggressor lane from TBD to -0.2 dBm, which is equal to 4.2 dBm TX OMA(max), minus 4 dB max insertion loss, minus 0.4dB MPI+DGD penalty.
To cover the case of breakout, add text to footnote (e), "If the device is being used to breakout lower line rate PMDs as described in Annex 180A, OMAouter of each aggressor lane should be equal to the value of Outer Optical Modulation Amplitude (OMAouter), each lane (max) given in Table 182-7."
A supporting presentation will be submitted for the Nov plenary.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Supporting presentation johnson_01a
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/johnson_3dj_01a_2411.pdf
was heard by the CRG.

Change the Aggressor OMA (dBm) value to 4.2.

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.7.2**   *P* **454**   *L* **35**   # 235

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

The requirement of no aggressors for 200G-DR1-2 only applies to single lane devices. If a DR1-2 PMD shares a multi-lane device with other DRn-2 PMDs, then the aggressor lanes must be used.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Table 182-8 footnote (e) to read: "No aggressors needed for 200GBASE-DR1-2 in a single lane device." as in footnote (e) of Table 180-8.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.7.1**   *P* **480**   *L* **41**   # 236

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tx optical parameter*

Transmitter power excursion (max) is 3.1 dB in Table 183-7 for 800GBASE-LR4. This value results in overshoot at OMA(max) being restricted to only 5%, which is less than existing 100G PHYs.

SuggestedRemedy

In existing 100G PHYs from P803.2cu, TPE(max) was chosen to give approximately 8% reduction in overshoot at OMA(max), i.e. maximum allowable OS is reduced from 22% at low OMA to ~ 14% at OMA(max).
Change 3.1 dB to 3.8 dB in Table 183-7. This results in OS at OMA(max) = 14.6%, consistent with 100G PHYs.
A supporting presentation will be submitted for the Nov plenary.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Supporting presentation johnson_01
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/johnson_3dj_01a_2411.pdf
was heard by the CRG.

Change TPEmax from 3.1 to 3.8dBm per slide 4.

Cl **185**   *SC* **185.6.2**   *P* **532**   *L* **34**   # 239

Johnson, John   Broadcom

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

ETCC inequality is pointing the wrong way

SuggestedRemedy

Change condition to read: "for 1 < ETCC <= 3.4 dB"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **239**   Page 37 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **176**   *SC* **176.3**   *P* **258**   *L* **34**   # 248

Shrikhande, Kapil   Marvell

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

In Table 176-6, when the sublayer above the PMA is a PCS, there is no PMA:IS_SIGNAL.request input (no PCS drives this signal). The table does not cover the common case of an m:n PMA with a PCS above.

SuggestedRemedy

Add two additional rows to the table with N/A in the left most column (no input value), and determine the output value of inst:IS_SIGNAL.request SIGNAL_OK signal depending only on the value of the align_status_mux variable. Alternative would be to have the PCS drive a signal to the PMA.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement using response to comment #56.

Cl **176**   *SC* **176.3**   *P* **258**   *L* **26**   # 249

Shrikhande, Kapil   Marvell

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

The subclause is about the service interface below the PMA. Therefore, the PMA:IS_SIGNAL.indication primitive should be inst:IS_SIGNAL.indication, and the PMA:IS_SIGNAL.request primitive should be inst:IS_SIGNAL.request.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace PMA with inst as outlined in the comment.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **181**   *SC* **181.2**   *P* **421**   *L* **45**   # 256

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *TDECQ KER*

Direct block error measurement requrie Golden HW receiver that may not exist and even then may introduce its own set of block erros.

SuggestedRemedy

Instead the recommendation is to measure block TDECQ where block TDECQ is by capturing 10x the SSPRQ waveform and only using worst 10% of block data for "Block TDECQ" limit. When all the blocks data are used the reporting value would be "Average TDECQ". Initial conversation with Oscope supplier is that this measurement is feasible and we won't need to change any limit or introduce any new test limit. The current average TDECQ will be changed to "Block TDECQ". See Ghiasi_3dJ_02_2411

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #259

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.2**   *P* **474**   *L* **45**   # 257

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *TDECQ KER*

Direct block error measurement requrie Golden HW receiver that may not exist and even then may introduce its own set of block erros.

SuggestedRemedy

Instead the recommendation is to measure block TDECQ where block TDECQ is by capturing 10x the SSPRQ waveform and only using worst 10% of block data for "Block TDECQ" limit. When all the blocks data are used the reporting value would be "Average TDECQ". Initial conversation with Oscope supplier is that this measurement is feasible and we won't need to change any limit or introduce any new test limit. The current average TDECQ will be changed to "Block TDECQ". See Ghiasi_3dJ_02_2411

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #259.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **257**   Page 38 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.2**   *P* **446**   *L* **46**   # 258

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *TDECQ KER*

Direct block error measurement requrie Golden HW receiver that may not exist and even then may introduce its own set of block erros.

SuggestedRemedy

Instead the recommendation is to measure block TDECQ where block TDECQ is by capturing 10x the SSPRQ waveform and only using worst 10% of block data for "Block TDECQ" limit. When all the blocks data are used the reporting value would be "Average TDECQ". Initial conversation with Oscope supplier is that this measurement is feasible and we won't need to change any limit or introduce any new test limit. The current average TDECQ will be changed to "Block TDECQ". See Ghiasi_3dJ_02_2411

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #259

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.2**   *P* **393**   *L* **45**   # 259

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *TDECQ KER*

Direct block error measurement requrie Golden HW receiver that may not exist and even then may introduce its own set of block erros.

SuggestedRemedy

Instead the recommendation is to measure block TDECQ where block TDECQ is by capturing 10x the SSPRQ waveform and only using worst 10% of block data for "Block TDECQ" limit. When all the blocks data are used the reporting value would be "Average TDECQ". Initial conversation with Oscope supplier is that this measurement is feasible and we won't need to change any limit or introduce any new test limit. The current average TDECQ will be changed to "Block TDECQ". See Ghiasi_3dJ_02_2411

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The following contribution was reviewed by the CRG.
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ghiasi_3dj_02_2411.pdf

The commenter is encouraged develop this further and review at future ad hoc meetings.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes at this time.

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.9.5**   *P* **376**   *L* **22**   # 260

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *TDECQ*

With concern rasied regarding block errors and if TDECQ captures jitter, need additional condition in the TDECQ setup to make sure TDECQ is representative of worst case operation

SuggestedRemedy

If the PMD under test has an optional AUI (C2M) the TDECQ is measured with the module in mission mode with the clock driving SSPRQ recovered from the AUI input. The AUI is operating with PRBS31Q pattern and worst case interference tolerance applied, see https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_09/ghiasi_3dj_01a_2409.pdf

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The proposed remedy is not sufficiently detailed to implement to the satisfaction of the commenter.

Cl **181**   *SC* **181.9.5**   *P* **436**   *L* **22**   # 261

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *TDECQ*

With concern rasied regarding block errors and if TDECQ captures jitter, need additional condition in the TDECQ setup to make sure TDECQ is representative of worst case operation

SuggestedRemedy

If the PMD under test has an optional AUI (C2M) the TDECQ is measured with the module in mission mode with the clock driving SSPRQ recovered from the AUI input. The AUI is operating with PRBS31Q pattern and worst case interference tolerance applied, see https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_09/ghiasi_3dj_01a_2409.pdf

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #260.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **261**   Page 39 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **182**　　*SC* **182.9.5**　　　　*P* **465**　　　*L* **22**　　　# 263

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **R**　　　　　*TDECQ*

With concern rasied regarding block errors and if TDECQ captures jitter, need additional condition in the TDECQ setup to make sure TDECQ is representative of worst case operation

SuggestedRemedy

If the PMD under test has an optional AUI (C2M) the TDECQ is measured with the module in mission mode with the clock driving SSPRQ recovered from the AUI input. The AUI is operating with PRBS31Q pattern and worst case interference tolerance applied, see https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_09/ghiasi_3dj_01a_2409.pdf

Response　　　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #260

Cl **183**　　*SC* **183.9.5**　　　　*P* **490**　　　*L* **3**　　　# 264

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **R**　　　　　*TDECQ*

With concern rasied regarding block errors and if TDECQ captures jitter, need additional condition in the TDECQ setup to make sure TDECQ is representative of worst case operation

SuggestedRemedy

If the PMD under test has an optional AUI (C2M) the TDECQ is measured with the module in mission mode with the clock driving SSPRQ recovered from the AUI input. The AUI is operating with PRBS31Q pattern and worst case interference tolerance applied, see https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_09/ghiasi_3dj_01a_2409.pdf

Response　　　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #260.

