

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 11

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The format used for defining the various status counters for the PCS (175.2.5.3), PMA (176.7.4.1), and Inner FEC (177.5.4.1, 184.5.7) vary wildly from clause to clause. Rewrite/reformat the counter definitions in the same style.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Reformat the counter definitions in 175.2.5.3, 176.7.4.1, 177.5.4.1, and 184.5.7 to be the same format. Use either 175.2.5.3 or 177.5.4.1/184.5.7 as the template.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Reformat the counter definitions in 176.7.4.1, 177.5.4.1, and 184.5.7 to use the same format as 175.2.5.3.

Implement with editorial license.

[Editor's note: CC: 176, 177, 184]

Cl 00 SC 0 P261 L47 # 273

Ran, Ade Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Management interface

"If the MDIO Interface is not implemented, provision of an equivalent mechanism to access the variables is recommended."

This sentence is repeated in multiple clauses and annexes (14 instances).

Access to the management variables is required ("shall") if MDIO is implemented, but otherwise it is only recommended to have them accessible.

MDIO is optional but access to the management variables should be a requirement even if it is not implemented.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "provision of... is recommended" to "shall be provided", with editorial license, in all instances

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In 175.8, 176.11, 177.10, 178.13, 179.14, 180.11, 181.11, 182.11, 184.9, 185.11, 186.7, 187.11, and 178B.15.

Change "If the MDIO Interface is not implemented, provision of an equivalent mechanism to access the variables is recommended."

To: "If the MDIO Interface is not implemented, an alternate mechanism to access management variables shall be provided."

Implement with editorial license.

Cl 00 SC 0 P338 L30 # 302

Ran, Ade Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D (withdrawn)

The Skew and Skew Variation at SP2 are specified with the words "is limited to", while for all other measurement points it is specified with "shall be less than".

"is limited to" reads like an informative statement, but it is a normative requirement (it is not related to the fact that SP2 may not be accessible; the same is true for SP5).

This wording appears in multiple places in the draft (per PMD and data rate). Note that the same wording is used in multiple clauses of the base standard. If necessary, it can be dealt with in maintenance.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "is limited to" to "shall be less than" in all instances of Skew and Skew variation at SP2.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 1 SC 1.4.92a P53 L10 # 269

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (withdrawn)

The definition of 1.6TAUI-n includes "used for chip-to-chip or chip-to-module electrical interfaces" followed by "For chip-to-module interfaces and for chip-to-chip interfaces". This duplicity is not helpful.

Following the new descriptions introduced in the new AUI annexes, the clarity of this definition can be improved.

Similar concerns exist in the definitions of 200GAUI-n, 400GAUI-n, and 800GAUI-n.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the definition text to:  
 "A physical instantiation of the PMA service interface over n lanes, enabling partitioning of a 1.6 Tb/s Physical Layer implementation across multiple devices. Specified separately for chip-to-chip and chip-to-module electrical interfaces. Two widths of 1.6TAUI-n are defined: 16-lane (1.6TAUI-16 C2C and 1.6TAUI-16 C2M), and eight-lane (1.6TAUI-8 C2C and 1.6TAUI-8 C2M)."

Apply corresponding changes in the definitions of 200GAUI-n, 400GAUI-n, and 800GAUI-n.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P57 L28 # 270

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Abbreviations ILcd and ILdc are also used, and should be defined.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add definitions for ILcd and ILdc.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 ILcd and ILdc are used only as variables (italicized), not acronyms.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1 P70 L7 # 272

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Inner FEC registers are contained in the PMA/PMD section but there is no reference to the inner FEC positioning in the stack, nor to the clauses where it is defined (177 and 184).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add test describing the inner FEC MDIO positioning (in the same MMD as the PMD).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 There is precedence for having FEC control and status registers in the PMA/PMD address space and the positioning of this FEC functionality is not called out in 45.2.1. There is no justification for making an exception for the inner FEC registers.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1 P70 L7 # 271

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

The base text of 45.2.1 includes references to multiple PMA sublayers and how MMD addresses are allocated. This text points to 83.1.4, 109.1.4, and 120.1.4, but does not include the corresponding references to the new PMAs: 173.1.4 (apparently missed by 802.3df) and 176.11.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Bring in the first paragraph of 45.1.2 and add references to 173.1.4 and 176.11.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Bring in the first paragraph of 45.2.1 from the base standard and add references to 173.1.4 and 176.1.5

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.213a P92 L13 # 6

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Replace the 8 enable bits with a single reset bit in Table 45-177a

*SuggestedRemedy*

In Table 45-177a delete rows "Inner FEC enable lane 1" to "Inner FEC enable lane 7" and in the row for "1.2400.0" change "enable" to "reset"

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.213a P92 L14 # 91

Nicholl, Shawn

AMD

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Description column of fields in "Table 45-177a - Inner FEC control register bit definitions" is inconsistent with other MDIO registers.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Propose the following text for the description column of 1.2400.7 row:

- 1 = Enable Inner FEC on lane 7
- 0 = Disable Inner FEC on lane 7

Propose similar update to description column of 1.2400.0 through 1.2400.6 rows.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #1.

CI 73 SC 73.5.1 P118 L38 # 547

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D AN DME swing

The ancient "DME electrical characteristics" table needs updating. Compare the proposed default preset to start training: 800 to 1000 \*0.75 +/-0.025 which is 580 to 775 mV, the traditional C2M max, 900 mV, and the XLPPI max, 850 mV.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Bring Table 73-1, DME electrical characteristics, into the draft. It contains:

Transmit differential peak-to-peak output voltage 600 to 1200 mV

Receive differential peak-to-peak input voltage 200 to 1200 mV.

Add two more rows, for anything capable of 200G/lane:

Transmit differential peak-to-peak output voltage 600 to 900 mV

Receive differential peak-to-peak input voltage 200 to 1000 mV.

Recommend that new product should comply to the newer limits, except product that only does 1000BASE-KX and/or 10GBASE-KX4 whose output should be 600 to 1000 mV (so they don't have to change voltage swing when going from AN to regular mode - their min is 800 mV). If the recommendation has to go through maintenance, add an editor's note "It has been proposed that" to gather feedback and build consensus.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The following related contribution was reviewed by the task force at a previous ad hoc meeting:

[https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/adhoc/optics/0125\\_OPTX/simms\\_3dj\\_optx\\_02\\_250109.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/adhoc/optics/0125_OPTX/simms_3dj_optx_02_250109.pdf)

It proposes only to limit the transmitter swing to 1000 mV for all PHY types. However, this would be out of scope for this project. It would have to be limited to implementations supporting PHYs defined in this project. Changing the receiver maximum limit to match would have to be conditional upon operating only with other devices which support PHYs defined in this project.

For task force discussion.

CI 73 SC 73.6.2.5.3 P122 L46 # 92

Nicholl, Shawn

AMD

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The paragraph that begins "The variable an\_rs\_fec\_int\_negotiated\_control indicates that RS-FEC-Int ..." is located in the incorrect sub-clause.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Propose to move the paragraph such that it is inserted after the second paragraph of 73.6.2.5.4 (consistent with editorial guidance found in 802.3ck-2022, Sub-Clause "73.6.5.3 FEC control variables").

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 73 SC 73.6.4 P125 L25 # 93  
 Nicholl, Shawn AMD  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Currently says "D[10:0] and D[47:16] contains the Unformatted Code Field ...", but should use the singular verb.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Propose "D[10:0] and D[47:16] contain the Unformatted Code Field"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 73 SC 73.10.2 P130 L15 # 545  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D AN/ILT time-out  
 According to 178B.14.2.1, there should be no time limit  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the two "TBD" to infinity  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #131.

CI 73 SC 73.8 P128 L21 # 94  
 Nicholl, Shawn AMD  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Typo mr\_lp\_adv\_extended\_ability[32:1] in "Table 73-6-Backplane Ethernet Auto-Negotiation variable to MDIO register mapping"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Propose mr\_lp\_adv\_extended\_ability[32:1]  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 73 SC 73.10.2 P130 L16 # 184  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D AN/ILT time-out  
 Value for link\_fail\_inhibit\_timer is TBD. Need value.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #131.

CI 73 SC 73.10.2 P130 L14 # 546  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 This is contrary to the standard order (slow to fast).  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Put the new entry immediately below the 100G/lane one. As the base document is out of order and this project amendment cannot deliver a properly ordered table without cleaning it up, bring the other two link\_fail\_inhibit\_timer rows into the draft and put them in the right order.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This would be best addressed at the revision project to create the updated base standard. Bringing in additional rows not relevant to 802.3dj scope would not be useful.

CI 73 SC 73.10.2 P130 L16 # 131  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D AN/ILT time-out  
 TBD needs to be filled in.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Set link fail inhibit timer to be 15 to 15.1s  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See the following related contribution:  
 <URL>/slavick\_3dj\_01\_2501  
 For task force discussion.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 73A SC 73A.1a P640 L40 # 97  
 Nicholl, Shawn AMD  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Currently says "... indicates additional abilities that were not accommodated in the link codeword Base Page ..." Present tense seems more appropriate.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Propose "... indicates additional abilities that are not accommodated in the link codeword Base Page ..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 116 SC 116.1.4 P138 L18 # 114  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Table 116-3b has a thick bar on the right side of clause 73 M  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 address the formatting issue  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 116 SC 116.3.3.4.1 P150 L12 # 152  
 Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Missing comma  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 To make consistent with the text in the previous section penultimate paragh, add a comma before: but it is considered...  
 Or delete the coma in the previous section penultimate paragh, watever makes sense grammatically.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 On page 149 line 27 delete comma preceding " but it is considered".

Cl 116 SC 116.4 P150 L52 # 24  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Delay limits for the 200GBASE-R Inner FEC are TBD in Table 116-6 but are indeed defined in 177.7.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Update Table 116-6 with the delay numbers specified in 177.7.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 116 SC 116.4 P151 L49 # 25  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Delay limits for the 400GBASE-R Inner FEC are TBD in Table 116-7 but are indeed defined in 177.7.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Update Table 116-7 with the delay numbers specified in 177.7.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 119 SC 119.3 P162 L33 # 14  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Error bin counters are provided for 800GBASE-R and 1.6TBASE-R PCS but not for the 200GBASE-R or 400GBASE-R PCS. These counters are needed for accurate testing of a PHY receive path per 174A.7.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 In Clause 119 add bin counters FEC\_codeword\_error\_bin\_i as defined in 172.3.6 stating that these counters are optional if the PCS is used in a PHY that includes 200 Gb/s per lane PMD.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In addition to bin counters FEC\_codeword\_error\_bin\_i as defined in 172.3.6, also add FEC\_cw\_counter as defined in 172.3.5. Since these counters are already optional in Clause 172, there is no need to restrict the optionality to " PHYs that includes 200 Gb/s per lane PMD"  
 Implement with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 120B SC 120B P642 L1 # 427

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D COM (bucket)

The response to comment 152 on draft D1.2 was not fully implemented. 200GAUI-8 C2C Annex 120B is also listed in tables 178-1 as an allowed optional interface for 200GBASE-KR etc. but it has the same problem as Annex 120D had with an allocated BER of 1e-5 whereas the Phy only allocates 6.7e-6 to the C2C interface when using the 200GAUI-1 C2M interface

SuggestedRemedy

Bring Annex 120B into 802.3dj and add an equivalent modification to the Channel COM test as has been done to Clause 120D for D1.3 with Case 1 And Case 2 and the same DER0 values for 200GAUI-8 and 400GAUI-16

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Annex 120B specifies receiver characteristics with maximum PCS FEC symbol error ratio of 1.1e-5 (consistent with BER<1e-6), transmitter characteristics with probability 1e-6, and COM with DER0=1e-6.  
 These specifications result in maximum BER lower than the 6.7e-6 allocated for other C2C interfaces, so there is no need to change the COM parameters.

Cl 120F SC 120F.1 P645 L53 # 428

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The reference to 120F.4 should be a hot link as this is changed in 802.3dj

SuggestedRemedy

Make it so.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120F SC 120F.1 P646 L9 # 429

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (withdrawn)

The reference to 135F.3.2.1 is not correct. That subsection is about Receiver Signalling rate.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference to 135F.5

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 169 SC 169.2.4 P172 L50 # 42

Huber, Thomas Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

This clause should include a reference to the 800GBASE-ER1 PMA

SuggestedRemedy

Add a sentence: The 800GBASE-ER1 PMA is specified in clause 186.3

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 169 SC 169.2.10 P173 L45 # 153

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

ILT provides a mechanism to control the modulation, not the module. Also ILT coordinates transition to DATA mode.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "For each ISL, ILT provides a mechanism for a receiver to control transmitter states, such as equalization, module, and precoding states on the link partner transmitter, and to indicate the receiver state."  
 To: "For each ISL, ILT provides a mechanism for a receiver to control transmitter states, such as equalization, modulation, and precoding states on the link partner transmitter, to indicate the receiver state, and to coordinate transition to DATA mode."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.4 P178 L22 # 43

Huber, Thomas Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Table 169-4 is missing rows for the 800GBASE-ER1 PCS and PMA

SuggestedRemedy

Add a row for the PMA. Depending on the disposition of other comments about ER1 architecture, add a row for the ER1 PCS or the ER1 FEC. The values for both in clause 186 are still TBD.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 169 SC 169.4 P178 L23 # 44

Huber, Thomas Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Clause 176 has delay constraints for 800G 32:4 and 4:4 PMAs, clause 177 has values for 800GBASE-R inner FEC, and clause 184 has values for the LR1 inner FEC

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the TBDs with the appropriate values from Table 176-7, Table 177-5, and from clause 184.7 for the LR1 inner FEC.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 169 SC 169.4 P178 L23 # 154

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The values for 800GBASE-R Inner FEC and 800GBASE-LR1 are defined in the respective referenced sections.

SuggestedRemedy

Fill the TBDs in Table 169-4 for 800GBASE-R Inner FEC and 800GBASE-LR1 with the values in the referenced sections

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #44.

Cl 171 SC 171.1 P190 L8 # 373

D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

800GMII is noted as required in first entry in Table 171-1

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change table entry to optional
2. Add note to 800GMII table entry - The 800GMII is an optional interface. However, if the 800GMII is not implemented, a conforming implementation behaves functionally as though the RS and 800GMII were present.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 171 SC 171.1 P190 L8 # 374

D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

1.6TMII is noted as required in first entry in Table 171-1a

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change table entry to optional
2. Add note to 1.6TMII table entry - The 1.6TMII is an optional interface. However, if the 1.6TMII is not implemented, a conforming implementation behaves functionally as though the RS and 1.6TMII were present.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 171 SC 171.7 P200 L41 # 418

Nicholl, Gary Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Annex 176B does not show any MMD numbering.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the second sentence from:

"Annex 173A and Annex 176B show additional examples of 800GXS partitioning and MMD numbering"

to:

"Annex 173A shows additional examples of 800GXS partitioning and MMD numbering using the BM PMA. 176B.6.2 shows additional examples of 800GXS partitioning using both BM PMA and SM PMA".

Change the second sentence of the second paragraph from:

"Annex 176B shows additional examples of 1.6TXS partitioning and MMD numbering."

to:

"176B.7.2 shows additional examples of 1.6TXS partitioning"

Change the title of 171.7 from:

"800GXS and 1.6TXS partitioning example"

to:

"800GXS and 1.6TXS partitioning examples"

Make sure to underline any added text and to strikethrough any deleted text.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 171 SC 171.8 P202 L18 # 3

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ER1 architecture

The variable PHY\_XS\_enhanced\_ptp\_accuracy\_enable is not present in Clause 172 and so does not belong in Table 171-2

SuggestedRemedy

Create new "Table 171-2a—MDIO PHY 800GXS to Clause 171 control variable mapping" table and move the PHY\_XS\_enhanced\_ptp\_accuracy\_enable into this this new table

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is likely to be overtaken by events assuming that comment #36 is accepted. Resolve using the response to comment #36.

Cl 171 SC 171.8 P203 L16 # 4

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

In Table 171-3 the register names have had "in ns" and "in sub-ns" deleted from their names. This is incorrect, the register names should be as specified in IEEE Std 802.3cx-2023. Also "RX" and "TX" indication does not match between MDIO and Clause 172 variable naming.

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 171-3 the register names have had "in ns" and "in sub-ns" deleted from their names. This was correct in draft 1.2 and the register names need to be reverted to their draft 1.2 state (see IEEE Std 802.3cx-2023 for the correct register names).

The Clause 172 status variable variables names have "RX" in their names when it should be "TX" and vice versa. Please correct this

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Revert the register names to those used in D1.2 as described in the suggested remedy. No change is required for the Clause 172 status variable names. Since the PHY XS is essentially an upside down PCS (Clause 172), there needs to be a Rx/Tx transposition between a Clause 172 status variable and the corresponding PHY XS status variable in Clause 171, for example the Rx path delay in Clause 172 is actually the Tx path delay in the PHY XS in Clause 171.

Cl 171 SC 171.9.5.5 P216 L22 # 95

Nicholl, Shawn AMD

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Currently says "transmits what it receives from the 800GMII". However, this sub-clause pertains to 1.6TXS.

SuggestedRemedy

Propose "transmits what it receives from the 1.6TMII".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 174 SC 174.2.12 P231 L41 # 155

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

ILT coordinates transition to DATA mode.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "equalization, modulation, and precoding states on the link partner transmitter, and to indicate the receiver state."

To: "equalization, modulation, and precoding states on the link partner transmitter, to indicate the receiver state and to coordinate transition to DATA mode."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 174 SC 174.3.2 P235 L20 # 87

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

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 rarely, if ever, 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 which creates an AUI interface between the two PMAs. And then add the necessary inter-layer signals on the AUI connection between the two PMAs.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The intent of this diagram (see figure title) is to show intersublayer interfaces not provide an exhaustive set of implementation configurations, which is provided instead in Annex 176B.



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 174A SC 174A.4 P662 L3 # 161  
 Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Pre-FEC BER should be  $2.21 \times 10^{-4}$ .  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change: " $2.21 \times 10^{-14}$ ."  
 To: " $2.21 \times 10^{-4}$ ."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 174A SC 174A.5 P662 L22 # 194  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ER1 error ratio  
 codeword error ratio and pre-correction BER values are TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #77.

Cl 174A SC 174A.5 P662 L22 # 77  
 Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ER1 error ratio  
 FEC codeword error ratio of less than TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 TBD will be updated in a future contribution.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending CRG review of the following contribution:  
 <URL>/sluyski\_3dj\_xx\_2501

Cl 174A SC 174A.5 P662 L23 # 78  
 Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ER1 error ratio  
 Equivalent to a pre-correction BER (BERtotal) of TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 For link based on OFEC the pre-FEC BER is  $2.0 \times 10^{-2}$   
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change TBD to  $2 \times 10^{-2}$ .  
 Pending CRG discussion.

Cl 174A SC 174A.5 P668 L14 # 469  
 Maki, Jeffery Juniper Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 "Frame loss ratio for entire PHY" is wrong or at least has been unnecessarily truncated to one significant digit compared to other cases in the draft and in the published 802.3-2022 standard.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "Frame loss ratio for entire PHY" to  $6.2 \times 10^{-11}$ .  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #467.

Cl 174A SC 174A.5 P668 L17 # 470  
 Maki, Jeffery Juniper Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 "Frame loss ratio for entire PHY" is wrong or at least has been unnecessarily truncated to one significant digit. In turn, the "Codeword error ratio for entire PHY" is wrong.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "Codeword error ratio for entire PHY" to  $1.50 \times 10^{-11}$ .  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #467.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 174A SC 174A.5 P668 L19 # 471  
 Maki, Jeffery Juniper Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 "Frame loss ratio for entire PHY" is wrong or at least has been unnecessarily truncated to one significant digit. In turn, the "BER for entire PHY (BERtotal)" is wrong.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "BER for entire PHY (BERtotal)" to 2.93x10^-4.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #467.

Cl 174A SC 174A.6 P663 L7 # 430  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 174A.7.1 does not constrain the error ratio of an ISL, only of the PCS to PCS link.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete this sentence  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1 P662 L21 # 377  
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Text in the body of the specification as well as in figures appears inconsistent, as at times it is talking at the PMD level, while other parts seem to be talking about at the PHY. And in the figures it refers to receiver under test.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Use "PHY" consistently unless specifically testing a PMD  
 Proposed Response Response Status Z  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.1 P663 L25 # 431  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 It would be helpful to describe where the pre-coder is in the testing.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 In Figure 174A-1, 174A-2, 174A-3 and 174A-4 change the title of the boxes to "PMD transmit function (including pre-coder if used)" and "PMD receive function (including pre-coder if used)" or add a sentence at line 17 "The Transmit and Receive PMD functions include precoding when it is used."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This level of detail is beyond the the scope of this annex and is described in detail for each PMD and AUI component.  
 The proposed change does not improve clarity or accuracy of the draft.

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.1 P663 L39 # 128  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Inner FEC test patterns  
 The CI177 and CI184 Inner FEC blocks are both reliant upon finding the AMs in the data stream to determine the RS-FEC CW boundary. So Figure 174A-2 is not a viable configuration unless that alignment and deskew processes are disabled in a test mode.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add a test\_mode to CI177 and CI184 that causes the input to permutation function in CI184 and the input to convolutional interleaver in CI177 to use the PMA service interface input data directly.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #10.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.1 P663 L43 # 150

He, Xiang Huawei  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Inner FEC test patterns

The PAM4 encoder should not be in front of the Inner FEC transmit function.  
 The PRBS31Q patten should not go through the Inner FEC transmit function in order to maintain its characteristics.  
 A presentation will be provided.

SuggestedRemedy

First, remove "PAM4 encoder" box. Then, either change "PRBS31Q" to "PRBS31", or move "PRBS31Q" into the "Inner FEC transmit function" box.  
 A presentation will be provided.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending CRG review of the following contribution:  
 <URL>/he\_3dj\_01\_2501

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.3 P664 L35 # 162

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

In Hm is not clear what is the meaning of "m"

SuggestedRemedy

Define the meaning of "m" in Hm or remove the "m"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 H\_m is a set of measured histograms.  
 Change: "Hm(i)(k) is a set of 17-bin histograms"  
 To: "Hm(i)(k) is a set of measured 17-bin histograms"

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.3 P664 L41 # 163

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The polynomial for PRBS31Q is not defined

SuggestedRemedy

Define that the PRBS31Q is produced by the polynomial defined in Equation (49-2) and shown in Figure 49-9.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The PRBS31Q test pattern is defined in the either the PMA clause or the Inner FEC clause.  
 This detail is beyond the scope of this annex. The proposed change does not improve clarity or accuracy of the draft.

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.3 P664 L48 # 432

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Wrong equation reference

SuggestedRemedy

Change Equation 174A-3 to 174A-1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.4 P665 L16 # 164

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

max should not replace m but be target for Hm(k)

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "Hmax(k)"  
 to: "max(Hm(k))" in the 3 occurences in this section.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 h\_max(k) is a maximum limit for the corresponding measured value h\_m(k), for each value k on each lane i. This is a per-lane test, so for any k there is only one measured value.  
 However, the purpose of the histogram should be clarified.  
 Add the following sentence at the beginning of the second paragraph of 174A.6.1.4: "The upper limit for H\_m(i)(k) is defined by the histogram H\_max(k)."

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.4 P665 L24 # 165

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Define the ranges of k and i

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "for all k and i."  
 To: "for k = 0 to 16 and i = 0 to p-1"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The lane index i and number of lanes p are defined in 174A.6.1.2. It is not necessary to repeat this elsewhere.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.4 P665 L24 # 180

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D KER, per-lane

The block error ratio test method in 174A.6.x.x provides a means to constrain the block error ratio due to a single lane by constraining the error histogram to be below a limit curve. This is overly conservative and does not provide a single metric for optical and electrical waterfall curves.

*SuggestedRemedy*

An effective block error ratio metric for a single lane on a multi-lane PMD is required. A contribution with proposal will be provided.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The following related contribution was reviewed at a previous ad hoc meeting:  
[https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/adhoc/optics/0125\\_OPTX/barrie\\_3dj\\_optx\\_01\\_250109.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/adhoc/optics/0125_OPTX/barrie_3dj_optx_01_250109.pdf)

Implement both proposals on slide xxx of barrie\_3dj\_optx\_01\_250109.

Pending CRG review of the following contribution:

<URL/barrie\_3dj\_01\_2501>

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.5 P665 L33 # 183

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D KER, per-lane

The method in this subclause was "simplified" as proposed by adopted D1.2 comment #78. However, some intermediate equations which provided context were eliminated. Some of the changes should be reversed, reviving some of the original variables and equations.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Revive the intermediate equations that we in D1.1, similar to the way they are used in 174A.7.1.4.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.5 P665 L34 # 166

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D KER, all-lanes

Point b) is unclear:  
 - Is equation 174A-5 defining  $He(k)$  ? If yes, then it should say: " $He(k) = \dots$ "  
 - Not clear how to iterate

*SuggestedRemedy*

Clarify the meaning of point b).  
 Maybe add a small pseudocode to describe the iterations

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #384.

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.1.5 P665 L40 # 384

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D KER, all-lanes

The operation defined by Equation (174A-5) and (174A-6) would be better described as a function so that it can be invoked in a more clear and concise way. For example, if the function "combine( $H_x(k)$ ,  $H_y(k)$ )" was defined to be result of Equations (174A-5) and (174A-6), the instruction in item b) above could reduce to "For  $i = 0$  to  $p-1$ , iteratively assign  $He(k)$  the result of combine( $He(k)$ ,  $H_m(i)(k)$ )" or similar.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a subclause that defines the combination of two histograms in a functional form. Replace references to Equation (174A-5) and (174A-6), with the corresponding text regarding substitutions, with an expression the uses that new function definition.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 174A SC 174A.6.2 P667 L37 # 8

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D PHY TX KER

Residual errors are permitted at a C2M component output or PMD transmit output when part of a PHY. This residual error ratio must be constrained in the same way errors generated by a PHY transmitter are constrained.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add frame loss error ratio and block error ratio constraints for the transmitter output of a complete PHY. Methodology may need to be added in 174A. A contribution will provide more details.

New specifications are need in each of PMD clauses: 178 through 183.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Pending CRG review of the following contribution:  
<URL>/brown\_3dj\_04\_2501.

Cl 174A SC 174A.7 P666 L8 # 376

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D KER for PHY

Title does not reflect what is actually being tested - Per 174A.7.1 - This test method permits measurement of the performance of all physical lanes in a PHY as a group using FEC error counters in the PCS.

*SuggestedRemedy*

1. Change title of Annex to "Error ration tests for a PHY"
2. In Figure 174A-4, change "receiver under test" to "PHY under test"
3. In figure 174A-4 , change "inner FEC only if required by the PMD" to "inner FEC only if required by the PHY"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Change the title of 174A.7 to "Error ratio tests for a PHY"  
In Figure 174A-4...  
Change "Receiver under test" to "PHY receiver under test"  
Change "Inner FEC only if required by the PMD" to "Inner FEC only if required by the PHY"

Cl 174A SC 174A.7 P666 L9 # 130

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D KER for xMII Extender

This method is also valid for between a DTE\_XS and PHY\_XS.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Rename 174A.7 as "Error ratio tests for a PHY or XS using PCS statistics"

Add this to the end of the first paragraph of 174A.7 "The same method works for an Extender Sublayer which includes 200Gb/s signaling on one or more ISLs."

Remove PCS-to-PCS from the second paragraph and add "or XS" to the end of the first sentence in the second paratph of 174A.7

Remove "in a PHY" and "in the PCS" from the first sentence and add "or XS" after PHY in the second sentence of 174A.7.1

Add "Note: The DTE and PHY XS sub-layers are functionally equivalent to a PCS for the purpose of this test method." to 174A.7.1

Create a new figure for the XS test structure leveragin Fig 174A-4 removing hte Inner FEC and PMD and changing PCS to XS.

Remove PCS from the title of 174A.7.1.2 and the first sentence of the section.

Implement with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
In principal, a method for the the xMII Extender can be provided and would be similar that for the PCS to PCS link. However, the method as currently defined is for measurement of the PHY (PMD/.../PCS) only. Whereas, the XS to XS link within an xMII Extender (XS/PMA/.../PMA/XS) is somewhat different. A complete proposal is required.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 174A SC 174A.7.1.1 P666 L41 # 107

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

the purpose of PCS-to-PCS error ratio test is to test the performance of a PHY, which should include transmitting-side PCS, PMA and PMD, the Medium, and the receiving-side PMD, PMA and PCS. Therefore the test configuration should include the full link, with the testing pattern generated by the PCS Transmitter under test.

The current drawing is more suitable for a receiver test, with a generic test source, an unspecified test channel and receiver under test.

*SuggestedRemedy*

The PMA transmit function should also consider the three variations with different AUI instantiation.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The test configuration showing in Figure 174A-4 is for measurement of the PHY receiver path only. Contribution of errors from a real PHY transmit path is accomodated by step f and g in 174A.7.1.4.

Note that comment #8 proposes adding a new test for PHY transmitter

Cl 174A SC 174A.7.1.3 P667 L1 # 129

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

This section is not really "measuring" or comparing the hisograms to anything it's just acquiring the data. In 174A.6.1.3 we don't include the word measurement in the section title.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the word "measurement" from the title of 174A.7.1.3

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The text literally says that these are measurements "An error histogram using PCS counters is measured using the following method:" However, it makes sense to align the subclause titles in 174A.6.1.3 and 174A.7.1.3. Change the title of 174A.6.1.3 to "PMA error histogram measurement"

Cl 174A SC 174A.7.1.4 P667 L17 # 385

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D (withdrawn)

An "error mask" test method can also be defined for PCS-based measurements. This option can be used for lane-by-lane testing and would enable a quick assessment of whether or not the block error ratio requirement is met with reduced (or no additional) post-processing. As is the case for PMA-based measurements, failure to meet the error mask does not necessarily mean the block error ratio requirement is not met. It instead means that the method currently defined in 174A.7.1.4 would need to be used to confirm whether the block error ratio requirement is, or is not, met.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Consider adding a subclause for "Error mask test method using PCS-based measurements". The error mask is computed in the same way as defined in 174A.6.1.4 (using the value of BERadded appropriate for PCS-based measurments). The new subclause should also note that errors on unstressed lanes will be (incorrectly) attributed to the lane under test and should be minimized for the most accurate results.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 174A SC 174A.7.1.4 P667 L20 # 167

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D KER stress

It is not clear what is "stress" or where is it applied in the lane.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In point a) change: "with no stress applied to any lane" to "with no stress applied to the receiver of any lane" InPoint b) change: "with stress applied only to lane i" to: "with stress applied only to the receiver of lane i"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Pending review of slides with topic "Block error ratio stress" in the following editorial contribution:  
<URL>/brown\_3dj\_03\_2501

Cl 174A SC 174A.7.1.4 P667 L26 # 168

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Point e) is unclear

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change: "substituting Hms(k) for Hx(k) for Hms (i)(k) for Hy(k)"  
 To: "substituting Hms(k) for Hx(k) and Hms (i)(k) for Hy(k)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 174A SC 174A.7.1.4 P667 L35 # 106

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The last sentence of this subclause "The measured codeword error ratio is expected be less than 1.45 e-11." is misleading.

At the beginning, it states "The following method is used to calculate the block error ratio using FEC bin counters provided in the PCS."  
 Step h defines the block error ratio as Hms(16), not the code word error ratio.

CL174A.8 provides the definition of FEC codeword error ratio, which seems to be Hm(16).

It is unclear which error ratio should be less than 1.45e-11.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to "the measured block error ratio is expected to be less....". Or state the relation between codeword error ratio and block error ratio in the subclause.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change "The measured codeword error ratio"  
 To "The measured block error ratio"

Cl 174A SC 174A.9 P668 L11 # 151

He, Xiang Huawei  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Error ratio budget

Table 174A-1 has a single 2.28E-4 number for "BER per sublayer in a PHY" column, and this table is for all optical PHYs. It did not include the 4.85E-3 BER number for PHYs using Inner FEC.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Put two numbers in the field with footnotes:  
 2.28 x 10-4 b  
 4.85 x 10-3 c  
 Where footnote b says "If the PMD is a type defined in Clause 180 and Clause 181" and footnote c says "If the PMD is a type defined in Clause 182 and Clause 183"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 This BER budget is in the context of the RS-FEC in the PCS. The BER measurement point is defined as being in the PMA, this would be after Inner FEC decoding when Inner FEC is required by the PHY. The BER is therefore common for PMD with Inner FEC or PMD without Inner FEC.  
 However, it would be helpful to point this out.  
 Add a footnote to "PMD-to-PMD" saying "As measured at the PMA closest to the PMD".

Cl 174A SC 174A.9 P668 L12 # 467

Maki, Jeffery Juniper Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

"Frame loss ratio for entire PHY" is wrong or at least has been unnecessarily truncated to one significant digit. In turn, the "Codeword error ratio for entire PHY" is wrong and the "BER for entire PHY (BERtotal)" is wrong.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Frame loss ratio for entire PHY" to 6.2x10^-11, "Codeword error ratio for entire PHY" to 1.50x10^-11, and change "BER for entire PHY (BERtotal)" to 2.93x10^-4.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 As explained in 174A.3, 6.2E-11 is frame loss ratio target for the entire link from the RS transmit at one end to the RS receive at the other end. As further explained in 174A.4 and 174A.5 the net frame loss ratio is allocated to two xMII extenders (one at each end, 0.1E-11 each) and the PHY to PHY link (from PCS transmit at one end to the PCS receive at the other end, 6E-11). The total is 6.2E-11.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 174A SC 174A.9 P668 L16 # 434

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

AUI's from Annex 120B also need to meet the requirement described in footnote a

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Annex 120B (i.e. 25Gb/s per lane)" to the list in Tables 174A-1, 174A-2 and 174A-3

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The BER target current defined in Annex 120B is 1E-6 which meets the requirement defined in footnote a.

Cl 174A SC 174A.9 P668 L16 # 433

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

Footnote a should be applied to the xAUI-n C2C in the bottom row as well as the top.

