

```

1  +-----+
2  |                                     |
3  +-----+
4  DATE: May 14th, 2024
5  NAME: Andras de Koos
6  COMPANY/AFFILIATION: Microchip Technology
7  E-MAIL: andras.dekoos@microchip.com
8
9  REQUESTED REVISION:
10 STANDARD: 802.3cx / 802.3df
11 CLAUSE NUMBER: 90A.3
12 CLAUSE TITLE: Considerations for use of different data delay
13 measurement points
14 PROPOSED REVISION TEXT:
15 In Table 90A-1-Magnitude of potential timestamp accuracy impairments,
16 the magnitude of potential timestamp accuracy impairments due to
17 alignment marker / codeword marker insertion/removal for 200G,
18 400G and 800G should all be 5.12
19
20
21
22 RATIONALE FOR REVISION:
23 The current number in the table for 200G/400G/800G, 2.56, is wrong.
24 The time in the table is meant to be the AM's time on the wire,
25 or MII time of the alignment markers.
26 The alignment markers for 200/400G/800G are 4/8/16x 257b blocks,
27 which is equivalent to 1024/2048/4096 MII bits, which is 5.12ns
28 for all 3 rates.
29
30
31
32 IMPACT ON EXISTING NETWORKS:
33 No impact on existing networks, just reflects the true number.
34 Annex 90A is only informative, not normative.
35 The 'potential' timestamp impairment is only relevant if either end
36 of the link do not support the 'PCS Dynamic Path Data Delay ability'
37 (MDIO bit 3.1800.10)
38
39
40 +-----+
41 |Please attach supporting material, if any
42 |Submit to:- David Law, Chair IEEE 802.3
43 |and copy:- Adam Healey, Vice-Chair IEEE 802.3
44 |
45 |At:- E-Mail: stds-802-3-maint-req@ieee.org
46 |
47 |          +----- For official use -----+
48 |          | REV REQ NUMBER: 1432
49 |          | DATE RECEIVED: 14 May 2024
50 |          | EDITORIAL/TECHNICAL
51 |          | ACCEPTED/DENIED
52 |          | BALLOT REQ'D YES/NO
53 |          | COMMENTS:
54 +-----+
55 | For information about this Revision Request see -
56 | http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/revision\_history.html#REQ1432
57 +-----+

```