Cl **180**　　*SC* **180.9.5**　　　　*P* **412**　　　*L* **33**　　　# 265

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*Tap weights*

Maximum equalizer pre-cursors equal 3 also implies that we could have 0, 1, or 2 pre-cursors

SuggestedRemedy

Given the intention that equalizer doesn't float repalce "Maximum equalizer pre-cursors" with "Number of equalizer pre-cursors tap" and put 3 also in the min or create table with min-value-max. Make post taps i explicit 3 to 11. Feedforward equalizer length should be listed under Value col as 15, this is not a max as there is no Min!

Response　　　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In Table 180-18 change Feed-forward equalizer (FFE) length to only list one value of 15. Move the Maximum and Minimum column headings below this row.

IN the second row change "Maximum equalizer pre-cursors" to "Number of equalizer pre-cursor taps".

With editorial license.

[Editor's note: changed clause from 181 to 180 and subclause from 181.9.5 to 180.9.5]

Cl **181**　　*SC* **181.9.5**　　　　*P* **436**　　　*L* **33**　　　# 266

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*Tap weights*

Maximum equalizer pre-cursors equal 3 also implies that we could have 0, 1, or 2 pre-cursors

SuggestedRemedy

Given the intention that equalizer doesn't float repalce "Maximum equalizer pre-cursors" with "Number of equalizer pre-cursors tap" and put 3 also in the min or create table with min-value-max. Make post taps i explicit 3 to 11. Feedforward equalizer length should be listed under Value col as 15, this is not a max as there is no Min!

Response　　　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #265
[Editor's note: changed clause from 182 to 181 and subclause from 182.9.5 to 181.9.5]

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general　　　　　*Comment ID* **266**　　Page 40 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn　　11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.9.5**   *P* **490**   *L* **23**   # 267

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tap weights*

Maximum equalizer pre-cursors equal 3 also implies that we could have 0, 1, or 2 pre-cursors

SuggestedRemedy

Given the intention that equalizer doesn't float repalce "Maximum equalizer pre-cursors" with "Number of equalizer pre-cursors tap" and put 3 also in the min or create table with min-value-max. Make post taps i explicit 3 to 11. Feedforward equalizer length should be listed under Value col as 15, this is not a max as there is no Min!

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #265

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.9.5**   *P* **412**   *L* **35**   # 268

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit $C(-1)=0.05$ is too restricted

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase $C(-1)$ positive limit to +0.1 from 0.05, see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The CRG reviewed ghiasi_01
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ghiasi_3dj_01_2411.pdf

Expand Table 180-18 to $C(-3)$ to $i(>=7)$ and incorporate the proposed FFE values on slide 9.

With editorial license.

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.9.5**   *P* **412**   *L* **36**   # 269

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit $C(-2)=0.2$ is too restricted given that we have $C(-1)=0.5$, to correct for $C(-1)=-0.5$ $C(-2)$ can be as large as 0.25

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase $C(-2)$ positive limit to +0.25 from 0.2, see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.9.5**   *P* **412**   *L* **37**   # 270

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit $C(1)=0.05$ is too restricted in cases of fast transmitter ability to use positive tap can be very beneficial

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase $C(1)$ positive limit to +0.2 from 0.05 helpful on fast transmitters to reduce the BW and noise see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.9.5**   *P* **412**   *L* **39**   # 271

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit $C(2)=-0.1$ and $C(2)=0.2$ is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase $C(2)$ positive limit to +0.3 from 0.2 given that $C(-1)=-0.6$ the follow on tap can be as much as prior tap weight. $C(2)$ negative limit ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 data show can be as large as 0.129, recomending to increase $C(2)$ negative limit from -0.1 to -0.2.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **271**   Page 41 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **180**　　*SC* **180.9.5**　　　*P* **412**　　*L* **39**　　# 272

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps negative limit C(3)=-0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(3) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(3) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 data show can be as large as 0.129

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **180**　　*SC* **180.9.5**　　　*P* **412**　　*L* **39**　　# 273

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(4)=0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(4) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(4) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 with some taps exceeding 0.1

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **180**　　*SC* **180.9.5**　　　*P* **412**　　*L* **39**　　# 274

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps negative limit C(5)=-0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase 5(4) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(5) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 with some taps exceeding -0.1

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **181**　　*SC* **181.9.5**　　　*P* **436**　　*L* **35**　　# 275

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(-1)=0.05 is too restricted

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(-1) positive limit to +0.1 from 0.05, see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **181**　　*SC* **181.9.5**　　　*P* **436**　　*L* **36**　　# 276

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(-2)=0.2 is too restricted given that we have C(-1)=0.5, to correct for C(-1)=-0.5 C(-2) can be as large as 0.25

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(-2) positive limit to +0.25 from 0.2, see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **181**　　*SC* **181.9.5**　　　*P* **436**　　*L* **37**　　# 277

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(1)=0.05 is too restricted in cases of fast transmitter ability to use positive tap can be very beneficial

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(1) positive limit to +0.2 from 0.05 helpful on fast transmitters to reduce the BW and noise see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general　　　　　*Comment ID* **277**　　Page 42 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn　　　　　11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **181**   *SC* **181.9.5**   *P* **436**   *L* **39**   # 278

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(2)=-0.1 and C(2)=0.2 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(2) positive limit to +0.3 from 0.2 given that C(-1)=-0.6 the follow on tap can be as much as prior tap weight. C(2) negative limit ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 data show can be as large as 0.129, recomending to increase C(2) negative limit from -0.1 to -0.2.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **181**   *SC* **181.9.5**   *P* **436**   *L* **39**   # 279

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps negative limit C(3)=-0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(3) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(3) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 data show can be as large as 0.129

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **181**   *SC* **181.9.5**   *P* **436**   *L* **39**   # 280

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(4)=0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(4) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(4) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 with some taps exceeding 0.1

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **181**   *SC* **181.9.5**   *P* **436**   *L* **39**   # 281

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps negative limit C(5)=-0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase 5(4) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(5) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 with some taps exceeding -0.1

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.9.5**   *P* **465**   *L* **35**   # 282

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(-1)=0.05 is too restricted

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(-1) positive limit to +0.1 from 0.05, see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.9.5**   *P* **465**   *L* **36**   # 283

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(-2)=0.2 is too restricted given that we have C(-1)=0.5, to correct for C(-1)=-0.5 C(-2) can be as large as 0.25

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(-2) positive limit to +0.25 from 0.2, see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **283**   Page 43 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **182** *SC* **182.9.5** *P* **465** *L* **37** # 284

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(1)=0.05 is too restricted in cases of fast transmitter ability to use positive tap can be very beneficial

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(1) positive limit to +0.2 from 0.05 helpful on fast transmitters to reduce the BW and noise see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **182** *SC* **182.9.5** *P* **465** *L* **39** # 285

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(2)=-0.1 and C(2)=0.2 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(2) positive limit to +0.3 from 0.2 given that C(-1)=-0.6 the follow on tap can be as much as prior tap weight. C(2) negative limit ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 data show can be as large as 0.129, recomending to increase C(2) negative limit from -0.1 to -0.2.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **182** *SC* **182.9.5** *P* **465** *L* **39** # 286