SuggestedRemedy

Make this change in tables 174A-1 and 174A-2 Also in a74A-1 delete the extraneous "at" in the last sentence of footnote a where it says "to meet at the BER allocations .."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 174A SC 174A.9 P668 L29 # 468

Maki, Jeffery Juniper Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

"Frame loss ratio for entire PHY" is wrong or at least has been unnecessarily truncated to one significant digit. In turn, the "Codeword error ratio for entire PHY" is wrong and the "BER for entire PHY (BERtotal)" is wrong.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Frame loss ratio for entire PHY" to  $6.2 \times 10^{-11}$ , "Codeword error ratio for entire PHY" to  $1.50 \times 10^{-11}$ , and change "BER for entire PHY (BERtotal)" to  $2.93 \times 10^{-4}$ .

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #467.

Cl 174A SC 174A.9 P668 L43 # 435

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Error ratio budget

As stated in the editor's note the random BER target far exceeds the sum of random BER targets. There is no need to constrain the C2C BER allocation in the extender to 0.08e-4. (particularly for the lower speed C2C's where the historical BER is 0.1 e-4).

SuggestedRemedy

Change the BER per sublayer in an xMII Extender for the C2C to 0.1e-4.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 A complete proposal is required to show how an alternate BER would be practical given that in most cases the host xAUI-n might be either within a PHY (e.g., if no XS + PCS is provided on the module) or within an xMII extender. Also, the proposal would need to show precisely how the specifications would be modified in order to test for interoperability. This would affect specifications in annexes 120B, 120C, 120D, 120E, 120F, 120G, 176C, and 176D.  
 The draft is complete and accurate as written.  
 Delete the editor's note.

Cl 175 SC 175.2.4.6.1 P247 L1 # 181

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The acronym AM (and plural AMs) is used a few times but never defined. Better to just spell it out.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "AM" to "alignment marker" is several places at page/line: 247/1, 248/12, 249/42, 249/51, 249/54, 251/32 x2, 253/16 x2

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 175 SC 175.2.4.6.2 P266 L2 # 476

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

Typo in variable name tx\_acrambled\_f1\_i<256:0>.

SuggestedRemedy

Change tx\_acrambled\_f1\_i<256:0> to be tx\_scrambled\_f1\_i<256:0>.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 175 SC 175.2.5.3 P254 L41 # 21  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 The following description is overly specific: "The following counters shall be implemented to aid a network operator in determining the link quality." It is also for PHY and LINK testing in general.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "The following counters shall be implemented:"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176 SC 176.1.3 P270 L32 # 16  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 The terms defined in this subclause are not ordered in a consistent way. Typically for definitions we order them alphanumerically according to the rules according to the guidelines here:  
[http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG\\_tools/editorial/requirements/words.html#sort](http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG_tools/editorial/requirements/words.html#sort)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Reorder the terms alphanumerically according to the guidelines.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 176 SC 176.1.4 P271 L33 # 477  
 Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Should modify "Delay alternating PCSs by two RS-FEC codewords ..." to be "Delay of alternating PCSs by two RS-FEC codewords ..."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change:  
 "Delay alternating PCSs by two RS-FEC codewords ..."  
 To:  
 "Delay of alternating PCSs by two RS-FEC codewords ...".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The comment proposes a change that is not sufficiently justified. The current text is technically correct as written.

Cl 176 SC 176.1.4 P271 L42 # 478  
 Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Now that PMAL is a defined term, the parenthetical "(lanes)" on line 43 should be updated to "(PMALs)".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "(lanes)"  
 with: (PMALs).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Since PMAL has been defined as lanes operating at 212.5Gb/s, it will be better to simply replace "... and data streams (lanes) operating at 212.5 Gb/s" with "and PMALs".  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 176 SC 176.2 P273 L47 # 480  
 Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Prior to line 47 on page 273, at the start of four paragraphs that describe the various PMA \*.request and \*.indication primitives, it would be good to add a cross-reference to the PMA block diagrams which illustrate the interface primitives and their positions either above or below the PMA to orient the reader to their position.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Suggest adding a single sentence paragraph prior to the paragraph starting at line 47 with wording similar to "The PMA service interfaces are illustrated in Figure 176-2, 176-11 and 176-12."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 176 SC 176.2 P274 L17 # 85

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

In the last sentence of the paragraph right before Table 176-5, the statement "[the parameter] is set to the value of the received SIGNAL\_OK value" is ambiguous. Which received SIGNAL\_OK is to be used? There are two different SIGNAL\_OK inputs.

The same kind of statement is made in the last sentence of the paragraph immediately before Table 176-6 on page 275, in subclause 176.3, line 29.

Both of these statements should be made more clear.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In 176.2, immediately prior to Table 176-5 change the sentence from:  
 "For the n:n PMAs, the SIGNAL\_OK parameter at the client interface is set to the value of the received SIGNAL\_OK value.

to:  
 "For the n:n PMAs, the SIGNAL\_OK parameter at the client interface is set to the value of the received SIGNAL\_OK parameter from the sublayer below the PMA (inst:IS\_SIGNAL.indication(SIGNAL\_OK))."

And in subclause 176.3, change the last sentence immediately prior to Table 176-6 from:  
 "For the n:n PMAs, the SIGNAL\_OK parameter at the interface below the PMA is set to the value of the received SIGNAL\_OK value."

to:  
 "For the n:n PMAs, the SIGNAL\_OK parameter at the interface below the PMA is set to the value of the received SIGNAL\_OK parameter from the sublayer above the PMA (PMA:IS\_SIGNAL.request(SIGNAL\_OK))."

*Proposed Response* Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 176 SC 176.3 P275 L6 # 479

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

Verb tense is not correct.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change: "..., the m:n PMAs sends n parallel symbol streams ..."  
 to: "..., the m:n PMAs send n parallel symbol streams ...".

And on line 11 of the same page 275,  
 Change: "..., the n:m PMAs sends m parallel symbol streams ..."  
 to: "..., the n:m PMAs send m parallel symbol streams ..."

And on line 18 of the same page 275,  
 Change: "..., the n:n PMAs sends n parallel symbol streams ..."  
 to: "..., the n:n PMAs send n parallel symbol streams ..."

*Proposed Response* Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176 SC 176.4 P276 L16 # 481

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

Now that PMAL is a defined term, it can be used to replace term "212.5 Gb/s interface lanes".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace:  
 "Note that m equals the number of PCSs and n equals the number 212.5 Gb/s interface lanes for each xBASE-R m:n PMA."  
 With:  
 "Note that m equals the number of PCSs and n equals the number PMALs for each xBASE-R m:n PMA."

Similar updates can be made throughout Clause 176 where there are references to "212.5 Gb/s interface lanes" such as line 51 on page 292.

*Proposed Response* Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 176 SC 176.4.1 P276 L21 # 482

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

Should add "PMAL" term when referring to the appropriate PMA interface lanes.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace:  
 "In the transmit (multiplexing) direction, the m:n PMAs perform a transmit function which multiplexes RS-FEC symbols from m PCSL input lanes received at the PMA service interface to n output lanes at the service interface below the PMA. In the receive (demultiplexing) direction, the m:n PMAs perform a receive function which demultiplexes RS-FEC symbols from n input lanes at the service interface below the PMA to m PCSL output lanes toward the PMA service interface."

With:  
 "In the transmit (multiplexing) direction, the m:n PMAs perform a transmit function which multiplexes RS-FEC symbols from m PCSL input lanes received at the PMA service interface to n PMAL output lanes at the service interface below the PMA. In the receive (demultiplexing) direction, the m:n PMAs perform a receive function which demultiplexes RS-FEC symbols from n PMAL input lanes at the service interface below the PMA to m PCSL output lanes toward the PMA service interface."

Similar updates can be made to 176.5.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In 176.4.1

Change:  
 "In the transmit (multiplexing) direction, the m:n PMAs perform a transmit function which multiplexes RS-FEC symbols from m PCSL input lanes received at the PMA service interface to n output lanes at the service interface below the PMA. In the receive (demultiplexing) direction, the m:n PMAs perform a receive function which demultiplexes RS-FEC symbols from n input lanes at the service interface below the PMA to m PCSL output lanes toward the PMA service interface."

To:  
 "In the transmit (multiplexing) direction, the m:n PMAs multiplex RS-FEC symbols from m PCSLs at the PMA service interface to n PMALs at the service interface below the PMA. In the receive (demultiplexing) direction, the m:n PMAs demultiplex RS-FEC symbols from n PMALs at the service interface below the PMA to m PCSLs toward the PMA service interface."

In 176.5.1

Change:  
 "In the transmit (demultiplexing) direction, the n:m PMAs perform a transmit function which demultiplexes RS-FEC symbols from n input lanes at the PMA service interface to m PCSL output lanes at the service interface below the PMA. In the receive (multiplexing) direction, the n:m PMAs perform a receive function which multiplexes RS-FEC symbols from m

PCSL input lanes at the service interface below the PMA to n output lanes at the PMA service interface."

To:  
 "In the transmit (demultiplexing) direction, the n:m PMAs demultiplex RS-FEC symbols from n PMALs at the PMA service interface to m PCSLs at the service interface below the PMA. In the receive (multiplexing) direction, the n:m PMAs multiplex RS-FEC symbols from m PCSLs at the service interface below the PMA to n PMALs at the PMA service interface."

Implement the with editorial license.

CI 176 SC 176.4.1 P277 L52 # 420

Nicholl, Gary Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Symbol Demux

Figure 176-2. I find the "symbol demultiplexing" block to be somewhat confusing as this block is essentially a "blind 20-bit demux and slip" function , and only truly represents a symbol demux when the 20-bit demux aligns with the 20-bit symbol-pair boundaries as confirmed by the subsequent 'alignment marker lock" function. It is actually the combination of the "blind 20-bit demux and slip" and "alignment marker lock" functions that perform the "symbol demux" .

*SuggestedRemedy*

I think at this level the functional block diagram would be much easier to understand if we were to combine the "symbol demultiplexing" and "Alignment marker lock" functional blocks into a single functional block called "Symbol demultiplexing" . This functional block would internally be comprised of two blocks, "20-bit demux and slip" and "alignment marker lock". These two blocks would be described later in the subclause (perhaps with their own block diagram).

A presentation will be provided with more details on this proposal.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of the following presentation and CRG discussion.  
 <URL>/nicholl\_3dj\_02\_2501

CI 176 SC 176.4.2.4.2 P281 L32 # 96

Nicholl, Shawn AMD  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Currently says "... and for the 400GBASE-R 32:4 PMA, the odd lanes ..."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Propose "... and for the 400GBASE-R 16:2 PMA, the odd lanes ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 176 SC 176.4.3.2.1 P286 L30 # 86

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The statement "... continues until all eight PCS lanes have alignment marker lock using the same 20-bit symbol-pair boundary" can be made more clear by stating what is meant by the "same boundary".

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence on page 286, line 30 from:  
 "This process of a one-bit slip followed by alignment marker search continues until all eight PCS lanes have alignment marker lock using the same 20-bit symbol-pair boundary."  
 to:  
 "This process of a one-bit slip followed by alignment marker search continues until all eight PCS lanes have alignment marker lock using the 20-bit boundary set by the demultiplexer."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In the Suggested Remedy, replace the word "set" by "chosen".  
 Change:  
 "This process of a one-bit slip followed by alignment marker search continues until all eight PCS lanes have alignment marker lock using the same 20-bit symbol-pair boundary."  
 To:  
 "This process of a one-bit slip followed by alignment marker search continues until all eight PCS lanes have alignment marker lock using the 20-bit boundary chosen by the demultiplexer."

Implement with editorial license.

CI 176 SC 176.4.4.2.1 P289 L25 # 483

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Definition of variable restart\_lock\_demux<y> states that it is set to true in the SYMBOL\_LOCK\_RESTART state, but is actually set to true in two separate states in state diagram Figure 176-10.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "Boolean variable that is set to true in the SYMBOL\_LOCK\_RESTART state to restart ..."  
 To: "Boolean variable that is set to true in the SYMBOL\_LOCK\_RESTART and SLIP\_CONTROL states to restart ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

CI 176 SC 176.4.4.2.3 P290 L4 # 484

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

Numbers less than or equal to 10 (ten) should be written out.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "Counts 3 alignment marker intervals."  
 To: "Counts three alignment marker intervals."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 176 SC 176.4.4.3 P290 L34 # 145

He, Xiang Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The index y is not a PMAL but a PAML number.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "where y is the input PMAL" to "where y is the input PMAL number"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 176 SC 176.4.4.3 P291 L2 # 84

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The initial condition (open arrow) to enter the LOSS\_OF\_ALIGNMNET state in Figure 176-9 is "reset + !all\_locked\_mux". (!signal\_ok\_mux) should be added to this condition

SuggestedRemedy

Change the open arrow condition to enter LOSS\_OF\_ALIGNMENT state from:  
 reset + !all\_locked\_mux  
 to:  
 reset + !signal\_ok\_mux + !all\_locked\_mux

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 176 SC 176.4.4.3 P291 L16 # 83

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

In the Figure 176-9 state diagram, after entering ALIGNMENT\_FAIL state, the state machine will transition immediately to LOSS\_OF\_ALIGNMENT\_STATE. There should be an arc added from ALIGNMENT\_FAIL to LOSS\_OF\_ALIGNMENT (as an unconditional transition). Adding this arc will make the state diagram easier for the reader to understand. Without this arc, the reader must figure out that setting restart\_lock\_mux to true causes restart\_lock in Figure 119-2 to be true, and that variable causes the Fig. 119-12 state machine to go to the LOCK\_INIT state which sets the amps\_lock<x> variable to false and when any amps\_locks<x> is false for x = 0 to 31, then the variable all\_locked in clause 119 also becomes false. And then all\_lock\_mux in CL 176 takes the value of CL 119 all\_locked. And finally the user can see that (!all\_locked\_mux) is an open arrow global transition condition to the LOSS\_OF\_ALIGNMENT state.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In the Figure 176-9 state diagram, add an unconditional transition arc (UCT) from the ALIGNMENT\_FAIL state to the LOSS\_OF\_ALIGNMENT state.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The state diagram is correct as shown. It follows similar state diagrams in Cl119 which does not show the UCT transition. The comment has a fair point that in CL176, the level of indirection is greater and showing the UCT transition is better. Not strictly needed though.

Cl 176 SC 176.4.4.3 P292 L17 # 485

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

In Figure 176-10, the state transitions out of SLIP\_CONTROL and SYMBOL\_LOCK\_RESTART do not have a condition.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Unconditional state transitions should be labelled "UCT".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In Fig 176-10, label the unconditional state transitions out of SLIP\_CONTROL and SYMBOL\_LOCK\_RESTART with "UCT"

Cl 176 SC 176.5.4.1.5 P319 L48 # 20

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D (withdrawn)

The index "i" is typically used for the lane number. Since counters need to be defined per lane, this index "i" will cause some ambiguity in the management variables and MDIO register definitions. For similar bin counters defined in 174A.6 and 176.7.4.1 the index "k" is used for this purpose.

*SuggestedRemedy*

For the bin counters defined in 177.5.4.1.5 change the index "i" to "k". Also update Table 177-7 and definitions in Clause 45 appropriately.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 176 SC 176.7.4 P298 L3 # 18

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Subclause 176.7.4 specifies that test pattern generators and checker defined in 120.5.11.2 are optional but does not elaborate which ones. Necessary pattern generators are PRBS31Q, PRBS13Q, SSPRQ, and square wave. Necessary pattern checkers are PRBS31Q and PRBS13Q.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Create a subclause for each pattern generator and checker that is optionally required and refer back to 120.5.11.2.x for details.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Create subclauses for PRBS31Q, PRBS13Q, SSPRQ and Square wave patterns. State that PRBS31Q pattern generator and checker are mandatory. State that PRBS13Q, PRBSQ9, SSPRQ and square wave generators are optional. Within each subclause, point to the subclause that describes the pattern in 120.5.11.2 for further details. Implement with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176 SC 176.7.4 P298 L3 # 19

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Draft 1.2 comment #135 adopted response said that the PRBS31Q block error counters were mandatory but not the checker. The PRBS31Q pattern checker with block error checking is needed for PMD and AUI component testing.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Specify that the PRBS31Q pattern check is mandatory.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176 SC 176.7.4.1 P298 L16 # 394

Shrikhande, Kapil Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D counter format

The definition and format of the test block error bin counters should be aligned to match the bin counters defined in the PCS clauses (see FEC codeword error bin counter definition in 175.2.5.3). The counter size is not included in 176.7.4.1, whereas bin counters in PCS/FEC clauses include counter size.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Align bin counter definition format in 176.7.4.1 to the bin counter definition in 175.2.5.3, and also include counter size in the definition in 176.7.4.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #11.

[Editor's note (to be deleted): Note that comment #11 is in bucket #1. Resolve after bucket #1 motion.]

Cl 176 SC 176.7.4.1 P298 L26 # 12

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Some of the block error counters may increment closed to once per block. As such, these counters, if 32 bits, will saturate around 30 seconds after being reset to zero. In order to ensure that there is at least 15 minutes between reset and saturation, bin counters for 0, 1, 2, and 3 should be larger.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Specify the counter size for test\_block\_error\_bin\_i\_k to be 48 bits for k from 0 to 3 and 32 bits otherwise.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 176 SC 176.8 P199 L9 # 22

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D PMA delay

Delay limits for 200GBASE-R, 400GBASE-R, and 1.6TBASE-R PMAs are TBD and the one for 800GBASE-R PMAs may need to be refined.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Update Table 116-6, Table 116-7, 169-4, and Table 174-4 with the adopted numbers.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #451.

Cl 176 SC 176.8 P299 L4 # 451

Shrikhande, Kapil Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PMA delay

In Table 176-7, complete the TBD delay values for the SM-PMAs.

*SuggestedRemedy*

A presentation will be provided for the TBD values in Table 176-7.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Pending review of the following presentation and CRG discussion.

<URL>/shrikhande\_3dj\_01\_2501

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176 SC 176.8 P299 L6 # 226

de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D PMA delay

In the table, why is the value for a 4:4 PMA so large (2x the 4:32 / 32:4 PMA)? Wouldn't it just be a wire?

Is it because it could reasonably be implemented with a 4:32 PMA in series with a 32:4 PMA?

Assuming the 4:4 PMA value is correct, the same rules can be used for the 1:1, 2:2 and 8:8 PMAs, i.e double the values of the 1:8, 2:16, and 8:16 PMA, respectively.

*SuggestedRemedy*

For the '200GBASE-R 1:1 PMA' delay constraint values, double the delay constraint values of the '200GBASE-R 1:8 PMA or 8:1 PMA' delay constraints.

For the '400GBASE-R 2:2 PMA' delay constraint values, double the delay constraint values of the '400GBASE-R 2:16 PMA or 16:2 PMA' delay constraints.

For the '1.6TBASE-R 8:8 PMA' delay constraint values, double the delay constraint values of the '1.6TBASE-R 8:16 PMA or 16:8 PMA' delay constraints.

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #451.

Cl 176 SC 176.8 P299 L6 # 223

de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D PMA delay

Should the 4-codeword deskew (compensating for skew across an AUI) be included in the PMA delay constraint? I think not. This should be seen as the delay of the AUI itself, and should not be included in the PMA's delay constraint.

*SuggestedRemedy*

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #451.

Cl 176 SC 176.8 P299 L6 # 225

de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D PMA delay

The max delay values for the '1.6TBASE-R 8:16 PMA or 16:8 PMA' should be roughly equal to those of the 800GBASE-R 4:32 PMA or 32:4 PMA. It is true that the 1.6T PMA does not have the 'Delay odd PCSs by one symbol' function (176.4.2.4.1), but the latency of one 10-bit symbol is negligible in the context of these delays.

*SuggestedRemedy*

For the '1.6TBASE-R 8:16 PMA or 16:8 PMA' delay constraints, use the same values as the '800GBASE-R 4:32 PMA or 32:4 PMA'

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #451.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 176 SC 176.8 P299 L6 # 222

de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D PMA delay

For Table 176-6, the delay of the 1:8 and 8:1 (for 200GBASE-R) and 2:16 and 16:2 (for 400GBASE-R) PMAs is complicated because of the 2CW skew introduced. Must be careful to avoid double-accounting the delay due to this skew! The max delay constraint (which is for the \*sum\* of Rx and Tx) should thus be calculated as the max base delay plus the intentional skew, (not 2x the intentional skew). This way, the total constraint will count the skew's contribution only once.

SuggestedRemedy

For the 1:8, 8:1, PMAs use the base max delay value (same as the 800GBASE-R 4:32 PMA or 32:4 PMA, presumably?) plus the intentional skew.  
Skew = 2 FEC CWs = 51.2ns for 200Gbps

200GBASE-R 1:8 PMA or 8:1 PMA :  
Maximum (bit time): 36864 + 40960 = 77824  
Maximum (pause\_quanta): 72 + 80 = 152  
Maximum (ns): 46.08 + 51.2 = 97.28

For the 2:16, 16:2, PMAs use the base max delay value (same as the 800GBASE-R 4:32 PMA or 32:4 PMA, presumably?) plus the intentional skew.  
Skew = 2 FEC CWs = 25.6ns for 400Gbps

400GBASE-R 2:16 PMA or 16:2 PMA :  
Maximum (bit time): 36864 + 20480 = 57344  
Maximum (pause\_quanta): 72 + 40 = 112  
Maximum (ns): 46.08 + 25.6 = 71.68

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #451.

CI 176 SC 176.8 P299 L21 # 224

de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D PMA delay

Whatever method is used to specify the max delay for the 1:8, 8:1, 2:16, 16:2 SM-PMAs in Table 176-6, a footnote to the table is required to explain the method. Otherwise, readers may get confused: looking at the delay through the Rx PMA in isolation, and the Tx PMA in isolation, one could conclude that they should each have a 2CW delay for the skew.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following note after the table:  
Note that since the delay constraint is respect to the sum of Rx and Tx delays, the intentional skew for the 1:8 and 8:1 PMAs (51.2ns) and for the 2:16 and 16:2 PMAs (25.6ns) contributes only ONCE.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #451.

CI 176 SC 176.9 P299 L23 # 452

Shrikhande, Kapil Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PMA skew

Complete the subclause 176.9 on Skew Constraints of the SM-PMA.

SuggestedRemedy

A presentation will be provided to update the Skew constraints subclause

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See related slides in the following editorial contribution:  
<URL>/nicholl\_3dj\_01\_2501  
For task force discussion.

CI 176 SC 176.9 P299 L24 # 26

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D PMA skew

Skew constraints are not defined for the PMAs. However, the skew at each interface is defined in 116, 169, and 174 and thus the numbers. The PMA skew constraints may be derived from these.

SuggestedRemedy

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #452.



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176 SC 176.11 P300 L15 # 5  
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Table 176-8 needs populating  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Refer to "Table 45-3—PMA/PMD registers" in IEEE Std 802.3 for the correct MDIO register bit references  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 176B SC 176B.3 P683 L12 # 378  
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 This subclause is included to highlight the co-existence of bit and symbol muxing in an implementation, but the figure uses generic language for the PMA sublayers that doesn't help.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add "BM-" or "SM-" as appropriate to the PMA sublayer boxes in Fig 176B-4.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176B SC 176B.4.1 P660 L51 # 424  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)  
 The editor's notes do not appear to be correct for the AUI's in the tables. E.g. 200GAUI-8 is not clause 176C. It should only apply to the PMA's and the changes to the PMA's are not what the editor's note implies. E.G. The sublayer in the first row of Table 176B-1 should not be changed from 200GBASE-R 8:n PMA to 200GBASE-R 8:8 PMA it appears to be correct as it is:  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make the necessary changes and delete the editor's note. Also on page 663 line 35, page 665 line 3, and page 668 line 3

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The editor's notes convey that the tables should also include guidance for use of AUIs with 50 Gb/s per lane and 25 Gb/s per lane (e.g., 200GAUI-8). Including these was deferred since it was not clear initially these were specified for use with the new PHY types defined in 802.3dj. However, updates to D1.2 and D1.3 imply that indeed these lower lane-rate AUIs are intended.  
 Update the tables per the editor's notes in 176B.4.1, 176B.4.2, 176B.5.1, and 176B.5.2. Implement with editorial license.

Cl 176B SC 176B.6.2 P695 L28 # 417  
 Nicholl, Gary Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Incorrect reference. Reference to "Figure 176B-2" should be "Figure 176B-3"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "Figure 176B-2" to "Figure 176B-3".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176C SC 176C.3 P701 L47 # 436

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

It might be confusing that "any PMA" includes bit muxed PMA's

SuggestedRemedy

replace "PMA" with "SM-PMA" just in these sentences where it is talking about "any PMA". E.g. change "The PMA above the 200 Gb/s per lane AUI-C2C is any m:1 PMA for 200GAUI-1, m:2 PMA for 400GAUI-2, m:4 PMA for 800GAUI-4, and m:8 PMA for 1.6TAUI-8, as specified in Clause 176." to "The PMA above the 200 Gb/s per lane AUI-C2C is any m:1 SM-PMA for 200GAUI-1, m:2 SM-PMA for 400GAUI-2, m:4 SM-PMA for 800GAUI-4, and m:8 SM-PMA for 1.6TAUI-8, as specified in Clause 176.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.1 P702 L43 # 437

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Test points (bucket)

The procedure in Annex 163A calls for the computations in 163A.3.1 and 163.4.1 which refer to calculations in Annex 93A that are different from those for 200G in Annex 178A.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "using the procedure in Annex 163A but replacing the COM related calculations in Annex 93A with those of Annex 178A"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.3 P703 L23 # 195

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D SCMR

Value for "Signal to AC common-mode noise ratio, SCMR (min)" is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 548.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.3 P703 L23 # 438

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D SCMR

The Signal to AC common-mode ratio is TBD. It is likely that similar performance devices will be used for C2C as for KR

SuggestedRemedy

Change TBD to 15 the same as for KR. Remove the Editor's note on page 705 line 19

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 548.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.3 P703 L23 # 439

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D RLcc

The common-mode to common-mode return loss is TBD. It is likely that similar performance devices will be used for C2C as for KR

SuggestedRemedy

Change TBD to 3.25 the same as for KR.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.3 P703 L23 # 548

Heck, Howard TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D SCMR

Minimum signal to AC common-mode noise ratio (SCMR) is TBD in D1.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change TBD to 15 dB, taken from KR Table 178-6. A presentation is planned to support the suggested remedy.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending CRG review of heck\_3dj\_01\_2501.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.3 P703 L26 # 549

Heck, Howard TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D RLcc

Minimum common-mode to common-mode return loss (RLcc) is TBD in D1.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change TBD to 3.25 dB, taken from KR Table 178-6. A presentation is planned to support the suggested remedy.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 439.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.3 P703 L26 # 196

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D RLcc

Value for "Common-mode to common-mode return loss, RLcc (min)" is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 439.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.3.1 P704 L17 # 169

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ILT (bucket)

inter-sublayer link training has a defined acronym already used in this Annex in 176C.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "inter-sublayer link training"  
 To: "ILT"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.3.1 P704 L19 # 139

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ILT

steady state measurement is also needed by ILT

SuggestedRemedy

Add "The steady state voltage specification needed in 178B.11.4 is specified in 178.9.2.4" to the subclause.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #138.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.3.1 P704 L19 # 134

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ILT (bucket)

Listing the coefficients and presets that are supported by the PMD here will lay the groundwork for reuse of the 178B over interfaces with differing support.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following with editorial license at the end of the second paragraph of 176C.4.3.1  
 "The coefficients and presets supported by the C2C transmitter during link training are:  
 -- k\_list = {-3, -2 -1, 0, 1}  
 -- preset 1  
 -- preset 2  
 -- preset 3  
 -- preset 4  
 -- preset 5"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with considerations of any changes due to other comments about presets.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 176C SC 176C.4.3.2 P705 L4 # 440  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D C2C ACCM  
 The C2C target BER is lower than the C2M target. The probability for measurement should be at least as low as that for C2M ( $p=-7$ ) which should be adequate even for the C2C BER target.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the exception.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 For CRG discussion.

CI 176C SC 176C.4.3.4 P705 L24 # 197  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D SNR\_ISI  
 Exceptions for SNR\_ISI method is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #550.

CI 176C SC 176C.4.3.4 P705 L25 # 550  
 Heck, Howard TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D SNR\_ISI  
 The method specified for signal-to-residual-intersymbol-interference ratio (SNR\_ISI) is defined in 179.9.4.3 with exceptions TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove "with exceptions TBD." A presentation is planned to support the suggested remedy.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending CRG review of heck\_3dj\_01\_2501.

CI 176C SC 176C.4.3.5 P705 L43 # 442  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ERL  
 The procedure in 163A.3.2.2 refer to calculations in Annex 93A that are different from those for 200G in Annex 178A.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "using the procedure in Annex 163A.3.2.2 but replacing the COM related calculations in Annex 93A with those of Annex 178A" Make the same change on page 706 line 35  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 176C SC 176C.4.3.5 P705 L50 # 551  
 Heck, Howard TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ERL N  
 The length of the reflection signal, N, for ERL calculation is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change TBD to 400 UI, taken from KR Table 178-8. This is consistent with prior standards (.cd, .ck) wherein the values for KR and C2C identical. The proposed value scales to account for the reduction in unit interval. A presentation is planned to support the suggested remedy.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending CRG review of heck\_3dj\_01\_2501.

CI 176C SC 176C.4.3.5 P705 L50 # 198  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ERL N  
 Value for "Length of the reflection signal", N, is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 551.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.3.5 P705 L51 # 441

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ERL N

The length of the reflection signal is listed as TBD. It should be long enough to include reflections from the end of the longest path expected within a component and, as similar components are expected to be used as for KR, the same value as for KR is reasonable

SuggestedRemedy

Change TBD to 400. Remove the editor's note on page 706 line 4

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 551.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.3 P706 L47 # 199

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D RX RLcd

Values/equations for RL\_cd are TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 443.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.3 P706 L47 # 443

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D RX RLcd

The differential-mode to common-mode return loss is TBD. It is an important parameter for system performance, but proceeding to working group ballot will be delayed if values are not available. Without further evidence that it could be relaxed it should be scaled from 100G.

SuggestedRemedy

Use 25-0.36f from 0.05 to 27.8GHz and 15 from 27.8GHz to 60GHz. Modify the editor's note on page 707 line 26 to still encourage further work.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested response with editorial license.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.4.1 P707 L44 # 444

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITT Np (bucket)

The noise source emulates non-equalizable distortions not equalizable

SuggestedRemedy

Change "equalizable" to "non-equalizable"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.4.2 P708 L31 # 200

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITT Np

Values for N\_p is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 552.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.4.2 P708 L31 # 446

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITT Np

The value of Np is TBD. This should be related to the reference equalizer length. As the floating taps can move to 50 make Np=50

SuggestedRemedy

Change Np to 50

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 552.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.4.2 P708 L31 # 552  
 Heck, Howard TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITT Np  
 The linear fit pulse length, Np, for ITT noise calibration is TBD in D1.3.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change TBD to 22 UI. This is scaled from N=11 in p802.3ck to account for the reduction in unit interval. A presentation is planned to support the suggested remedy.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending CRG review of heck\_3dj\_01\_2501.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.4.2 P708 L33 # 445  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITT Cal  
 The target BER is approx 1e-5 so a lower probability than 1e-3 should be used. J4u03 is now used for KR.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Use J4u03 and equations 178-2 and 178-3.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending CRG discussion.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.4.3 P709 L30 # 252  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ITT ILdd  
 Receiver interference tolerance parameters are TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Per [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_07/heck\\_3dj\\_01a\\_2407.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_07/heck_3dj_01a_2407.pdf) recommend the following parameters:  
 Receiver package class A or B  
 Test1: 10.5 to 11.5 dB  
 Test2: 31.5 to 32.5 dB  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 553.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.4.3 P709 L30 # 201  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITT ILdd  
 Values for IL\_dd are TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 553.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.4.3 P709 L31 # 448  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITT ILdd  
 Table 176C-4 contains many TBDs. The minimum insertion loss should be the same for both package class A and classB (as it is for KR). It should however be related to the shortest C2C link we expect. The Maximum should be the max TP0d to TP5d supported minus the package loss. 32dB has been adopted for C2M with a more relaxed BER requirement, so suggest 30dB as a reasonable value for C2C  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make the Test 1 values 9.5 min 10.5max as they were for 100G and make the Test 2 Class A values 23.5 min 24.5max and class B values 19.5min 20.5max. In section 176.5.2 and Table 176-5 clarify that the Maximum channel insertion loss is from TP0d to TP5d and make the value 30dB.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 553.

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.4.3 P709 L31 # 553  
 Heck, Howard TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITT ILdd  
 Min/max insertion loss, l1dd, for Rx ITT is TBD for all combinations of low/high loss channel and class A/B package.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 A presentation is planned to propose specific values.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending CRG review of heck\_3dj\_01\_2501.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176C SC 176C.4.4.5 P710 L4 # 253

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D JTOL

Real links must operate with noise, ISI, and SJ. Recomendating that jitter tolerance test have no broadband noise will render JTOL test useless. C2M JTOL has always included broadband noise with SJ, the test method exist to perform such as test and given the concern about block error the JTOL test should be comprehensive. The KR/C2C JTOL leagcy goes back to 25G-KR which only tested the receiver with SJ, we all know any SerDes unstress will do good job tracking SJ and any SerDes can do good job with ISI in absent of SJ!

SuggestedRemedy

Given that the same JTOL test is used for C2M which historiclaly had comprehensive JTOL test change No broadband noise added to Broadband noise is redcued by 0.05 UI.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The comment proposes a change that breaks with prior methods without providing sufficient justification. For CRG discussion.

Cl 176C SC 176C.5 P710 L25 # 554

Heck, Howard TE Connectivity

Comment Type T Comment Status D ILdd

Recommended maximum insertion loss at 53.125 GHz in Table 176C-5 is TBD in D1.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change TBD to 32 dB, based upon results presented in [https://ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_07/heck\\_3dj\\_01a\\_2407.pdf](https://ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_07/heck_3dj_01a_2407.pdf).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Pending CRG review of the planned presentation.

Cl 176C SC 176C.5 P710 L25 # 202

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D ILdd

Value for "Maximum insertion loss at 53.125 GHz (recommended)"

SuggestedRemedy

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment 554.

