

IEEE 802.3dk D1.1 Bidirectional 100Gb/s Optical Access PHYs 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 30 SC 30.51.1.2 P12 L # 1

Stassar, Peter Huawei

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

The syntax for 100GBASE-BRxx-y does not contain a reference to the bitrate.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the syntax along the lines of the syntax in dj D1.3 "200GBASE-R PCS/PMA over single-mode fiber PMD with a reach of up to at least 500 m as specified in Clause 180" or Table 157-2

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl 157 SC 157.4 P23 L23 # 2

Stassar, Peter Huawei

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

The reference to 80.4 is rather ambiguous. It would be better to specify separate delay constraints for the new 100G specifications

*SuggestedRemedy*

Create a new subclause 157.4.1 with delay constraints for 100GBASE-BRx, reusing the delay constraints in Clause 140.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl 168 SC 168.1 P25 L # 3

Stassar, Peter Huawei

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

This overview doesn't even call out that it are bidirectional interfaces such as described in 157.1.1. Also referring to "one medium" is not correct, because 3 mediums are defined, one for 10km, one for 20km and one for 40km.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Rewrite 168.1 to reflect that this is about bi-directional interfaces over 3 types of medium

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl 168 SC 168.5.1 P29 L # 4

Stassar, Peter Huawei

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

Figure 168-2 is confusing, because it shows TP2 and TP3 but also lambda 1 and lambda 2, suggesting that lambda 2 is from TP3 to TP2, which is not correct.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a note to the figure and associated text that the direction from TP2 to TP3 is only for one wavelength and that for the second wavelength the direction is opposite. Maybe introduce TP2/TP3 for Lambda 1 and TP2/TP3 for Lambda 2.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl 168 SC 168.7.1.2 P40 L # 5

Stassar, Peter Huawei

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

This subclause uses SECQ as a parameter whereas it should TECQ in both Figuree and equations

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the reference to SECQ to TECQ in related parts of 168.7.12

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl 168 SC 168.7.5.2 P37 L28 # 6

Yu, Rang-chen InnoLight

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**

Fiber dispersion equation for 40km still follows the worst case which original ITU-T G.652 defined. It could be too tight for TDECQ spec measurement of 100G-BR-40.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Updating the dispersion equation of 40km option with statistical fitting coefficient (M=16) defined in Table I.4 of ITU-T G.652-202408.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**