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps negative limit C(3)=-0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(3) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(3) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 data show can be as large as 0.129

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **182** *SC* **182.9.5** *P* **465** *L* **39** # 287

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(4)=0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(4) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(4) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 with some taps exceeding 0.1

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **182** *SC* **182.9.5** *P* **465** *L* **39** # 288

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps negative limit C(5)=-0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase 5(4) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(5) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 with some taps exceeding -0.1

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

Cl **183** *SC* **183.9.5** *P* **490** *L* **35** # 289

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(-1)=0.05 is too restricted

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(-1) positive limit to +0.1 from 0.05, see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **289** Page 44 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **183**	*SC* **183.9.5**	*P* **490**	*L* **22**	# 290

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**	*Comment Status* **A**	*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(-2)=0.2 is too restricted given that we have C(-1)=0.5, to correct for C(-1)=-0.5 C(-2) can be as large as 0.25

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(-2) positive limit to +0.25 from 0.2, see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268
[Editor's note: changed clause from 181 to 183 and subclause from 181.9.5 to 183.9.5]

Cl **183**	*SC* **183.9.5**	*P* **490**	*L* **23**	# 291

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**	*Comment Status* **A**	*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(1)=0.05 is too restricted in cases of fast transmitter ability to use positive tap can be very beneficial

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(1) positive limit to +0.2 from 0.05 helpful on fast transmitters to reduce the BW and noise see ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268.
[Editor's note: changed clause from 181 to 183 and subclause from 181.9.5 to 183.9.5]

Cl **183**	*SC* **183.9.5**	*P* **490**	*L* **24**	# 292

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**	*Comment Status* **A**	*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(2)=-0.1 and C(2)=0.2 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(2) positive limit to +0.3 from 0.2 given that C(-1)=-0.6 the follow on tap can be as much as prior tap weight. C(2) negative limit ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 data show can be as large as 0.129, recomending to increase C(2) negative limit from -0.1 to -0.2.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268
[Editor's note: changed clause from 181 to 183 and subclause from 181.9.5 to 183.9.5]

Cl **183**	*SC* **183.9.5**	*P* **490**	*L* **25**	# 293

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**	*Comment Status* **A**	*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps negative limit C(3)=-0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(3) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(3) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 data show can be as large as 0.129

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268
[Editor's note: changed clause from 181 to 183 and subclause from 181.9.5 to 183.9.5]

Cl **183**	*SC* **183.9.5**	*P* **490**	*L* **26**	# 294

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**	*Comment Status* **A**	*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps positive limit C(4)=0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase C(4) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(4) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 with some taps exceeding 0.1

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #268
[Editor's note: changed clause from 181 to 183 and subclause from 181.9.5 to 183.9.5]

Cl **183**	*SC* **183.7.1**	*P* **480**	*L* **35**	# 295

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**	*Comment Status* **R**	*Tap weights*

TDECQ taps negative limit C(5)=-0.1 is too restricted and exceed limited data in the ghiasi_3dj_01_2411

SuggestedRemedy

Recomend to increase 5(4) positive limit to -0.15 from 0.1 and C(5) negative from -0.1 to -0.15 given the data in ghiasi_3dj_01_2411 with some taps exceeding -0.1

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
This comment appears to be a mistake as the referenced location has no mention of tap weights

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **295**

Page 45 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.7.1**   *P* **480**   *L* **35**   # 298

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *TDECQ*

johnson_3df_01a_221011 presentation which include both dispersion penalty for FR4 and LR4 was used to set the LR4 TDECQ limit to 3.9 dB, and given slighly lower dispersion penalty for FR4 the same presentation show dispersion penalty of 3.4 dB

SuggestedRemedy

see ghiasi_3dj_03_2411 for additional details with following limits for
TDECQ= 3.4 dB
TECQ= 3.0 dB
|TDECQ-TECQ|(max)=2.5 dB

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.9.13**   *P* **415**   *L* **28**   # 300

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

121.8.10 is the Wrong reference

SuggestedRemedy

It should be 121.8.9

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **181**   *SC* **181.9.13**   *P* **439**   *L* **8**   # 301

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

121.8.10 is the Wrong reference

SuggestedRemedy

It should be 121.8.9

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.9.13**   *P* **468**   *L* **4**   # 302

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *(bucket)*

121.8.10 is the Wrong reference

SuggestedRemedy

It should be 121.8.9

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

182.9.13 is "Stressed receiver sensitivity" and the current cross reference is to "Stressed receiver sensitivity" which is correct. The suggested remedy points to "Receiver sensitivity" which is incorrect.

Note editorial comment #300 is the same comment against 180.9.13 and will not be implemented.

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.9.13**   *P* **493**   *L* **11**   # 303

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

121.8.10 is the Wrong reference

SuggestedRemedy

It should be 121.8.9

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.7.2**   *P* **482**   *L* **31**   # 304

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Rx optical parameter*

johnson_3df_01a_221011 presentation can also be used to address TBDs for the stressed sensitivity

SuggestedRemedy

see also ghiasi_3dj_03_2411 for additional details with following limits for
Stressed receiver sensitivity (OMAouter) (max)=-3.7 dB + 2.5 dB=-1.2 dBm
Stressed eye clousure for PAM4(SECQ), each lane is the max TDECQ=3.4 dB

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #146.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **304**

Page 46 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **182**   *SC* **182.7.1**   *P***452**   *L***45**   # 306

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *TDECQ*

TDECQ, TECQ, and TDECQ-TECQ are TBD
johnson_3df_01a_221011 presentation which include both dispersion penalty for FR4 and
LR4 was used to set the LR4 TDECQ limit to 3.9 dB, the difference between the LR4 and
DR-2 links is a dispersion about 1/5 of LR4

SuggestedRemedy

see ghiasi_3dj_03_2411 for additional details with following limits for
TDECQ= 3.4 dB
TECQ= 3.0 dB
|TDECQ-TECQ|(max)=2.5 dB

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **179A**   *SC* **179A.5**   *P***698**   *L*   # 308

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Tx spec methodology*

Transmitter jitter specifications is ineffective and. Not sensitive for farend TP1a
specifications as was demonstrted by Rysin_3dj_01_2407.pdf
It makes no sense to use transmit jitter at TP1a when TP1a is actually at receiver pin, and
what receiver care about is VEO, VEC, and possibly EW.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace Ouput jitter and SNDR with, see ghiasi_01_2407
VEO=8 mV
VEC=10.7 dB
If you want jitter then we should consider adding EW.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #404.

Cl **179B**   *SC* **179B.2**   *P***778**   *L***12**   # 310

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *(bucket)*

Figure is not visiable just the labels are visiable

SuggestedRemedy

Please use an import that is visibale in pdf

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

See Editor's note: "Figure 179B-1 equations have not been adopted, and serve as
placeholders."

There is no graphic to display in Draft 1.2.

Cl **179B**   *SC* **179B.4.1**   *P***782**   *L***12**   # 311

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *(bucket)*

Figure is not visiable just the labels are visiable

SuggestedRemedy

Please use an import that is visibale in pdf

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

See Editor's note: "Figure 179B-2 equations have not been adopted, and serve as
placeholders."

There is no graphic to display in Draft 1.2.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **311**   Page 47 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.3**   *P* **700**   *L* **34**   # 313

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

C2M historically had Vmax of 900 mV or Vf of 450 mV, increasing Vf to 600 mV add additional power and may result in compatability issue with legacy module

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce Vf max from 600 mV to 500 mV which offers all the benefit but with reduced crosstalk penalty as was shown in simms_3dj_01a_2409
Also if we increase Vf to 600 mV the current common mode voltage would need to scale up by the ratio of 600/450 otherwise it will be very diffcult to meet common mode limits that came from CK!

