

# Motions and Straw Polls

IEEE P802.3dj Task Force Joint Meeting

July 2024 Plenary Meeting

Kent Lusted, Intel

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

# Foreword

- Straw polls related to resolving comments may be found in the associated comment response files.
- This contribution summarizes motions and straw polls not related to comments.
- This contribution is not the official minutes of the meeting.

If there is any discrepancy between this contribution and the meeting minutes, then the minutes take precedence.

15 July 2024

# Attendance Straw Poll

For those attending in person, for Tuesday I will be attending

- Track 1 - Logic / Optical
- Track 2 - Electrical
- Both

Results: Track1: 28, Track2: 13 , Both: 21

16 July 2024

# Straw Poll #E-1

I would support using the COM receiver discrete-time equalizer with MLSD (Annex 178A.1.11) as the reference receiver for 200 Gbps/lane CR and KR PHYs

(choose one)

Results (all): Y: 38, N: 10 , A: 9

# Straw Poll #E-2

I would support the direction of modifying the calculation of COM for an MLSD reference receiver to add a method of receiver impairments per healey\_3dj\_01a\_2407

(choose one)

Results (all): Y: 36, , N: 7 , A: 15

# Straw Poll #E-3

When approximating the impact of pre-MLSD receiver impairments in the COM calculation, I prefer the approach of:

- Option A: scale the receiver noise (e.g. healey\_3dj\_01a\_2407, slide 4)
- Option B: define a MLSD implementation allowance  $Q$  that is a function of COM\_DFE (e.g. healey\_3dj\_01a\_2407, slide 6)
- Option C: Need more information
- Option D: Abstain

Results (all): A: 15, , B: 0 , C: 28 , D: 10



# Straw Poll #E-4

I would support the proposed COM parameter values per heck\_3dj\_01a\_2407, slide 13

And with editor note: “The RX FFE tap values limits were chosen based upon no reliance upon the TX FFE taps. Further work is required to determine how the equalization effect is distributed between the RX FFE and the TX FFE taps to account for some reasonable implementation choices.”

(choose one)

Results (all): Y: 27 , N: 7 , A: 14

# Straw Poll #O-1

I support a specification approach for 800GBASE-FR4 and 800GBASE-LR4 chromatic dispersion ranges by:

- referencing ITU-T Rec G.652 for fiber specs and the newly updated Appendix I for the CD values
- 800GBASE-FR4 cd range -11.26 to +6.02 ps/nm as proposed in johnson\_3dj\_01a\_2407
- 800GBASE-LR4 cd range -24.6 to +2.8 ps/nm as proposed in rodes\_3dj\_01a\_2407
- develop an Informative Annex to describe the background for these choices, explaining the statistical link design approach which factors in fiber, transceiver and length statistics

Results (all): Y:50      N:5      A:15

17 July 2024

# Motion #1:

Move that the IEEE P802.3dj Task Forces approve:

- IEEE\_802d3\_to\_OIF\_3dj\_2407\_CEI-224G\_redacted.pdf with editorial license granted to the Chair (or his appointed agent) as a liaison communication from the IEEE 802.3 Working Group to OIF.
- IEEE\_802d3\_to\_OIF\_3dj\_2407\_coherent\_redacted.pdf with editorial license granted to the Chair (or his appointed agent) as a liaison communication from the IEEE 802.3 Working Group to OIF.

M: Tom Huber

S: Adeo Ran

Technical (>=75%)

802.3 voters only

Result: Passed by unanimous consent. 4:44 p.m.

18 July 2024

# Straw Poll #TF-1

I support addressing the de-skew issue for 800GbE/1.6TbE Inner FEC (Clause 177) identified in dudek\_3dj\_01\_2407

- Yes
- No
- Abstain

Results (all): Y: 78, N: 1, A: 28

# Straw Poll #TF-2

To address the de-skew issue for 800GbE/1.6TbE Inner FEC (Clause 177) identified in dudek\_3dj\_01\_2407, the de-skew function should be addressed in:

- A. Within Clause 177 Inner FEC sublayer (option 2 in dudek\_3dj\_01\_2407)
- B. Within Clause 176 SM-PMA sublayer (option 3 in dudek\_3dj\_01\_2407)
- c. Need more information

(choose one)

Results (all): A: 59, B: 17, C: 21

# Straw Poll #TF-3

I would support putting the COM parameter values and the editors note for CR and KR (per lusted\_3dj\_06b\_2407, slides 6-7) into the P802.3dj draft specification

(choose one)

Results (all): Y: 73, N: 2, A: 20



# Straw Poll #TF-4

I would support putting the following COM parameter values for CR and KR into the P802.3dj draft specification:

- Number of floating tap groups ( $N_g$ ) = 2
- Number of taps per floating tap group ( $N_f$ ) = 4
- Highest allowed tap index ( $N_{max}$ ) = 80

(choose one)

Results (all): Y: 63, N: 4, NMI: 17, A: 19

# Straw Poll #TF-5

I would support the approach presented in ran\_3dj\_01b\_2407, of having a specific combination of package and PCB length per CR host class

A: Yes, with the original PCB parameters in the presentation (per ran\_3dj\_01b\_2407, slides 13-15)

B: Yes but with modified PCB parameters to create 1.1 dB/inch (per ran\_3dj\_01b\_2407, slides 23-25)

C: No

D: Abstain

(choose one)

Results (all): A: 8, B: 18, C: 25, D: 42

# Straw Poll #TF-6

For the CR host channel model, I would prefer the combination of package and PCB length as follows:

A: Shorter package trace and longer PCB trace, with  $C0 = 0$  (similar to option 1 in ran\_3dj\_01b\_2407)

B: Longer package trace and shorter PCB trace, with  $C0 = 0$  (similar to option 2 in ran\_3dj\_01b\_2407)

C: Shorter package trace and longer PCB trace, with  $C0 > 0$  (similar to option 3 in ran\_3dj\_01b\_2407)

D: Longer package trace and shorter PCB trace, with  $C0 > 0$  (similar to option 4 in ran\_3dj\_01b\_2407)

E: Abstain

(chicago rules)

Results(all): A: 14, B: 23, C: 26, D: 18, E: 59

# Straw Poll #TF-7

I would support putting the values in diminico\_3dj\_01a\_2407.pdf slide 7 for Annex 179A.5 TBDs of MTF and TP0d-TP2, TP3-TP5d.

Results(all): Y: 42, N: 16, A: 47