Cl 176C SC 176C.5.1 P711 L37 # 559

Heck, Howard TE Connectivity

Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The value for COM single-ended receiver transmitter termination resistance in Table 176C-6 is highlighted in orange. This value is consistent with those in 178 and 179.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the orange highlighting.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176C SC 176C.5.1 P711 L37 # 203

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

46.25 has orange highlight.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove highlight.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176C SC 176C.5.2 P713 L33 # 449

Dudek, Mike Marvell

Comment Type T Comment Status D ILdd

The Channel performance cannot easily be described by a frequency domain limit line and the equivalent equations and figure have been removed from Clause 178. The COM specification provides the critical requirement for the channel.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete equation 176C-4 and figure 176C-6.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment 555.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176C SC 176C.5.2 P713 L36 # 204  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ILdd  
 Value for maximum IL\_dd at Nyquist frequency is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 555.

Cl 176C SC 176C.5.3 P714 L34 # 205  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Channel ERL  
 Value for minimum channel ERL is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 556.

Cl 176C SC 176C.5.2 P713 L36 # 254  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ILdd  
 Channel ILD is TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Per [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_07/heck\\_3dj\\_01a\\_2407.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_07/heck_3dj_01a_2407.pdf) recommend channel ILD of 32 dB  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 554.

Cl 176C SC 176C.5.3 P714 L34 # 556  
 Heck, Howard TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Channel ERL  
 In D1.3, sub-annex 176C.5.3 lists the channel ERL as TBD, while Table 176C-5 specifies a value of 9.7 dB (minimum), which was the value adopted in the resolution of comment #66 against D1.2.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Set the minimum ERL in 176C.5.3 to a value of 9.7 dB, consistent with Table 176C-5 per comment #66 against D1.2. A presentation is planned to support the suggested remedy.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending CRG review of heck\_3dj\_01\_2501.

Cl 176C SC 176C.5.2 P713 L37 # 555  
 Heck, Howard TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ILdd  
 Recommended maximum insertion loss at 53.125 GHz and its defining equation is TBD in D1.3.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the sub-clause to be consistent with the approach in 178.10.2: Remove the equation and plot, and set the maximum insertion loss to be consistent with the value adopted in Table 176C-5 (subject of another comment).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending CRG review of heck\_3dj\_01\_2501.

Cl 176C SC 176C.5.3 P714 L34 # 450  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Channel ERL  
 The ERL requirement is TBD. Reflections from the channel will cause more of a problem for C2C with its more stringent BER requirement than for KR therefore the channel ERL should be more stringent than the KR value of 11dB.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make the min ERL value equal to 13dB.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment 556.



Cl 176D SC 176D.5.3 P724 L6 # 350

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D R\_peak

R\_peak for host output is TBD.

Since we have a reference model for the C2M host, the "difference" method can be used for R\_peak, as has been done for SNDR (now dSNDR). This would remove dependence of the requirements on the test fixture specifications and on the host model (in case these change in future drafts).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Define the minimum R\_peak requirement to be relative to what the reference transmitter will create with the test fixture used.  
 A contribution with more details will be provided.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #303.

Cl 176D SC 176D.5.3 P724 L24 # 206

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D R\_peak

Value for "Linear fit pulse peak ratio, Rpeak (min)" is TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #303.

Cl 176D SC 176D.5.3 P724 L38 # 219

Rysin, Alexander NVIDIA  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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. A different methodology that will better quantify phase-only uncorrelated jitter has to be explored. Presentation is planned.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Other method of uncorrelated jitter measurement should be considered.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of rysin\_01.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176D SC 176D.5.3 P724 L39 # 261

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D JTOL

We currently have no effective output compliance test method for C2M or input calibration of stressor. We replaced VEC with with JRMS, EOJ, and J4U without any demonstration that using transmit jitter is sufficient 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 captures the jitter as shown in ghiasi\_3dj\_01a\_2409 but also captures amplitude penalty and the effect of PM to AM conversion in the same way as receiver will observe the penalty. EECQ for receive stress measurement and calibration we need to do the following:

Add editor note encouraging data if current jitter test method can be used for receive compliance and encourage data on EECQ for receive compliance.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment is a restatement of comment #315 against D1.2.

The response to that comment was:

"REJECT.

Resolve using the response to comment #404."

The response to comment #404 was:

"REJECT.

The CRG reviewed slides 11-14 of

[https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_11/ran\\_3dj\\_01a\\_2411.pdf](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](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."

TDECQ (and EECQ, not defined in 802.3) are not specifications of AUI-C2M, but of optical transmitters. The claims made in previous comments and repeated here (comment and suggested remedy) have been refuted; there is no consensus that TDECQ of optical transmitters captures the effect of jitter (the referenced presentation was about EECQ with a high-loss host channel).

Tx jitter measurements and Rx jitter tolerance are part of well-established CR compliance methodology, which has been adopted for C2M in this project (comments #186-#189 against D1.0).

This comment includes neither new information to support changing previous decisions, nor sufficient detail to implement a change to the draft.

Cl 176D SC 176D.5.3 P724 L40 # 540

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Jitter

As already pointed out, the "jitter measurement" method here doesn't work for the relevant bandwidths, losses and amplitudes for host output. This is particularly obvious for J3u03; J4u03 seems to be beyond the state of the art. EOJ should be part of an eye spec like EECQ, not a separate spec item.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete this method. Use an eye spec to control signal quality, following the evolution of xECQ.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment is essentially a restatement of comment #404 and related comments against D1.2 (and similar comments against previous drafts), which claimed that jitter measurement is not feasible and suggested to delete it.

The response to comment #404 was:

"REJECT.

The CRG reviewed slides 11-14 of

[https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_11/ran\\_3dj\\_01a\\_2411.pdf](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](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."

The claims made in previous comments and repeated here are not backed by data.

Conversely, presentations have shown that quite accurate jitter measurements are feasible.

While this proposal was rejected, improvements to the measurement method have been adopted by other comments (see the response to comment #213), which alleviate some of the claimed concerns. However, the comment does not address these improvements.

This comment includes neither new information to support changing previous decisions, nor sufficient detail to implement a change to the draft.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176D SC 176D.5.4 P725 L24 # 351

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D R\_peak

R\_peak for module output is TBD.

Since we have a reference model for the C2M module, the "difference" method can be used for R\_peak, as has been done for SNDR (now dSNDR). This would remove dependence of the requirements on the test fixture specifications and on the module model (in case these change in future drafts).

The module reference model in Table 176D-5 includes two test cases for "transmission line 1 length". Case 2 is the longer one and should be used for the reference R\_peak.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Define the minimum R\_peak requirement to be relative to what the reference transmitter will create with the test fixture used.  
 A contribution with more details will be provided.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #303.

Cl 176D SC 176D.5.4 P725 L24 # 207

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D R\_peak

Value for "Linear fit pulse peak ratio, Rpeak (min)" is TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #303.

Cl 176D SC 176D.5.4 P725 L38 # 262

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D JTOL

We currently have no effective output compliance test method for C2M or input calibration of stressor. We replaced VEC with with JRMS, EOJ, and J4U without any demonstration that using transmit jitter is sufficient for receive compliance.

*SuggestedRemedy*

TDECQ method works given all the data presented and with the work of OIF LPO and RTL R developing. TDECQ/EECQ already captures the jitter as shown in ghiasi\_3dj\_01a\_2409 but also captures amplitude penalty and the effect of PM to AM conversion in the same way as receiver will observe the penalty. EECQ for receive stress measurement and calibration we need to do the following:

Add editor note encouraging data if current jitter test method can be used for receive compliance and encourage data on EECQ for receive compliance.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The comment text and suggested remedy are identical those of comment #261. It is assumed that these two comments are against host output and module output.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #261.

Cl 176D SC 176D.5.4 P725 L38 # 220

Rysin, Alexander NVIDIA  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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. A different methodology that will better quantify phase-only uncorrelated jitter has to be explored. Presentation is planned.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Other method of uncorrelated jitter measurement should be considered.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #219.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl **176D** SC **176D.6.2** P**729** L**16** # **389**  
 Noujeim, Leesa Google  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Partial channel model  
 Capacitance C0 in table 176D-5, "Single ended package capacitance at port 1" description is incorrect; C0 represents part of the partial host channel, while Cp is "Single ended package capacitance at the package-to-board interface".  
*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Change "Single ended package capacitance at port 1" to "Single ended board capacitance at the package-to-board interface (port 1)"  
*Proposed Response* Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #391.

Cl **176D** SC **176D.6.2** P**729** L**22** # **390**  
 Noujeim, Leesa Google  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Partial channel model  
 Capacitance C1 in table 176D-5 is not associated with the package, so description "Single ended package capacitance at Port 2" is incorrect.  
*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Change "Single ended package capacitance at port 2" to "Single ended board capacitance at board-model-to-test\_connector interface (port 2)"  
*Proposed Response* Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #391.

Cl **176D** SC **176D.6.2** P**730** L**26** # **265**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** (bucket)  
 Typical gDC1 gain for C2M is just few dB's, and there is no reason to have the same gDC1 as KR/CR  
*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Reduce gDC1 to -12 dB  
*Proposed Response* Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment is an exact restatement of comment #318 against D1.2.  
 The response to that comment was:  
 "REJECT.  
 The comment does not provide sufficient justification to support the suggested remedy. It is unclear what benefit the change would achieve. The reference receiver is only used to calibrate the noise in input tests. Even if the typical gDC1 value is limited as stated (without data to support this claim) the results would not be changed by reducing the range."  
 This comment does not include new information to support changing previous decisions.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176D SC 176D.7.1 P731 L25 # 539

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Differential peak-to-peak

A "square wave with a period of at least 128 UI" is statistically off-the-scale unlikely for a scrambled signal, so it's not relevant. Also the scope CRU is not likely to lock to it. A probability of 1e-7 implies an expensively long time collecting data. Signals should be assessed on PRBS13Q or SSPRQ wherever feasible to avoid multiple data captures.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to a more reasonable and statistically relevant method, using extrapolation where feasible. For module output where the loss to the observation point is very moderate, go back to PRBS13Q.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Test patterns are specified to be useful for specific measurements. For peak to peak measurements, a square wave is quite useful, while PRBS13Q has been shown to be inadequate. See comment #82 against D1.2, its supporting presentation [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_11/ran\\_3dj\\_05a\\_2411.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_05a_2411.pdf), and additional references therein.

A CRU is not necessary for measurement of peak to peak. Regardless, there is no evidence that a scope's CRU cannot lock on a periodic square wave.

A probability of 1e-7 is relevant for peak-to-peak measurements. The minimum measurement time is  $10^7 \times 128$  UI or about 12 milliseconds. Even with a sampling scope with effective undersampling, it is not prohibitively long.

The argument "statistically off-the-scale unlikely for a scrambled signal" can be made for any test pattern.

Multiple data captures are performed for C2M and other interfaces anyway, for multiple reasons, including variable Tx equalizer settings. A single peak-to-peak measurement does not add a significant burden.

Cl 176D SC 176D.7.6 P732 L50 # 135

Slavick, Jeff

Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ILT (bucket)

Listing the coefficients and presets that are supported by the PMD here will lay the groundwork for reuse of the 178B over interfaces with differing support.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the following with editorial license at the end of the first paragraph of 176D.7.6

"The coefficients and presets supported by the C2M transmitter during link training are:

-- k\_list = {-3, -2 -1, 0, 1}

-- preset 1

-- preset 2

-- preset 3

-- preset 4

-- preset 5"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with considerations of any changes due to other comments about presets.

Cl 176D SC 176D.7.6 P732 L50 # 140

Slavick, Jeff

Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ILT

steady state measurement is also needed by ILT

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "The steady state voltage specification needed in 178B.11.4 is specified in 176D.7.4" to the subclause.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #138.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176D SC 176D.7.6 P733 L2 # 425

Dudek, Mike

Marvell

Comment Type T Comment Status D Tx FFE presets

There is a significant advantage to not overloading the receiver on short links at the start of transmitter training. This is particularly important for chip to module where multi-rate implementations are only required to support a maximum peak to peak output amplitude of 900mV at the lower speeds.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the OUT-OF-SYNC value of c(0) to 0.5+/-0.025 in table 176D-8. Consider making that change for KR, CR and C2C as well.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Note that comment #514 suggests a different modification of the default equalization state, Resolve using the response to comment #514.

Cl 176D SC 176D.7.7 P733 L45 # 423

Dudek, Mike

Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Host output

The referenced measurement for the measurement of SNDR does not include crosstalk from the Rx into the Tx. This is OK for 100GBASE-CR1 as the Rx signal at the measurement point is relatively small due to having to get through the channel to get to the measurement point and for the most critical systems the channel loss will be large. This is not the case for the host output where with a high loss channel the module will be requested to provide a large amplitude output.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add an additional exception "- For the measurement of SNDR for the host output, the inputs to the host compliance board at TP4a shall be 1000mV peak to peak PAM4 signals with 5ps risetime and PRBS31Q, or PCS data." Consider whether a similar requirement should be added for the module output with 500mV peak to peak amplitude and 10ps risetime.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment addresses the potential problem of the host's connector or internal routing having excessive NEXT that could degrade the signal that reaches the module's receiver.

See editorial slides in the following editorial contribution:  
<URL>/ran\_3dj\_01\_2501

Cl 176D SC 176D.7.11 P734 L33 # 396

Healey, Adam

Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D Amplitude tolerance

The amplitude tolerance of a receiver is defined to be the maximum amplitude at which the block error ratio requirement is met when in DATA mode. The test condition is stated to be preset 1 (no equalization). However, the subclause also states that the receiver "is allowed to control the transmit equalizer coefficients of its partner using the ILT protocol (see 176D.7.6) to create suitable output signal." This means that receiver can change the transmitter configuration to something other than preset 1 resulting in a signal with lower amplitude, higher equalization, or some combination thereof prior to reaching DATA mode. This calls into question why the receiver is required to meet block error ratio requirements for preset 1 in DATA mode. It would be more justifiable to require a receiver to be able to acquire training frame lock when connected to a transmitter with maximum amplitude and in the preset 1 configuration. However, this only requires reliable detection of DME-encoded (PAM-2) data at a lower effective rate. This can be expected to be a (much) lower bar than meeting block error ratio requirements in DATA mode. Note the Clause 178 and Annex 176C do not include amplitude tolerance requirements while Clause 179 and Annex 176D do. There is no obvious reason why amplitude tolerance requirements are needed in some cases but not in others since ILT is available throughout.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the amplitude tolerance requirements from Clause 179 and Annex 176D. If it is deemed necessary to state that a receiver must be able to acquire training frame lock over some range of transmitter parameters, and thereby enable transmitter configuration via ILT, then the requirement should be restated in these terms and applied to all relevant clauses and annexes (including Clause 178 and Annex 176D).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The text in 176D.7.11 defines amplitude tolerance specifically as the "maximum initial peak-to-peak output", where that "initial" is defined as the value with preset 1. This initial value is a characteristic of the transmitter used in the test. The DUT is allowed to control the equalization state using ILT (before going into DATA mode), and thus the error ratio requirements are not required to be met at preset 1. However, the initial value may still affect the signal after ILT (e.g. if the DUT only selects another preset, the swing will be scaled by the "initial" value) .

Note that comment #352 suggests rephrasing the specification such that tolerance is defined as v<sub>f</sub> of the transmitter (which is specified more precisely, including measurement with preset 1), instead of the peak-to-peak value, aligning it with the definition in 179.9.5.2. This may clarify the intent of the amplitude tolerance.

The comment highlights the lack of amplitude tolerance requirements in clause 178 and annex 176C.

Add a row for amplitude tolerance in Table 178–9 and in Table 176C–3, and add subclauses defining amplitude tolerance based on 179.9.5.2 with appropriate modifications. Implement with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 176D SC 176D.7.11 P734 L34 # 352

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Amplitude tolerance

It is preferable to define amplitude tolerance in terms of  $v_f$  of the connected transmitter at its compliance point (as done in 179.9.5.2, following comment #406 against D1.2) rather than peak-to-peak differential voltage, which depends on the pattern and the loss at the measurement point.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In the first paragraph, change "defined as the maximum initial peak-to-peak output" to "defined as the maximum steady-state voltage (see 176D.7.4)".

In the second paragraph, change "The initial peak-to-peak output is defined as the peak-to-peak differential output (see 176D.7.1), with equalization set to preset 1 (see Table 176D-8), of the transmitter that is connected" to "The steady-state voltage is measured for the transmitter that is connected".

In Table 176D-3 and Table 176D-5, change the parameter name from "Amplitude tolerance" to "Amplitude tolerance ( $v_f$ )" and change the value from 1 to 0.5.

Implement with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 176D SC 176D.7.12 P735 L13 # 208

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITOL

Values for channel ILdd are TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #353.

CI 176D SC 176D.7.12 P735 L13 # 353

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ITOL

In Table 176D-9, the test channel insertion loss for all module tests is TBD.

The IL should be the min/max die-to-die IL minus the IL allocation for the module, plus the nominal HCB IL (which is equal to the IL allocation for the module).

The test channel includes a mated test fixture as a minimum.

The minimum IL case (for test 1) should represent a direct connection to the MCB (such that the test channel is just the mated test fixture, with a nominal IL of 9.75 dB).

The maximum IL case (for Test 2) should be based on the adopted C2M die-to-die channel budget of 32 dB, as shown in Figure 176D-6.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In row "Test channel IL", change column values (currently TBD) as follows:

Module test 1 (low loss) - Min: 9.25, Max: 10.25  
 Module test 2 (high loss) - Min - 31.5, Max: 32.5

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176D SC 176D.7.12 P735 L13 # 259

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ITOL

Receiver interference tolerance parameters are TBD

*SuggestedRemedy*

Per [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_05/kareti\\_3dj\\_01\\_2405.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_05/kareti_3dj_01_2405.pdf), and recommend the following parameters:

Receiver package class A or B  
 Test1: 12.5 to 13.5 dB  
 Test2: 31.5 to 32.5 dB

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The referenced presentation does not seem to recommend, or directly mention, the loss values provided in the suggested remedy.

Package class is not part of the test channel, although it does affect the test calibration (see items a and b of 176D.7.12.2). It is not TBD and does not require a change.

The loss values for test 2 match the ones suggested by comment #353.

The values for test 1 do not match the ones suggested by comment #353; they are substantially larger than the ILdd of nominal mated test fixtures (9.75 dB), which is the assumed minimum channel.

Resolve using the response to comment #353.

Cl 176D SC 176D.7.12 P735 L14 # 354

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ITOL

In Table 176D-9, "Host channel parameters" is TBD.

The host channel model has been adopted, and is summarized in Table 176D-5. This table is specified to be used in item a of 176D.7.12.2. Therefore, the "TBD" is already defined.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In row "Host channel parameters", change "Host test" column from TBD to "Table 176D-5".

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 176D SC 176D.7.12 P735 L14 # 209

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITOL

Value for "Host channel parameters" is TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Expect a contribution with proposals.

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #354.



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 176D SC 176D.7.13.2 P739 L9 # 260

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D JTOL

Real links must operate with noise, ISI, and SJ. Recomening that jitter tolerance test have no broadband noise will render JTOL test useless. C2M JTOL has always included broadband noise with SJ, the test method exist to perform such as test and given the concern about block error the JTOL test should be comprehensive. The KR/C2C JTOL leagcy goes back to 25G-KR which only tested the receiver with SJ, we all know any SerDes unstress will do good job tracking SJ and any SerDes can do good job with ISI in absent of SJ!

*SuggestedRemedy*

Lets not weaken C2M JTOL test by not including broadband noise, change No broadband noise added to Broadband noise is redcued by 0.05 UI.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

SJ is not an inherent impairment of links. It is a model of bounded uncorrelated jitter that transmitters can have, which is used in tests.

The interference tolerance (ITOL) test is calibrated with additive broadband noise using COM, in consideration of the jitter of the test transmitter (which is recommended to be adjusted to be adjusted "such that the jitter parameters are as close as practical to their specified limits"; this typically requires injection of both RJ and SJ). Thus, the ITOL itself requires tracking the maximum jitter that a transmitter is allowed to generate.

Note that the specified jitter limit is based on a dual-Dirac model with DJ amplitude A\_DD=0.02 UI (peak-to-peak is 0.04 UI) and RJ with RMS of 0.01 UI.

Jitter tolerance (JTOL) is a separate test that covers the jitter tracking capability at multiple frequencies considering the expected CDR bandwidth. The jitter is sinusoidal and has a minimum peak-to-peak of 0.05 UI, larger than that of the dual-Dirac model, and at low frequencies that create colored noise, so it has a larger stress on the receiver than the COM model. As the NOTE under Table 176D-10 indicates, it is possible that this jitter will cause failure to meet the COM requirement even without additive noise. The statement "with the exception that no noise is injected" in 176D.7.13.2 pertains to the additive noise used in ITOL.

Contrary to the claim in the comment, C2M JTOL in previous generations does not include any broadband noise, only jitter (RJ and BUJ, whose values are not specified). See Figure 120G-10, Figure 120E-12, and Figure 83E-15. Thus the current C2M requirements are no weaker than in previous generations (in fact, ITOL is a new addition that make them stronger).

In practice, a receiver that is unable to track jitter as required will likely fail at one or more of the test frequencies regardless of the noise stress, which has a minor effect compared to untracked jitter. Adding more complexity to the test that is unrelated to the purpose (jitter tolerance) is not required.

Cl 177 SC 177.1.4 P307 L26 # 274

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D decoding

In Figure 177-2, the receive direction is shown as if the first function is PAM4 decoding and the rest of the data path is defined as bits. This description matches a hard-decoding operation, but the inner FEC is assumed to have a soft decoder, as stated in 177.5.4.

In a soft-decoding receiver, the "PAM4 decoding" operation is actually part of the "Inner FEC decode" block.

The PAM4 (hard) decoding is required for the inner FEC sync - since this cannot rely on the decoder output - but the rest of the data path (deinterleaving and decoding) should operate on the input symbols directly. The suggested remedy is based on this idea.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move the "PAM4 decoding" and "inner FEC sync" operations to a separate branch. Make the output of the "Inner FEC sync" a dashed-line input into the "pad removal" (a separate block) and the deinterleaver (renamed from "1:8 bit-pair deinterleaver" to "1:8 symbol deinterleaver").

The main input to the deinterleaver block is the signal from the sublayer below.

In the "PAM4 decoding" subclause 177.5.1, add a statement that this function includes hard decision and is used only for initial synchronization. The output of this function is not used in the remainder of the data path, since the "Inner FEC decode" function in 177.5.4 performs the required decoding.

In the "PAM4 deinterleaving" subclause 177.5.3 change the title to "1:8 symbol deinterleaving" and in its text change "bit pairs" to "input symbols".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See related slides in the following editorial contribution:

<URL>/nicholl\_3dj\_01\_2501.

For task force discussion.

Cl 177 SC 177.1.4 P307 L31 # 148

He, Xiang Huawei  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Inner FEC test patterns

There should be some test patten checker on the receive path.  
 A contribution will be provided to support this with block diagrams.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "test pattern check" on the receive path on the PAM4 decode box, similar as in Figure 176-2.

*Proposed Response* Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of the following presentation and CRG discussion.  
 <URL>/he\_3dj\_01\_2501  
 Also see related slides in editorial contribution:  
 <URL>/nicholl\_3dj\_01\_2501  
 Address this along with comment #274.

Cl 177 SC 177.2 P307 L47 # 486

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** (bucket)

"may" indicates an optional function. In the context of the first paragraph in 177.2, "might" could be preferred.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change: "For the 200GBASE-R Inner FEC, the client sublayer may be the 200GBASE-R 8:1 SM-PMA or 200GBASE-R 1:1 SM-PMA."

To: "For the 200GBASE-R Inner FEC, the client sublayer might be a 200GBASE-R 8:1 SM-PMA or a 200GBASE-R 1:1 SM-PMA."

And make similar changes to each sentence in the first paragraph of 177.2.

*Proposed Response* Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change: "For the 200GBASE-R Inner FEC, the client sublayer may be the 200GBASE-R 8:1 SM-PMA or 200GBASE-R 1:1 SM-PMA."  
 To: "For the 200GBASE-R Inner FEC, the client sublayer is either a 200GBASE-R 8:1 SM-PMA or a 200GBASE-R 1:1 SM-PMA."  
 And make similar changes in 177.2 and 184.3.  
 [Editor's note: CC: 177, 184]

Cl 177 SC 177.2 P308 L22 # 487

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** (bucket)

The last sentence prior to Table 177-1 states "When the value of SIGNAL\_OK is IN\_PROGRESS or FAIL, the corresponding rx\_symbol parameters on all lanes are unspecified.". This implies the rx\_symbol parameters have valid values when SINGAL\_OK is OK or READY. However, the READY value is set when "all\_synced==false". Shouldn't the rx\_symbol parameter also be invalid/unspecified when the SIGNAL\_OK is READY?

The same may be true for the SINGNAL\_OK description immediately prior to Table 177-2 on page 309.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change: "When the value of SIGNAL\_OK is IN\_PROGRESS or FAIL, the corresponding rx\_symbol parameters on all lanes are unspecified."

To: "When the value of SIGNAL\_OK is READY, IN\_PROGRESS or FAIL, the corresponding rx\_symbol parameters on all lanes are unspecified."

*Proposed Response* Response Status **W**

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

CI 177 SC 177.3. P308 L44 # 275

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D PMD service interface

The statement that the PMD service interface is in instance of the inter-sublayer service interface is misleading.

The service interface semantics in 116.3.3.1.1 state that tx\_symbol and rx\_symbol are either from a set of two values (NRZ) or from a set of four values (PAM4).

In this interface (which is the service interface below the inner FEC), the tx\_symbol parameters are PAM4 symbol streams, but contrary to what's written here, the rx\_symbol are not PAM4 symbol streams - they are converted to PAM4 symbols by the inner FEC's decoding function.

The final sentence of this paragraph states that rx\_symbol "may include an implementation-dependent set of values that are beyond the scope of this standard" which is an awkward way of saying it is not PAM4 symbols. In fact, 177.5.4 states that the decoder requires "a higher resolution than two bits for each received PAM4 symbols" (sic), so "more than PAM4" is a requirement, not "may".

A similar problem exists in the definitions of the PMD service interfaces in 182.3 and 183.3, and in 185.3 (this PMD uses the inner FEC in 184 - but there is no definition of the interface below the inner FEC in clause 184).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Separate this paragraph into two, one for transmit direction and one for receive direction.

In the transmit direction, the service interface primitives (PMD:IS\_UNITDATA\_i.request and PMD:IS\_SIGNAL.indication) are as defined in the generic inter-sublayer service interface (as written in D1.3).

In the receive direction, PMD:IS\_SIGNAL.indication is as defined by the generic inter-sublayer service interface, but PMD:IS\_UNITDATA\_i.indication is modified from that service interface, in that the rx\_symbol parameters are taken from a set of more than four values, as generated by the PMD's service interface. The size of this set is implementation dependent.

Apply similar changes in the PMD service interface definitions in 182.3, 183.3, and 185.3.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See related slides in the following editorial contribution:  
 <URL>/brown\_3dj\_01\_2501.  
 For task force discussion.

[Editor's note: CC 182, 183, 185]

CI 177 SC 177.4. P309 L27 # 121

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Introductory sentence could be useful

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the following to 177.4 "The following processes are performed independently on each FEC service interface input lane.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

CI 177 SC 177.4. P332 L26 # 10

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Inner FEC test patterns

In order to properly test the performance of an optical link for PMD that uses the Inner FEC a PRBS31 test pattern with Inner FEC encoding is required. The generator and checker may be defined in the Inner FEC sublayer or in the PMA sublayer above the Inner FEC.

*SuggestedRemedy*

At the input to the convolutional interleaver on the transmit path add the ability to insert a PRBS31 (not PRBS31Q) test pattern and at the output of the convolutional deinterleaver on the receive path add the ability to check a PRBS31 pattern. If the PRBS31 checker is defined in the Inner FEC sublayer then the block error counters as defined in 176.7.4.1 will also need to be added. Alternately source and terminate the PRBS31 pattern on the PMA above the Inner FEC; PRBS31 will need to be added (in addition to PRBS31Q).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add PRBS31 test pattern generator and checker on the PMA above the Inner FEC.  
 Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

CI 177 SC 177.4.1. P309 L32 # 276

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

"4-symbol" is used only here, elsewhere the term "symbol quartet" is used instead.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "symbol quartet"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 177 SC 177.4.1.1 P310 L29 # 120  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)  
 The demultiplexing function refers to "service interface below the PMA" but this is above the Inner FEC.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add "with the exception that it operates on the Inner FEC service interface input lanes"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 177 SC 177.4.1.2 P310 L36 # 419  
 Nicholl, Gary Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 I think the sentence "The data stream is not altered.", although accurate, is confusing/contradictory as the first sentence in the subclause states that "The alignment marker lock function is performed as defined in 176.4.3.3.", , and 176.4.3.3 by definition does alter the data stream.  
 I tihnk it would be better to update Figure 177-3 to show the symbol demultiplex and alignment marker lock functions for 200G/400G to be "off to the side" from the main data path, with the main data path drawn as a straight arrow from top to bottom of diagram (indicating that the main data path is passthrough and is not altered in any way).  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete the sentence "The data path is not altered" on line 36.  
 Update the 200GBASE-R/400GBASE-R portion of Figure 177-3 as described in the comment.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Keep the "data stream is not altered", and update the diagram to show a straight arrow. Otherwise implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 177 SC 177.4.1.3 P310 L47 # 45  
 Huber, Thomas Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 The wording here is a bit awkward - the intent is to define a much stricter maximum skew tolerance in the inner FEC than in 800GBASE-R PCS, but the text says "... Skew between PCSLs is removed as defined in 172.2.5.1, except that the 800GBASE-R deskew function shall support a maximum Skew of 25 ns between PCS lanes..."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Use language more like what 172.2.5.1 uses. Change the text to read "... Skew between PCSLs is removed as defined in 172.2.5.1, except that a maximum Skew of 25 ns is supported between PCS lanes..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 177 SC 177.4.1.3 P310 L52 # 46  
 Huber, Thomas Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 The wording here is a bit awkward - the intent is to define a much stricter maximum skew tolerance in the inner FEC than in 800GBASE-R PCS, but the text says "... Skew between PCSLs is removed as defined in 172.2.5.1, except that the 1.6TBASE-R deskew function shall support a maximum Skew of 25 ns between PCS lanes..."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Use language more like what 175.2.5.1 uses. Change the text to read "... Skew between PCSLs is removed as defined in 175.2.5.1, except that a maximum Skew of 25 ns is supported between PCS lanes..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

CI 177 SC 177.4.1.5 P311 L15 # 277

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The reader may be curious why symbol multiplexing is not performed for 200GBASE-R and 400GBASE-R PHYs.

This is because the data on each PCS lane already includes 4-way RS-FEC interleaving performed by the PMA (as illustrated in Figure 176–6). But that may be difficult to understand if not stated explicitly.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add an informative note at the end of 177.4.1.5:  
 "NOTE--In 200GBASE-R and 400GBASE-R PHYs, this operation is not required, since the output of the PMA below the PCS is already symbol multiplexed with 4-way interleaving (see Figure 176–6)."

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

CI 177 SC 177.4.2 P311 L18 # 146

He, Xiang Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The term "PMA lane" is not accurate. Within the Inner FEC sublayer, it is an "Inner FEC lane".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "PMA lane" to "Inner FEC lane", to be consistent within the clause.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 177 SC 177.4.2 P311 L24 # 278

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (withdrawn)

The last delay line (labeled "Delay Line 2") is actually not a delay line.  
 The interleaver can be described as being composed of three data paths, of which the first two include delay lines (0 and 1) and the third does not.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Rephrase the text in this subclause and change Figure 177-4 per this comment, changing "Delay Line n" to "interleaver path n".

Implement any additional edits required by this change with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 177 SC 177.4.2 P311 L25 # 34

Huber, Thomas Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The text here seems a bit repetitive. The four paragraphs that start at line 25 spell out the delays for each delay line for each rate in detail, and then at line 50 there is a more abstract specification of the same thing.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Rewrite the first paragraphs to be algorithmic rather than per-rate:  
 "The first line (Delay Line 0) delays the data by 4x2xQ RS-FEC symbols, the second line (Delay Line 1) by 4x1xQ RS-FEC symbols, and the last line (Delay Line 2) adds no delay. The values of Q are shown in table 177-X."  
 Add a table with a column for the rate (200GBASE-R, 400GBASE-R, etc.) and a column for the value of Q.  
 Delete the sentence at lin 51 that starts with "The number Q differs for each..." and the bullet list that follows (this information is replaced by the table).

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 177 SC 177.4.2 P311 L26 # 279

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

Commas are missing in the 4 paragraphs about delay lines, and periods are inconsistent.

SuggestedRemedy

In the first paragraph, add commas after "200GBASE-R" and before "and the last line". Similarly for the other 3 paragraphs.

Add a period at the end of the second and third paragraphs.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.4.2 P311 L42 # 115

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The deskewed data is fed into the covolutioner.

SuggestedRemedy

Change " The input data from the FEC service interface lane is fed into" to: "The data from deskewed PMA lane is fed into"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 177 SC 177.4.2.5 P311 L10 # 489

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The plural of PCSL ahould be PCSLs, not PCSLS.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "PCSLs" to "PCSLs" (lowercase s).

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.4.2.5 P311 L50 # 490

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Incorrect cross-reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Figure 177-5" to "Figure 177-4".

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.4.4 P312 L34 # 280

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

The last sentence in 177.4.4 is "Within each RS-FEC symbol, bit 0 is transmitted first and bit 9 is transmitted last". The transmission order is relevant for the 120-bit block creation, not for the circular shift (circular shift would be the same regardless of the bit order within a symbol).

SuggestedRemedy

Move the quoted sentence to 177.4.3.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 177 SC 177.4.5 P313 L24 # 281

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

Missing commas

SuggestedRemedy

Add a comma after "flows".  
 Add commas before and after "m<119:0>".

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 177 SC 177.4.5 P313 L51 # 282

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

the integer i is a scalar, not a vector, so it should not be in boldface here (it is not bold in other instances)..