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.4**   *P* **701**   *L* **31**   # 314

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

C2M historically had Vmax of 900 mV or Vf of 450 mV, increasing Vf to 600 mV add additional power and may result in compatability issue with legacy module

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce Vf max from 600 mV to 500 mV which offers all the benefit but with reduced crosstalk penalty as was shown in simms_3dj_01a_2409
Also if we increase Vf to 600 mV the current common mode voltage would need to scale up by the ratio of 600/450 otherwise it will be very diffcult to meet common mode limits that came from CK!

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.3**   *P* **700**   *L* **49**   # 315

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Tx spec methodology*

We currenlty have no effective output compliance test method for C2M or input caliburtion of stressor. We replaced VEC with with JRMS, EOJ, and J4U wihout any demonstration that using transmit jitter is suffcent for receive compliance.

SuggestedRemedy

TDECQ method works given all the data presented and with the work of OIF LPO and RTLR developing. TDECQ/EECQ already captrues the jitter as shown in ghiasi_3dj_01a_2409 but also captures amplitude penalty and the effect of PM to AM conversion in thre same way as receiver will observe the penalty. EECQ for receive stress measurement and caliburation we need to do the follwing:
Add editor note encouraging data if current jitter test method can be used for receive compliance and encourage data on EECQ for receive compliance.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #404.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.4**   *P* **701**   *L* **46**   # 316

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Tx spec methodology*

We currenlty have no effective output compliance test method for C2M or input caliburtion of stressor. We replaced VEC with with JRMS, EOJ, and J4U wihout any demonstration that using transmit jitter is suffcent for receive compliance.

SuggestedRemedy

TDECQ method works given all the data presented and with the work of OIF LPO and RTLR developing. TDECQ/EECQ already captrues the jitter as shown in ghiasi_3dj_01a_2409 but also captures amplitude penalty and the effect of PM to AM conversion in thre same way as receiver will observe the penalty. EECQ for receive stress measurement and caliburation we need to do the follwing:
Add editor note encouraging data if current jitter test method can be used for receive compliance and encourage data on EECQ for receive compliance.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #404.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **316**   Page 48 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **176D** *SC* **176D.7.13.2** *P* **715** *L* **4** # 319

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *(editorial)*

Extra character

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the "e" between step and 176D.7.12.2

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **171** *SC* **171.9** *P* **195** *L* **1** # 321

Nicholl, Gary Cisco Systems

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

Need to update PICS to include path data delay for time synchronization (see 171.6b) .
See 175.9.4.7 as an example for what was done for the 1.6TBASE-R PCS in Clause 175.

SuggestedRemedy

Updated PICs to include path data delay for time synchronization. See 175.9.4.7 as an example.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **171** *SC* **171.9** *P* **195** *L* **1** # 322

Nicholl, Gary Cisco Systems

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

Need to add a PICS item to address optional support for Enhanced PTP accuracy (see 171.6a).

SuggestedRemedy

Update PICS to add an item for optional support of Enhanced PTP accuracy (referencing 171.6a)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **176** *SC* **176.12** *P* **252** *L* **1** # 323

Nicholl, Gary Cisco Systems

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

Need to update PICS to include path data delay for time synchronization (see 176.10) .
See 175.9.4.7 as an example for what was done for the 1.6TBASE-R PCS in Clause 175.

SuggestedRemedy

Updated PICs to include path data delay for time synchronization. See 175.9.4.7 as an example.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **177** *SC* **177.12** *P* **311** *L* **1** # 324

Nicholl, Gary Cisco Systems

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

Need to update PICS to include path data delay for time synchronization (see 177.10) .
See 175.9.4.7 as an example for what was done for the 1.6TBASE-R PCS in Clause 175.

SuggestedRemedy

Updated PICs to include path data delay for time synchronization. See 175.9.4.7 as an example.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **184** *SC* **184.10** *P* **519** *L* **1** # 325

Nicholl, Gary Cisco Systems

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *(bucket)*

Need to update PICS to include path data delay for time synchronization (see 184.8) . See 175.9.4.7 as an example for what was done for the 1.6TBASE-R PCS in Clause 175.

SuggestedRemedy

Updated PICs to include path data delay for time synchronization. See 175.9.4.7 as an example.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **325** Page 49 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **186**   *SC* **186.8**   *P* **589**   *L* **1**   # 326

Nicholl, Gary   Cisco Systems

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Need to update PICS to include path data delay for time synchronization (see 186.6) . See 175.9.4.7 as an example for what was done for the 1.6TBASE-R PCS in Clause 175.

SuggestedRemedy

Updated PICs to include path data delay for time synchronization. See 175.9.4.7 as an example.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.1**   *P* **389**   *L* **46**   # 327

Nicholl, Gary   Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

Is there a reason that "90-Time synchronization" was added as the last row in the Table 180-1. According to "https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_09/nicholl_3dj_01a_2409.pdf" , slide 24, it should have been added at the top of the table. Similar comment for Table 180-2, 180-3, 180-4.
and against equivlanet tables in clauses 178, 179, 181, 182, 183, 185 and 187.

SuggestedRemedy

Move "90-Time synchronization" row to the top of Table 180-1 in accordance with "https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_09/nicholl_3dj_01a_2409.pdf" , slide 24. Similar change to Table 180-2, 180-3, 180-4, and to equivalent tables in clauses 178, 179, 181, 182, 183, 185 and 187.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **180A**   *SC* **180A.2**   *P* **807**   *L* **24**   # 329

Nicholl, Gary   Cisco Systems

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

The second pargraph is referencing 16-position optical connectors and the 3rd paragraph then goes on to reference 12-position optical connectors. But the following sections then switch the order with 180A.3 referring to 12-position optical connectors and 180A.4 referrring to 16-position optical connectors.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest switcing the order of the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs in 180A.2, to match the order of the subsequent subclauses 180A.3 and 180A.4.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179C**   *SC* **179C.2.1**   *P* **796**   *L* **51**   # 332

Kocsis, Sam   Amphenol

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

SFF-TA-1031 Rev 1.0 does not include SFP224

SuggestedRemedy

Add an Editor's note: The reference for SFP224 does not currently include 200G per lane specificatoins but it's expected to include before publication of this standard.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179C**   *SC* **179C.2.3**   *P* **798**   *L* **42**   # 337

Kocsis, Sam   Amphenol

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

SFF-TA-1027 Rev 1.0 does not include QSFP224

SuggestedRemedy

Add an Editor's note: The reference for QSFP224 does not currently include 200G per lane specificatoins but it's expected to include before publication of this standard.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **337**   Page 50 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **179C** *SC* **179C.2.4** *P* **799** *L* **36** # 338

Kocsis, Sam Amphenol

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *(editorial)*

QSFP-DD MSA Revision to 7.?

SuggestedRemedy

Update QSFP-DD MSA Revision to 7.1

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179C** *SC* **179C.2.5** *P* **800** *L* **22** # 341

Kocsis, Sam Amphenol

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *(editorial)*

OSFP MSA Revision to 5.0?

SuggestedRemedy

Update OSFP MSA Revision to 5.1

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **179C** *SC* **179C.2** *P* **796** *L* **35** # 344

Kocsis, Sam Amphenol

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *(editorial)*

Editor's note is no longer needed

SuggestedRemedy

See contribution kocsis_3dj_01_2411

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **178** *SC* **178.9.2** *P* **322** *L* **18** # 345

Simms, William (Bill) NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Output voltage range*

Table 178-6 has the Differential pk-pk voltage (max) Transmit enabled as 1.2V. This
should be reduced to 1.0V to be consistent with Vf of 0.500

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce Differential pk-pk voltage (max) to 1.0V when Transmitter enabled

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The CRG reviewed slides 5-8 of the editorial presentation
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_01a_2411.pdf, and the related
contribution: https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/simms_3dj_01a_2411.pdf.

Implement slide 4 of simms_3dj_01a_2411 with Ane equal to 0.481 V.
Implement with editorial license.

