

IEEE 802.3bs 400GbE Task Force  
Electrical Interface Adhoc  
Monday, 8 Sept 2014, 7:30pm Meeting

## NOTES

Adhoc co-Chairs – Vasu Parasarathy and Joel Goergen  
Note taker – Vasu Parasarathy

7.30 PM Monday  
-----

No objections on Patent Policy

Meeting opened with the Agenda

a) John D'ambrosia presentation on Architecture and Electrical interfaces

Q1) What do we do on FEC definition for 25Gbps?

Q2) End-to-end FEC in PMD's: When will it get defined? Led to general clarifications on segmented (vs) end-to-end FEC

John said that at some point we (as a group) would need to discuss including segmented FEC's for applications and group needs to work that out. The electrical interface adhoc does not own the FEC discussion, but will have to address the effects and any point to point specific requirements an interface might require.

Further discussions on segmented FEC (vs) end-to-end FEC.

VOTE: How many would vote on an end-to-end FEC today?

End to end FEC vote: Yes:  $13 + 9 = 22$

No : 4

Q3) Chris: FEC increases cost on a module. Don't want it in there. Keep it at the end-points

Q4) Gary: Is it right to put one strong FEC in the switch since many applications with many requirements are supported

Guidance from JohnD: Work with folks on a common solution

b) Mike Li presentation on “Specification considerations for CDAUI-16 chip-to-chip and chip-2-module applications”

Notes: Reuse CAUI-4 as a baseline for CDAUI-16

Q1) Relax BER on the C-to-C and C-to-M interface to make interface more feasible

Q2) General discussion on the motions for Wednesday

Q3) Piers raised questions on Mike Li’s recommendation on CTLE be auto-adaptive without a suggested default setting

Q4) John: Further discussions on motion

c) Question on XSR and its relevance to 400Gbps Electrical specification

Mike: XSR should be an application space that we should look into. However, prefer not to have a separate specification on this.

Chris Cole: XSR is an important interface to think about but not necessarily standardize in this forum. Compatibility and power with the VSR/MR specification is

important

Tom: XSR should be addressed here and have it as an objective

Piers: Need to consider it

Steve: VSR and MR are CDR based. XSR should be non-CDR based and is not part of this project

Dave: We should standardize it here.

John: Leave it proprietary

Chris: Do our own XSR. [Do not link it to OIF.](#)

## Attendees

- 1) Pravin Patel
- 2) Paul Mooney
- 3) Dave Estes
- 4) Cortis Donahue
- 5) Xinyuan Wang
- 6) Tony Zortea
- 7) Ryan Latchman
- 8) Francois Tremblay
- 9) Scott Sommers
- 10) Chad Erven
- 11) Peter Stassor
- 12) Xiaolu Song
- 13) Jeff Maki
- 14) David Ofelt
- 15) Dale Murray
- 16) Megha Shanbhag
- 17) Nathan Tracy
- 18) John Petrilla
- 19) Rita Horner
- 20) Chris Cole
- 21) David Koehler
- 22) Peter Jare
- 23) Rob Stone
- 24) Scott Irwin
- 25) Salvatore Rotab
- 26) Stefano Valli
- 27) Pete Anslow
- 28) Mike Dudek
- 29) Andy Zambell
- 30) Piers Dawe
- 31) Takashi Kawamoteo
- 32) Steve Trowbridge
- 33) John D'Ambrosia