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the boldface format from i.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.4.5 P313 L51 # 283

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

"(s<sub>0,i</sub>, s<sub>1,i</sub>, s<sub>2,i</sub>, s<sub>3,i</sub>, s<sub>4,i</sub>, s<sub>5,i</sub>, s<sub>6,i</sub>) is the binary vector corresponding to the element α<sub>i</sub> in the Galois Field GF(2<sup>7</sup>) with primitive polynomial x<sup>7</sup> + x<sup>3</sup> + 1"

This reads as if the s bits are the binary representation of the 128 elements of the field - but per Equation 177-2 these are actually the binary coefficients in the linear combination of α<sub>0</sub> through α<sub>6</sub> that creates α<sub>i</sub>. I suspect these are not the same.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the quoted sentence after the subsequent one (which states that the elements can be expressed as a linear combination), and change "binary vector corresponding to" to "binary coefficients of the linear combination that creates".

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.4.5 P314 L1 # 284

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

The second sentence in the first paragraph spans 5 lines and includes 6 commas, 3 instances of "and", and 2 instances of "where". It is difficult to follow. It also includes "first", but there seems to be no further steps.

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite this sentence, preferably breaking it into more readable pieces.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.4.7 P315 L10 # 285

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

"The rate... is..."

The exact rate depends on the input rate which has some tolerance.

It would be helpful for the reader to write the ratio of the output rate and the input rate. This information should preferably be placed in the "summary of functions" in 117.1.3 as well.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "the rate" to "the nominal rate".

Add a statement about the ratio, here and in 177.1.3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.4.7.1 P316 L6 # 421

Dudek, Mike Marvell

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The FAS descriptions in table 177-4 have the MSB transmitted first as other clauses do and as is shown with the vectors in Annex 177A. In other clauses the MSB is also transmitted first and is shown as the left most bit in diagrams. Figure 177-8 however might be interpreted as the FAS being transmitted in the other order.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify Figure 177-8 to match the text and Annex

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 177 SC 177.4.9 P317 L4 # 286

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

"These test patterns are used to test adjacent layer interfaces or to perform testing between an Inner FEC and external testing equipment"

Which adjacent layer interfaces? and what is "testing between"?

These generators are only in the output direction, so they can only be used to drive the PMD service interface (which is then used with external testing equipment).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to  
 "If implemented, these test patterns can be used to drive the PMD service interface for PMD testing purposes".

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

CI 177 SC 177.4.9 P317 L5 # 287

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

It is not specified what happens when more than one generator is enabled on the same lane.  
 The definitions in clause 120 which are referenced include different control variables and MDIO mappings, and the case where two are enabled is only covered in 45.2.1.170.

Note that some of the patterns in clause 120 are not per-lane but here all patterns have enable bits per lane.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add text in 177.4.9 stating that all generators are per-lane, that enabling any of the pattern generators on a lane affects only that lane, and that the behavior when more than one generator is enabled on the same lane is not specified.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

CI 177 SC 177.5 P317 L27 # 123

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Introductory sentence could be useful

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the following to 177.5 "The following processes are performed independently on each PMD service interface input lane.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 177 SC 177.5.1 P338 L27 # 9

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Inner FEC test patterns

In Draft 1.3, PRBS13Q and PRBS31Q generators were added to the Inner FEC transmit path output (see 177.4.9). A checker on the input of the receive path would be helpful for rudimentary testing of a PMD or link.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add PRBS13Q and PRBS31Q pattern checkers to the input of the Inner FEC receive path.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #148.



Cl 177 SC 177.5.1.1 P317 L41 # 288

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D decoding

"If inverse precoding is enabled, the Inner FEC receive function processes the detected data equivalent to the process specified for input lanes in 135.5.7.2"  
 In practice, the processing is equivalent only if hard decoding is performed (i.e., in the initial synchronization). In the main data path it is assumed that the Inner FEC decoding operation is performed on soft inputs, so inverse precoding is performed separately as part of that decoding.  
 It may be beneficial to inform the reader of this difference.

The suggested remedy assumes that the Inner FEC decoding operation is performed on soft input from the PMD, as suggested in another comment.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add an informative note at the end of 177.5.1.1:  
 "NOTE--If inverse precoding operation is enabled as part of the PAM4 decoding, it also affects the decoding operation in 177.5.4, which does not use the output of the PAM4 decoding function."

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.5.1.1 P317 L43 # 491

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The second and third sentences of the third paragraph of 177.5.1.1 is hard to understand. Also, this is the first use of "ILT" in this clause and it should be spelled out.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest changing:  
 "If ILT function is enabled by the management variable mr\_training\_enable (see 178B.15), the precoding state on the link partner transmitter is requested using the ILT function. If ILT is disabled by the management variable mr\_training\_enable, the precoding state on the link partner transmitter is set by management."

to:  
 "If inter-sublayer link training (ILT) is enabled by the control variable mr\_training\_enable (see 178B.15), precoding of the received data is enabled at the link partner (transmitter) as requested by the receiver using ILT. If ILT is disabled, then the precoding of data at the transmitter is controlled by a management entity."

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.5.2 P318 L4 # 501

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

Extra "to" and missing verb in second sentence of 177.5.2.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change:  
 "The eight codewords inserted as pad (see 177.4.7) are used to frame to the data stream and then removed before the received data is processed."  
 to:  
 "The eight codewords inserted as pad (see 177.4.7) are used to frame the data stream and are then removed before the received data is processed further."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.5.2 P318 L7 # 290

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The initial ("blind") deinterleaving and synchronization is performed on bit pairs, since they cannot rely on the FEC decoder.  
 The source of the bit pairs is likely hard decoding of the input symbols into PAM4 and then into bits.  
 However, the same deinterleaving is later performed on the input symbols, which are more than bit pairs. This is currently not stated.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add text stating that the alignment found by the initial synchronization based on the PAM4 hard decoding is used for deinterleaving of soft inputs into the Inner FEC decoding.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 177 SC 177.5.2 P318 L7 # 289

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

"Blind 1:8 bit-pair deinterleaving (each pair of bits corresponding to a PAM4 symbol) is performed to eight Inner FEC flows"

It is unclear what "blind" refers to in this operation. "blind" is no defined in 802.3 and its occasional use is inconsistent.

Perhaps "initial" is more adequate here.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "blind" to "initial" in the quoted sentence and the one with the other instance of "blind" in this subclause.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the first sentence to:

"1:8 bit-pair deinterleaving (each pair of bits corresponding to a PAM4 symbol) is performed to eight Inner FEC flows. The initial position is not specified."

Cl 177 SC 177.5.2 P318 L19 # 116

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The statement that you can identify flow 0 and how its done should be one paragraph

SuggestedRemedy

Combine paragraph 4 & 5 in 177.5.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 177 SC 177.5.4 P319 L10 # 291

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

"The Inner FEC decoder is a soft-decision decoder that requires a higher resolution than two bits for each received PAM4 symbols"

Wording can be improved.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to

"The Inner FEC decoding assumes soft-decision operation that requires a resolution of more than two bits for each received symbol".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 177 SC 177.5.4 P319 L10 # 488

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

Typo in tense of "PAM4 symbols".

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "... for each received PAM4 symbols."

To: "... for each received PAM4 symbol."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.5.4 P319 L11 # 293

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

"The decoder evaluates the incoming codeword and determines the most likely codeword value"

Then input to the decoder is not a codeword (a codeword is a member of a set of 128-bit vectors). The input is a vector of "soft" samples that corresponds to a transmitted codeword.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The decoder evaluates the incoming block of 64 rx\_symbol inputs and determines the most likely codeword value".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 177 SC 177.5.4 P319 L11 # 292

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The assumed correction capability of the decoder is not stated. Also, it is not stated what happens when a codeword is uncorrectable. I assume the decoder does not mark the data as error in any way (since it is an inner code) but it is not stated. The error patterns that appear in this case are not described.

Compare to the RS-FEC decoder specification in 91.5.3.3 (where there are normative specifications for correction capability and uncorrectable error marking).

This is important information for testing, monitoring and analyzing the performance of an implementation.

The suggested remedy is based on slide 9 of [https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/public/22\\_05/22\\_0517/bliss\\_3df\\_01a\\_220517.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/public/22_05/22_0517/bliss_3df_01a_220517.pdf).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add some test e.g.  
 "The decoder is expected to correct all codewords in which hard decision would result in up to one bit error and most codewords with up to three bit errors. Codewords that are not decoded correctly will contain at least four bit errors"  
 Or modifications of the above if necessary.

If there is no consensus for additional text (either the one above or otherwise), add an editor's note inviting contributions in this area.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.5.4.1.5 P319 L52 # 118

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

We're specifying the behavior of bin 3, so starting with 'Note' could be a bit misleading

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the last sentence to read "Error bin 3 increments when three or more bits are corrected in an Inner FEC codeword."

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.5.4.1.1 P319 L21 # 294

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

"The output of the Inner FEC decoder will recognize the miscorrected codewords as corrected codewords."

The output is not a separate entity, it is a block of 120 bits that has no information about the type of codeword it came from. The counter is internal to the decoder.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to  
 "The Inner FEC decoder will treat any miscorrected codeword as a corrected codeword."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change to:  
 "The Inner FEC decoder interprets miscorrected codewords as corrected codewords."  
 Implement with editorial license.

Cl 177 SC 177.5.4.1.1 P319 L24 # 117

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

There is a reference to clause 45 here, I think we want that all to be in the tables

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the "(see 45.2.1.213h)"  
 In 177.5.4.1 add the following sentence "Mapping of the counters to management variables is specified in 177.10"

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 177 SC 177.5.4.1.2 P319 L29 # 295

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D decoding

"An uncorrected Inner FEC codeword is a codeword that contains errors that were not able to be corrected by the decoders."

The phrase "able to be corrected by the decoders" is convoluted. The ability is in the decoder, not in the codeword.

It is unclear to me if a decoder is even allowed to "not correct" a codeword. Does it mean that hard detection would result in 4 errors, such that the decoder is unsure of the most likely codeword, so it just spits the hard-detected bits (stripping the parity bits)? if that is done, then the (normative?) statement in 177.5.4 "The decoder evaluates the incoming codeword and determines the most likely codeword value" is not true.

*SuggestedRemedy*

At the minimum change the quoted statement to "An uncorrected Inner FEC codeword is a codeword with errors that the decoder chose not to correct due to a high probability of miscorrection".

Preferably add some text in 177.5.4 to cover this possibility and the likelihood that the message contains several bit errors.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "contains errors that were not able to be corrected by the decoder" to "contains errors that the decoder was unable to correct".

CI 177 SC 177.5.4.1.4 P319 L45 # 108

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

inner FEC bin counters can be used to roughly measure pre-Inner FEC BER. Pre-FEC BER is implicit.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to "pre-Inner-FEC BER"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

CI 177 SC 177.5.4.1.5 P319 L48 # 13

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The index "i" is typically used for the lane number. Since counters need to be defined per lane, this index "i" will cause some ambiguity in the management variables and MDIO register definitions. For similar bin counters defined in 174A.6 and 176.7.4.1 the index "k" is used for this purpose.

*SuggestedRemedy*

For the bin counters defined in 177.5.4.1.5 change the index "i" to "k". Also update Table 177-7 and definitions in Clause 45 appropriately.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 177 SC 177.5.4.1.5 P319 L49 # 395

Shrikhande, Kapil Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The definition of the inner fec codeword error bin counters in 177.5.4.1.5 could be edited to better align to the FEC codeword error bin counter in 175.2.5.3.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Align bin counter definition format in 177.5.4.1.5 to the bin counter in 175.2.5.3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #11.

CI 177 SC 177.5.7 P320 L15 # 122

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

We're restoring to the data stream to its original order, but it could have errors in the so we can't state it's the original data from the SM-PMA and that'd be the far end SM-PMA not the local one.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "to restore the original data received from the BASE-R SM-PMA." to be "to restore the order of the data received to be compatible with the BASE-R SM-PMA."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 177 SC 177.6.2.1 P320 L33 # 493  
 Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 The word AND should be lowercase.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change: "... for all eight flows AND the Inner FEC ..."  
 to: "... for all eight flows and the Inner FEC ..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.6.2.1 P320 L34 # 494  
 Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Remove comma used between phrases when it is not separating independent clauses of a compound sentence.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change: "... is identified, and is set to false ..."  
 to: "... is identified and is set to false ..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.6.2.1 P320 L34 # 296  
 Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)  
 The definition of all\_synced does not (strictly) cover the case where sync\_flow<x> is true for all eight flows but the Inner FEC flow 0 is not identified.  
 Also, "and" here has no special meaning and should not be capitalized.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "set to false when sync\_flow<x> is false for any x" to "set to false otherwise".  
 Change "AND" to "and".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.6.2.1 P320 L43 # 492  
 Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)  
 The word boolean should be capitalized.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "boolean" with "Boolean" in the definition of these variables:  
 fas\_valid  
 Inner\_FEC\_sync\_status  
 slip\_done  
 test\_cw  
 test\_fas  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.6.2.1 P320 L53 # 88  
 Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D reset variable  
 FEC\_reset is referred to in the definition of the "reset" variable, but FEC\_reset is not defined except through a cross-reference to 45.2.1.1.1. The MDIO control variable table (Table 177-6) should instead be used for the cross reference to CL 45 registers).  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the cross-reference text "(see 45.2.1.1.1)" from the definition of reset in 177.6.2.1.  
 Add the definition of "FEC\_reset" to the list of variables in 177.6.2.1 as: "Boolean variable that is true when set by a management entity and is false otherwise".  
 Add FEC\_reset to the MDIO control variables table (Table 177-6) in subclause 177.10 with cross-references to 177.6.2.1 and 45.2.1.1 and the MDIO register bit number, 1.0.15.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Editorial slides with topic "Reset variable" are provided in the following contribution:  
 <URL>/brown\_3dj\_04\_2501. For task force discussion.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 177 SC 177.6.2.1 P321 L2 # 498

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The definition of the variable restart\_inner\_fec\_sync states it is set by a process, but it can now be set by two separate processes.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace: "A Boolean variable that is set by the Inner FEC synchronization process ..."

with: "A Boolean variable that is set by the Inner FEC synchronization process or the Inner FEC pad detection process ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.6.2.1 P321 L13 # 497

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The definition of sync\_flow<x> should be made more clear. What does it mean to be "in a flow of Inner FEC"? Also, a range of values should be given as "A to B" instead of "A:B".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest changing the definition of sync\_flow<x> from:  
 "A Boolean variable that is set to true when the receiver has found the correct boundary of codewords in a flow of Inner FEC, where x = 0:7"

to:  
 "A Boolean variable that is set to true after the inner FEC codeword boundary is found for an inner FEC flow, where x=0 to 7 and represents an inner FEC flow ID before identifying the actual inner FEC flow numbering."

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.6.2.1 P321 L22 # 495

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The variable "valid\_cw" is used in the state diagram in Figure 177-10 and should be added to the list of variable definitions.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add definition of "valid\_cw" to list of variable definitions in 177.6.2.1 in alphabetical order.

Suggested definition (to make CAL\_SYNDROME function obsolete):  
 "A boolean variable that is set to true when the calculated syndrome of the Inner FEC codeword beign tested is zero and is set to false otherwise."

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

CI 177 SC 177.6.2.2 P321 L26 # 496

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The function CAL\_SYNDROME is not necessary and should be removed from the list of functions and from the state diagram in figure 177-10. The variable "valid\_cw" (definition is missing), should be defined to make this function not necessary.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove CAL\_SYNDROME from the list of functions. Remove CAL\_SYNDROME from figure 177-10 in states CW\_CHECK\_1, CW\_CHECK\_2 and CW\_CHECK\_3

Also remove references to CAL\_SYNDROME in definition of bad\_cw\_cnt and valid\_cw\_cnt counters in 177.6.2.3

Change the definition of bad\_cw\_cnt from:  
 "Counts the number of invalid Inner FEC codewords based on the output of CAL\_SYNDROME function. A codeword is considered invalid when its syndrome is non-zero."  
 to:  
 "Counts the number of invalid inner FEC codewords received within a period of 150 codewords."

Change the definition of valid\_cw\_cnt from:  
 "Counts the number of valid Inner FEC codewords based on the output of CAL\_SYNDROME function. A codeword is considered valid when its syndrome is zero."  
 to:  
 "Counts the number of valid inner FEC codewords within a period of 50 codewords."

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

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

CI 177 SC 177.6.2.3 P321 L45 # 502

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The definition of "fas\_cnt" is "Counts the interval of Inner FEC codewords between two adjacent pads." What is the interval value? How many codewords?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a number to to explicitly state the number of codewrds that need to be counted or else add a cross-reference to the subclause with this information.

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add a cross-reference to the subclause, and implement this change with editorial license.

CI 177 SC 177.6.3 P321 L53 # 499

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Should add a statement that the 8 self-sync processes operate independantly of each other and spell out the word synchronization. Should also state that 8 such processes are required on each input lane.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change:  
 "The Inner FEC sublayer shall implement eight self-sync processes as shown in Figure 177-10 to identify the boundaries of the Inner FEC codewords."

to:  
 "The Inner FEC sublayer shall implement eight self-synchronization processes as shown in Figure 177-10 for each input lane in the receive direction. Each synchronization process operates independantly on an Inner FEC flow to identify the boundaries of the Inner FEC codewords."

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

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

CI 177 SC 177.6.3 P321 L54 # 500

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Should add a statement that a PAD detection process is required for each input lane.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change:  
 "Pad detection process follows the process shown in Figure 177-10."

to:  
 "An inner FEC Pad detection process as illustrated in the state diagram in Figure 177-10 shall be implemented for each input lane in the receive direction."

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 177 SC 177.6.3 P322 L4 # 507  
 Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** (bucket)  
 In figure 176-10, a space is needed between the logical-OR (+) operator and variable name.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "+restart\_inner\_fec\_sync" with "+ restart\_inner\_fec\_sync".  
 And make the same change in Figure 177-11 on page 323, line 4.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.6.3 P322 L10 # 504  
 Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** (bucket)  
 In figure 176-10, the condition to transition out of stte INNER\_FEC\_SYNC\_INIT is incorrect.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the condition from:"all\_synced" to "UCT"  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.6.3 P322 L12 # 505  
 Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** (bucket)  
 In figure 176-10, in CW\_CHECK\_3 state, the extra space between variable names and increment operator ++ should be removed.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "cw\_cnt ++" with "cw\_cnt++"  
 and  
 replace "bad\_cw\_cnt ++" with "bad\_cw\_cnt++"  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.6.3 P322 L21 # 506  
 Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** (bucket)  
 In figure 176-10, the new state UNSYNC could use a better name.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Rename state "UNSYNC" to be "RESTART\_SYNC"  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 177 SC 177.6.3 P322 L22 # 119  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** (bucket)  
 In Fig 177-10 the exit from INNER\_FEC\_SYNC can't be all\_sync because that's false when any sync\_flow is false and in that state we set it false and need to go through the sync process to set it to true.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Create new variable "none\_synced" -- A Boolean variable that is set to true when sync\_flow<x> is false for all eight flows and is set to false when sync\_flow<x> is true for any x.  
 In Fig. 177-10 replace the all\_sync criteria from INNER\_FEC\_SYNC\_INIT to GET\_BLOCK to be UCT  
 In Fig 177-11 replace the restart\_inner\_fec\_sync criteria for entering FAS\_LOCK\_INIT with none\_synced  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #504.



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 177 SC 177.6.3 P322 L23 # 503

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom

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

In figure 176-10, in state CW\_CHECK\_1, the conditional increment of cw\_cnt should be written with the condition in parentheses on the same line as the increment. See figure 1-1 in 1.2.1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change:  
 "if valid\_cw  
 valid\_cw\_cnt++"  
 to:  
 "valid\_cw\_cnt++ (if valid\_cw)"

in three places: in CW\_CHECK1, CW\_CHECK\_2 and CW\_CHECK3 states.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 177 SC 177.6.3 P323 L6 # 508

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom

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

In figure 177-11, there are three separate states with the name, COUNT\_NEXT. They should have different names.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Leave COUNT\_NEXT as-is at line 6.  
 On line 24, change "COUNT\_NEXT" to "COUNT\_2ND".  
 On line 28, change "COUNT\_NEXT" to "COUNT\_3RD".

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #297.

CI 177 SC 177.6.3 P323 L9 # 509

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom

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

In figure 177-11, there is an incomplete change to FAS\_LOCK\_INIT state from D1.2 comment #389.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In FAS\_LOCK\_INIT state, add:  
 "fas\_lock <= false"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 177 SC 177.6.3 P323 L13 # 510

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** (bucket)

In figure 177-11, in BAD\_FAS state, the extra space between variable names and increment operator ++ should be removed.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace "bad\_fas\_cnt ++" with "bad\_fas\_cnt++"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 177 SC 177.6.3 P323 L29 # 297

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** (bucket)

In Figure 177-11 there are two states titled "COUNT\_NEXT", with identical operations and transition conditions.  
 I assume both are required (if not, the bottom one should be deleted).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Rename the states to COUNT\_NEXT\_1 and COUNT\_NEXT\_2.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 177 SC 177.8 P324 L17 # 27

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** Skew

Skew constraints are not defined for the PMAs. However, the skew at each interface is defined in 116, 169, and 174 and thus the numbers. The PMA skew constraints may be derived from these. Note however, that the combination of the Inner FEC and the PMA above will need to share any skew allocation.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #452.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 177 SC 177.10 P325 L9 # 147

He, Xiang Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

"Inner FEC enable lane x" variables are not defined or backed by any proposal, and should be removed in the next draft.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove rows "Inner FEC enable lane 0" through "Inner FEC enable lane 7" in Table 177-6.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.10 P325 L29 # 1

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Change the "enable" control variables to a single "reset" variable

*SuggestedRemedy*

In Table 177-6 rename "Inner FEC enable lane 0" to "Inner FEC reset"  
 Make the variable reference be to 177.6.2.1 (where Inner FEC reset is defined)  
 Delete rows for "Inner FEC enable lane 1" to "Inner FEC enable lane 7"  
 Delete editor's note below Table 177-6  
 In Table 45-177a delete rows "Inner FEC enable lane 1" to "Inner FEC enable lane 7" and in the row for "1.2400.0" change "enable" to "reset"  
 On page 320 line 53 for the reset variable change the cross reference from "45.2.1.1.1" to "45.2.1.213a"

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.10 P326 L9 # 17

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

In Table 177-6 the enable bits are never defined in this clause nor are they necessary.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the enable bits from Table 177-6 and delete the editor's note below.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.10. P325 L9 # 298

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Table 177-6 includes control variables for per-lane inner FEC enable. As stated in the editor's note, these variables are not defined.

There idea of disabling the FEC and the behaviors of the encoder and decoder in this state have never been discussed.

If the intent is to have a way to power down the FEC logic, then the adjacent PMD's output enable and signal detect functions can be used. However, this would not be observable and need not be specified in a standard.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the "Inner FEC enable" control variables in table 177-6 and the corresponding MDIO registers in clause 45.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 177 SC 177.10. P325 L39 # 299

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The status variable name "pma\_locked\_demux" is not mentioned in the referenced 177.4.1.2. It is defined in 176.4.4.2.1. Also, it is a per-lane variable.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Either change the cross-reference to clause 176, or add text in 177.4.1.2 that the inner FEC has separate status variables for this function (only in the transmit direction? Or both?) Add "lane 0 through 7".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change the cross reference to clause 176, and implement with editorial license.



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 178 SC 178.8.9 P340 L32 # 126

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ILT (bucket)

Listing the coefficients and presets that are supported by the PMD here will lay the groundwork for reuse of the 178B over interfaces with differing support.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the following with editorial license after the first paragraph of 178.8.9 "The coefficients and presets supported by the PMD transmit function are:

- k\_list = {-3, -2 -1, 0, 1}
- preset 1
- preset 2
- preset 3
- preset 4
- preset 5"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Implement the suggested remedy with considerations of any changes due to other comments about presets.

Cl 178 SC 178.8.9 P340 L34 # 137

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ILT

steady state measurement is also needed by ILT

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "The steady state voltage specification needed in 178B.11.4 is specified in 178.9.2.4" to the subclause.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #138.

Cl 178 SC 178.9.3.3. P347 L34 # 426

Dudek, Mike Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx FFE presets

The test transmitter used in the interference tolerance test is limited to a maximum peak to peak amplitude of 0.8V but it is possible that the allowed 1.0V peak to peak signal from a compliant transmitter will overload the Rx making it incapable of reducing the amplitude through the training protocol.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Either change the value of C(0) in the OUT-OF\_SYNC condition in table 179-8 to 0.8 +/- 0.025 (see separate comment on Chip to Module) or add an additional subsection called "Receiver Overload". That states "The reciver shall also meet the interference tolerance requirements of 178.9.3.3 when the test transmitter has an initial peak to peak output amplitude of 1.0V and the limitation on the output amplitude of the test transmitter is removed. Make similar changes in Clause 179 and Annex 176C

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
For CRG discussion.  
[Editor's note: CC 179, 176C]

Cl 178 SC 178.9.3.3.2 P346 L25 # 557

Heck, Howard TE Connectivity

Comment Type T Comment Status D ITT Np

D1.3 has N\_p = 400 for ITT noise calibration. This is inconsistent with the value in 179 and with values used in prior standards.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change N\_p from 400 to 58, consistent with the value in 179.9.4.5.1. A presentation is planned to support the suggested remedy.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The correct reference is to 179.9.5.3.3, rather than 179.9.4.5.1 as written in the suggested remedy.

Pending CRG review of dudek\_3dj\_01\_2501.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 178 SC 178.9.3.3.3 P347 L14 # 447  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITT Test Method  
 Scrambled idle cannot be used with the test method defined in 174A.6.1  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "method defined in 174A.6.1 or a74A7.1. Make the same change to C2C on page 709 line 21  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.  
 [Editor's note: CC 176C]

Cl 178 SC 178.10.1 P350 L38 # 558  
 Heck, Howard TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 The value for COM single-ended receiver termination resistance is highlighted in orange. This value is consistent with those in 179 and 176C.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the orange highlighting.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 178 SC 178.10.6 P354 L52 # 255  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D AC Coupling  
 Location of AC coupling may also be on chip and stating TP0 to TP5 would not allow that  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change TP0 to TP5 to TP0d to TP5d  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #256.

Cl 178 SC 178.14.4.5 P361 L29 # 257  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D AC Coupling  
 Location of AC coupling may also be on chip and stating TP0 to TP5 would not allow that  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change TP0 to TP5 to TP0d to TP5d  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #256.

Cl 178A SC 178A P757 L26 # 360  
 Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Quantization noise  
 Add quantization noise.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add a new sub-section "178A.1.7.6 Quantization Noise". Please refer to slides 2-4 of the supporting document for the proposed sub-section content and text.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Supporting document  
 <[https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/comments/D1p3/8023dj\\_D1p3\\_comment\\_360\\_attachment.p df](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/comments/D1p3/8023dj_D1p3_comment_360_attachment.pdf)> was provided.  
 Straw poll #1 from the IEEE P802.3dj May 2024 Task Force meeting indicated a lack of support for an additional noise term to more explicitly represent noise from an analog-to-digital converter.  
 "IEEE P802.3dj May 2024 Task Force Straw Poll #1  
 I support adding a new noise term (such as 'eta\_1' in healey\_3dj\_01a\_2405, slide 6) to the COM reference receiver.  
 Results (all) Y: 13, , N: 37 , A: 31"  
 Instead, the receiver input-referred noise (eta0) was increased to allocate margin for this noise.  
 The supporting document introduces two new parameters: "Number of quantization bits" and "Quantization clip rate". Values for these parameters have not been proposed and the result of adopting the proposal as currently stated would be the addition of multiple "TBDs" to the draft. It may also be necessary to reconsider the agreed values for the eta0 parameter, and possibly other parameters, if this additional noise source is included. Analysis of channels will likely need to redone to justify new values and changes to existing values.  
 Response is pending CRG discussion.  
 [Editor's note: CC: 178, 179, 176C, 176D]

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.3 P748 L15 # 47

Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D COM frequency range

"It is recommended that the scattering parameters be measured with a uniform frequency step from a start frequency no greater than 10 MHz to a stop frequency of at least 67 GHz

*SuggestedRemedy*

Referencing wording in 179B.2.1 and 179B.3.1.  
 Insert line:

If, after specified filtering, significant power exists above the stop frequency or the stop frequency is near a local resonance or anti-resonance, differences in COM and ERL are to be accounted for.

See presentation showing delta COM up to 0.8 dB

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The comment appears to state a concern that the recommended 67 GHz stop frequency may be too low in some cases. However, the suggested remedy states a set of ambiguous conditions under which the lack of higher-frequency content in the measurement should be addressed (what constitutes "significant" power, or what constitutes an "(anti-)resonance"). Furthermore, the suggested remedy provides no guidance on how to account for "differences in COM and ERL" resulting from the lack of higher-frequency information (re-measure the channel with an extended frequency range?). Therefore, it is not clear that the proposed text is actionable by a user of the standard and it could possibly lead to confusion about the requirements for s-parameter measurements.

[Editor's note: The suggested remedy refers to a contribution. It may be mellitz\_3dj\_02\_0125.]

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.3 P748 L15 # 535

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D COM frequency range

Unnecessary ambiguity, and 802.3 is not a test spec. We define terms by procedures, not write methods of implementation.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "from a start frequency no greater than 10 MHz to a stop frequency of at least 67 GHz" to "from a start frequency of 10 MHz to a stop frequency of 67 GHz."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This sentence is a recommendation for the maximum start frequency and minimum stop frequency for s-parameter measurements that will used for the calculation of Channel Operating Margin. It is neither ambiguous nor a specification for a method of test implementation. It indicates that it is acceptable for frequencies below the recommended minimum and/or above the recommended maximum to be included in the calculation. Also see comment #47.

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.4.3 P751 L21 # 387

Noujeim, Leesa Google  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Partial channel model

Capacitance C0 in table 178A-5, "Single ended package capacitance at port 1" description is incorrect; C0 represents part of the partial host channel, while Cp (in Table 178A-4) is "Single ended package capacitance at the package-to-board interface".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Single ended package capacitance at port 1" to "Single ended board capacitance at the package-to-board interface (port 1)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "Single-ended package capacitance at port 1" to "Single-ended board capacitance at the package-to-board interface". This agrees with the description of Cp given in Table 178A-4.

Change "Single-ended package capacitance at port 2" to "Single-ended capacitance at the model-to-measurement interface". This is a more generic, but accurate, description of this capacitor's position in the calculation.

Implement with editorial license.

[Editor's note: CC: 179, 176D.]

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.4.3 P751 L31 # 388

Noujeim, Leesa Google  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Partial channel model

Capacitance C1 in table 178A-5 is not associated with the package, so description "Single ended package capacitance at Port 2" is incorrect.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Single ended package capacitance at port 2" to "Single ended capacitance at board-model-to-test\_connector interface (port 2)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #387.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.6.4 P754 L9 # 537

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D COM CTLE

f\_p2, the fixed highest pole in the CTLE, always fb, is a relic from a time before we had a proper receiver front-end filter. We need to make a careful compromise between the receiver front-end filter, coax connector and other limitations and the maximum frequency in S-parameters, and f\_p2. At least for a BT filter, 5th order works well, but this is a Butterworth filter.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Combine f\_p2 and the receiver front-end filter, take f\_p2 out of the COM tables.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The comment appears to suggest two separate actions. The first is to fix the value of fp2 to be fb and remove it from the COM parameter tables (making it independent of clause or annex). It is suggested that, if this action is taken, fp3 be removed and fp2 be assigned the value of fp3. The second is to move the 1-pole lowpass filter, with pole fb, from the receiver continuous-time equalizer to the receiver noise filter. It is not clear what the purpose of this change would be. If it is to reduce the bandwidth or steepen the roll-off of the receiver noise filter, it is suggested that this may be better accomplished by increasing the filter order (and/or reducing the 3 dB bandwidth fr).

These actions are somewhat unrelated and can be decided separately. Response pending CRG discussion. [Editor's note: CC: 178, 179, 176C, 176D.]

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.7 P754 L32 # 364

Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Quantization noise

Following first comment, "sampler" should be replaced with "quantizer".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "sampler" to "quantizer".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #360.

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.7 P754 L50 # 361

Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Quantization noise

Following first comment, Figure 178A-7 should show addition of the quantization noise after the sampler.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add quantization noise to the figure. Please refer to slide 5 of the supporting document for the proposed change.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #360.

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.7 P755 L2 # 362

Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Quantization noise

Following first comment, Table 178A-9 should include quantization noise parameters.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add two quantization noise parameters to the table. Please refer to slide 6 of the supporting document for the proposed change.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #360.

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.7 P755 L15 # 365

Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Quantization noise

Following first comment, "sampler" should be replaced with "quantizer".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "sampler" to "quantizer".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #360.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.7 P755 L19 # 363  
 Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Quantization noise  
 Following first comment, Equation (178A-14) should include quantization noise PSD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add quantization noise PSD to the equation and its description to the descriptions. Please refer to slide 7 of the supporting document for the proposed change.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #360.

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.7.3 P756 L12 # 511  
 Li, Mike Intel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D COM Tx noise  
 Including  $\sigma_x^2$  in EQ (178A-18) is incorrect. It will make the TX noise modulation dependent which is wrong.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the  $\sigma_x^2$  in EQ (178A-18)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.  
 Note that this change brings the COM model for transmitter noise into closer alignment with the measurement of SNDR defined in 179.9.4.5.1.

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.8.1 P757 L18 # 367  
 Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Quantization noise  
 Following first comment, quantization noise should be added before sampler output is applied to the feed-forward filter in Figure 178A-9.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add quantization noise to the figure. Please refer to slide 8 of the supporting document for the proposed change.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #360.

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.8.1 P757 L43 # 366  
 Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Quantization noise  
 Following first comment, "sampler" should be replaced with "quantizer".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "sampler" to "quantizer".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #360.

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.8.1 P758 L33 # 534  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 If  $N_b$  is the number of feedback taps,  $N_f$  is the number of feedforward taps. Obvs. Although OIF use it for something else. 10GBASE-LRM uses  $E_q N_f$  and  $E_q N_b$ . 802.3ck has:  
 DFE maximum span including floating taps  $N_f$  (but it doesn't have receiver FFE taps so the contradiction doesn't apply) and  
 Number of DFE floating tap banks  $N_{bg}$ .  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change Number of (FFE) taps per floating tap group, from  $N_f$  to  $N_{fg}$   
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 For consistency with the notation used in Annex 93A, change "Number of floating tap groups" from  $N_{\{g\}}$  to  $N_{\{wg\}}$  and change "Number of taps per floating tap group" from  $N_{\{f\}}$  to  $N_{\{wf\}}$ . The change from "b" to "w" in the subscripts indicates that this floating tap structure is in the feed-forward filter defined in Annex 178A, whose tap coefficients are denoted as  $w(i)$ , and not in the feedback filter as defined in Annex 93A.  
 Implement with editorial license.  
 [Editor's note: CC: 178, 179, 176C, 176D.]