The following straw poll was taken:
Straw poll #E-1 (directional):
I would support the proposal in slide 4 of simms_3dj_01a_2411, with Ane set to 0.481 V, to
resolve the related comments.
Y: 22 N: 10 NMI: 5 A: 9

Cl **178** *SC* **178.10.1** *P* **333** *L* **12** # 346

Simms, William (Bill) NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Output voltage range*

Table 178-13 has Ane set to 0.578V which is consistent with 0.6Vf but should be reduced
to 0.482 to match Vf of 0.5V

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce Ane to 0.482

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **346** Page 51 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **179**　　*SC* **179.9.4**　　　　*P* **356**　　　*L* **40**　　　　# 347

Simms, William (Bill)　　　　　　NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Output voltage range*

Table 179-7 has the Differential pk-pk voltage (max) Transmit enabled as 1.2V. This should be reduced to 1.0V to be consistent with Vf of 0.500

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce Differential pk-pk voltage (max) to 1.0V when Transmitter enabled

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **179**　　*SC* **179.9.4**　　　　*P* **356**　　　*L* **51**　　　　# 348

Simms, William (Bill)　　　　　　NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Output voltage range*

Table 179-7 has Transmitter steady-state voltage, Vf (range) 0.4 to 0.6 V. This range should be reduced to 0.4 to 0.5 to be consistent with Vf of 0.500

SuggestedRemedy

change Transmitter steady-state voltage, Vf (range) to 0.4 to 0.5V

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **179**　　*SC* **179.9.5**　　　　*P* **365**　　　*L* **40**　　　　# 349

Simms, William (Bill)　　　　　　NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Output voltage range*

Table 179-10 has the Amplitude tolerance set to 1.2V. This should be reduced to 1.0V to be consistent with Vf reduced to 0.5V

SuggestedRemedy

Change Amplitude tolerance to 1.0V

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **179**　　*SC* **179.9.5.2**　　　*P* **366**　　　*L* **4**　　　　# 350

Simms, William (Bill)　　　　　　NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Output voltage range*

Amplitude tolerance set to 1.2V. This should be reduced to 1.0V to be consistent with Vf reduced to 0.5V

SuggestedRemedy

Change Amplitude tolerance to 1.0V

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **179**　　*SC* **179.11.7.1**　　*P* **378**　　　*L* **34**　　　　# 351

Simms, William (Bill)　　　　　　NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Output voltage range*

Table 179-17 has Ane set to 0.578V which is consistent with 0.6Vf but should be reduced to 0.482 to match Vf of 0.5V

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce Ane to 0.482

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **176D**　　*SC* **176D.5.3**　　　*P* **700**　　　*L* **24**　　　　# 353

Simms, William (Bill)　　　　　　NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　*Output voltage range*

Table 176D-1 has the Differential pk-pk voltage (max) Output enabled as 1.2V. This should be reduced to 1.0V to be consistent with Vf of 0.500

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce Differential pk-pk voltage (max) to 1.0V when Transmitter enabled

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **353**　　Page 52 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.3**   *P* **700**   *L* **34**   # 354

Simms, William (Bill)   NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

Table 176D-1 has Transmitter steady-state voltage, Vf (range) 0.4 to 0.6 V. This range
should be reduced to 0.4 to 0.5 to be consistent with Vf of 0.500

SuggestedRemedy

change Transmitter steady-state voltage, Vf (range) to 0.4 to 0.5V

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.4**   *P* **701**   *L* **19**   # 355

Simms, William (Bill)   NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

Table 176D-2 has the Differential pk-pk voltage (max) Output enabled as 1.2V. This should
be reduced to 1.0V to be consistent with Vf of 0.500

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce Differential pk-pk voltage (max) to 1.0V when Transmitter enabled

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.4**   *P* **701**   *L* **31**   # 356

Simms, William (Bill)   NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

Table 176D-2 has Transmitter steady-state voltage, Vf (max) 0.6 V. This should be
reduced to 0.5 to be consistent with Vf of 0.500

SuggestedRemedy

change Transmitter steady-state voltage, Vf (range) to 0.4 to 0.5V

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.5**   *P* **702**   *L* **27**   # 357

Simms, William (Bill)   NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

Table 176D-3 has the Amplitude tolerance set to 1.2V. This should be reduced to 1.0V to
be consistent with Vf reduced to 0.5V

SuggestedRemedy

Change Amplitude tolerance to 1.0V

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.6**   *P* **703**   *L* **17**   # 358

Simms, William (Bill)   NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

Table 176D-4 has the Amplitude tolerance set to 1.2V. This should be reduced to 1.0V to
be consistent with Vf reduced to 0.5V

SuggestedRemedy

Change Amplitude tolerance to 1.0V

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.6.2**   *P* **706**   *L* **9**   # 359

Simms, William (Bill)   NVIDIA

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

Table 176D=6 has Ane set to 0.578V which is consistent with 0.6Vf but should be reduced
to 0.482 to match Vf of 0.5V

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce Ane to 0.482

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **359**   Page 53 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.7.11**   *P***710**   *L***36**   # 360

Simms, William (Bill)   NVIDIA

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

Amplitude tolerance set to 1.2V. This should be reduced to 1.0V to be consistent with Vf
reduced to 0.5V

SuggestedRemedy

Change Amplitude tolerance to 1.0V

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **176C**   *SC* **176C.4.3**   *P***680**   *L***24**   # 361

Sakai, Toshiaki   Socionext

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *ERL*

In "Table 176C-1 Transmitter electrical characteristics at TP0v", Difference effective return
loss, dERL (min) is still TBD. In "Table 176C-3 Receiver characteristics at TP5v", the dERL
value for receiver is "-3dB". In CL178 (KR), the ERL values for transmitter and receiver are
the same. (-3dB)
There is no reason not to set the dERL value for tranmitter to "-3dB".

SuggestedRemedy

Change C2C tranmitter dERL value from "TBD" to "-3dB".

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #66.

Cl **177**   *SC* **177.5.2**   *P***298**   *L***32**   # 362

Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Where flow 0 is "will be" indentified once the lock process is complete, it's not possible to
fail to do that.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "may be" to "is"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **176**   *SC* **176.1.4**   *P***255**   *L***1**   # 372

Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(bucket)*

Forwarding of the clock is a necessary function for the PMA regardless of ILT. Since the
PMA does not do any PPM compensation.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the last paragraph of 176.1.4 that begins with "In order to support the inter-
sublayer link training"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using response to comment # 26.

Cl **176**   *SC* **176.1.3**   *P***253**   *L***34**   # 373

Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

Eleven items is a bit more than what I'd considered to be several.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Several terms" to "The following terms"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **373**   Page 54 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **176**　　*SC* **176.2**　　　　　*P***256**　　*L***47**　　　　# 374

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　　　　*(editorial)*

The last several paragraphs of 176.2 are dealing with specific types of PMAs and the SIGNAL_OK function. We have 3 different types of PMAs whose functionality we do group into different sub-clauses later on, so making each its own sub-clause of 176.2 I think would organize it better.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert this heading "176.2.1 PMA service interface for m:n PMA" before the paragraph that begins with "In the transmit direction, the m:n PMAs"
Insert this heading "176.2.2 PMA service interface for n:m PMA" before the paragraph that begins with "In the transmit direction, the n:m PMAs"
Insert this heading "176.2.3 PMA service interface for n:n PMA" before the paragraph that begins with "In the transmit direction, the n:n PMAs"
Insert this heading "176.2.4 SIGNAL_OK for the PMA service interface" before the paragraph that begins with "The PMA receives signal status"

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176**　　*SC* **176.4.4.2.1**　　　*P***271**　　*L***45**　　　　# 376

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　　　　*(editorial)*

The mapping of SIGNAL_OK to signal_ok_*mux is an active mapping of the service interface to status value.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "It is true if the value was OK" to "It is true when the value is OK" in both signal_ok_mux and signal_ok_demux definitions.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **176**　　*SC* **176.2**　　　　　*P***257**　　*L***39**　　　　# 377

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　　　　*(editorial)*

Noting that there is a clock propagation in addition to the actual listed primitives should occur right after we list out those parameters and before we fully define them.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the last paragraph of 176.2 and 176.3 to be after the bullet list of interface primitives.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **177**　　*SC* **177.2**　　　　　*P***290**　　*L***37**　　　　# 378

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　　　　*(editorial)*

Noting that there is a clock propagation in addition to the actual listed primitives should occur right after we list out those parameters and before we fully define them.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the last paragraph of 177.2 to be after the bullet list of interface primitives.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **171**　　*SC* **171.6a**　　　　*P***184**　　*L***17**　　　　# 379

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**A**　　　　　　*(editorial)*

Enahanced PTP should likley come after the "normal" TimeSync function of path delay information.

