

IEEE P802.3cd 50 Gb/s, 100 Gb/s, 200 Gb/s Ethernet 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 135 SC 135.5.5 P 178 L 30 # r02-1

Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status D <bucket>

Comment r01-33 against the revision project D3.1 has slightly re-worded the note added to 120.5.5. See:
<http://www.ieee802.org/3/cj/comments/P8023-D3p1-Comments-Final-byID-r1.pdf#page=12>

As the same note is being added to 135.5.5 it would be a good idea to use the same wording here as in the revision.

SuggestedRemedy

Change
 "where the output signaling rate is higher than the input signaling rate," to:
 "where the signaling rate on each output lane is higher than the signaling rate on each input lane,"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 135 SC 135.5.5 P 178 L 31 # r02-33

Dawe, Piers J G Mellanox Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status D <bucket>

The wording here and in 120.5.5 are slightly different. The 120.5.5 version came later and was preferred by the 802.3cj meeting.

SuggestedRemedy

Change
 Note--For a PMA where the output signaling rate is higher than the input signaling rate, any low-frequency jitter on the input lanes may result in more jitter relative to the UI on the output lanes.
 to
 NOTE--For a PMA where the signaling rate on each output lane is higher than the signaling rate on each input lane, any low frequency jitter on the input lanes may result in more jitter relative to the UI on the output lanes.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 135G SC 135G.1 P 379 L 4 # r02-13

Dudek, Michael Cavium

Comment Type ER Comment Status D <bucket>

OIF defined CEI-56G-VSR in OIF-CEI-4.0 not OIF-CEI-3.2 and the reference has become B56 in 802.3cj

SuggestedRemedy

Change OIF-CEI-3.2[B55] to OIF-CEI-4.0 [B56]

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 135G SC 135G.3.1 P 379 L 21 # r02-6

Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D <bucket>

Comment r01-31 against the revision project D3.1 has changed the specifications in Annex 120E to include a VEC requirement. See:
<http://www.ieee802.org/3/cj/comments/P8023-D3p1-Comments-Final-byID-r1.pdf#page=11>
http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/public/anslow_2_0318.pdf

As 135G.3.1 references 120E.3.1, which now includes a requirement for the vertical eye closure to be less than 12 dB, there is no longer any need to repeat this requirement in 135G.3.1.

Similarly, as 135G.3.4 references 120E.3.4, which now includes a requirement for the input vertical eye closure in the module stressed input test to be less than 12 dB, there is no longer any need to repeat this requirement in 135G.3.4.

The vertical eye closure definition in 135G.4.1 is also now not needed as it has been added to Annex 120E as 120E.4.3.

In 135G.5.4.4, PICS item RM1 contains: ", with the exception that input vertical eye closure is less than 12 dB for stressed input test", which is no longer needed.

SuggestedRemedy

In 135G.3.1, delete "and vertical eye closure, determined according to 135G.4.1, shall be less than 12 dB".

In 135G.3.4, delete ", with the modification that for the module stressed input test in 120E.3.1 the input vertical eye closure, determined according to 135G.4.1, is required to be less than 12 dB".

Delete the whole of 135G.4.1.

In 135G.5.4.4, item RM1, delete ", with the exception that input vertical eye closure is less than 12 dB for stressed input test".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3cd 50 Gb/s, 100 Gb/s, 200 Gb/s Ethernet 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 138 **SC 138.7.1** **P 270** **L 22** # **r02-41**
Dawe, Piers J G Mellanox Technologie

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** <bucket>

I suppose we should use the same description for TDECQ as in clauses 121, 122, 124.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "for PAM4". Make the left column wider and the others narrower.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use TDECQ parameter nomenclature consistent with 121, 122, 124, 139 and 140