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.8.1 P758 L35 # 536

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Not clear what "Highest allowed tap index" means. The reader doesn't know if tap 0 is the cursor, or he should count from 1, or from 0, or something else. Also, Fig 178A-9 and 178A-10 have N\_w which might be the same thing. 802.3ck has "DFE maximum span", not "index"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please align and explain the terminology

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: Changed subclause from 178A.1.3 to 178A.1.8.1.]

Add the following sentence after the first sentence of the second paragraph on page 759 (line 7).

"By convention, feed-forward filter tap index 1 corresponds to the earliest pre-cursor tap, tap index Nfix corresponds to the latest fixed-position post cursor tap, and Nmax corresponds to the highest index that can be chosen for a floating tap. This means that the feed-forward filter includes Nfix-dw-1 fixed-position post-cursor taps and a floating tap range of Nmax-dw-1 taps."

Note that the Nmax values in Clauses 178 and 179, and Annexes 176C and 176D, do not appear to have been set in a manner that is consistent with this convention. In Clauses 178 and 179, change Nmax to  $6+1+80 = 87$  (consistent with a floating tap range of 80). In Annexes 176C and 176D, change Nmax to  $5+1+50 = 56$  for (consistent with a floating tap range of 50).

Implement with editorial license.

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.9 P761 L L # 372

Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Xtalk noise has not been mentioned in this section. This is important because this noise will also be amplified by the receiver FFE.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add sufficient text and possibly equation to the section to include xtalk noise and highlight its amplification by Hrxffe.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The crosstalk signals are subject to filtering by the receiver feed-forward filter (see page 760, line 50). In 178A.1.10.2, it is stated that the terms defined in 178A.1.9 are to be used for the calculation of the distribution of noise and interference amplitude. Therefore, the impact of the feed-forward filter on crosstalk is included.

However, it is recognized that the relationships between 178A.1.9, 178A.1.10.2, and 93A.1.7.3 may be difficult to follow.

Resolve using the response to comment #371.

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.9 P761 L10 # 368

Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada

Comment Type T Comment Status D Quantization noise

Following first comment, Equation (178A-34) should include quantization noise PSD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add quantization noise PSD to the equation. Please refer to slide 9 of the supporting document for the proposed change.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Resolve using the response to comment #360.

Cl 178A SC 178A.1.9 P761 L14 # 371

Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Dual-Dirac jitter also goes through receiver FFE noise amplification. This is not captured in the referenced section 93A.1.7.2 and needs to be mentioned here.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add sufficient text and possibly equation to the section to highlight dual-Dirac jitter noise amplification by Hrxffe.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Jitter is converted to amplitude noise via the slope of the signal around the sampling points. The slope of the signal is filtered by the receiver feed-forward equalizer prior to computation of the corresponding amplitude noise (see page 760, line 53). In 178A.1.10.2, it is stated that the terms defined in 178A.1.9 are to be used for the calculation of the distribution of noise and interference amplitude. Therefore, the impact of the feed-forward filter on the noise due to dual-Dirac jitter is included.

However, it is recognized that the relationships between 178A.1.9, 178A.1.10.2, and 93A.1.7.3 may be difficult to follow.

Add a new subclause under 178A.1.10 that consolidates the content of 178A.1.9 and 93A.1.7.1 through 93A.1.7.3 to clarify the process for computing the noise and interference amplitude distribution for Annex 178A COM.

Implement with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 178A SC 178A.1.10.2 P761 L51 # 369

Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Quantization noise

Following first comment, more text should be added to describe the procedure for deriving the probability density function of the quantization noise and its addition to the probability distribution function of the noise and interference.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the suggested text in slides 10-11 of the supporting document before the last sentence of the paragraph.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #360.

CI 178A SC 178A.1.10.2 P762 L11 # 383

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

The editor's note indicates that the content of NOTE 1 was included as a placeholder recommendation for the amplitude step. This placeholder is consistent with a similar recommendation in Annex 93A and no proposals for a different recommendation have been received. The editor's note no longer seems to have a purpose.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 178A SC 178A.1.11 P762 L39 # 370

Shakiba, Hossein Huawei Technologies Canada  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Quantization noise

Following first comment, quantization noise should be added before sampler output is applied to the feed-forward filter in Figure 178A-10.

SuggestedRemedy

Add quantization noise to the figure. Please refer to slide 12 of the supporting document for the proposed change.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #360.

CI 178B SC 178B P765 L19 # 542

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Introduction

This annex needs an introductory diagram, and the terminology needs cleaning up

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient detail to implement.

CI 178B SC 178B P765 L22 # 544

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Introduction

Explain the interaction between this annex and Clause 73 AN

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #131

CI 178B SC 178B.5 P766 L33 # 355

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The first two paragraphs of 178B.5 are not about the protocol, but about AUI components and PMDs. They seem to belong to 178B.4, based on its title.

SuggestedRemedy

Move these paragraphs to 178B.4.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The first paragraph of 178B.5 is related to the section, so it should stay in 178B.5. Move the second paragraph of 178B.5 to the beginning of 178B.4 Implement with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 178B SC 178B.5 P767 L1 # 381

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The "continue training" bit is in the control field. Also the cross-reference to 178B.8.8 does not point to the definition of the "Continue training" bit.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The continue training bit in the control field of the training frames (see 178B.7.2) if training is enabled."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 178B SC 178B.7 P774 L11 # 515

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Presets

At present, the same preset 1, the loudest, is used for a special measurement condition and the default startup. While it makes sense to measure a large signal, it is bad practice to start a lane at maximum crosstalk, which exceeds the 900 mV limit for 50G/lane and 100G/lane AUIs which may be connected.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 1 0 1 from Reserved to Preset 6;  
 In 178B.11.2, add lines for preset 6;  
 In 178B.14.3.1, ic\_sel, add preset 6.  
 See other comments for associated changes.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 For CRG discussion.

Cl 178B SC 178B.11.2 P779 L38 # 125

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Presets

Pseudo code should have check for unsupported requests.

SuggestedRemedy

change the else to be "else if CHECK\_REQ(ic\_req)"

add "else ic\_sts = updated coeff\_sts = not supported" before the end if

add the following after the end if

CHECK\_REQ(ic\_req)

Compares the ic\_req against the list of specified presets for the AUI component or PMD. Returns true if the requested preset is specified and false otherwise.

Implement with editorial license

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Refer to resolution of comment #514 for additional changes to the UPDATE\_IC function.

Cl 178B SC 178B.11.2 P780 L5 # 512

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx FFE presets

At present, preset 1 is the loudest. But it is bad practice to start a lane at maximum crosstalk, and the voltage can exceed the 900 mV limit for 50G/lane and 100G/lane AUIs which may be connected.

SuggestedRemedy

Assuming we like the association between 1 and default:

Change the definition of preset 1 and OUT\_OF\_SYNC from 0 0 0 1 0 to 0 0 0 0.75 0.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #457.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 178B SC 178B.11.4 P781 L33 # 133  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ILT (bucket)  
 The list of supported coefficients may be different for various components  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace the {-3, -2, -1, 0, 1} in the definition of k\_list with "is defined by the AUI component or PMD"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 178B SC 178B.11.4 P781 L37 # 136  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ILT  
 The steady state measurement technique differs from 136 for 179.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the "(see `136.9.3.1.2)"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #138.

Cl 178B SC 178B.14.2.1 P783 L10 # 356  
 Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D State diagram  
 The NOTE about SIGNAL\_OK seems to apply not just the adjacent\_isl\_ready but also to adjacent\_remote\_rts.  
 Also, "the other interface of the device" is not defined for an endpoint (when client\_is\_pcs is true).  
 Also, I am not sure the concept of "other interface" is fully defined for the case of an optical module, where one interface is the PMD and the other interface is a PMA. Neither the NOTE nor the text in 178B.5 address this case.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Define an additional variable adjacent\_signal\_ok whose value is taken from the parameter of the appropriate primitive (as the current note explains) and is undefined when client\_is\_pcs is true.  
 Redefine adjacent\_remote\_rts and adjacent\_isl\_ready based on the new variable.  
 Add whatever is needed to cover the optical module case.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The case of a PMA adjacent to a PMD is a special case of the retimer defined in 178B.5.2. In section 178B.5.2 there is a definition of the "other interface".  
 Add a note to 178B.5.2: "NOTE - Interface A (see Figure 178B-2) is a component of a PMA and Interface B may be a component of PMA or a PMD."  
 Define an additional variable adjacent\_signal\_ok defined as: "Enumerated variable derived from the value of the SIGNAL\_OK parameter. This variable may be assigned one of the following values: PROGRESS, READY, OK, FAIL. If client\_is\_pcs is true this variable is undefined."  
 Move the note mentioned in the original comment to be below the new adjacent\_signal\_ok variable.  
 Change the definition of the adjacent\_isl\_ready variable to: "Boolean variable that indicates the value of isl\_ready on the other interface of the device. It is set to true if the value of adjacent\_signal\_ok is OK or READY and to false otherwise."  
 Change the definition of the adjacent\_remote\_rts variable to: "Boolean variable that indicates the value of remote\_rts on the other interface of the device. It is set to true if the value of adjacent\_signal\_ok is OK and to false otherwise."  
 Implement with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 178B SC 178B.14.2.1 P783 L13 # 124

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Interfaces

"other" interface is a bit ambiguous and the listed situations are the typical use case but does not cover all use cases. As a remote PCS (after a XS) could do either local or clock forwarding modes.

SuggestedRemedy

Rename client\_is\_pcs to be "uses\_local\_clock\_only" and update the definition to be "Boolean variable that indicates if the PMA will never swap to a forwarded clock. For example this will be true for the first PMA below the RS."

Replace both uses of client\_is\_pcs with uses\_local\_clock\_only in Fig 178B-7

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of presentation  
 <URL/brown\_3dj\_03\_2501>  
 Clock switching related slides

Cl 178B SC 178B.14.2.1 P783 L22 # 543

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D AN/ILT time-out

This says "There is no specified time limit for the ILT protocol", which is misleading because it seems the Clause 73 link\_fail\_inhibit\_timer will override it.

SuggestedRemedy

As it seems the intention is that there should be no time limit, and this is unlike e.g. 50GBASE-CR and 100GBASE-CR1, refer to Table 73-7 in 73.10.2 and say that link\_fail\_inhibit\_timer does not apply at 200G/lane. In Table 73-7 in 73.10.2, set link\_fail\_inhibit\_timer to infinite.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #131.

Cl 178B SC 178B.14.2.1 P783 L31 # 382

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The "Continue training" bit is in the control field.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the last sentence of the definition of local\_rts to "The logical-NOT of this variable is encoded as the "continue training" bit in the control field of transmitted training frames."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.  
 Also in the definition of remote\_rts change: "of the status field" to "of the control field".

Cl 178B SC 178B.14.3.5 P789 L41 # 141

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Ambiguous transition if timer\_done and tf\_lock both occur simultaneously

SuggestedRemedy

Add "!recovery\_timer\_done \*" to the transition back to TRAIN\_LOCAL

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 178B SC 178B.14.3.5 P790 L20 # 143

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

Fig 178B-9 has an extraneous line

SuggestedRemedy

extran | to th right of the UCT exiting POLARIY\_INVERT

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Remove extraneous line from Figure 178B-9.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 178B SC 178B.14.3.5 P790 L20 # 142

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

Fig 178B-9 has text box overlapping lines

SuggestedRemedy

tf\_offset in GET\_NEW\_MARKER is covering up lies

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Fix the GET\_NEW\_MARKER box and text to avoid overlap.

Cl 178B SC 178B.14.3.5 P790 L27 # 144

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D State diagram

Fig 178B-9 needs to clarify the transitions out of TEST\_MARKER.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the transition from TEST\_MARKER to INVALID\_MARKER to be "!invalid\_marker \* !inverse\_valid\_marker) + (polarity\_correction \* inverse\_valid\_marker)"

Change the transition from TEST\_MARKER to POLARITY\_INVERT to be "!polarity\_correction \* inverse\_marker\_valid"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of presentation  
 <URL/brown\_3dj\_03\_2501>  
 Polarity inversion slides

Cl 178B SC 178B.15 P792 L6 # 7

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

MDIO register bit references need to be added to Tables 178B-6 and 178B-7

SuggestedRemedy

Consider a proposal on how to do this during the January 2025 802.3dj task force meeting

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the reponse to comment #170

Cl 178B SC 178B.15 P792 L13 # 170

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The Management tables need to be updated

SuggestedRemedy

Update Tables 178B-6 and 176B-7 variables and references. Refer to lane 0 of the upstream interface and add a footnote for the other interfaces/lanes (similar to Clause 162 Table 162-7).

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 179 SC 179.7.1 P368 L41 # 30

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Skew (bucket)

The skew numbers from previous generations should be fine.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 179 SC 179.7.2 P369 L12 # 31

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Skew (bucket)

Skew constraints for 1.6TBASE-R based on 800GBASE-R should be fine.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179 SC 179.8.9 P372 L43 # 138

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ILT

steady state measurement is also needed by ILT

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "The steady state voltage specification needed in 178B.11.4 is specified in 179.9.4.1.2" to the subclause.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: changed line from 34 to 43.]

It seems that the comment pertains to the steady-state voltage referred to in 178B.11.4 (in the definition of the function CHECK\_EQ), addressed by comment #136.

"steady-state voltage" currently points to 136.9.3.1.2 - which is superseded by 179.9.4.1.

One way to handle this is to change 178B.11.4 to point to 179.9.4.1 (definition of steady-state voltage in this project) instead.

However, we should not expect the ILT implementation (which is probably 100% logic design nowadays) to verify that steady-state voltage (essentially an electrical/analog spec) is not exceeded .

It seems preferable to change the definition of CHECK\_EQ such that it does not refer to the steady-state voltage but only the the equalization capability (which is more natural in the context of ILT).

To ensure that the steady-state voltage is not exceeded by equalization, an explicit requirement should be added in the electrical specifications, that the sum of the absolute values of all coefficients does not exceed 1.

For CRG discussion.

Cl 179 SC 179.8.9 P372 L43 # 132

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ILT (bucket)

Listing the coefficients and presets that are supported by the PMD here will lay the groundwork for reuse of the 178B over interfaces with differing support.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the following with editorial license after the first paragraph of 179.8.9 "The coefficients and presets supported by the PMD transmit function are:

```
-- k_list = {-3, -2 -1, 0, 1}
-- preset 1
-- preset 2
-- preset 3
-- preset 4
-- preset 5"
```

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with considerations of any changes due to other comments about presets.

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4 P374 L6 # 185

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D R\_peak

Values for R\_peak are TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #303.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4 P374 L22 # 221

Rysin, Alexander

NVIDIA

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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. A different methodology that will better quantify phase-only uncorrelated jitter has to be explored. Presentation is planned.

SuggestedRemedy

Other method of uncorrelated jitter measurement should be considered.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #219.

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4.1 P374 L6 # 303

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D R\_peak

R\_peak is TBD for the three host classes.

Since we have a reference model for each host class, the "difference" method can be used for R\_peak, as has been done for SNDR (now dSNDR). This would remove dependence of the requirements on the test fixture specifications and on the host models (in case these change in future drafts).

SuggestedRemedy

Define the minimum R\_peak requirement to be relative to what the reference transmitter will create with the test fixture used.  
A contribution with more details will be provided.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Pending review of the contribution mentioned in the suggested remedy. It is expected that this contribution will also address C2M.  
[Editor's note: CC 179, 176D]

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4.1.1 P376 L2 # 513

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx FFE presets

At present, the same preset 1, the loudest, is used for a special measurement condition and the default startup. While it makes sense to measure a large signal, it is bad practice to start a lane at maximum crosstalk, which exceeds the 900 mV limit for 50G/lane and 100G/lane AUIs which may be connected to a 200G AUI. C2C, C2M, CR and KR can stay aligned for convenience.

SuggestedRemedy

Assuming we like the association between 1 and default, change this to preset 6, defined in 179.9.4.1.3 as 0 0 0 1 0. Preset 1 becomes 0 0 0 0.75 0.  
In 179.9.4.1.2, 179.9.5.3.3, 179.9.5.3.5 and 176D.7.12.4, change 1 to 6.  
Similarly in and 176D.7.12.2, but in 176D.7.11, "preset 1" (the default startup) remains correct.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
The comment text is identical to that of comment #514 but the suggested remedy is different.  
Resolve using the response to comment #514.

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4.1.3 P377 L19 # 516

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status D Tx FFE presets

This table and Table 176D-8 say that for OUT\_OF\_SYNC, ic\_req is N/A yet Figure 178B-10, Coefficient update state diagram, shows that in the OUT\_OF\_SYNC state, ic\_req is set to preset 1. This seems inconsistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Here, one could make the table easier to understand by deleting the first column and the "N/A" row, and rely on the text just above the table. If so, similar text may be needed in 176D.7.6.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #514.



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4.1.3 P377 L19 # 514

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx FFE presets

At present, the same preset 1, the loudest, is used for a special measurement condition and the default startup. While it makes sense to measure a large signal, it is bad practice to start a lane at maximum crosstalk, which exceeds the 900 mV limit for 50G/lane and 100G/lane AUIs which may be connected to a 200G AUI. C2C, C2M, CR and KR can stay aligned for convenience.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change OUT\_OF\_SYNC and preset 1 from 0 0 0 1 0 to 0 0 0 0.75 0, with the usual tolerances.

Add a row for preset 6, values 0 0 0 1 0, without tolerances. In the table footnote, change 1 to 6, twice, and delete "and OUT\_OF\_SYNC". Similarly in 176D.7.6.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Preset 1 is provided as the "unequalized" state that is required by the linear fit procedure as well as electrical specifications (v<sub>f</sub>). It is preferable to keep this meaning of preset 1. There is provision for separate equalization coefficients for the initial state in training; these are listed in the OUT\_OF\_SYNC row of table 179-8, and are currently identical to those of preset 1, but that can be changed.

There are several comments on this topic. Assuming there is support for this direction, the comment may be satisfied by changing the values in the OUT\_OF\_SYNC row to a different set of values (footnote a should be updated accordingly).

To address comment #516, this should be renamed (e.g. "Initialize", "Preset 0" or "Default"). Figure 178B-10 and 178B.11.2 should be changed to use the same name.

This should also be applied in Table 176D-8 if (unless it is replaced by a reference to table 179-8).

If the initial setting is changed it may affect receiver algorithms. A NOTE (or a temporary editor's note to be removed before publication) may be adequate to inform readers that the default state is not equal to preset 1 as it was in previous generations.

For CRG discussion.

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4.1.3 P377 L20 # 457

Simms, William

NVIDIA

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx FFE presets

Table 179-8 - Coefficient initial conditions contains a larger jump between preset 1 and 2 where C(0) goes from 1 to 0.5. Preset3 uses C(0) of 0.75 but also adds additional precursor which may not be desirable

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add or replace a preset with C(0) set to 0.75 and all other taps set to 0 (+/-0.025)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The intent of preset settings is to enable known settings that receivers can use as starting points for implementation-specific coefficient-update-based algorithms.

Starting from preset 1, the coefficient setting can be reached with a simple algorithm.

Adding more presets would increase test burden.

Note that comment #514 suggests a different modification of the default equalization state, Resolve using the response to comment #514.

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4.5 P378 L50 # 304

Ran, Adeo

Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D dSNDR (bucket)

The procedure for calculation of dSNDR may be somewhat easier to follow with an illustration.

Compare to the similar calculation of dR<sub>peak</sub> and dv<sub>f</sub>, defined in Annex 163A, which is illustrated by Figure 163A-1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a figure in 179.9.4.5 similar to Figure 163A-1 but with "reference SNDR" and "measured SNDR".

Add text referring to the figure with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4.5.3 P380 L6 # 538

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Reference SNDR

This complicated recipe for Reference SNDR is far too arcane.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Provide the table of Reference SNDR values for the host loss categories and presets concerned.

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The reference SNDR calculation method is provided for cases where part of the measurement setup is provided by the user of the procedure. The method is used by clause 178 (KR) and annex 176C (C2C), where there is no specified test fixture, so the reference SNDR is implementation-dependent. For clause 179 (CR) and annex 176D (C2M), there are specifications for the mated test fixtures (Annex 179B) that could potentially be used to calculate reference values, which may indeed be useful for readers. However, this would require a detailed proposal. The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient detail to implement.

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4.5.3 P380 L22 # 305

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Reference SNDR (bucket)

H<sub>t</sub>(f) is not fully defined since T<sub>r</sub> is not provided.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a reference to T<sub>r</sub> in Table 179-18

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Several COM parameters (from Table 179-18) are required for the calculation of the reference SNDR but are currently not mentioned.  
 - Equation 179-11 has H<sub>t</sub>(f) which refers to 178A.1.6.2 which needs T<sub>r</sub>.  
 - Equation 179-15 has S<sub>tn</sub>(theta) which refers to Equation 178A-18 which needs SNR<sub>TX</sub> and f<sub>b</sub>.  
 Add the following paragraph at the end of 179.9.4.5.3:  
 "Calculation of the reference SNDR uses values in Table 179-18 for the parameters f<sub>b</sub>, T<sub>r</sub>, SNR<sub>TX</sub>."  
 Include any other missing parameters.  
 Implement with editorial license.

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4.6 P381 L21 # 306

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Jitter

Jitter measurements refer to 120D.3.1.8.1 for the probability distribution calculation method. As noted in [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_11/ran\\_3dj\\_06a\\_2411.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_06a_2411.pdf), the method of combining measurements from different transitions into a single PDF in 120D.3.1.8.1 is troublesome.

As a specific example, additive noise (which is always present) is translated to timing error in an opposite way for rising/falling transitions. If the additive noise distribution is asymmetric, the distributions created by the noise alone (in the absence of clock phase jitter) are mirror images of each other, and combining them as in the 120D method would amplify the effect of the additive noise. Especially, th4 J4u would not be representative of the true jitter distribution.

It is possible to use information from multiple transitions to improve the accuracy of the measurement in the presence of additive (vertical) noise.

The method of combining the distributions should be improved to mitigate additive noise and slope dependence.

*SuggestedRemedy*

A contribution with further details is planned.

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Pending review of the contribution mentioned in the suggested remedy.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179 SC 179.9.4.6 P381 L26 # 541

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Jitter

As already pointed out, the "jitter measurement" method here doesn't work for the relevant bandwidths, losses and amplitudes. This is particularly obvious for J3u03; J4u03 seems to be beyond the state of the art. EOJ should be part of an eye spec like EECQ, not a separate spec item.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete this method. Use an eye spec to control signal quality, following the evolution of xECQ.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment is essentially a restatement of comment #404 and related comments against D1.2 (and similar comments against previous drafts), which claimed that jitter measurement is not feasible and suggested to delete it.

The response to comment #404 was: "REJECT.

The CRG reviewed slides 11-14 of [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_11/ran\\_3dj\\_01a\\_2411.pdf](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](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."

The claims made in previous comments and repeated here are not backed by data.

Conversely, presentations have shown that quite accurate jitter measurements after losses of >32 dB are feasible.

While this proposal was rejected, improvements to the measurement method have been adopted by other comments (see the response to comment #213), which alleviate some of the claimed concerns. However, the comment does not address these improvements.

This comment includes neither new information to support changing previous decisions, nor sufficient detail to implement a change to the draft.

Cl 179 SC 179.9.5 P384 L10 # 307

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Amplitude tolerance

The amplitude tolerance definition in 179.9.5.2 is now stated in terms of steady-state voltage ( $v_f$ ) rather than peak-to-peak. Therefore, the value 1 Volt is inadequate.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the parameter name from "Amplitude tolerance" to "Amplitude tolerance ( $v_f$  at TP2)".

Change the value from 1 to 0.5.

Delete footnote a.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

It is suggested to retain the parameter name, and instead add a footnote stating that it is defined as  $v_f$  at the test transmitter's output. The referenced 179.9.5.2 is suggested to be defined this way (subject of comment #352).

Implement the rest of the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 179 SC 179.9.5.3 P385 L15 # 386

Noujeim, Leesa Google  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ITOL

The adopted values for test channel insertion loss for use in the interference tolerance test were based on [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_11/ran\\_3dj\\_03\\_2411.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_03_2411.pdf). Slide 4 of this presentation has an error: the "MCB IL = 3.5 dB" should be 5.95dB so that it includes the connector allocation of 2.45dB. The current 3.5dB results in a double-counting of the host receiver connector; the test channel insertion losses in Table 179-11 are thus insufficient to appropriately stress the receiver under test. The resulting "frequency dependent attenuator" values would be too small.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Increase test channel insertion losses in Table 179-11 Test Case 2 (high loss) columns from (34.55,29.55,24.55)+/-0.5dB to (37,32,27)+/-0.5 dB.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The host channel loss of 13.95 dB on slide 3 of [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_11/ran\\_3dj\\_03\\_2411.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_03_2411.pdf) includes the host connector (as shown on Figure 179A-2).

Therefore, the MCB that replaces the host channel should also include the connector.

The MCB loss budget is equal to the mated test fixture minus the HCB; per Figure 179A-1, this is 9.75-3.8 = 5.95 dB, or an additional 2.45 dB.

Applying this correction results in the values in the suggested remedy.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179 SC 179.9.5.3 P385 L31 # 308

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ITOL

The editor's note says "The internal loss of the test pattern generator may need to be addressed".  
 The pattern generator in this case is expected to be an instrument-grade equipment (unlike the corresponding KR test, there is no provision for just "a compliant transmitter). The "internal loss" is not externally observable and is possibly compensated for by internal equalization as part of the instrument's calibration.  
 Deviation from the reference transmitter model is addressed by using the measured T<sub>r</sub> in item b of 179.9.5.3.3, instead of the reference T<sub>r</sub> (which models the transition time of the signal into the device model). This may be emphasized by separating the transition measurement into a different list item (similar to items c and d that address measurements of other parameters).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Separate the measurement of the transition time in item b of 179.9.5.3.3 from the calculation of the channel S-parameters (which uses the measurement result).  
 Reorder the list with editorial license.  
 Delete the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 179 SC 179.11 P390 L33 # 309

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Nomenclature (bucket)

The term "cable assembly class" has been used as a placeholder for several drafts. No comments have been received to use another term.  
 It is suggested to formally adopt this term.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Unify the document by changing any other term referring to the cable assembly class with editorial license.  
 Delete the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 179 SC 179.11 P390 L48 # 258

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D AC coupling

We have increased the low frequency cut off but kept the capacitor value the same, 100 nF has cut off of 33 kHz!

*SuggestedRemedy*

If we go with 33 nF the cutoff is 96 kHz for 50 Ohms and 104 kHz for 46.5 Ohms, I suggest we go with min of 33 nF otherwise the next value is 36 nF (less common) followed by more common 47 nF.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The AC coupling specification is for a maximum cutoff frequency. It is permitted to go below 100 kHz. Using 100 nF capacitors with 46.5 Ohm impedance would result in 34 kHz, which is ok. Using 33 nF, as in the suggested remedy, would also be ok.  
 The recommendation for capacitors is made in order "to limit the inrush current", and it essentially creates a minimum cutoff frequency. It has not been claimed or demonstrated that reducing inrush current compared to previous generation is required; hosts likely need to be backward compatible anyway. Adopting the suggested remedy would unnecessarily limit implementation options.  
 The comment does not provide sufficient justification to support the suggested remedy.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 179 SC 179.11 P391 L5 # 310

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D CA reach

Table 179-13, Cable assembly characteristics summary, includes four cable classes in the first row, but does not state the expected reach of each class, which is the most useful information for the reader.

Note that previous PMD clauses include this information, and there is a NOTE in 179.11 that addresses the indicated length, although it is not indicated.

Comment #100 against D1.2 suggested modifying the table to include this information. There was general support for the idea, but the reach values in the suggested remedy were incorrect.

Based on offline discussion, the expected reach per cable assembly class is:  
 CA-A: 0.5 m  
 CA-B: 1 m  
 CA-C: 1.5 m  
 CA-D: 2 m

SuggestedRemedy

Implement the changes shown on slide 37 of [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_11/ran\\_3dj\\_01a\\_2411.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_11/ran_3dj_01a_2411.pdf), with the exception that the values in the "Expected Reach" row are as listed in this comment.

Move the NOTE in 179.11 to a NOTE (informative) in Table 179-13.  
 Delete the second editor's note in 179.11.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

CI 179 SC 179.11.1 P391 L28 # 311

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D eference impedance (bucket)

The reference differential impedance is stated, but there are also common-mode and mode-conversion specifications for cable assemblies.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a specification for common-mode impedance of 25 Ohm, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 179 SC 179.11.7 P393 L48 # 312

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D COM (bucket)

The minimum value of COM is included in Table 179-13, and has an exception for some cases. Having one value and referring to it is preferable.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "3 dB" with a reference to Table 179-13 with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 179 SC 179.11.7.1 P394 L27 # 466

Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Partial channel model

The partial host channel model parameters unnecessarily degrade COM performance. C0 is the same value as the previous specification generation.

SuggestedRemedy

Set to 0, OR remove C0 and C1 parameters

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #393.

CI 179 SC 179.11.7.1 P395 L27 # 391

Noujeim, Leesa Google  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Partial channel model

Capacitance C0 in table 179-16 "Single ended package capacitance at port 1" description is incorrect; C0 represents part of the partial host channel, while Cp is "Single ended package capacitance at the package-to-board interface".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Single ended package capacitance at port 1" to "Single ended board capacitance at the package-to-board interface (port 1)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The parameter matches the name "Single-ended package capacitance at port 1" in Table 178A-5. C1 is named similarly.  
 The names are indeed not representative of what the parameters stand for. However, the suggested remedy is not accurate either.  
 Change the names of C0 and C1 in Table 178A-5 to "Single-ended capacitance at port 1/2".  
 Change the parameter names in the COM parameter tables (Table 179-16 and Table 176D-5) accordingly.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179 SC 179.11.7.1 P395 L33 # 392  
 Noujeim, Leesa Google  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Partial channel model  
 Capacitance C1 in table 179-16 is not associated with the package, so description "Single ended package capacitance at Port 2" is incorrect.  
*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Change "Single ended package capacitance at port 2" to "Single ended board capacitance at board-model-to-test\_connector interface (port 2)"  
*Proposed Response* Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #391.

Cl 179 SC 179.11.7.1 P395 L33 # 393  
 Noujeim, Leesa Google  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Partial channel model  
 The capacitance C1 represents a shunt capacitance at the RF test connector ports of the Cable Assembly Test Fixtures (cl 179B.3). This capacitance C1 may have, in prior generations, been used to compensate the discontinuity on the CATF between the RF coax connector and the CATF printed circuit board transmission line. Note that the measurement calibration plane is typically at the coax connector mating interface. However, in the 200Gbps/lane generation the coax connector is multiple UI long and so a lumped element compensation is ineffective. A different method should be developed to remove the reflections due to the 50 ohm RF connector and launch that sits between the partial host channel model transmission line (characteristic impedance 92.5 ohms.) and the CATF transmission line (typ 92.5 ohm board impedance between the RF test connectors and the MDI connector).

*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Set C1 to 0 and time-gate the RF coax connector/launch out of the TP1-TP4 cable assembly measurements.  
*Proposed Response* Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The (nonzero) values of C0 and C1 were adopted by comment #537 against D1.1. During the discussion of this comment it was noted that these values do not represent real capacitances and thus it was proposed to make them zero.  
 However, it was claimed that these capacitances actually improve the COM result when attached to measured cable assembly S-parameters - possibly by reducing the inductive effect of the connector.  
 No data has been provided to support this statement, but the straw poll taken indicated support for the nonzero values:  
 Straw Poll #E-6 (directional)  
 I would support C1 value of:  
 A: as proposed (1e-5 nF)  
 B: 0 nF  
 A: 22 B: 14  
 Note that there are several comments on this topic. Data to support the decision would be welcome.  
 For CRG discussion.

Cl 179 SC 179.11.7.1 P396 L44 # 456

Simms, William NVIDIA  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D COM (bucket)

Table 179-18 - COM parameter values uses a value of 0.54 for the minimum allowed versus the preset2 which has 0.50 (-0.025) from table 179-8. Should COM limits match the presets?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make COM table entry 0.475 (0.5-0.025)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The transmitter specifications in Table 179-7 require ability to reduce c(0) to 0.5 or lower, consistent with preset 2. This enables receivers to reduce the input dynamic range. The COM parameters only specify the search range. There is no evidence that the current range of c(0) is insufficient - in fact, with the current parameters the selected value is always 1.

Cl 179 SC 179.11.7.1 P397 L38 # 533

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D COM

Put COM parameters in the COM parameter table

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a reference receiver method row for COM parameter table, value FFE-DFE or FFE-MLSD in this project, next to the DER\_0 row

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Annex 178A currently does not defined the detector type as a parameter. With only two distinct options, making this a parameter with a value would not improve clarity. For CRG discussion.

Cl 179 SC 179.11.7.2.2 P398 L32 # 313

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D COM (bucket)

Some of the parameters are given in Table 179-17 (as in the case of the signal path in 179.11.7.2.1).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "using the parameters in Table 179-16" to "using the parameters in Table 179-16 and Table 179-17."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 179 SC 179.11.7.2.2 P398 L34 # 314

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D COM (bucket)

The calculation of the NEXT path includes:  
 "The parameter z\_p^(h) for the transmitter is taken from the aggressor path column"  
 But there is no such column.  
 Similarly for the FEXT (line 46).

Comparing to 162.11.7.1.1 and 162.11.7.1.2, the value of z\_p was specified separately in each one but the value was the same, 110.3 mm (and it makes sense).