SuggestedRemedy

Flip-flop Enhanced PTP accuracy and Path data delay for time synchronization

Response　　　　　　*Response Status*　**C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **379**　　　Page 55 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **171**　　*SC* **171.9**　　　　　*P* **195**　　*L* **0**　　　　# 380

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

No PICS for TimeSync functions

SuggestedRemedy

Add PICS similar to Table 175-4 to Clause 171 but also add in the Enhanced PTP accuracy

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **171**　　*SC* **171.6a**　　　　　*P* **184**　　*L* **18**　　　　# 381

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

The opening paragraph is not accurately representing the Enhanced PTP accuracy functionality.

SuggestedRemedy

Update the first paragraph to read:
If the sublayer below the 800GXS is an 800GBASE-ER1 PCS, the enhanced PTP accuracy feature provides the indication of where in the 800GMII stream 800GBASE-R alignment markers once existed. This indicator allows for subsequent insertion of 800GBASE-R alingment markers into the same spot in the data stream.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **177**　　*SC* **177.4.2**　　　　　*P* **291**　　*L* **45**　　　　# 383

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

With the addition of the deskew process the Convolutional interleaver no longer uses the PMA lanes directly but rather the deskewed lanes.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the word "deskewed" before PMA in the first sentence of 177.4.2.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **177**　　*SC* **177.4.2**　　　　　*P* **291**　　*L* **47**　　　　# 384

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

No mechanism to identify the RS-FEC symbol boundaries is provided.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence that begins with "The four RS-FEC symbols in each RS-FEC symbol-quartet are from four different RS-FEC codewords"
to "Using the RS-FEC boundaries found by the Alignment and Deksew process (see 177.4.1) the convolutioner interleaver creates groups of four RS-FEC symbols from four RS-FEC codewords."

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **177**　　*SC* **177.4.2**　　　　　*P* **291**　　*L* **52**　　　　# 385

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(editorial)*

There is a , in the 1536 number.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the comma

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **177**　　*SC* **177.5.2**　　　　　*P* **298**　　*L* **22**　　　　# 386

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　*(bucket)*

Steps a) and b.2) and c) tell us what step to proceed to but b.1) does not.

SuggestedRemedy

Add go to step c) to end of step b) 1)

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **386**　　Page 56 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **177**　　*SC* **177.5.2.**　　　　*P* **298**　　*L* **27**　　# 387

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*(editorial)*

The phrase "at least 140" is intending the minimum value of invalid codewords in which you take this branch. Alternative wording could be used to improve clarity of the function.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "at least 140" to "140 or more"

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

Cl **177**　　*SC* **177.6.3**　　　　*P* **303**　　*L* **29**　　# 390

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　Broadcom

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*(bucket)*

The exit from CW_CHECK_1 and CW_CHECK_2 for values of 13 have the wrong variable name

SuggestedRemedy

Change valid_cw=13 to valid_cw_cnt=13 two places Fig 177-9

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **183**　　*SC* **183.7.1**　　　　*P* **480**　　*L* **34**　　# 396

Rodes, Roberto　　　　　　　　Coherent

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*TDECQ*

TDECQmax for FR4 is currently 'TBD'

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to replace TBD with 3.4 dB. Supporting presentation wil be provided

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **182**　　*SC* **182.7.1**　　　　*P* **452**　　*L* **43**　　# 397

Rodes, Roberto　　　　　　　　Coherent

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*TDECQ*

TDECQmax for DRx-2 is currently 'TBD'

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to replace TBD with 3.4 dB. Supporting presentation wil be provided

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #146.

Cl **1**　　*SC* **1.3**　　　　*P* **50**　　*L* **41**　　# 398

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **A**　　　　　*(bucket)*

The OSFP specification has been updated. Notice that 1.3 says "Standards may be subject to revision, and parties subject to agreements based on this standard are encouraged to investigate the possibility of applying the most recent editions of the standards indicated below"

SuggestedRemedy

Update OSFP from Rev 5.0, October 2, 2022 to Rev 5.1, September 12th, 2024, or remove the date and revision number from the reference.
Update any other references as appropriate if new revisions are published.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Update OSFP from Rev 5.0, October 2, 2022 to Rev 5.1, September 12th, 2024.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **398**　　　　Page 57 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.4**   *P* **701**   *L* **23**   # 399

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *AC common mode*

AC common-mode voltages are not as large as this in practice, even at 200G/lane. Notice that while the full-band VCM is lower than for host output, the low-frequency VCM is the same, which is not realistic; a module does not have the very heavy-duty power supply that a host uses.

SuggestedRemedy

Halve the LF ACCM limit for module output (Table 176E-2) because the module output is measured in the MCB which should have a clean power supply.
Also in Table 176E-3, host input ACCM tolerance.
We may need a sentence of explanation: the host must tolerate this much module-generated ACCM, as well as any that it generates itself.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the LF ACCM limit for module output (Table 176D-2) from 0.03 V to 0.015 V.
Apply the corresponding change in Table 176D-3, host input ACCM tolerance.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4.6**   *P* **362**   *L* **16**   # 400

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Tx spec methodology*

As explained in other comments (and see dawe_3dj_01a_2406), up to 3ck the SNDR spec acted together with the jitter spec and others to protect the link performance - but we don't have a satisfactory way of measuring jitter at today's speeds and losses with reasonable reflections. Basically, measurements can't tell jitter from noise, and trying to separate the two things out "leaves margin on the table". See calvin_3dj_02a_2407 and successor.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the SNDR section. Add a VEC-like, TDECQ-like spec using this clause's COM reference receiver which can be implemented in a scope, as in dawe_3dj_01_2409.
Similarly for KR and C2C.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #404.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4.7**   *P* **363**   *L* **1**   # 401

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Tx spec methodology*

Measuring jitter separately to other impairments relies on a better slew rate to noise ratio than we have at the observation point, and better than what is needed to make good links. calvin_3dj_01b_2407 shows that most of what is measured is not jitter. Also see calvin_3dj_02a_2407 and successor, and zivny_3dj_01_2409 which does not establish if any of the jitter measurements give measure the right thing.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the jitter section. Add a VEC-like, TDECQ-like spec using this clause's COM reference receiver which can be implemented in a scope, as in dawe_3dj_01_2409.
Similarly for KR and C2C.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #404.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4**   *P* **356**   *L* **39**   # 403

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

Supply voltages and voltage swing trend downwards over the years. This 1.2 V max has not changed since 10GBASE-KR, a long time ago. In 3ck and D1.0, C2M had 750 mV, and other C2M had 900 mV. PCIe have moved from 1.2 V to 1 V max. A high max is harmful when a receiver can ask someone else's transmitter to turn up to the max, causing the second party to suffer unnecessary NEXT in its receiver.