*SuggestedRemedy*

The reference to the "aggressor path column" should be removed.  
 The text in 179.11.7.2.2 can refer to the similar text in 179.11.7.2.1, with an exception that S is the measured NEXT/FEXT instead of through S-parameters.  
 Impalement with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 179 SC 179.12 P399 L21 # 315

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

The PMD is specified in 179.8 and 179.9. 179.14 contains management variable mapping and is irrelevant here.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the reference per the comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179 SC 179.14 P400 L10 # 90

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D reset variable

In Table 179-20, the variable PMD\_reset has a variable reference to subclause 178B.14.2.1; however, that subclause does not define "PMD\_reset".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest adding a subclause to CL 179 (perhaps 179.8.10) to define the PMD\_reset variable similar to 180.5.6, 181.5.6, 182.5.6, 183.5.6, and 185.5.6 and 187.5.6 with title "PMD reset function" and subclause text:  
 "If the variable PMD\_reset is asserted, the PMD shall be reset as defined in 45.2.1.1.1."

And change the cross-reference in Table 179-20 from 178B.14.2.1 to this new subclause in Clause 179.

A similar subclause should also be added as 178.8.10 titled "PMD reset function" with the same text as above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Editorial slides with topic "Reset variable" are provided in the following contribution:  
 <URL>/brown\_3dj\_04\_2501. For task force discussion.

Cl 179A SC 179A.4 P799 L12 # 267

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Host channels here is actually package+Host PCB

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest to call it Host package + host PCB, as the channel may imply the connector loss is included

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The Host Channel does include the connector loss. The text above Table179A-1 clearly states what losses are included in the Host Channel.

Cl 179A SC 179A.4 P799 L16 # 266

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Recommended channel IL in table 179A-1 don't add up

*SuggestedRemedy*

Assuming the via is part of channel, with loss of 2.45 dB connector and 3.8 dB HCB sums to 6.25 dB, the Max Host channel loss would be:  
 Host-Low=12.75-6.25=6.5 dB  
 Host-Med=17.75-6.25=11.5 dB  
 Host-High=22.75-6.25=16.5 dB

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using response to comment #267.

Cl 179A SC 179A.4 P800 L22 # 268

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Host Channel IL

l1dd MTF loss of 9.75 dB is the target loss and not min loss

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove minimum from the 179A-3 title and add target for the MTF loss

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The table title and parameter definition are correct as written and consistent with formatting in previous projects.

Cl 179A SC 179A.5 P799 L16 # 458

Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (withdrawn)

ILddCA,min is greater than ILddCH,min

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add an Editor's note to provide context and explain that testing the ILddCH,min condition is not possible.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179A SC 179A.5 P801 L47 # 532  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)  
 17.5  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 17.75, twice  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The comment indicates a typo in a label in Figure 179A-2. Replace 17.5 with 17.75 and Implement formatting with editorial license.

Cl 179A SC 179A.5 P802 L12 # 560  
 Heck, Howard TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 The first channel min calculation in Figure 179A-3 contains an error. The equation states that 13 dB @ 53.125 GHz = (16+4.45+4.45)-(2\*9.75). The correct equation is 13 dB = (16+8.25+8.25)=(2\*9.75). The 8.25 dB is taken from Table 179A-3 (Minimum insertion loss budget values at 53.125 GHz)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the equation in Figure 179A-3 to "Channel Min (TP0d-TP5d) = 13 dB @ 53.125 GHz = (16+8.25+8.25)-(2\*9.75)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement as proposed in suggested remedy.

Cl 179A SC 179A.5 P802 L13 # 531  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)  
 13 dB ... = (16+4.45+4.45)-(2\*9.75)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 13 dB ... = (16+8.25+8.25)-(2\*9.75)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #560.

Cl 179B SC 179B.(new) P811 L54 # 455  
 Sekel, Steve Wilder Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (withdrawn)  
 Reference impedance is 92.5 ohm differential, with test instruments being 100 ohm differential (50 ohm single ended). This introduces a discontinuity in the test environment which does not exist in application environment. Lab measurements suggest the location (in time delay) of this discontinuity will change some compliance measurement results. The location within the test fixtures should be specified in a new sub-clause in section 179B.4  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Problem will be presented with proposed location of 92.5 to 100 ohm discontinuity within the compliance test fixtures will be presented in contribution during 802.3 interim meeting  
 Proposed Response Response Status Z  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 179B SC 179B.1 P803 L23 # 527  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Now that we have adopted a reference impedance of 92.5 ohm for ERL, we need to address the other specs. All these parameters are measured with a VNA which does the calculations for us, so we can use whatever impedances are suitable.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Adopt consistent reference impedances for all spec items in this annex.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The comment is not specific about the scope of "other" specs or propose a specific change.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 179B SC 179B.2.1 P803 L39 # 357

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF IL

The reference insertion loss for TP2/TP3 test fixture (HCB) is TBD.

Assuming that the contributed S-parameters in sekel\_3dj\_02\_2407 represent the reference, Equation 179B-1 should be a polynomial in sqrt(f) fitted to the HCB insertion loss. Figure 179B-1 should be generated accordingly.

Alternatively, the content of 179B.2.1 (TP2 or TP3 test fixture insertion loss) can be replaced by the IL budget at 53.125 GHz.

SuggestedRemedy

A contribution with further details is planned.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of the contribution <URL>/ran\_3dj\_03\_2501,  
 For CRG Discussion.  
 Propose to implement resolution in ran\_3dj\_03\_2501 with editorial license.

CI 179B SC 179B.2.1 P803 L39 # 453

Sekel, Steve Wilder Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (withdrawn)

ILdd is listed as TBD

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed values and equations will be presented with measurement data in contribution during January 802.3 Interim meeting.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 179B SC 179B.2.1 P803 L39 # 210

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF IL

Value for ILdd\_rfref is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment #453.

CI 179B SC 179B.2.1 P804 L1 # 379

D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D MTF IL

There doesn't appear to be a figure - was it deleted? is this an editorial issue?

SuggestedRemedy

Add figure to 179B-1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment #357.

CI 179B SC 179B.3.1 P804 L44 # 211

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF IL

Value for ILdd\_catref is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment #357.

CI 179B SC 179B.3.1 P804 L44 # 358

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF IL

The reference insertion loss for the Cable assembly test fixture (MCB) is TBD.

Assuming that the contributed S-parameters in sekel\_3dj\_02\_2407 represent the reference, Equation 179B-2 should be a polynomial in sqrt(f) fitted to the MCB insertion loss.

Alternatively, the content of 179B.3.1 (cable assembly test fixture insertion loss) can be replaced by the IL budget at 53.125 GHz.

SuggestedRemedy

A contribution with further details is planned.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment #357.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179B SC 179B.3.1 P804 L49 # 528

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF IL

In line with how host loss for products is treated...

*SuggestedRemedy*

Instead of a test fixture PCB reference insertion loss, define the test fixture reference insertion loss from instrument (coax) connector to the HCB side of the MCB connector, i.e. the whole MCB. Then, MCB reference loss + HCB reference loss = mated CBs reference loss, and things are a little simpler.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment #357.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4 P805 L14 # 48

Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF COM

While 179B.4.1 to 179B.4.6 may be necessary, they are not sufficient, to guarantee the instrument quality fidelity required to make repeatable and accurate CR and C2M measurements.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a section.  
 179B.4.7 Test fixture COM  
 COM shall be equal to or greater than the specified minimum COM using specification from 179.11.7.1 (COM parameters) with a new table like Table 179–17 (Partial host channel model parameters per Host class)  
 Test case: 1, 2, 3  
 Tx Package class: B, B, B  
 Rx Package class: A, A, B  
 MLSE: 0, 0, 1  
 Rx FFE pre/post\_groups/taps\_span(UI): 6/14-2/4-50, 6/14-2/4-50, 6/15-2/4-80  
 Tx Package transmission line 1 length, zp1: 45, 45, 45  
 Rx Package transmission line 1 length, zp1: 4, 10, 45  
 Partial Tx host PCB transmission line length, Zp: 0, 220, 109  
 Partial Rx host PCB transmission line length, Zp: 0, 0, 109  
 tx C0: 0, 1.0e-5, 1.0e-5  
 Rx C0: 0, 0, 1.0e-5  
 Tx C1: 0, 2.9e-5, 2.9e-5  
 Rx C1: 0, 0, 2.9e-5  
 DER0: 2.0e-5, 2.0e-5, 1.0e-4  
 COM min: 5.3, 4.6, 4  
 Die-to-die losses for cases 1, 2, and 3 are about 20, 32, and 40 dB respectively  
 Using host PCB transmission defined in Table 176D–5 (Host and module model parameters)  
 See presentation.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The following related presentation was provided for review:  
 <URL>/mellitz\_3dj\_01\_2501  
 The comment suggests there is a better way to qualify mated test fixture performance and proposes a methodology for the TF to consider.  
 For CRG Discussion..

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.1 P805 L21 # 213  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF ILDD  
 Values for ILdd\_MTFmax and ILdd\_MTFmin are TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 This comment points out a TBD that must be addressed.  
 For task force discussion.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.1 P806 L1 # 380  
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)  
 There doesn't appear to be a figure - was it deleted? is this an editorial issue?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 add figure to 179B-2  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The issue is not editorial. The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient detail to implement.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.1 P805 L48 # 459  
 Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF FOM ILD  
 The value for the FOM\_ILD is TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace TBD with value as proposed in kocsis\_3dj\_01\_2501  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of the contribution <URL>/kocsis\_3dj\_02\_2501 and  
 <URL>/mellitz\_3dj\_01\_2501  
 For CRG Discussion.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.2 P807 L4 # 49  
 Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF ERL  
 table is TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace Table TBD with Table 93A-4  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #214.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.1 P805 L48 # 212  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF FOM ILD  
 Value for maximum FOM\_ILD is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment #459.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.2 P807 L4 # 460  
 Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF ERL  
 The table reference for unspecified MTF ERL parameters is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace TBD with "Table 179-18"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #214.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl **179B** SC **179B.4.2** P**807** L**4** # **214**  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** MTF ERL  
 Reference to "Table TBD".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Provide reference to intended table.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Two proposals: TABLE 93A-4, and TABLE 179-18  
 Pending review of <URL>/kocsis\_3dj\_02\_2501.  
 For CRG Discussion.

Cl **179B** SC **179B.4.2** P**807** L**7** # **530**  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** (bucket)  
 The round trip loss to the MCB connector is 7.6 dB from one side, and more from the other, so an ERL of 10.3 dB is very weak.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Now that we have a suitable reference differential impedance, choose a suitable ERL limit.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient detail to implement.

Cl **179B** SC **179B.4.2** P**807** L**10** # **463**  
 Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** MTF ERL  
 The value for Z<sub>t</sub>, the singled-ended source termination resistance for TDR and ERL reference is not listed  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add Z<sub>t</sub> to Table179B-1, with a proposed value of 46.25ohm, to align with ERL reference impedance of 92.5ohm  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of <URL>/kocsis\_3dj\_02\_2501.  
 For CRG Discussion.

Cl **179B** SC **179B.4.3** P**807** L**47** # **529**  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** *ITF Measurement Bandwidth*  
 The maximum frequencies in this annex are a mix of 67 GHz and 60 GHz. If any are 67, we are committed to the expense and they can all be 67. Test fixtures, like other test equipment, should be specified more stringently than product. High frequencies are as important relative to low frequencies for mixed-mode and common-mode specs as for differential-mode specs.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the 60 GHz to 67 GHz, 3 places. Adjust the graphs accordingly.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of <URL>/kocsis\_3dj\_02\_2501.  
 For CRG Discussion.

Cl **179B** SC **179B.4.4** P**809** L**33** # **464**  
 Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** MTF RLdc  
 The equation 179B-8 is incorrect (for the range 12.89GHz to 35GHz)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace equation with "17.85-0.225\*f"  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of <URL>/kocsis3dj\_02\_2501.  
 For CRG Discussion.

Cl **179B** SC **179B.4.6** P**810** L**29** # **525**  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** (bucket)  
 Some parameters are in the paragraphs, others are in the tables.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Move the parameters fMin fMax fStep (max) to the table(s)  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The current text formatting reflects the style of previous projects, but can be confusing to track all of the necessary information. Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.6 P810 L30 # 526  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Don't put unnecessary ambiguity in a definition.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "maximum frequency spacing of 10 MHz" to " frequency spacing of 10 MHz"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The current text formatting reflects the style of previous projects, but may be unnecessarily ambiguous. Implement suggested remedy as proposed.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.6 P810 L36 # 524  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 I don't know why the values in the NEXT table should differ from those in the FEXT, NEXT and IXT table. Also, Table 179B, with only one entry, isn't really a table.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Combine Table 179B-2 and 179B-4, using an additional column if needed. Combine tables 179B-3 and 179B-5.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The current text formatting reflects the style of previous projects, but does not propose values for the TBDs. Resolve with comment #217. Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.6 P810 L44 # 53  
 Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 A\_nt is not aligned with reference transmitter  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace 400 mV with 481 mV (table 179B-2)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #217.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.6 P810 L44 # 523  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 Although we can use any value we like for A\_nt and A\_ft, and keeping them the same across clauses would be desirable, people may expect that they align with the limits of the silicon.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change them from 600 mV to 500 mV  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve after review of <URL>/kocsis\_3dj\_02\_2501.  
 For CRG Discussion.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.6 P810 L45 # 465  
 Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 Value for rise/fall time in Table 179B-2 is inconsistent with Table 179B-4.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Update Tnt to 4.25ps  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #217.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.6 P810 L45 # 52  
 Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 T\_nt is not aligned with reference transmitter  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace 6 ps with 4 ps (table 179B-2)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #217.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 179B SC 179B.4.6 P811 L8 # 461  
 Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 The value for SFP224 MTF ICN is TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace TBD with value as proposed in kocsis\_3dj\_01\_2501  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #217.

CI 179B SC 179B.4.6 P811 L11 # 56  
 Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 ICN should be adjusted for PAM4  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Adjust ICN results from Equation 92-44 and 92-48 by multiplying by sigma\_X (0.7454)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #217.

CI 179B SC 179B.4.6 P811 L8 # 215  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 Value for maximum "Integrated near-end crosstalk noise voltage" is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #217.

CI 179B SC 179B.4.6 P811 L28 # 55  
 Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 A\_nt and A\_ft is not aligned with reference transmitter  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace 400 mV with 481 mV (table 179B-4)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #217.

CI 179B SC 179B.4.6 P811 L8 # 216  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 It is out of convention to specify a value "Less than xxx".  
 Similar issue in Table 179B-5.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "Integrated near-end crosstalk noise voltage" to "Integrated near-end crosstalk noise voltage (max)"  
 Change "Less than TBD" to "TBD"  
 Make similar updates in Table 179B-5.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.  
 Note that comment #217 proposes a value to use in place of TBD.

CI 179B SC 179B.4.6 P811 L31 # 522  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 The rise time for FOM\_ILD, SFP NEXT, and multi-lane NEXT and FEXT, are expected to be the same.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 4.25 ps to 6 ps, twice  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #217.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.6 P811 L31 # 54

Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 T\_nt and T\_ft is not aligned with reference transmitter

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 6 ps with 4 ps (table 179B-4)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #217.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.6 P811 L43 # 217

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 Values for crosstalk noise are TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of the contribution <URL>/kocsis\_3dj\_02\_2501,  
 <URL>/mellitz\_3dj\_01\_2501, and <URL>/mammenga\_3dj\_01\_2501.  
 For CRG Discussion.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.6 P811 L43 # 462

Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 The value(s) for Multi-lane MTF ICN is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace TBD with value as proposed in kocsis\_3dj\_01\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #217.

Cl 179B SC 179B.4.6 P811 L43 # 454

Sekel, Steve Wilder Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF XTALK  
 Values for MDFEXT, MDNEXT and Total ICN are listed as TBD

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed values along with measuremnt data will be presented in contribuion during 802.3 Interim meeting

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response for comment #217.

Cl 179B SC 179B4.1 P805 L48 # 50

Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF FOM ILD  
 FOM\_ILD is TBD

SuggestedRemedy

Based on posted MTF channel , sekel\_3dj\_02\_2407 replace TBD dB with 0.16 dB

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment #459.

Cl 179B SC 179B4.1 P806 L46 # 51

Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF FOM ILD  
 T\_t is not aligned with reference transmitter

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 6 ps with 4 ps

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment #459.



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl **179C** SC **179C.1** P**814** L**12** # **519**  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** (bucket)  
 Media Dependent Interface  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Medium Dependent Interface  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Medium Dependent Interface is consistent with the current nomenclature definitions.  
 Change "Media Dependent Interface" to "Medium Dependent Interface" across the draft  
 with editorial license.

Cl **179D** SC **179D.1.1** P**828** L**34** # **518**  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** (bucket)  
 This says "a common set of electrical parameters specified in 179.11, enabling a 1 m  
 length". What length(s) it enables is not relevant to this discussion of connector types and  
 breakout, and it is not accurate.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete "enabling a 1 m length"  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The current project scope supports multiple cable types of varying lengths, and so the  
 current text is incorrect.  
 Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **180** SC **180.3** P**412** L**15** # **227**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** signal ok  
 Signal\_OK as shown in Fig 180-2 is from the Inner sublayer above then goes into ILT box  
 on TX and another ILT box on the RX has Signal\_OK out. We talk about Signal\_OK then  
 jump into inter-suplayer variables before intorudcing ILT.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Referencing Fig 180-2 would be helfull here. After the 1st paragraph add sentence: The  
 PMD in this clause support Inter-sublayer Layer Training (ILT) type O1, see Annex 178B.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The third paragraph in 180.3 says "The SIGNAL\_OK parameter of the  
 PMD:IS\_SIGNAL.indication primitive corresponds to the variable  
 training\_status of the inter-sublayer training function, as defined in 178B.14.2.1." So it is  
 evident that the PMD includes ILT.

Also, a definitive statement as proposed in the suggested remedy is beyond the intent of  
 the service interface subclause, which is defining interfaces between sublayers.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 180 SC 180.5.1 P413 L27 # 316

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D PMD block diagram

The subclause title is "PMD block diagram", and the text refers to Figure 180-2 as the PMD block diagram, but it is not - it is a block diagram of the full link between two PMDs and their adjacent PMAs.

The diagram is good as it is, but the title and the text should be changed. The suggested remedy is one possibility, but variations of it can be used.

Also applies to the similar subclauses 181.5.1, 182.5.1, 183.5.1. Other two subclauses, 185.5.1 and 187.5.1, have a separate PMD block diagram and refer to the link diagram as "A block diagram for the PMD transmit/receive paths" instead, but their titles are still "PMD block diagram"..

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the subclause title to "PMD specification points". Change the text to refer to the diagram as a "link block diagram".

Change the figure title to align with the description.

Implement as appropriate in all optical PMD clauses with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The referenced block diagram provides much more than just the PMD. It shows the transmit and receive paths from the PMA at the transmitting end to the PMA at the receiving end and including the PMDs, MDIs, medium, test points, etc. between. It is therefore inaccurate to title the subclause "PMD block diagram". The figure title is okay as it is. The text in similar paragraphs is inconsistent with "The PMD block diagram" in the first paragraph and "The block diagram" in the second, third, and fourth paragraphs.

In 180.5.1...

Change the subclause title to "Block diagram"

On page 413 line 28, change "PMD block diagram" to "block diagram".

In 181.5.1...

Change the subclause title to "Block diagram"

On page 441 line 3, change "PMD block diagram" to "block diagram".

In 182.5.1...

Change the subclause title to "Block diagram"

On page 466 line 34, change "PMD block diagram" to "block diagram".

In 183.5.1...

Change the subclause title to "Block diagram"

On page 495 line 8, change "PMD block diagram" to "block diagram".

In 185.5.1...

Change the subclause title to "Block diagram"

On page 546 line 43, change "for the PMD transmit/receive paths" to "transmit/receive paths"

In 187.5.1...

Change the subclause title to "Block diagram"

On page 619 line 43, change "for the PMD transmit/receive paths" to "transmit/receive paths"

Implement with editorial license.

[Editor's note: CC: 180, 181, 182, 183, 185, 187]

Cl 180 SC 180.5.1 P414 L24 # 317

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The text boxes in Figure 180-2 are somewhat cluttered.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the service interface labels to "PMD:IS\_UNITDATA\_i.request" and "PMD:IS\_UNITDATA\_i.indication" (instead of "0 to 3").

Move the text "For clarity..." to the bottom of the diagram, and precede it with "NOTE".

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement part of the proposed remedy: "Move the text "For clarity..." to the bottom of the diagram, and precede it with "NOTE".

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Cl 180 SC 180.5.4 P415 L1 # 318

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

"The state of the Global\_PMD\_signal\_detect variable is conveyed to PMD client sublayers via the PMD service interface"

This is not true anymore; the service interface conveys the state of the ILT function (as shown in the diagram). The variable has a different semantic and is only accessible through management.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the quoted sentence.

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 180 SC 180.7.1 P418 L12 # 319

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (withdrawn)

The maximum optical return loss tolerance in 200GBASE-DR1 is different than in the other PMDs.  
 I assume this is due to the transmitter's connector; if that's true, should there be a different specification for a 200GBASE-DR1 with a multi-fiber MDI (breakout)? The receiver in that case can still have a single-lane MDI.  
 Should the transmitter's RINxxOMA in this case be measured with a reflectance corresponding to a single-lane MDI?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Not sure what the answer is and where this distinction should be made.

Whatever the solution is, implement similarly in clause 182 as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 180 SC 180.7.1 P463 L26 # 344

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

As a result of the resolution of comment #71 against D1.2, almost all rows in Table 180-7 now include the words "each lane". The few rows that do not, are also applicable per lane.

Also, the modified names of the parameters were not consistently applied to references to these parameters outside the table; for example footnote c as "RINxxOMA" without "each lane".

Apparently the whole table is applicable for each lane. The current parameter naming creates unnecessary clutter in the table and elsewhere in the clause, and having "each lane" on some of the parameters and not on others can raise questions.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add " on each lane" to the table heading. Delete it from the rows it appears on.  
 If necessary, add text above the table to clarify.

Delete "each lane" from the names of the parameters elsewhere in this clause (e.g. the text below the table).

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add "each lane" where appropriate. With editorial license

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 180 SC 180.7.3 P420 L24 # 320

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D power budget

This subclause is in the hierarchy under 180.7 "PMD to MDI optical specifications".

But the subclause content does not contain any specifications - it only explains the rationale for other specifications. It is informative in nature.

This can be solved by renaming clauses and/or changing the hierarchy. The suggested remedy is one option, but others may be chosen.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move this subclause out to a 2nd-level subclause after the 180.8 (that is, a new 180.9) and rename it "Power budget".

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Even when 180.7.3 is not normative it is very useful to the reader to show the capabilities and limitation of the interface. Separating it from 180.7.1 and 180.7.2 does not improve the quality of the draft.

Cl 180 SC 180.7.3 P420 L46 # 231

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D power budget

MPI/DGP penalty of 0.1 dB is too small for this PMD type

*SuggestedRemedy*

200GBASE-DR MPI penalty is 0.4 dB with 0.18 dB DGD the total penalty for this PMD is 0.58 dB  
 400GBASE-DR2/800GBASE-DR4/800GBASE-DR8 MPI penalty is 0.12 dB with 0.18 dB DGD the total penalty for this PMD is 0.3 dB. Make the MPI/DGD penalty 0.5 dB for all PMDs and reduce cable plant loss from 3 dB to 2.6 dB. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_02\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resubmission of comment #66 to D1.1 and #262 D1.2. which were rejected.  
 Table 140-12 does not show 0.4 dB MPI penalty. If 0.4 dB MPI penalty is needed then a complete revision of the DR1 spec is needed. Therefore the proposed remedy is incomplete. A complete proposal for the revision of the power budget is necessary."  
 A complete proposal for the revision of the power budget was not provided as requested.

Cl 180 SC 180.7.3 P473 L46 # 233

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D power budget

MPI/DGP penalty of 0.4 dB is too small for 200GBASE-DR and too generous for 400G/800G/1.6T

*SuggestedRemedy*

200GBASE-DR-2 MPI penalty is 0.45 dB with 0.18 dB DGD the total penalty for this PMD is 0.63 dB  
 400GBASE-DR2/800GBASE-DR4/800GBASE-DR8 MPI penalty is 0.1 dB with 0.18 dB DGD the total penalty for this PMD is 0.28 dB. We can either define different link budget, an acceptable alternative is to limit the number of connectors to 4 for 200GBASE-DR and stay with current 0.4 dB budget. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_02\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #231

Cl 180 SC 180.8 P421 L41 # 321

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

The words "shall meet the" appear twice in succession.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete once.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 180 SC 180.8 P421 L42 # 322

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

"per the definitions in 180.9" seems irrelevant. There are not specifications related to Table 180-10 in 180.9.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete "per the definitions in 180.9".

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 180 SC 180.8 P422 L17 # 323

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D channel requirements

"DGD\_max is the maximum differential group delay that the system is required to tolerate"

Within this footnote there are both a definition of an optical parameter, and a requirement of the "system" (but the way it is written makes it implicitly a receiver requirement).

Acknowledging that this footnote appears in many clauses in the base document, it is nevertheless a poor way of specifying things.

It would be preferable to separate the definition to a subclause, and possibly add a corresponding receiver specification.

*SuggestedRemedy*

If the intent is not to have DGD tolerance as a receiver requirement, change "that the system is required to tolerate" to "that a receiver is expected to tolerate".

If this is a receiver requirement, add a row in Table 180-8 with "DGD tolerance".

Preferably, either way, create a new subclause in 180.9 with a definition of DGD, instead of having it in a footnote.

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

DGD max is a fundamental requirement to the link, which automatically creates a worst case condition to the receiver in combination with a worst case transmitter. This is the fundament of optical interface specifications.

DGD\_max in Table 180-10 specifies the worst case intended/expected on the optical channel. The impact on the receiver is accounted for by the addition 0.1 dB penalty allocated as noted in Table 180-9, footnote b.

Cl 180 SC 180.8.1 P422 L43 # 324

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D fiber characteristics

A range of allowed values is usually indicated by "a to b" (see 14.2 in the style manual).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Implementing the proposed remedy does not improve the quality of the draft, which is not broken. This style has been used for quite some time in in-force specifications.

Cl 180 SC 180.8.1 P422 L44 # 325

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Dispersion slope unit is ps/(nm^2 km).

IEEE Std 260.1-2004 (4.3) requires parentheses in such cases. The IEEE SA style guide says a multiplication sign is required, but we often do not follow this rule.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add parentheses.  
 Consider adding a multiplication sign.

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 180 SC 180.8.3 P423 L45 # 326

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MDI

There are separate MDI definitions for each of the PMDs. These definitions do not appropriately address breakout, as described by Annex 180A (the word "breakout" does not even appear in this clause).

Although 180A is mentioned in NOTE paragraphs (which are informative) of "optical lane assignments" (180.8.3.1), there are normative ("shall") MDI requirements for 200GBASE-DR1 (180.8.3.2) that, as written, do not address the possible use of wider MDIs for this PMD. Similarly, 180.8.3.3 do not address the possible use of a 16-fiber interface for 400G and 800G.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In 180.8.3.2, add references to the alternative MDIs (180.8.3.3 and 180.8.3.4) and to Annex 180A.  
 In 180.8.3.3, add a reference to the alternative MDI (180.8.3.4) and to Annex 180A.

Consider adding a statement in the text of 180.8.3 with the word "breakout" and a reference to Annex 180A.

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #57

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 180 SC 180.8.3.1.1 P423 L52 # 327

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

"leftmost" and "rightmost" are standard English words (that appear in dictionaries). The hyphenated compounds are nonstandard and do not help the reader.

Note that 180.8.3.1.3 uses the correct words.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "leftmost" and "rightmost", here and elsewhere in this clause.

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 180 SC 180.8.3.1.1 P424 L1 # 328

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

Table 180-14 is for 800GBASE-DR4.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference to Table 180-13.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 180 SC 180.8.3.2 P426 L33 # 329

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

No need for quotes in "fiber optic cabling".

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the quotes.

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 180 SC 180.8.3.2 P426 L41 # 330

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The NOTE about transmitter compliance testing does not appear in any of other MDI requirements subclauses. It is not required.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this NOTE.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 180 SC 180.9 P427 L45 # 236

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D measurement methods

Counter propagating traffic must be active for these tests

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following paragraph, Counter-propagating asynchronous optical signal (crosstalk) at maximum OMA applied to the module under test TP3. The crosstalk pattern can be PRBS31Q, or a valid 100GBASE-R, 200GBASE-R, or 400GBASE-R, or 800GBASE-R, or 1.6TBASE-R signal. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_01\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

It is not demonstrated that there is a problem and that the proposed remedy will fix the problem.

Cl 180 SC 180.9.4 P430 L32 # 186

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D taps

Value for minimum "number of equalizer pre-cursor taps" is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Either set the the value to 0 allowing the number of pre-cursor taps to vary from 0 to 3 or straddle the minimum/maximum columns with a value of 3, permitting only a value of 3.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Pending CRG discussion. Comment needs to be closed in conjunction with comment #422 which proposes a different value.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 180 SC 180.9.5 P430 L4 # 171

Johnson, John Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D SER

The TDECQ test method points to clause 121.8.5.3, which uses a target SER of 4.8e-4, which is not appropriate for 200G/lane AUIs. As given in Table 174A-1, the appropriate value for 200G/lane AUIs should be 4.56e-4 for uncorrelated bit errors.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a new exception to the list:  
"Target PAM4 symbol error ratio of 4.56e-4."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Add a new exception to the list:  
"The target PAM4 symbol error ratio is 4.56e-4 and the related Q<sub>t</sub> value is 3.428."  
Implement with editorial license.

Cl 180 SC 180.9.5 P430 L22 # 240

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TDECQ

TDECQ masuremnt needs to define test condition when there is an optional AUI

SuggestedRemedy

Add following codition to the list of requiremetns in 180.9.5: Where AUI is exposed, a conforming implementation must meet TDECQ with the exposed AUI configured for applicable module stress input test as in 176C.4.4.5 Receiver jitter tolerance, 120G.3.4.3 Module stressed input tolerance, or 120E.3.4.1 Module stressed input test and the recovered AUI clock driving the TDECQ pattern. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_01\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Insufficient evidence has been provided that there is a problem and that the proposed remedy will fix it.

Cl 180 SC 180.9.5 P430 L22 # 244

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TDECQ

180.2 require block error measurement but the TDECQ is an average penalty measurement, either we need to develop a Golden hardware reference receiver or we have to improve TDECQ test method to capture block erros/penalty.

SuggestedRemedy

Instead the recommendation is to measure block TDECQ where block TDECQ is by capturing 10 SSPRQ waveforms which forms 65535 FEC symbols, ~120 KP4 FEC blocks, or 30 interleaved KP4 FEC blocks when 4-with way interleaving. Each of the 30 KP4 blocks are processed as in definition in [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_09/healey\\_3dj\\_02a\\_2409.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_09/healey_3dj_02a_2409.pdf) proposal. Use worst 3 blocks from each group of 30 blocks then combine 3 worst blocks from the 4 group to create the PDF. Then calculate block TDECQ, add line item to table 180-7 with limit of 3.6 dB. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_03\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
The follow related contribution is provided for review:  
<URL>/ghiasi\_3dj\_03\_2501  
Insufficient evidence has been provided that there is a problem and that the proposed remedy will fix it.

Cl 180 SC 180.9.5 P430 L30 # 251

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D taps

Number of pre-cursor is maximum with min TBD

SuggestedRemedy

What was agreed during Sept 2024 meeting to go with fixed 3 pre-cursors and not a floating at least for now, given than agreement merge the TBD and max line and just enter 3 similar to FFE length of 15.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #186

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 180 SC 180.9.5 P430 L32 # 422

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D taps

For commonality of implementation and because there is no expected reason for needing a different tap allocation for the TDECQ reference equalizer for the different clauses the TDECQ reference equalizer should be made the same for the clauses 180,181,182 and 183. In D1.3 all the clauses have the same 15 FFE length and the same 3 maximum number of pre-cursor taps however the minimum number of equalizer pre-cursor taps for the TDECQ reference equalizer is TBD in table 180-18 (for 200GBASE-DR1 etc.) as it is for 800GBASE-FR4-500 in table 181-13 and 800GBASE-FR4 etc. in table 183- 14 whereas for 200GBASE-DR1-2 etc in table 182-18 the format is different with a maximum number of post cursor taps of 13 implying a minimum number of pre-cursor taps of 2.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make the format of the tables the same. Adopt a minimum number of pre-cursor taps of 2 and maximum number of ppre-cursor taps of 3 for all the tables.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #186

Cl 180 SC 180.9.5 P430 L32 # 172

Johnson, John Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D taps

In Table 180-18, the minimum number of equalizer pre-cursor taps is TBD. In the absence of further proposals, this value should be 0, consistent with the 5-tap FFE defined in 121.8.5.4.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change TBD in Table 180-18 to 0.  
 Delete the associated editors note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #186

Cl 180 SC 180.9.5 P430 L35 # 331

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Footnote a of Table 180-18 says "Relative to main tap".  
 "Main tap" is not defined anywhere, though it may be assumed that it is the largest positive value.  
 Even with that assumption, It is unclear whether this means that the coefficient limits are normalized by the main tap's coefficient or that the coefficient indices are such that the main tap index is 0, or both.

I suspect the answer is "both" but it is not clear from the text.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change footnote a to read "The main tap is marked by i=0. The minimum and maximum values are relative to this tap's coefficient."

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement suggested remedy (also in 181, 182, and 183) with editorial license.  
 [Editor's note: CC: 180, 181, 182, 183]

Cl 180 SC 180.9.5 P430 L46 # 15

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Table 180-8. Footnote b redundantly defines the limit of FFE gain. The row for FFE gain specifies the target value 1 so it doesn't need to be repeated in the footnote. However, the footnote is helpful to explain what FFE gain is.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change footnote b to "The sum of the all equalizer coefficients."

Proposed Response Response Status W

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



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 180 SC 180.9.5 P431 L9 # 332

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D channel requirements

The last column of Table 180-19 contains the term "mean DGD", and this term also appears in the text (last paragraph of this subclause).

It is unclear what this term means. DGD is defined (in a footnote to Table 180-10) as a difference between two times; based on this definition, it is not a random variable (given a specific channel), so it does not have a mean.

I suspect that the intent is just that the DGD of the channel is below the maximum value, but I may be wrong..