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce 1.2 mV to 1 V, here, in the receiver Table 179-10 and in the text in 179.9.5.2.
Reduce the steady-state voltage vf max from 0.6 V to 0.5 V. Make appropriate adjustments to Av Afe Ane and eta0 in COM tables.
Similarly for KR and C2C. See another comment for C2M.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Comment ID* **403**   Page 58 of 63
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4**   *P* **357**   *L* **22**   # 404

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Tx spec methodology*

Our way of measuring jitter doesn't work well enough with the increased max host loss over 3ck: it is very sensitive to signal amplitude, loss to the point of observation, and allowed reflections, so it is very inaccurate. It is not clear that it can or should be fixed. Our way of defining SNDR doesn't work correctly over host loss either. This can be fixed, but "vertical and horizontal noise" act together to degrade BER: more of one goes with less of the other. Attempting to separate them out is diagnostics; it is not the standard's concern how a signal got to be the way it is, only whether it is good enough or not. See calvin_3dj_02a_2407 and successor.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the SNDR and jitter specs. Add a VEC-like, TDECQ-like spec (see dawe_3dj_01_2409) using this clause's COM reference receiver which can be implemented in a scope. Similarly for KR and C2C.
Delete SNR_ISI because it is a contributor to eye opening.
RLM is a contributor to eye opening defined right, too: see another comment.
Define VEC and Eye Amplitude (based on the equalised scope measurement) for nominal maximum signals; don't ask the scope to resolve very small signals (same idea as SNDR being defined for the presents in Table 179-8 today, not for every possible case).

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The CRG reviewed slides 11-14 of
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_01a_2411.pdf, and the contribution
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/dawe_3dj_01_2411.pdf, related to this comment
and a related group of comments.

There was no support to make the proposed changes in comment 404 and related comments 400, 308, 411, 416, 405, 315, 316, and 401.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4.3**   *P* **361**   *L* **33**   # 405

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Tx spec methodology*

SNR_ISI is not needed as a separate spec: it is a component of eye opening. There is no need for a not-quite-consistent special equalizer with its special Nb for this.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the SNR_ISI section and the editor's note. See other comments and dawe_3dj_01_2409 for the holistic VEC-like, TDECQ-like spec that includes it.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #404.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.4.3**   *P* **700**   *L* **23**   # 409

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

In D1.1, vf min was 0.387 V, from 3ck CR, which was too high for C2M anyway. This draft shows 0.4 which is even worse and not consistent with 0.4 V at the silicon.

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce it, at least back to 0.387 but preferably to 0.9/2*4/5*0.387/0.4 = 0.348 V for a nominal 900 mV +0/-20%

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.4.3**   *P* **700**   *L* **23**   # 410

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

1.2 V is quite excessive for C2M, and, considering modern silicon processes, excessive for anything high speed in 2024.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 0.9 V, as is normal for C2M. Similarly, reduce vf max to 450 mV.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **410**

Page 59 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.5.3**   *P* **700**   *L* **34**   # 411

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Tx spec methodology*

Several inappropriate backplane-style "micro-managing" many-quotas spec items have appeared that are wasteful and unnecessary diagnostics, and some are not measurable with the losses allowed in C2M with reasonable reflections. This is not the way to specify an observable signal. Remember, our task is to specify the *signal at the interface* not hypothesise about the silicon 20-ish dB behind it.
See other comments noting the impracticality of the 120D style jitter measurement method for this project. See dawe_3dj_01a_2406, calvin_3dj_02a_2407 and successor.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vf (min), Rpeak, SNDR, SNR_ISI and output jitter. Add a VEC-like, TDECQ-like spec, which can be measured in a scope using the COM reference receiver parameters from Table 176D-6 (see dawe_3dj_01_2409). The VEC limit is derived from the COM table too.
Remove RLM; in 120E we decided we didn't need a separate eye linearity spec.
Add an Eye Amplitude spec based on the same measurement (note that dawe_3dj_01_2409 says Eye Height: Eye Amplitude is meant).
Note that because of instrument noise, VEC and Eye Amplitude (like SNDR) should not be measured on small signals, but on nominal-minimum signals before any training process has reduced them ("presets").
Apply to C2M throughout 176D.
Another comment proposes the same approach for 179, CR.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #404.

Cl **176D**   *SC* **176D.6.2**   *P* **706**   *L* **9**   # 413

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Output voltage range*

These voltages Av Afe Ane look like old style backplane-style values, which should be reduced even for CR and KR, and should be reduced further for C2M. The Ane value, 0.578 V, is even worse than in the last draft (0.45 V).

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce Av Afe and Ane. Reduce the ratio between Ane and the others (representing the tolerance of the silicon, which should not be +/-20% in 2024). To make the COM table pass and fail the same scenarios, reduce eta0 in proportion.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #345.

Cl **179**   *SC* **179.9.4.2**   *P* **361**   *L* **26**   # 416

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Tx spec methodology*

If we look at the signal at TP2 and its equalised eye rather than just hypothesising about it (see other comments), we probably don't need a separate RLM spec. Today, COM doesn't address RLM carefully. 3ck C2M doesn't have an equivalent; if a signal has enough nonlinearity to matter, it shows up in a worse VEC.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the RLM spec and 179.9.4.2. See another comment for the holistic VEC-like, TDECQ-like spec that includes it.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #404.

Cl **184**   *SC* **184.2**   *P* **498**   *L* **43**   # 420

Kota, Kishore   Marvell Semiconductor

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**   *(editorial)*

ADC input signals in Figure 184-2 are labelled RX_Ai, RX_Aq, RX_Bi and RX_Bq. I think the labels A/B are used to highlight the fact that the polarization angle at the receiver is not necessarily aligned with the X/Y polarizations at the transmitter. However, A/B are somewhat arbitrary and do not clearly reflect the fact that those are orthogonal polarizations.

SuggestedRemedy

My suggestion is to use H/V (for horizontal and vertical) instead of A/B because it is common to use these letters in coherent DSPs instead of X/Y to indicate orthogonal polarizations. i.e. use RX_Hi, RX_Hq, RX_Vi, RX_Vq. Same change would also apply to uses of these names in 184.5.1 on page 508, lines 45, 47 and 51 and in 184.5.2 on page 509, line 5 and 184.5.7 on page 510, line 10.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement with editorial license and discretion.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **420**

Page 60 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **185**	*SC* **185.5.1**	*P* **528**	*L* **32**	# 421

Kota, Kishore   Marvell Semiconductor

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**   *ADC signal labelling*

ADC input signals in Figure 185-5 are labelled RX_Ai, RX_Aq, RX_Bi and RX_Bq. I think the original X/Y were changed to A/B to highlight the fact that the polarization angle at the receiver is not necessarily aligned with the X/Y polarizations at the transmitter. However, A&B are somewhat arbitrary and do not clearly reflect the fact that those are orthogonal polarizations.

SuggestedRemedy

My suggestion is to use H/V (for horizontal and vertical) instead of A/B because it is common to use these letters in coherent DSPs instead of X/Y to indicate orthogonal polarizations. i.e. use RX_Hi, RX_Hq, RX_Vi, RX_Vq. Same change would also apply to uses of these names in 185.5.3 on page 529 line 25,

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: Change comment type from E to T.]

In clauses 184 through 187 change all signal labels from Rx_AI, Rx_AQ, Rx_BI, and Rx_BQ to Rx_XI, Rx_XQ, Rx_YI, and Rx_YQ.

Add a clarifying sentence in 185 and 187 similar to "The signals Rx_XI, Rx_XQ, Rx_YI, and Rx_YQ each carry a combination of the transmitting Inner FEC Tx_XI, Tx_XQ, Tx_YI, and Tx_YQ signals used by the transmitting PMD to generate the DP-16QAM symbols.".

Implement with editorial license.

Cl **182**	*SC* **182.2**	*P* **446**	*L* **39**	# 429

Mi, Guangcan   Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Error ratio*

"A PMD is expected to meet the block error ratio specifications in 174A.6, measured at a PMA, with BERadded equal to 6.4 × 10-5. the statement of measured at a PMA may not be sufficient, for the following reason. The optical PMD interfaces with PMA at both side of the link, shown in Figure 180-2. Checking acroos the clauses, Figure 176C-2 and Figure 176D-2 showed both AUI C2C and AUI C2M interface with PMA. therefore, a user could use the PMA before an C2C/C2M channel as transmitter and the PMA after an C2C/C2M channel as receiver, and still be measuring the block error ratio of an optical PMD at PMA. However in this case, employing BERadded would mean double counting the error allocation to C2C/C2M. It is therefore suggested to either specify by wording or provide an illustrative drawing.. "

SuggestedRemedy

Add description where appropriate, such as "the test pattern should be generated by the PMA sub-layer immediately before the PMD interface at the transmitting side,while the error ratio measured by the PMA sublayer immediately after the PMD interface at the receiving side." A figure may also be helpful, will provide in a contribution.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #433.