*SuggestedRemedy*

If the intent is to calculate a mean of some distribution of DGD, clarify what that distribution is. Otherwise, reword as appropriate.

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The inclusion of a value for mean DGD is to make sure that the TDECQ compliance channel is not "spoiled" by excessive DGD so that the major contributor to TDECQ is chromatic dispersion and that the penalty due to DGD is a minor contributor to TDECQ. Add a new note d to Table 180-19 (and also in 181, 182 and 183): "The limit for maximum mean DGD in the compliance channel specification is to ensure that the contribution to TDECQ from DGD is substantially less than the primary contribution due to chromatic dispersion."  
 Implement with editorial license.

Cl 180 SC 180.9.10 P432 L35 # 333

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D channel requirements

Transmitter transition time measurement is defined with good detail, but it is unclear whether the reference equalizer is to be used in the measurement or not (this will likely affect the result).

Note that for RINxxOMA (180.9.11) it is specified explicitly that the noise is measured before the reference equalizer. I assume this should apply to the transition time too.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Specify whether the reference equalizer is to be used or not.

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The reference equalizer is specified for measuring TDECQ or TECQ only. A separate "reference receiver" is also defined for TDECQ/TECQ measurements and is also specified for use of measuring RIN measurements.

It is not clear if the OE bandwidth defined for transition time is the same as the reference receiver defined for TDECQ/TECQ. If these are the same a consistent specification would be helpful.

Note that Clause 121 does not unambiguously define a reference receiver.

There is some ambiguity about what filtering is used where.

For CRG discussion.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 180 SC 180.9.11 P433 L12 # 334

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D channel requirements

The editor's note makes an important observation that the equation is intended to make the result consistent with that of the older method. This is important information for the reader; without this observation, the equation does not make much sense.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add an informative note such as  
 "NOTE--The definition of RINxxOMA in equation 180-1 is intended to make the result consistent with the measurement method defined in 52.9.6.3."

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The note is specifically intended to convey the message to the TF that more work is needed on RIN before going to WG Ballot

Cl 180 SC 180.9.13 P433 L37 # 335

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The transition time and the RINxxOMA of the SRS test transmitter are said to be "no greater than the value specified in Table 180-7".

However, for the extinction ratio it just says "as given", which is unclear; should it be above the minimum of a transmitter, or no higher than the minimum (because the intent is to stress the receiver)?

The suggested remedy assumes that ER is just required to be compliant (rather than be used as stress). If this is not the case, something else should be written.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "are as given in" to "are within the limits specified in".

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license

Cl 180 SC 180.10.1 P433 L47 # 336

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

Why is "IEC 62368-1" in green? It is not expected to become an active cross-reference.

Similarly for IEC references in 180.10.2.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the format of these references to regular text.

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 180 SC 180.11 P435 L46 # 337

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

"PMD\_signal\_detect\_3, to PMD\_signal\_detect\_2"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete "to".

Implement similarly in other optical PMD clauses as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 180A SC 180A P831 L1 # 57

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D MDI

This is a resubmission of Comment #188 against D1.2-  
The annex is not written in an ethernet standards approach, where it addresses the breakout implementation, and doesn't address the MDI choices of the DRx / DRx-2. Additionally, Clauses 180 and 182 are making normative statements regarding the MDIs, despite the annex then providing additional MDI Connector choices. While the comment was rejected, the CRG noted that "a more detailed proposal is encouraged."

SuggestedRemedy

Implement attached file ("dambrosia\_3dj\_01\_250102.pdf") with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Implement suggested remedy from <URL>/dambrosia\_3dj\_01\_250102.pdf with editorial license.

Cl 180A SC 180A P831 L6 # 517

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D MDI

This says "informative" while line 18 says "This annex defines". It can't be both. While 802.3 should acknowledge the reality and importance of breakout, it does not have to specify details of connectors, and as there are so many connector module formats, that would be better avoided. Leave it to the MSAs, TIA and IEC.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "defined" to "describes", like 179D.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #57.

Cl 181 SC 181.1 P438 L49 # 338

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

169.2 is included in this amendment.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it an active link.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 181 SC 181.3 P440 L2 # 228

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D signal ok

Signal\_OK as shown in Fig 180-2 is from the Inner sublayer above then goes into ILT box on TX and another ILT box on the RX has Signal\_OK out. We talk about Signal\_OK then jump into inter-suplayer variables before introducing ILT.

SuggestedRemedy

Referencing Fig 180-2 would be helpful here. After the 1st paragraph add sentence: The PMD in this clause support Inter-sublayer Layer Training (ILT) type O1, see Annex 178B.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Resolve using the response to comment #227

Cl 181 SC 181.3 P440 L6 # 339

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

"where i = 0 to n-1"  
For this PMD, the number of PMD lanes is always 4 (as stated on the subsequent line). Using "n" just makes life harder for the reader, especially since n (with this meaning) only appears a few times in the clause, and in some places (e.g. Figure 181-2, 181.5.2, 181.5.3) explicit numbers are used.

Note that the "n" in 800GAUI-n is a different variable and should be kept as is.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "where i = 0 to 3".  
Delete "The number of parallel streams, n, is 4."

In 181.5.4 change n to 4.  
In 181.5.5, in Table 181-15, and in Table 181-16, change "n-1" to 3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 181 SC 181.4.1 P440 L25 # 340  
 Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)  
 169.4 is included in this amendment.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make it an active link.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 181 SC 181.4.2 P440 L28 # 341  
 Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)  
 169.5 is included in this amendment.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make it an active link (twice).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 181 SC 181.7.1 P445 L13 # 342  
 Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx optical parameter  
 The specification of "Total average launch power" is 6 dB higher (a factor of 4 in power) than the per-lane average launch power.  
 This makes the "total" specification redundant - if each lane meets its specification then the total will also be met; if the total fails, one of the lanes must also fail.  
 The same holds for the FR4/LR4 WDM transmitters in Table 183-4.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete the "Total" row. Add a footnote for the "each lane" row stating that the maximum total power is 6 dB above the per-lane maximum or 10.9 dB.  
 Implement similarly in 183.7.1 with modified values as necessary.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Maintaining total average power is a useful addition to the draft and completely consistent with in-force clauses. The total power is necessary to stay within optical safety limits.

Cl 181 SC 181.7.3 P448 L48 # 232  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D power budget  
 MPI/DGP penalty of 0.5 dB maybe to small for this PMD type  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 The MPI penalty is 0.41 dB and DGD penalty is 0.18 the total penalty is 0.59 dB, not considering worst case current 0.5 dB mabe be acceptable. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_02\_2501  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 No evidence has been provided that the draft is incorrect.

Cl 181 SC 181.9 P451 L51 # 237  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D measurement methods  
 Counter propagating traffic must be active for these tests  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add the following paragrpah, Counter-propagating asynchronous optical signal (crosstalk) at maximum OMA applied to the module under test TP3. The crosstalk pattern can be PRBS31Q, or a valid 100GBASE-R, 200GBASE-R, or 400GBASE-R, or 800GBASE-R, or 1.6TBASE-R signal. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_01\_2501  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #236

Cl 181 SC 181.9.5 P454 L4 # 173  
 Johnson, John Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D SER  
 The TDECQ test method points to clause 121.8.5.3, which uses a target SER of 4.8e-4, which is not appropriate for 200G/lane AUIs. As given in Table 174A-1, the appropriate value for 200G/lane AUIs should be 4.56e-4 for uncorrelated bit errors.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add a new exception to the list:  
 "Target PAM4 symbol error ratio of 4.56e-4."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add a new exception to the list:  
 "The target PAM4 symbol error ratio is 4.56e-4 and the related Q\_t value is 3.428."  
 Implement with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 181 SC 181.9.5 P454 L22 # 245

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TDECQ

181.2 require block error measurement but the TDECQ is an average penalty measurement, either we need to develop a Golden hardware reference receiver or we have to improve TDECQ test method to capture block errors/penalty.

SuggestedRemedy

Instead the recommendation is to measure block TDECQ where block TDECQ is by capturing 10 SSPRQ waveforms which forms 65535 FEC symbols, ~120 KP4 FEC blocks, or 30 interleaved KP4 FEC blocks when 4-with way interleaving. Each of the 30 KP4 blocks are processed as in definition in [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_09/healey\\_3dj\\_02a\\_2409.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_09/healey_3dj_02a_2409.pdf) proposal. Use worst 3 blocks from each group of 30 blocks then combine 3 worst blocks from the 4 group to create the PDF. Then calculate block TDECQ, add line item to table 181-7 with limit of 3.6 dB. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_03\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Resolve using the response to comment #244

Cl 181 SC 181.9.5 P454 L22 # 241

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TDECQ

TDECQ measurement needs to define test condition when there is an optional AUI

SuggestedRemedy

Add following condition to the list of requirements in 180.9.5: Where AUI is exposed, a conforming implementation must meet TDECQ with the exposed AUI configured for applicable module stress input test as in 176C.4.4.5 Receiver jitter tolerance, 120G.3.4.3 Module stressed input tolerance, or 120E.3.4.1 Module stressed input test and the recovered AUI clock driving the TDECQ pattern. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_01\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Resolve using the response to comment #240

Cl 181 SC 181.9.5 P454 L30 # 187

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D taps

Value for minimum "number of equalizer pre-cursor taps" is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Either set the value to 0 allowing the number of pre-cursor taps to vary from 0 to 3 or straddle the minimum/maximum columns with a value of 3, permitting only a value of 3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #186

Cl 181 SC 181.9.5 P454 L30 # 250

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D taps

Number of pre-cursor is maximum with min TBD

SuggestedRemedy

What was agreed during Sept 2024 meeting to go with fixed 3 pre-cursors and not a floating at least for now, given that agreement merge the TBD and max line and just enter 3 similar to FFE length of 15.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #186

Cl 181 SC 181.9.5 P454 L31 # 174

Johnson, John Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D taps

In Table 181-13, the minimum number of equalizer pre-cursor taps is TBD. In the absence of further proposals, this value should be 0, consistent with the 5-tap FFE defined in 121.8.5.4.

SuggestedRemedy

Change TBD in Table 181-13 to 0.  
Delete the associated editors note.  
For the editor's consideration: If the specs are identical, delete Table 181-13 completely and refer to Table 180-18.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #186

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 181 SC 181.9.11 P456 L39 # 343

Ran, Adee Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The subclause title includes a specific value of xx, 17.1, but the text still has "xx".

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the subclause text to use the specific value.  
 In the reference to 180.9l.11 add "with xx equal to 17.1".

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 181 SC 181.9.13 P457 L7 # 263

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D reference

Reference 121.8.10 doesn't exist

SuggestedRemedy

The correct reference is 121.8.9

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The comment refers to 121.8.10, while 181.9.13 refers to 122.8.10.  
 122.8.10 is the correct reference.

Cl 182 SC 182.3 P465 L6 # 229

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D signal ok

Signal\_OK as shown in Fig 180-2 is from the Inner sublayer above then goes into ILT box on TX and another ILT box on the RX has Signal\_OK out. We talk about Signal\_OK then jump into inter-suplayer variables before intorudcing ILT.

SuggestedRemedy

Referencing Fig 180-2 would be helfull here. After the 1st paragraph add sentence: The PMD in this clause support Inter-sublayer Layer Training (ILT) type O1, see Annex 178B.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See resolution to comment #227

Cl 182 SC 182.7.1 P471 L27 # 33

Landry, Gary Texas Instruments  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

OMAUouter vs max(TECQ, TDECQ) figure was not updated when the OMAouter (min) values were changed in D1.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Update the figure to match D1.3 data. To be specific, OMAouter (min) line should be -0.3 dBm for max(TECQ, TDECQ) < 0.9 dB and 1.2+max(TECQ, TDECQ) dBm for > 0.9 dB.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 182 SC 182.9 P480 L45 # 238

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D measurement methods

Counter propagating traffic must be active for these tests

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following paragpah, Counter-propagating asynchronous optical signal (crosstalk) at maximum OMA applied to the module under test TP3. The crosstalk pattern can be PRBS31Q, or a valid 100GBASE-R, 200GBASE-R, or 400GBASE-R, or 800GBASE-R, or 1.6TBASE-R signal. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_01\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #236

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 182 SC 182.9.1 P481 L9 # 345

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D test pattern

Pattern 3 as defined in 177.4.9.2 is PRBS31Q without the inner FEC encoding. In contrast, Pattern 5 is defined to include the Inner FEC encoding.

Table 182-17 says RS and SRS can be tested with either pattern 3 or pattern 5.

To measure the block error ratio in either of these tests, the Inner FEC encoding is required. This cannot be achieved for per-lane testing with the current test pattern definition.

Note that measuring the pre-FEC BER with PRBS31Q (without inner FEC encoding) may seem like a desirable test, but this cannot be the normative requirement, since it does not account for correlated errors that the PMD's receiver can cause.

*Suggested Remedy*

Either redefine pattern 3 in 177.4.9.2 to include the inner FEC encoding, or change the reference to the PMA's PRBS31Q and specify that the Inner FEC has to be able to add inner FEC encoding to this signal.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Pending CRG discussion.

Cl 182 SC 182.9.1 P507 L8 # 111

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Table 182-12 lists the pattern that will be used by the PMDs in CL182 and its last column gives references of the definition of these test pattern. This table can be found in all PMD clauses. Table 182-12 uses the subclauses in CL177 Inner FEC as reference sources for all test pattern, because the PMD interfaces with inner FEC sublayer. This is good for test pattern 5 and 7 where the test pattern is encoded by the 800GBASE-R Inner FEC. However, for other test patterns that are generic to all PMDs, referencing to the original source would be a better choice.

Take square wave as an example, CL 177.4.9.4 says "The Inner FEC may optionally support a square wave (quaternary) test-pattern generator, as specified in 120.5.11.2.4, on each transmit output lane towards the PMD service interface." This subclause is not defining the pattern of square wave, rather stating a function of the Inner FEC sublayer. For readers who want to know the definition of squarewave, one will have to jump again to 120.5.11.2.4. Therefore it is better to just reference directly to 120.5.11.2.4 in Table 182-12.

*Suggested Remedy*

change the defined in reference to 120.5.11.2.4

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
The reference here points to test pattern function defined for the Inner FEC. This subclause in turn leverages specifications in another subclause.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 182 SC 182.9.1 P507 L9 # 112

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Table 182-12 lists the pattern that will be used by the PMDs in CL182 and its last column gives references of the definition of these test pattern. This table can be found in all PMD clauses. Table 182-12 uses the subclauses in CL177 Inner FEC as reference sources for all test pattern, because the PMD interfaces with inner FEC sublayer. This is good for test pattern 5 and 7 where the test pattern is encoded by the 800GBASE-R Inner FEC. However, for other test patterns that are generic to all PMDs, referencing to the original source would be a better choice.

Take square wave as an example, CL 177.4.9.4 says "The Inner FEC may optionally support a square wave (quaternary) test-pattern generator, as specified in 120.5.11.2.4, on each transmit output lane towards the PMD service interface." This subclause is not defining the pattern of square wave, rather stating a function of the Inner FEC sublayer. For readers who want to know the definition of squarewave, one will have to jump again to 120.5.11.2.4. Therefore it is better to just reference directly to 120.5.11.2.4 in Table 182-12.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change the defined in reference to in 120.5.11.2.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Resolve using the response to comment #111

Cl 182 SC 182.9.1 P507 L11 # 113

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Table 182-12 lists the pattern that will be used by the PMDs in CL182 and its last column gives references of the definition of these test pattern. This table can be found in all PMD clauses. Table 182-12 uses the subclauses in CL177 Inner FEC as reference sources for all test pattern, because the PMD interfaces with inner FEC sublayer. This is good for test pattern 5 and 7 where the test pattern is encoded by the 800GBASE-R Inner FEC. However, for other test patterns that are generic to all PMDs, referencing to the original source would be a better choice.

Take square wave as an example, CL 177.4.9.4 says "The Inner FEC may optionally support a square wave (quaternary) test-pattern generator, as specified in 120.5.11.2.4, on each transmit output lane towards the PMD service interface." This subclause is not defining the pattern of square wave, rather stating a function of the Inner FEC sublayer. For readers who want to know the definition of squarewave, one will have to jump again to 120.5.11.2.4. Therefore it is better to just reference directly to 120.5.11.2.4 in Table 182-12.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change the defined in reference to in 120.5.11.2.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Resolve using the response to comment #111



Cl 182 SC 182.9.1 P507 L16 # 98

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

Table 182-12 lists the pattern that will be used by the PMDs in CL182 and its last column gives references of the definition of these test pattern. This table can be found in all PMD clauses. Table 182-12 uses the subclauses in CL177 Inner FEC as reference sources for all test pattern, because the PMD interfaces with inner FEC sublayer. This is good for test pattern 5 and 7 where the test pattern is encoded by the 800GBASE-R Inner FEC. However, for other test patterns that are generic to all PMDs, referencing to the original source would be a better choice.

Take square wave as an example, CL 177.4.9.4 says "The Inner FEC may optionally support a square wave (quaternary) test-pattern generator, as specified in 120.5.11.2.4, on each transmit output lane towards the PMD service interface." This subclause is not defining the pattern of square wave, rather stating a function of the Inner FEC sublayer. For readers who want to know the definition of squarewave, one will have to jump again to 120.5.11.2.4. Therefore it is better to just reference directly to 120.5.11.2.4 in Table 182-12.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change the defined in reference to in 120.5.11.2.3

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Resolve using the response to comment #111

Cl 182 SC 182.9.5 P483 L1 # 346

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D SER

"Target PAM4 symbol error ratio of  $9.6 \times 10^{-3}$ "  
If this value is used instead of  $4.8e-4$  as TDECQ was originally defined, then TDECQ of an ideal transmitter would be negative, because the normalization factor  $Q_t$  is "consistent with the BER and target symbol error ratio for Gray coded PAM4" (which is  $4.8e-4$ ).

This makes TDECQ something other than a "penalty" as it is typically understood.

In addition, as demonstrated by several presentations, TDECQ with such high SER is not feasible, as test signal achieving the maximum TDECQ cannot be measured..

It would make more sense to keep the target PAM4 SER as  $4.8e-4$  (with the same  $Q_t$ ) and instead relax the maximum TDECQ value in this clause by a factor corresponding to the lower Q function of the higher SER, to allow a more closed eye:

- For SER= $4.8e-4$ :  $Q(SER^{2/3})=3.414$  (as in 121.8.5.3)
  - For SER= $9.6e-3$ :  $Q(SER^{2/3})=2.489$
  - $10 \cdot \log_{10}(3.414/2.489)=1.37$  dB
- Thus the relaxation should be 1.37 dB.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the target PAM4 SER to  $4.8e-4$ .  
Change the maximum TDECQ and TECQ from 3.2 dB to  $3.2+1.37=4.57$  dB.  
Make corresponding changes to the receiver specifications (SECQ) in Table 181–6.

Implement similarly in clause 183 with modified values as necessary, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Similar as comment #146 to D1.2. A strawpoll was held and it was agreed to maintain the SER value  $9.6 \times 10^{-3}$ . The comment does not contain sufficient evidence that this value not sufficient.  
However, the  $Q_t$  value should be adjusted to align with the SER value.  
In 182.9.5...  
Change: "Target PAM4 symbol error ratio of  $9.6 \times 10^{-3}$ ."  
To: "The target PAM4 symbol error ratio is  $9.6 \times 10^{-3}$  and the related  $Q_t$  value is 2.489."  
In 183.9.5...  
Change: "Target PAM4 symbol error ratio of  $9.6 \times 10^{-3}$  for 800GBASE-FR4 and 800GBASE-LR4"  
To: "The target PAM4 symbol error ratio is  $9.6 \times 10^{-3}$  and the related  $Q_t$  value is 2.489."  
Implement with editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 182 SC 182.9.5 P483 L17 # 246

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TDECQ

182.2 require block error measurement but the TDECQ is an average penalty measurement, either we need to develop a Golden hardware reference receiver or we have to improve TDECQ test method to capture block errors/penalty.

SuggestedRemedy

Instead the recommendation is to measure block TDECQ where block TDECQ is by capturing 10 SSPRQ waveforms which forms 65535 FEC symbols, ~120 KP4 FEC blocks, or 30 interleaved KP4 FEC blocks when 4-with way interleaving. Each of the 30 KP4 blocks are processed as in definition in [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_09/healey\\_3dj\\_02a\\_2409.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_09/healey_3dj_02a_2409.pdf) proposal. Use worst 3 blocks from each group of 30 blocks then combine 3 worst blocks from the 4 group to create the PDF. Then calculate block TDECQ, add line item to table 182-7 with limit of 3.6 dB. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_03\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Resolve using the response to comment #244

Cl 182 SC 182.9.5 P483 L17 # 242

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TDECQ

TDECQ measurement needs to define test condition when there is an optional AUI

SuggestedRemedy

Add following condition to the list of requirements in 180.9.5: Where AUI is exposed, a conforming implementation must meet TDECQ with the exposed AUI configured for applicable module stress input test as in 176C.4.4.5 Receiver jitter tolerance, 120G.3.4.3 Module stressed input tolerance, or 120E.3.4.1 Module stressed input test and the recovered AUI clock driving the TDECQ pattern. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_01\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Resolve using the response to comment #240

Cl 182 SC 182.9.5 P483 L25 # 249

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D taps

Number of pre-cursor is not maximum but rather just 3

SuggestedRemedy

What was agreed during Sept 2024 meeting to go with fixed 3 pre-cursors and not a floating at least for now, given than agreement merge the cell with max cell and just enter 3 similar to FFE length of 15.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #186

Cl 182 SC 182.9.5 P483 L25 # 175

Johnson, John Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D taps

In Table 182-18, the minimum number of equalizer pre-cursor and post-cursor taps is left blank. In the absence of further proposals, this FFE definition should be the same as given in Table 180-18, and the value for minimum pre-cursor taps should be 0, consistent with the 5-tap FFE defined in 121.8.5.4.

SuggestedRemedy

Format Table 182-18 to be the same as Table 180-18 (delete the row for number of post-cursor taps), and change the minimum number of pre-cursor taps to 0. Delete the associated editors note. For the editor's consideration: If the specs are identical, delete Table 182-18 completely and refer to Table 180-18.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #186

Cl 182 SC 182.9.5 P483 L25 # 189

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D taps

Value for minimum "number of equalizer pre-cursor taps" is not specified.

SuggestedRemedy

Either set the value to 0 allowing the number of pre-cursor taps to vary from 0 to 3 or straddle the minimum/maximum columns with a value of 3, permitting only a value of 3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #186

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 182 SC 182.12 P490 L3 # 109  
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (withdrawn)  
 type 400GBASE-DR4 is not the PMD type of clause 182  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to type" 200GBASE-DR1-2, 400GBASE-DR2-2, 800GBASE-DR4-2, and 1.6TBASE-DR8-2"  
 Proposed Response Response Status Z  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 182 SC 182.12 P490 L8 # 110  
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (withdrawn)  
 PMD types should be updated in the text.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "type 400GBASE-DR4" to " type 200GBASE-DR1-2, 400GBASE-DR2-2, 800GBASE-DR4-2, and 1.6TBASE-DR8-2"  
 Proposed Response Response Status Z  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 183 SC 183.3 P494 L6 # 230  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D signal ok  
 Signal\_OK as shown in Fig 180-2 is from the Inner sublayer above then goes into ILT box on TX and another ILT box on the RX has Signal\_OK out. We talk about Signal\_OK then jump into inter-suplayer variables before intorudcing ILT.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Referencing Fig 180-2 would be helfull here. After the 1st paragraph add sentence: The PMD in this clause support Inter-sublayer Layer Training (ILT) type O1, see Annex 178B.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #227

Cl 183 SC 183.7.3 P502 L46 # 234  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D power budget  
 MPI/DGP penalty of 0.5 dB is larger than needed for 800GBASE-FR4  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 MPI/DGD can be reduced to 0.4 dB then link budget increased by 0.1 dB. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_02\_2501  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Pending review of the following presentation and CRG discussion. Ghiasi\_3dj\_02\_2501  
 A complete proposal for the revision of the power budget is necessary

Cl 183 SC 183.7.3 P502 L46 # 235  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D power budget  
 MPI/DGP penalty of 0.5 dB is larger than needed for 800GBASE-LR4  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 MPI/DGD can be reduced to 0.3 dB then link budget increased by 0.1 dB or allocated to DGD. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_02\_2501  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Pending review of the following presentation and CRG discussion. Ghiasi\_3dj\_02\_2501  
 A complete proposal for the revision of the power budget is necessary

Cl 183 SC 183.9 P506 L38 # 239  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D measurement methods  
 Counter propagating traffic must be active for these tests  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add the following paragrph, Counter-propagating asynchronous optical signal (crosstalk) at maximum OMA applied to the module under test TP3. The crosstalk pattern can be PRBS31Q, or a valid 100GBASE-R, 200GBASE-R, or 400GBASE-R, or 800GBASE-R, or 1.6TBASE-R signal. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_01\_2501  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #236

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 183 SC 183.9.5 P509 L4 # 243

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TDECQ

TDECQ masuremnt needs to define test condition when there is an optional AUI

SuggestedRemedy

Add following codition to the list of requiremetns in 180.9.5: Where AUI is exposed, a conforming implementation must meet TDECQ with the exposed AUI configured for applicable module stress input test as in 176C.4.4.5 Receiver jitter tolerance, 120G.3.4.3 Module stressed input tolerance, or 120E.3.4.1 Module stressed input test and the recovered AUI clock driving the TDECQ pattern. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_01\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #240

Cl 183 SC 183.9.5 P509 L4 # 247

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TDECQ

183.2 require block error measurement but the TDECQ is an average penalty measurement, either we need to develop a Golden hardware reference receiver or we have to improve TDECQ test method to capture block erros/penalty.

SuggestedRemedy

Instead the recommendation is to measure block TDECQ where block TDECQ is by capturing 10 SSPRQ waveforms which forms 65535 FEC symbols, ~120 KP4 FEC blocks, or 30 interleaved KP4 FEC blocks when 4-with way interleaving. Each of the 30 KP4 blocks are processed as in definition in [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24\\_09/healey\\_3dj\\_02a\\_2409.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dj/public/24_09/healey_3dj_02a_2409.pdf) proposal. Use worst 3 blocks from each group of 30 blocks then combine 3 worst blocks from the 4 group to create the PDF. Then calculate block TDECQ, add line item to table 183-7 with limit of 3.6 dB for 800GBASE-FR4 and 4.0 dB for 800GBASE-LR4. See Ghiasi\_3dj\_03\_2501

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #244

Cl 183 SC 183.9.5 P509 L14 # 176

Johnson, John Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D taps

In Table 183-14, the minimum number of equalizer pre-cursor taps is TBD. In the absence of further proposals, this value should be 0, consistent with the 5-tap FFE defined in 121.8.5.4.

SuggestedRemedy

Change TBD in Table 183-14 to 0.  
 Delete the associated editors note.  
 For the editor's consideration: If the specs are identical, delete Table 183-14 completely and refer to Table 180-18.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #186.

Cl 183 SC 183.9.5 P509 L14 # 248

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D taps

Number of pre-cursor is maximum with min TBD

SuggestedRemedy

What was agreed during Sept 2024 meeting to go with fixed 3 pre-cursors and not a floating at least for now, given than agreement merge the TBD and max line and just enter 3 similar to FFE length of 15.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #186.

Cl 183 SC 183.9.5 P509 L14 # 188

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D taps

Value for minimum "number of equalizer pre-cursor taps" is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Either set the the value to 0 allowing the number of pre-cursor taps to vary from 0 to 3 or straddle the minimum/maximum columns with a value of 3, permitting only a value of 3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #186.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 183 SC 183.9.13 P512 L12 # 264  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Qunatum/Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D reference  
 Reference 121.8.10 doesn't exist  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 The correct reference is 121.8.9  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The comment refers to 121.8.10, while 183.9.13 refers to 122.8.10.  
 122.8.10 is the correct reference.

Cl 184 SC 184.1.2 P515 L35 # 375  
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Fig 184-1 does not show the correct boundaries of a PHY. It ends at the PMD sublayer,  
 not the MEDIUM.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change lower boundary of PHY to the bottom of the PMD sublayer box.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 184 SC 184.2 P517 L34 # 149  
 He, Xiang Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Testing  
 Clause 814 Inner FEC for 800GBASE-LR1 did not include any test patterns.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 It is recommended to add at least one test pattern for this clause. Add "Test patten generate" to  
 the DP-16QAM mapper box. Also insert a subclause in 184.4.11 describing the test  
 pattern(s).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Some test patterns are defined in 185.8.1, but the references there are wrong. In Table  
 185-10 for test pattern 5 change the reference from "184.4" to "172.2.4.11" and for test  
 pattern 7 change the reference from "184.4" to "172.2.4".  
 This comment is related with comment #128.  
 Pending review of presentation <URL/he\_3dj\_01\_2501>

Cl 184 SC 184.4.1 P519 L5 # 409  
 Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Alignment  
 Reference is made to clause 172.2.5.1 for alignment lock, which requires a full deskew.  
 The PCS for 800GBASE-LR1 only requires deskew to 20 bit boundaries, covering two RS  
 symbols.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Update the text to define the requirement as a 20-bit deskew  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment #472

Cl 184 SC 184.4.1 P519 L5 # 472  
 Kota, Kishore Marvell Semiconductor  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Alignment  
 Lane deskew has been changed from the adopted baseline requirement of RS(544,514)  
 symbol alignment to a full RS(544,514) codeword alignment without any supporting data.  
 Symbol alignment (instead of codeword alignment) for 800GBASE-LR1 has been studied in  
 the past and determined to have a burst tolerance which exceeds the 400ZR burst  
 tolerance of 1024b which is considered acceptable for this interface. Specifically, lane  
 alignment lock in D1.3 refers to 172.2.5.1 for deskew. However, 172.2.5.1 specifies a  
 complete de-skew of all the PCS lanes. The permutation function only requires a partial  
 deskew of 20-bits (i.e. dual 10-bit RS symbol boundaries). A full deskew places an  
 unreasonable burden on implementations which are targeted at low-power applications  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the text to reflect the intention from the baseline adopted at Berlin meeting and  
 ensure consistency with the 20-bit alignment adopted in the OIF 800LR IA. Supporting  
 presentation to be provided.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 A similar comment (#423) against D1.2 was rejected with the following response:  
 <start of response to D1.2 #423>  
 "The lane alignment and deskew requirement for Clause 184 inner FEC is very similar to  
 the lane alignment required for the Clause 177 inner FEC which currently requires a full  
 deskew of the input lanes for the correct function of the convolutional interleaver.  
 If a new presentation can show that a full deskew is not required, this subclause can  
 subsequently be modified and/or a limit of the maximum tolerable skew can be added.  
 There is no consensus to make a change at this time"  
 <end of response to D1.2 #423>  
 Pending review of presentation  
 <URL/>kota\_3dj\_01\_2501

Cl 184 SC 184.4.3 P520 L2 # 156

Bruckman, Leon

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Lane grouping

The figure seems to imply that the even PCS lanes are assigned to even pcsla flows, and the odd to odd. Also it may imply that the PCS lanes 0-15 are mapped to pcsla flows 0-15, and the PCS lanes 16-31 to pcsla flows 16-31. This contradicts the text in the last paragraph of section 184.4.2.

*SuggestedRemedy*

A contribution will be provided with a detailed proposal to either remove Figure 184-3 and related text, or to show a more generic example and change text to indicate that the figure is an example

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Pending review of presentation  
<URL>/bruckman\_3dj\_01\_2501

Cl 184 SC 184.4.5 P522 L5 # 35

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The description of the parity polynomial says "A parity polynomial  $p(x)$  of degree 15 is defined as the remainder from the division (modulo 2) of  $m(x) \times x^{16}$  by the generator polynomial shown in Equation (184-2)". The intent of this is that the resulting parity polynomial  $p(x)$  is in equation 184-2 (with the generator polynomial in (184-1), but that isn't what the text says.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the text to read: "A parity polynomial  $p(x)$  of degree 15 is defined as the remainder from the division (modulo 2) of  $m(x) \times x^{16}$  by the generator polynomial, as shown in Equation (184-2)."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Change: "A parity polynomial  $p(x)$  of degree 15 is defined as the remainder from the division (modulo 2) of  $m(x) \times x^{16}$  by the generator polynomial shown in Equation (184-2)" to: "A parity polynomial  $p(x)$  of degree 15 (shown in Equation 184-2) is defined as the remainder from the division (modulo 2) of  $m(x) \times x^{16}$  by the generator polynomial shown in Equation (184-1)"  
Implement with editorial license.

Cl 184 SC 184.5.7 P528 L8 # 347

Ran, Adeel

Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Decoder

The assumed correction capability of the decoder is not stated. Also, it is not stated what happens when a codeword is uncorrectable. I assume the decoder does not mark the data as error in any way (since it is an inner code) but it is not stated. The error patterns that appear in this case are not described.

Compare to the RS-FEC decoder specification in 91.5.3.3 (where there are normative specifications for correction capability and uncorrectable error marking).

This is important information for testing, monitoring and analyzing the performance of an implementation.

The suggested remedy is based on slide 9 of [https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/public/22\\_05/22\\_0517/bliss\\_3df\\_01a\\_220517.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/df/public/22_05/22_0517/bliss_3df_01a_220517.pdf), modified to account for having 16 parity bits and thus  $d_{min}=8$ .

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add some test e.g.  
"The decoder is expected to correct all codewords in which hard decision would result in up to five bit errors and most codewords with up to seven bit errors. Codewords that are not decoded correctly will contain at least eight bit errors"  
Or modifications of the above if necessary.

If there is no consensus for additional text (either the one above or otherwise), add an editor's note inviting contributions in this area.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
For CRG discussion

Cl 184 SC 184.5.7 P528 L36 # 32

Brown, Matt

Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D Counters

Bin counters are not provided for the BCH codewords.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add bin counters defined in the same way as for the 800GBASE-R Inner FEC in 177.5.4.1.5, except change the index "i" to "k", set the range of k to 0 to 4, and bin 4 counts codewords with 4 or more bits corrected.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Implement suggested remedy with editorial license

Cl 184 SC 184.5.7.1 P535 L9 # 348

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Counters

This inner FEC does not have bin counters defined (binning codewords by the number of errors corrected), as in 177.5.4.1.5.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add bin counters as in 177.5.4.1.5, but possibly with a larger number of bins (assuming the decoder is expected to correct more bit errors).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment #32

Cl 184 SC 184.5.7.2 P528 L20 # 473

Kota, Kishore Marvell Semiconductor  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

This section defines an uncorrected codeword as "An uncorrected FEC codeword is a codeword that contains errors that were not corrected, including FEC codewords that may have been miscorrected or not completely corrected". However, codewords which are miscorrected are not detectable as uncorrected codewords.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update the definition to something similar to: "An uncorrected FEC codeword is a codeword with errors which are detectable at the decoder, but the decoder is unable to correct."

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 184 SC 184.5.7.2 P535 L19 # 349

Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

The definition of the "uncorrected CW counter" seems to assume that the inner FEC is capable of detecting codewords that are uncorrectable, or that may have been miscorrected.

This capability exists in the RS-FEC (and there is a "shall" statement for ability to detect uncorrectable errors). Is it assumed that a soft-decision BCH decoder can also detect a miscorrected codeword or a "not completely corrected" one?

Note that there is no information about the assumed correction capability of the decoder.

Also note that the definition of the corresponding counters in 177.5.4.1.1. and 177.5.4.1.2 is different; a miscorrected codeword is counted in the "corrected" codeword, suggesting that the decoder cannot detect an uncorrectable codeword.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Possibly, add some test about the ability to detect uncorrected codewords (and how it can be done) somewhere in this clause.  
 Or change the definition of this counter to account for not being able of such detection.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient detail to implement.

Cl 184 SC 184.6.2.2 P530 L47 # 89

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D reset variable

FEC\_reset is referred to in the definition of the "reset" variable, but FEC\_reset is not defined except through a cross-reference to 45.2.1.1.1. The MDIO control variables table (Table 184-4) already has a cross reference to 184.6.2.2 as well as CL 45 and the MDIO register bit number,

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the cross-reference text "(see 45.2.1.1.1)" from the definition of reset in 184.6.2.2.

Add the definition of "FEC\_reset" to the list of variables in 184.6.2.2 as: "Boolean variable that is true when set by a management entity and is false otherwise".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Editorial slides with topic "Reset variable" are provided in the following contribution:  
 <URL>/brown\_3dj\_04\_2501. For task force discussion.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 184 SC 184.9 P535 L15 # 2

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D reset variable

Make FEC\_reset reference Inner FEC control register 1.2400

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 184-4 make the MDIO bit 1.2400.0 and reference 45.2.1.213a  
 Change variable name from "FEC\_reset" to "Inner\_FEC\_reset" and also on page 530 line 47  
 In Table 45-177a delete rows "Inner FEC enable lane 1" to "Inner FEC enable lane 7" and in the row for "1.2400.0" change "enable" to "reset"  
 On page 530 line 47 for the reset variable change the cross reference from "45.2.1.1.1" to "45.2.1.213a"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Editorial slides with topic "Reset variable" are provided in the following contribution:  
 <URL>/brown\_3dj\_04\_2501. For task force discussion.

Cl 185 SC 185.3.1.1 P545 L13 # 72

Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

This clause include a reference (184.4.11.1) and later to (185.5.2).

SuggestedRemedy

Would it be better and clearer to reference Figure 185-2 instead of text 184.4.11.1 (Picture is clearer than words). Likewise Reference to Figure 185-5 than text in 185.5.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Subclause 185.3.1.1 specifies the receipt of the PMD:IS\_UNITDATA.request primitive.  
 The noted referece to 184.4.11.1 specifies how the primitive is created and contains relevent information not included in the Figure 185-2 or 185-3.  
 No change to the draft  
 [Editor's note: changed subclause from 185.3.1.1 800GBASE-L to 185.3.1.1]

Cl 185 SC 185.5.3 P548 L29 # 99

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D primitive

"The four analog streams 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.", it is not clear what is the meaning of Inner FEC in this sentence. In other places in this clause, when referring to Tx\_XI et. al, they are referred to as four analog signals.

SuggestedRemedy

change "the transmitting Inner FEC Tx\_XI, Tx\_XQ,...." to "the analog Tx\_XI, Tx\_XQ, ...."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Refer to figure 185-5 that shows Tx\_XI, Tx\_XQ, Tx\_YI and Tx\_YQ originating in the Inner FEC. The intention of the statement is to clarify that while the figure shows Tx\_XI, Tx\_XQ, Tx\_YI and Tx\_YQ for both transmit and receive directions, for the receive direction the analog streams contain mixture of the Tx\_XI, Tx\_XQ, Tx\_YI and Tx\_YQ components sent from the transmitting Inner FEC and are therefor different even the labels are the same.  
 No change to draft.

Cl 185 SC 185.6.1 P550 L42 # 397

Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Tx optical parameter

The Transmitter OSNR specification of 35dB is lower than required for an unamplified Transmitter, and requires allocating additional penalty due to the additional noise.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the value of Transmitter OSNR from 35 dB to 40 dB.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 185 SC 185.6.1 P550 L52 # 398

Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Tx optical parameter

Tx laser frequency slew rate: post acquisition (max) is currently listed as TBD. The slew rate post acquisition should be slower than the pre-acquisition rate.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the TBD for Tx laser frequency slew rate: post acquisition (max) with 1 GHz/s.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 185 SC 185.6.1 P550 L52 # 190  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Tx optical parameter  
 The value for "Tx laser frequency slew rate: post acquisition (max)" is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #398.

CI 185 SC 185.6.1 P551 L5 # 474  
 Kota, Kishore Marvell Semiconductor  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx optical parameter  
 "Tx clock phase noise: phase noise mask frequency (max)" is an ill-defined spec in table 185.5. Unlike previous coherent interfaces 800GBASE-LR1 clocking on the line interface is derived from the upper layers. Without a clear spec on the phase noise of those layers, it is not possible to design to the specified phase noise mask at the 800GBASE-LR1 interface. Section 185.5.13 is also related to this spec.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 No equivalent transmit clock phase noise mask specification is present in any of the prior IMDD clauses such as Clause 124. Recommendation is to delete this spec. Presentation to be provided.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of the following presentation and CRG discussion.  
 kota\_3dj\_0x\_2501

CI 185 SC 185.6.2 P551 L34 # 399  
 Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Rx optical parameter  
 In order to ensure interop with OIF 800LR, a higher damage threshold should be specified.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Increase specification for Receiver Damage threshold to -2 dBm.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 185 SC 185.6.2 P551 L46 # 400  
 Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Rx optical parameter  
 State of polarization (max) is not the correct entry, this refers to the rate of change in SOP. The term used in 802.3ct is Polarization rotation speed (max)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change this entry to "Polarization rotation speed (max)"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In Table 185-6 change "State of polarization (max)" to "Polarization rotation speed (max)"  
 Make the same change in Table 187-6.

CI 185 SC 185.6.3 P552 L14 # 178  
 Sheffi, Nir Alphawave  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Link budget  
 Per Table 185-7, the link power budget is 6.8 dB if allocation for penalties of 0.5 dB is included. But difference between TX power specified in Table 185-5 and RX power specified in Table 185-5 is 6.3 dB.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Either increase TX power by 0.5 dB in Table 185-5 or set the allocation for penalties in Table 185-7 to 0.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In Table 185-7 change the Allocation of penalties from "0.5" to "0".

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 185 SC 185.7 P552 L45 # 101

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

It is unclear what is "a simplex fiber optic link segment". For 800GBASE-LR1, the fiber optical link use a pair of SMF, which would be a duplex optical link. It is also unclear what purpose this sentence serve.

*SuggestedRemedy*

clarify the purpose of this sentence. Or delete it.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In second to last sentence in 185.7 change "The fiber optic cabling model (channel) defined here is the same as a simplex fiber optic link segment" to

"The fiber optic cabling model (channel) defined here applies to each simplex fiber that makes up the duplex fiber link segment".

Make the same wording change in 180.8, 182.8 and 187.7.

Implement with editorial license.

Cl 185 SC 185.8.3 P555 L34 # 157

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

There is no Lane wavelength (range) in Table 185-5

*SuggestedRemedy*

If this is called "Carrier frequency (range)" in Table 185-5, then make naming consistent.

Update also Table 185-11 row 2.

If not, add Lane wavelength (range) to Table 185-5.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In Table 185-11 and 185.8.3 change "Lane wavelength (range)" to

"Carrier frequency (range)".

Implement with editorial license.

Cl 185 SC 185.9.1 P557 L21 # 102

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

LO linewidth (max) was limited to 100kHz. While the Tx laser line width max. is limited to 1MHz.

It is very common for coherent modules to use a single laser as both Tx laser source and Rx LO. The Rx signal processing thus should be able to work with a LO of upto 1MHz linewidth.

Similar to the reference receiver in TECQ/TDECQ, the coherent detector frontend of ETCC should be based on the bare minimum capability of any LR1 coherent Rx, so that a Tx signal passing the ETCC measurement provide enough confidence that it can work with any compliant LR1 Rx and form a coherent optic link with sufficient FLR performance.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Re-examine the necessity of requiring LO linewidth of 100kHz in E-TCC measurement. Align to the laser linewidth requirement.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient detail to implement.

Cl 185 SC 185.12.4.1 P562 L10 # 401

Maniloff, Eric Ciena

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Transmitter nominal center frequency is not applicable to this PMD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete this entry.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 185 SC 185.12.4.1 P562 L13 # 402

Maniloff, Eric Ciena

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Receiver nominal center frequency is not applicable to this PMD

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete this entry.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 185 SC 185.12.4.4 P563 L19 # 404  
 Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 SMSR is not defined as a parameter in clause 185  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete this entry.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 185 SC 185.12.4.4 P563 L34 # 405  
 Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Adjustable range of transmit optical power is not defined for clause 185  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete this entry.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 185 SC 185.12.4.4 P563 L36 # 406  
 Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Minimum average channel power at maximum adjustable power setting is not applicable to clause 185 PMDs  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete this entry.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 185 SC 185.12.4.4 P563 L41 # 407  
 Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 800GBASE-LR1 is an unamplified PMD, ROSNR is not defined  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete entries OM11 and OM13  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 185 SC 185.12.4.24 P562 L40 # 403  
 Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 PMD receive center frequency ability is not applicable to this PMD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete this entry.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 185 SC 185.2 P542 L36 # 71  
 Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Does IEEE style allow embedded parameter values as part of the text (e.g. BERadded equal to 3.2 x 10-5 and BERadded equal to 6.4 x 10-5)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 A small table might be clearer than values buried in text.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Stating parameter values as text is supported by IEEE and widely used in IEEE Std 802.3-2022.  
 No changes to the draft.  
 [Editor's note: changed subclause from 185.5.2 Error ratio allocation to 185.2]

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl **185A** SC **185A** P**839** L**6** # **520**  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** (bucket)  
 ETCC is normative, like TDECQ or COM.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "informative" to "normative."  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **185A** SC **185A** P**839** L**15** # **521**  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** ETCC  
 802.3 is not a test spec. There was an 802.3 test spec once, but it was withdrawn.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Write this as a definition of what we mean by ETCC, rather than "defines test methodologies".  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 It is common to specify measurement methods, e.g., "180.9 Definition of optical parameters and measurement methods".  
 However, ETCC is a parameter, not a measurement method.  
 Replace the paragraph in 185A.2 with the following:  
 "ETCC is a parameter representing the quality of the transmitter output signal used for 800GBASE-LR1, 800GBASE-ER1, and 800GBASE-ER1-20 PMDs. The ETCC parameter is defined in this annex."  
 In the annex title change "Test methods" to "Measurement methods".  
 In 185A.1 change "test methodologies" to "measurement methods".  
 The subclauses 185.9/187.9 title should be the parameter name, not test method; to be consistent with other sister subclauses.  
 Change title of 185.9/187.9 to "Extended transmitter constellation closure (ETCC)"  
 Implement in 185, 187, and 185A with editorial license.

Cl **185A** SC **185A.2.3** P**842** L**22** # **475**  
 Kota, Kishore Marvell Semiconductor  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** ETCC  
 The offline digital signal processing described in this section is missing a post-equalizer after the "carrier phase recovery" block which is required to allow relaxation of the TX I-Q skew to the 0.75ps spec in Table 185-5.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add post-equalizer stage to the digital signal processing. Presentation to be provided.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of the following presentation and CRG discussion.  
 kota\_3dj\_0x\_2501

Cl **185A** SC **185A.2.3** P**842** L**38** # **359**  
 Ran, Adeo Cisco  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** ETCC  
 Figure 185A-4 includes the word "decisioning". This word also appears in 185A.2.3.7. It is not defined anywhere, and I think it is not part of the English language, although there are a few instances in Google search.  
 The act of deciding what symbol is generated by a receiver is commonly called "slicing".  
 The suggested remedy is based on that. An alternative term is "estimation".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "symbol slicing", all instances.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In 185A.2.3 change all instances of "symbol decisioning"  
 to  
 "symbol estimation"  
 With editorial license.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 185A SC 185A.2.3.2 P843 L4 # 177

Johnson, John Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ETCC

A constant value for the lowpass filter bandwidth is specified, which detracts from the generality of the ETCC test method. The value of 65 GHz is suitable for 800GBASE-LR1 and -ER1 (52.6% and 55% of signaling rate, respectively), but may not be suitable for future PMDs that refer to 185A.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "with a 3 dB bandwidth equal to 65 ± 1 GHz" to "with a 3 dB bandwidth equal to 0.5 times the signaling rate, ± 1 GHz."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In 185A.2.3.2 change "with a 3 dB bandwidth equal to 65 +/- 1 GHz" to "with a 3 dB bandwidth equal to 0.5 times the signaling rate, +/- 1 GHz" With editorial license.

Cl 185A SC 185A.2.4 P843 L35 # 408

Maniloff, Eric Ciena

Comment Type T Comment Status D ETCC

Text is needed to fill in entries for 185A.2.4.1, 185A.2.4.2, 185A.2.4.3, 185A.2.4.4, 185A.2.4.7, 185A.2.4.9, and 185A.2.4.10

SuggestedRemedy

A contribution with the definitions for these parameters will be provided.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Pending review of the following presentation and CRG discussion. maniloff\_3dj\_0x\_2501

Cl 185A SC 185A.2.4 P843 L36 # 82

Issenhuth, Tom Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D ETCC

There are 7 missing parameter definitions which are currently TBD in this subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the TBDs with parameter definitions as proposed in the supporting presentation to be provided.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #408.

Cl 186 SC 186 P565 L1 # 36

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D ER1 architecture

In the work to define the alignment marker location transparency (AMLT) feature that is needed for the 800GBASE-ER1 PHY, it has become evident that the model of this PHY as a separate PCS creates some difficulties, largely because that model does not match the OIF 800ZR specification with which we are trying to align. The introduction of the AMLT feature exacerbates the misalignment and requires PHY-specific behaviors to be introduced to the 800GXS, which is not really consistent with the concept of the XS as being PHY-agnostic.

SuggestedRemedy

Two broad options: modify clause 171 to include specification of a separate 800GBASE-ER1 PHY\_XS to avoid introducing PHY-specific behavior to the 800GXS, or revise clause 186 to define an ER1 FEC sublayer rather than a PCS sublayer to avoid the need for an XS that is specific to the ER1 PHY. A more detailed presentation will be provided.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the second option, pending review of the following presentation and CRG discussion: <URL>/huber\_3dj\_01\_2501

Cl 186 SC 186 P576 L6 # 182

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The acronym AMs is used but never defined. Better to just spell it out. Exception is if it is used specifically for a field name of "AM".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "AMs" to "alignment markers".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make suggested change throughout clause 186. Implement with editorial license.

Cl 186 SC 186.2.2 P568 L23 # 37

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

The AM field was renamed FAM to clarify that it is not the 800GBASE-R AMs.

SuggestedRemedy

Change OH/AM to OH/FAM

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 186 SC 186.2.3.6 P572 L51 # 38  
 Huber, Thomas Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 With the addition of the AML field, the overhead is no longer a subset of what is in the OIF IA. Also, the reference to ITU-T G.709.6 should be to ITU-T G.709.1  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise the text to read: "The frame overhead is based on the frame defined in subclause 4.3.3 of OIF-800ZR-01.0, which is a subset of what is defined in Recommendation ITU-T G.709.1."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 186 SC 186.2.3.6.10 P575 L34 # 218  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D ER1 architecture  
 The definition of what values is sent in the AML, how the TAML and RAML are generated and passed between layers, and how monitoring of the RAML location in the data stream needs improvement.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Presentation will be provided.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Update description of AMLT feature, pending review of the following presentation and CRG discussion:  
 <URL>/huber\_3dj\_01\_2501

Cl 186 SC 186.2.4.1 P580 L20 # 127  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Don't have the counters be their own sub-headings, just be inline functionality that is part of the decoder.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add this sentence prior to the 186.2.4.1.1 heading "The following counters shall be implemented to aid a network operator in determining the link quality."  
 Remove the sub-headings of 186.2.4.1.1-4 and make them inline definitions like is done in 175.2.5.3

Update the references in Table 186-8  
 Implement with editorial license.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement suggested remedy with editorial license

Cl 186 SC 186.2.4.4 P581 L34 # 191  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ER1 errors  
 The value for "number of bit errors detected is increased" is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Pending review of the following presentation and CRG discussion:  
 <URL>

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 186 SC 186.3.3 P587 L34 # 39

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D ER1 architecture

There is an extra layer of hierarchy in the PMA clause compared to the PCS clause that seems unnecessary. PCS has Transmit and Receive functions as level 3 clauses, PMA has level 3 as "functions within the PMA", with the transmit and receive as level 4 headings below that. This seems to have been inherited from other PMAs that don't distinguish Tx and Rx directions as clearly as this PMA does.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the extra layer of hierarchy. Make 186.3.3 the transmit functions, and 186.3.4 the receive functions.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Pending TF discussion of related comments 36 and 218.

Cl 186 SC 186.3.3.1.2 P589 L17 # 40

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

In figure 186-13, 'mfas' should be 'faw' to align with the text in 186.3.3.1.5 (faw is used here to avoid conflict with the MFAS field in the PCS frame structure in clause 186.2)

SuggestedRemedy

Change mfas to faw

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 186 SC 186.3.3.2.2 P594 L19 # 158

Bruckman, Leon

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ER1 frame alignment

Although TS and PS are different for X and Y only the FAW is used to lock and identify the polarity (see Figure 186-16). No indication as how to use the TS and PS to identify polarity or I/Q is defined. Users can choose to use TS and PS in their proprietary way.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete: "using the multi-frame alignment signal, training sequence, and pilot sequence"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 186 SC 186.4.2.1 P597 L6 # 41

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

As is tersely explained in 186.2.3.5.1 (with reference to G.709.6, where there is additional detail), the FAM field contains 32 bytes that are providing the frame alignment pattern, and 28 bytes that are reserved (0x00). The alignment process should only be looking at the 32 bytes; the 28 bytes that are transmitted as 0x00 are not required to match.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise the definition of fam\_valid to consider only the 32 bytes that have the frame alignment pattern rather than the entire FAM field:  
"A Boolean variable that is set to true if the first 256 bits of the FAM field are a valid PCS frame alignment mechanism sequence..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 186 SC 186.5 P605 L39 # 23

Brown, Matt

Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D ER1 delay

Delay limits for 800GBASE-ER1 PC1 are TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #73

Cl 186 SC 186.5 P605 L40 # 73

Sluyski, Mike

Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ER1 delay

The maximum delay contributed by the 800GBASE-ER1 PCS and 800GBASE-ER1 PMA (sum of transmit and receive delays at one end of the link) shall be no more than TBD bit times (TBD pause\_quanta or TBD ns)

SuggestedRemedy

I might be able to provide delay measurement results for an 800ER1 PHY in January timeframe. Early measurement is 3.3uSec for PCS + PMS TX/RX.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
For task force discussion.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 186 SC 186.5 P605 L40 # 192

Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi

Comment Type T Comment Status D (withdrawn)

Delay constraints are TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Expect a contribution with proposals.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 187 SC 187.6.1 P623 L # 67

Sluyski, Mike Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx optical parameter

Tx clock phase noise: phase noise mask frequency (max). Specified in 185-5 is it required in Table 187-5?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add values common with Table 185-5 pg. 551 lines 5-11

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In Table 187-5 for ER1-20 and ER1 add a line with description "Tx clock phase noise: phase noise mask frequency (max)".

As part of the new parameter there are 4 associated points and values with all units "dBc/Hz"

1 x 10e4 with a value of -100

4 x 10e5 with a value of -132

1 x 10e6 with a value of -1360

<=1 x 10e7 with a value of -146

With editorial license.

[Editor's note: changed subclause from Table 187.5 to 187.6.1]

Cl 187 SC 187.1 P614 L8 # 74

Sluyski, Mike Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

The optical signal generated by these PMD types are modulated using a dual polarization 16-state quadrature amplitude modulation

*SuggestedRemedy*

either signal is plural as in signals or the are should be is if singular.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "The optical signal generated by these PMD types are modulated" to "The optical signals generated by these PMD types are modulated".

Cl 187 SC 187.2 P615 L34 # 75

Sluyski, Mike Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

Reference 174A.4 is not linked.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Link reference to 174A.4

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 187 SC 187.3.1.1 P618 L13 # 76

Sluyski, Mike Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket)

This clause include a reference (186.3.3.1.6) and later to (187.5.2).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Would it be better and clearer to reference Figure 187-2 instead of text 186.3.3.1.6 (Picture is clearer than words). Likewise Reference to Figure 187-5 than text in 187.5.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Subclause 187.3.1.1 specifies the receipt of the PMD:IS\_UNITDATA.request primitive. The noted referce to 186.3.3.1.6 specifies how the primitive is created and contains relevent information not included in the Figure 187-2 or 187-3.

No change to the draft

[Editor's note: changed subclause from "187.3.1.1 800GBASE-E" to 187.3.1.1]



EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 187 SC 187.5.3 P621 L29 # 100  
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D primitive  
 "The four analog streams 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". 800GBASE-ER1-20 and 800GBASE-ER1 do not use inner FEC. This sentence has the same issue as the sentence in CL185.5.3.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "the transmitting Inner FEC Tx\_XI, Tx\_XQ,...." to "the analog Tx\_XI, Tx\_XQ, ...."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change "The four analog streams carry a combination of the transmitting Inner FEC Tx\_XI, Tx\_XQ, Tx\_YI, and Tx\_YQ signals" to  
 "The four analog streams carry a combination of the transmitting PMA Tx\_XI, Tx\_XQ, Tx\_YI, and Tx\_YQ signals".

Cl 187 SC 187.5.5 P622 L8 # 103  
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Signal detect  
 the average optical power limit of -18dBm for signal detection is not correct. The average receiver power min value defined in Table 187-6 is -18dBm. For PMD\_signal\_detect to be 0, the power should be below average receive power min.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 in LR1, there is a 1.5dB margin between power level at which PMD\_signal\_detect=0 (-19dBm) and the average receive power min (-17.5dBm). Change the average optical power at TP3 max limit to be -19.5dBm or -20dBm for PMD\_signal\_detect=0  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In Table 187-3 change the Average optical power at TP3 from <= -18 dBm to <= -19.5 dBm

Cl 187 SC 187.6.1 P623 L32 # 193  
 Brown, Matt Alphawave Semi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D ETCC  
 ETCC limits are TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Expect a contribution with proposals.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 This comment was submitted on behalf of the leadership team and a supporting presentation is not expected.  
 Pending CRG discussion.

Cl 187 SC 187.6.2 P624 L14 # 104  
 Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Rx optical parameter  
 The damage threshold of 800GBASE-ER1-20 and 800GBASE-ER1 was set to 10dBm. The max. average launch power of 800GBASE-ER1 was -1dBm. There was no optical amplifier defined in the optical channel characteristic.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to -1dBm, as assuming max. Transmit output power of 800GBASE-ER1, and 0dB link loss.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In Table 187-6 change Damage threshold from 10 dBm to 1 dBm.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 187 SC 187.6.2 P624 L16 # 79

Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Rx optical parameter

Average Receive power (max) and Average receive power (min)? Is this average signal power or average total power?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Coherent receivers can distinguish signal power. Clarify by adding "Average receive signal power".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In Table 185-6 change "Average receive power (max)" and Average receive power (min)" to "Average receive signal power (max)" and Average receive signal power (min)"  
 With editorial license.  
 [Editor's note: changed page from 603 to 624]

Cl 187 SC 187.6.2 P624 L16 # 60

Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Rx optical parameter

Average Receive power (max) and Average receive power (min)? Is this average signal power or average total power?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Coherent receivers can distinguish signal power. Clarify by adding "Average receive signal power".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In Table 187-6 change "Average receive power (max)" and Average receive power (min)" to "Average receive signal power (max)" and Average receive signal power (min)"  
 With editorial license.

Cl 187 SC 187.6.2 P624 L17 # 179

Sheffi, Nir Alphawave  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Tx/Rx optical parameter

The ETCC has no effect on the transmit launch power (min) and average receive launch power (min.), as opposed to Clause 185.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the specification for the transmitter "Average launch power (min)" (Table 187-5) and the receiver "Average receive power (min)" (Table 187-7) to be a function of ETCC similar to Clause 185 (Table 185-5 and Table 185-6).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient detail to implement.

Cl 187 SC 187.7 P625 L40 # 80

Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D channel requirements

Differential group delay (max)^c should be defined as a statistical value.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add to subnote C. "Due to the statistical nature of polarization mode dispersion (PMD), the relationship between maximum DGD (DGDmax) and mean DGD (DGDmean) can only be defined probabilistically. The probability of the instantaneous DGD exceeding any given value of DGDmax can be inferred from its Maxwellian statistics.

For purposes of this specification the ratio of DGDmax to DGDmean is defined as 3.3, corresponding to a  $4.1 \times 10^{-6}$  probability of the instantaneous DGD exceeding DGDmax.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In Table 187-8 add the stated text to footnote c.  
 Make the same change to footnote c in Table 185-8.  
 With editorial license.  
 [Editor's note: changed page from 604 to 625]

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

CI 187 SC 187.7 P625 L40 # 62

Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D channel requirements

Differential group delay (max)<sup>Δ</sup> should be defined as a statistical value.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to subnote C. "Due to the statistical nature of polarization mode dispersion (PMD), the relationship between maximum DGD (DGD<sub>max</sub>) and mean DGD (DGD<sub>mean</sub>) can only be defined probabilistically. The probability of the instantaneous DGD exceeding any given value of DGD<sub>max</sub> can be inferred from its Maxwellian statistics.

For purposes of this specification the ratio of DGD<sub>max</sub> to DGD<sub>mean</sub> is defined as 3.3, corresponding to a 4.1 × 10<sup>-6</sup> probability of the instantaneous DGD exceeding DGD<sub>max</sub>.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add the noted text to footnote c in Table 187-8.

Make the same change to footnote c in Table 185-8

With editorial license.

[Editor's note: changed subclause from Table 187.8 to 187.7]

CI 187 SC 187.7.1 P626 L11 # 61

Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Fiber characteristics

Zero Dispersion wavelength

SuggestedRemedy

Is this spec required for ER1 application over C-band 1550nm?

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

While the zero dispersion wavelength is not applicable in ER1 or ER1-20 specifications it is a fundamental characteristic of the fiber that must be used.

No changes to the draft.

[Editor's note: changed subclause from Table 187.8 to 187.7.1]

CI 187 SC 187.8.1 P627 L12 # 81

Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Test pattern

Is PRBS raw or framed in payload?

SuggestedRemedy

Assumed to be framed but make it clear

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The details of the PRBS31 signal are documented in the Defined in cross reference of 186.2.3.13

[Editor's note: changed page from 606 to 627]

CI 187 SC 187.8.1 P627 L9 # 105

Mi, Guangcan Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Test pattern

PRBS31 can be encoded by PCS or FEC, not PMD

SuggestedRemedy

change to PRBS31 encoded by the 800GBASE-ER1 PCS and PMA.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment to be considered after the resolution of comment #36.

In Table 187-10 change "PRBS31 encoded by the 800GBASE-ER1"

to

"PRBS31 encoded by the 800GBASE-ER1 FEC sublayer" if comment #36 is accepted

or

"PRBS31 encoded by the 800GBASE-ER1 PCS" if comment #36 is rejected

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 187 SC 187.8.3 P627 L42 # 159

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D (bucket)

There is no Lane wavelength (range) in Table 187-5

SuggestedRemedy

If this is called "Carrier frequency (range)" in Table 187-5, then make naming consistent.  
 Update also Table 187-11 row 2.  
 If not, add Lane wavelength (range) to Table 187-5.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In Table 187-11 and 187.8.3 change "Lane wavelength (range)"  
 to  
 "Carrier frequency (range)".  
 Implement with editorial license.

Cl 187 SC 187.8.6 P628 L8 # 160

Bruckman, Leon Nvidia  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D (bucket)

Redundant "is".

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "ETCC is the quality metric is used to define"  
 To: "ETCC is the quality metric used to define"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 187 SC 187.9 P629 L1 # 63

Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D ETCC

ETCC test setup and calculation is not limited to ER1 and ER1-20. Should the test setup  
 and calculation be relocated to it's own or a different clause?

SuggestedRemedy

If yes. Also move 187.8.6 Extended transmitter constellation closure - definition.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The ETCC test setup and calculation details are in Annex 185A. This annex is titled Test  
 methods for coherent optical Physical Layer devices and contains a subclause detailing  
 ETCC testing. 187.9 references this annex and Tables 187-12 and 187-13 contain the  
 specific parameters values needed for the ETCC calculation.  
 No change to the draft.

Cl 187 SC 187.12.4.1 P634 L10 # 410

Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Transmitter nominal center frequency is not applicable to this PMD.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this entry.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 187 SC 187.12.4.1 P634 L13 # 411

Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Receiver nominal center frequency is not applicable to this PMD

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this entry.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 187 SC 187.12.4.2 P634 L40 # 412

Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

PMD receive center frequency ability is not applicable to this PMD

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this entry.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 187 SC 187.12.4.4 P635 L34 # 413

Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)

Adjustable range of transmit  
 optical power is not defined for clause 187

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this entry.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 187 SC 187.12.4.4 P635 L36 # 414  
 Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Minimum average channel power at maximum adjustable power setting is not applicable to clause 187 PMDs  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete this entry.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 187 SC 187.12.4.4 P635 L41 # 415  
 Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Clause 187 PMDs are not amplified, receiver OSNR and tolerance are not applicable or defined.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete entries OM11 and OM13  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 187 SC 187.12.4.6 P636 L21 # 416  
 Maniloff, Eric Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D (bucket)  
 Clause 187 is not a DWDM PMD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete entry for DWDM black link  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 187 SC 187.6.1 P623 L # 66  
 Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Tx optical parameter  
 Tx laser frequency stability: post-acquisition.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Not required (see line 19)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient detail to implement.  
 [Editor's note: changed subclause from Table 187.5 to 187.6.1]

Cl 187 SC 187.6.1 P623 L # 69  
 Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx optical parameter  
 Tx clock phase noise: total periodic jitter (max) - specified in Table 185-5  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add values common with Table 185-5 pg. 551 lines 13  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In Table 187-5 for ER1-20 and ER1 add a line with description "Tx clock phase noise: total periodic jitter (max)", value of "0.03" and Unit of "U1pp".  
 With editorial license.  
 [Editor's note: changed subclause from Table 187.5 to 187.6.1]

Cl 187 SC 187.6.1 P623 L # 68  
 Sluyski, Mike Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx optical parameter  
 Tx clock phase noise: total integrated random jitter (max) - specified in Table 185-5  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add values common with Table 185-5 pg. 551 lines 12  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In Table 187-5 for ER1-20 and ER1 add a line with description "Tx clock phase noise: total integrated random jitter (max)", value of "0.015" and Unit of "UIrms".  
 With editorial license.  
 [Editor's note: changed subclause from Table 187.5 to 187.6.1]

EEE P802.3dj D1.3 200 Gb/s, 400 Gb/s, 800 Gb/s, and 1.6 Tb/s Ethernet 4th Task Force review comment

Cl 187 SC 187.6.1 P623 L21 # 58

Sluyski, Mike Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx optical parameter

Signaling rate 118.2 +/- 20ppm GBd is rounded.  
118.200000000 is below allowed min.

SuggestedRemedy

The exact rate is 118.203350603 GBd.  
118.200986536 min.  
118.203350603 nom.  
118.205714670 max.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Change "118.2 +/- 20ppm Gbd" to "118.203351 +/- 1 20 ppm Gbd".

[Editor's note: changed subclause from Table 187.5 to 187.6.1]

Cl 187 SC 187.6.1 P623 L51 # 64

Sluyski, Mike Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Tx optical parameter

Tx laser frequency slew rate: pre-acquisition (max). Specified in table 185-5 is it required for 187-5?

SuggestedRemedy

Not required. ER1 and ER1-20 does not include DWDM use cases. Consider turn-up time specification which covers laser tuning and convergence. Recommend 180(max).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient detail to implement.  
[Editor's note: changed subclause from Table 187.5 to 187.6.1]

Cl 187 SC 187.6.1 P623 L52 # 65

Sluyski, Mike Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Tx optical parameter

Tx laser frequency slew rate: post-acquisition (max). Specified in table 185-5 is it required for 187-5?

SuggestedRemedy

Not required. (see line 19)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient detail to implement.  
[Editor's note: changed subclause from Table 187.5 to 187.6.1]

Cl 187 SC 187.6.2 P624 L10 # 59

Sluyski, Mike Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Tx optical parameter

Signaling rate 118.2 +/- 20ppm GBd is rounded.  
118.200000000 is below allowed min.

SuggestedRemedy

The exact rate is 118.203350603 GBd.  
118.200986536 min.  
118.203350603 nom.  
118.205714670 max.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Change "118.2 +/- 20ppm Gbd" to "118.203351 +/- 1 20 ppm Gbd".

[Editor's note: changed subclause from Table 187.6 to 187.6.2]

Cl 187 SC 187.6.2 P624 L # 70

Sluyski, Mike Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Rx optical parameter

RX acquisition time - time to acquire and lock to valid signal.

SuggestedRemedy

Time to fully acquire signal in the presence of a valid input signal. Recommend 10 (max) Sec.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient detail to implement.  
[Editor's note: changed subclause from Table 187.7 to 187.6.2]