Cl **182**	*SC* **182.2**	*P* **446**	*L* **42**	# 430

Mi, Guangcan   Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Error ratio*

BERadded at PMA being 6.4e-5, which corresponds to Table 174A-1, adding two C2C and two C2M allocation. BER added at PCS being 3.2e-5, which doesn't seem write. Need to recheck.

SuggestedRemedy

If the test pattern is generated by and transmitted from the PCS layer at the transmitting side, then there should be no BER_added needed. If the test pattern is generated by and transmitted from the PMA layer at the transmitting side, where the PMA is the PMA immediatedly before the PMD interface, then BER_added of 3.2e-5, equivalent to a two-part AUI link at the receiver side only, seems correct. Some clarification will be good.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #434.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **430**

Page 61 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.2**   *P* **474**   *L* **38**   # 431

Mi, Guangcan   Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Error ratio*

"A PMD is expected to meet the block error ratio specifications in 174A.6, measured at a PMA, with
BERadded equal to 6.4 × 10-5. the statement of measured at a PMA may not be sufficient, for the following reason. The optical PMD interfaces with PMA at both side of the link, shown in Figure 180-2. Checking acroos the clauses, Figure 176C-2 and Figure 176D-2 showed both AUI C2C and AUI C2M interface with PMA. therefore, a user could use the PMA before an C2C/C2M channel as transmitter and the PMA after an C2C/C2M channel as receiver, and still be measuring the block error ratio of an optical PMD at PMA. However in this case, employing BERadded would mean double counting the error allocation to C2C/C2M. It is therefore suggested to either specify by wording or provide an illustrative drawing.. "

SuggestedRemedy

Add description where appropriate, such as "the test pattern should be generated by the PMA sub-layer immediately before the PMD interface at the transmitting side,while the error ratio measured by the PMA sublayer immediately after the PMD interface at the receiving side." A figure may also be helpful, will provide in a contribution.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #433.

Cl **183**   *SC* **183.2**   *P* **474**   *L* **41**   # 432

Mi, Guangcan   Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *Error ratio*

BERadded at PMA being 6.4e-5, which corresponds to Table 174A-1, adding two C2C and two C2M allocation. BER added at PCS being 3.2e-5, which doesn't seem write. Need to recheck.

SuggestedRemedy

If the test pattern is generated by and transmitted from the PCS layer at the transmitting side, then there should be no BER_added needed. If the test pattern is generated by and transmitted from the PMA layer at the transmitting side, where the PMA is the PMA immediatedly before the PMD interface, then BER_added of 3.2e-5, equivalent to a two-part AUI link at the receiver side only, seems correct. Some clarification will be good.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #434.

Cl **180**   *SC* **180.2**   *P* **393**   *L* **37**   # 433

Mi, Guangcan   Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**   *Error ratio*

"A PMD is expected to meet the block error ratio specifications in 174A.6, measured at a PMA, with
BERadded equal to 6.4 × 10-5. the statement of measured at a PMA may not be sufficient, for the following reason. The optical PMD interfaces with PMA at both side of the link, shown in Figure 180-2. Checking acroos the clauses, Figure 176C-2 and Figure 176D-2 showed both AUI C2C and AUI C2M interface with PMA. therefore, a user could use the PMA before an C2C/C2M channel as transmitter and the PMA after an C2C/C2M channel as receiver, and still be measuring the block error ratio of an optical PMD at PMA. However in this case, employing BERadded would mean double counting the error allocation to C2C/C2M. It is therefore suggested to either specify by wording or provide an illustrative drawing.. "

SuggestedRemedy

Add description where appropriate, such as "the test pattern should be generated by the PMA sub-layer immediately before the PMD interface at the transmitting side,while the error ratio measured by the PMA sublayer immediately after the PMD interface at the receiving side." A figure may also be helpful, will provide in a contribution.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The following presentation was reviewed by the CRG:

In 180.2 ...
Change "A PMD is expected to meet the block error ratio specifications in 174A.6, measured at a PMA, with BERadded equal to 6.4 × 10-5."
To:
A PMD is expected to meet the block error ratio specifications in 174A.6, measured at the PMA adjacent to the PMD, with BERadded equal to 6.4 × 10-5.

Apply similar changes to 181.2, 182.2, 183.2.

Add additional explanation and diagrams in 174A.6 to clarify where and how these measurements are performed. In the PMD make clear references to this material.

Implement with editorial license.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **433**

Page 62 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM

Cl **180** *SC* **180.2** *P* **393** *L* **40** # 434

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *Error ratio*

BERadded at PMA being 6.4e-5, which corresponds to Table 174A-1, adding two C2C and two C2M allocation. BER added at PCS being 3.2e-5, which doesn't seem write. Need to recheck.

SuggestedRemedy

If the test pattern is generated by and transmitted from the PCS layer at the transmitting side, then there should be no BER_added needed. If the test pattern is generated by and transmitted from the PMA layer at the transmitting side, where the PMA is the PMA immediatedly before the PMD interface, then BER_added of 3.2e-5, equivalent to a two-part AUI link at the receiver side only, seems correct. Some clarification will be good.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The specification for a PMD is the case where the signal is coming from a test source with no errors due to AUI C2M or C2C and is measured at the adjacent (or closest) PMA without any AUI C2M or C2C between. Therefore the allocation for all possible AUI C2C and C2M that may occur in a PCS to PCS path (6.4E-5) must be added.
When measuring a complete PHY at the PCS the PHY includes any allocation from the local AUI C2C and C2M, but again the input to the PMD is from a test source with no errors due to AUI C2C or C2M; therefore only the allocation for one AUI C2C and one AUI C2M (3.2E-5) is added.

Cl **181** *SC* **181.2** *P* **421** *L* **36** # 435

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Error ratio*

"A PMD is expected to meet the block error ratio specifications in 174A.6, measured at a PMA, with
BERadded equal to 6.4 × 10-5. the statement of measured at a PMA may not be sufficient, for the following reason. The optical PMD interfaces with PMA at both side of the link, shown in Figure 180-2. Checking acroos the clauses, Figure 176C-2 and Figure 176D-2 showed both AUI C2C and AUI C2M interface with PMA. therefore, a user could use the PMA before an C2C/C2M channel as transmitter and the PMA after an C2C/C2M channel as receiver, and still be measuring the block error ratio of an optical PMD at PMA. However in this case, employing BERadded would mean double counting the error allocation to C2C/C2M. It is therefore suggested to either specify by wording or provide an illustrative drawing.. "

SuggestedRemedy

Add description where appropriate, such as "the test pattern should be generated by the PMA sub-layer immediately before the PMD interface at the transmitting side,while the error ratio measured by the PMA sublayer immediately after the PMD interface at the receiving side." A figure may also be helpful, will provide in a contribution.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #433.

Cl **181** *SC* **181.2** *P* **421** *L* **39** # 436

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *Error ratio*

BERadded at PMA being 6.4e-5, which corresponds to Table 174A-1, adding two C2C and two C2M allocation. BER added at PCS being 3.2e-5, which doesn't seem write. Need to recheck.

SuggestedRemedy

If the test pattern is generated by and transmitted from the PCS layer at the transmitting side, then there should be no BER_added needed. If the test pattern is generated by and transmitted from the PMA layer at the transmitting side, where the PMA is the PMA immediatedly before the PMD interface, then BER_added of 3.2e-5, equivalent to a two-part AUI link at the receiver side only, seems correct. Some clarification will be good.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Resolve using the response to comment #434.

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 Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **436**

Page 63 of 63
11/12/2024 8:48:55 PM