

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P 32 L 14 # 50  
 Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D editorial (bucket1)  
 The publication date for the SFP-DD MSA v4.2 was August 17, 2020, not August 10, 2020 as shown in the draft. See <http://sfp-dd.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/SFP-DDrev4.2.pdf>  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the date to August 17, 2020  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120 SC 120.5.7.2 P 102 L 30 # 55  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D editorial (bucket1)  
 In the change to the first paragraph it has removed the requirement of this paragraph for 50G copper PMDs.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add 200GBASE-KR4/CR4 to the list in both the first and second sentences.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120 SC 120.5.7.2 P 102 L 45 # 54  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D editorial (bucket1)  
 The cross out of the text "The variables" and "by the PMD control function" in the second sentence of the paragraph seems to be too much since the sentence would read "precoder\_tx\_out\_enable\_i and precoder\_rx\_in\_enable\_i shall be set as determined in the LINK\_READY state of the PMD control state diagram on lane i (see 136.8.11.7.5)"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Update the second senetence to be ""precoder\_tx\_out\_enable\_i and precoder\_rx\_in\_enable\_i shall be set as determined by the PMD control function in the LINK\_READY state on lane i (see Fig 136-7)"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120 SC 120.5.7.2 P 103 L 44 # 56  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D editorial (bucket1)  
 In the change to the fourth paragraph it has removed the requirement of this paragraph for 50G copper PMDs.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add 200GBASE-KR4/CR4 to the list in the first sentence.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120F SC 120F.3.1 P 212 L 50 # 47  
 Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D editorial (bucket1)  
 The following sentence is repeated in both 120F.3.1 and 120F.3.1.2. "The state of the transmitter equalizer may be configured via the transmitter control interface described in 120F.3.1.4."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete the sentence in 120G.3.1.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120F SC 120F.3.1.2 P 214 L 34 # 134  
 Ran, Adeo Intel  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D TX EQ  
 The editor's note states that pre-cursor tap c(-3) will be removed from this specification if it is shown to "have no value".  
 This has not been shown in four comment cycles since the addition of this note, so there is no need to keep it.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete the editor's note.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

CI 120F SC 120F.3.1.2 P 214 L 34 # 108

Hidaka, Yasuo Credo Semiconductor, Inc.  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** TX EQ

C(-3) has been discussed and the editor's note should have been removed long time ago.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove editor's note on the pre-cursor tap c(-3).

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #134.

CI 120F SC 120F.3.1.2 P 214 L 35 # 28

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** TX EQ

The editor's note written in D1.0 indicates that the transmitter c(-3) tap should be removed if it is shown to have no value. There have been no proposals accepted to remove the tap.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #134.

CI 120F SC 120F.3.2.3 P 218 L 16 # 136

Ran, Adeo Intel  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** measurement BW

"Bessel-Thomson low pass response with 53 GHz 3 dB bandwidth" - we have 40 GHz in all other corresponding places in this draft.

This is for calibrating the pattern generator in the C2C Rx test setup. There is no reason for higher bandwidth in this specific subclause. All precedent cases use the same bandwidth for Rx and for the Tx test (e.g. 33 GHz in 120D.3.2.1).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "53" to "40".

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 120F SC 120F.3.2.3 P 218 L 43 # 135

Ran, Adeo Intel  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** RIT IL

(Addressing editor's note requiring confirmation)  
 The editor's note states that the values specified for "Insertion loss at 26.5625 GHz" for test 2 require confirmation. (These values are for the high-loss test).

No proposal has been made to change the values in this table in four comment cycles since the addition of this note, so there is no need to keep it.

Note that the baseline proposal [https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/19\\_09/li\\_3ck\\_01d\\_0919.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/19_09/li_3ck_01d_0919.pdf) has a comment in slide 16 that "Max informative recommended loss value is place holder and require further investigation". But the value in this table is not the informative recommended loss - it is the normative loss of the interference tolerance test. The annex does not include a "max informative recommended loss value", so there is nothing to confirm/investigate.

The IL in the high-loss test suggests the maximum loss for a channel, but the project's objective are met regardless of the value.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Delete the editor's notes on page 218 line 43 and page 222 line 4.

CI 120F SC 120F.3.2.3 P 218 L 44 # 29

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** RIT IL

The editor's note written in D1.0 indicates that the IL for stressed input test 2 (high loss) requires no confirmation. No proposals to change the specified values have been submitted.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #135.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl **120F** SC **120F.4.1** P **220** L **29** # **117**

Li, Mike Intel  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** COM Cp (CC) (WG)

Cp of 8.7x1e-5 nF could be improved to provide the needed channel/link solution margin and it is supported by the latest package technology/product (see oif2020.224.01). Moreover, such an improvement would be aligned with the latest CEI-112G-MR-PAM4 spec, and benefiting the ecosystem at large.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change Cp to 6.0x1e-5 nF

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.  
 Resolve with comments #115 (Clause 162) and #116 (Clause 163).  
 Note that CEI-112G-MR-PAM4 Version 4 provided in the OIF liaison to IEEE data 7 January 2021 specifies 60 nF for Cp.  
[https://www.ieee802.org/3/private/liaison\\_docs/OIF/0121\\_OIF\\_liaison\\_IEEE\\_CEI\\_Projects\\_cover\\_drafts\\_07Jan21.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/private/liaison_docs/OIF/0121_OIF_liaison_IEEE_CEI_Projects_cover_drafts_07Jan21.pdf)  
 [Editor's note: CC: 120F, 162, 163.]

Cl **120F** SC **120F.4.2** P **222** L **4** # **30**

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** channel IL

The editor's note written in D1.0 indicates that the channel maximum insertion loss requires further investigation. No proposals to change the specification have been submitted.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #135.

Cl **120F** SC **120F.4.3** P **223** L **5** # **31**

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** channel ERL

The specified value for channel ERL is TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Provide a value and update PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #123.

Cl **120F** SC **120F.4.3** P **223** L **5** # **123**

Ran, Adeo Intel  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** channel ERL

(addressing TBD)  
 Channel ERL minimum is TBD.

The ERL parameters specific to C2C take into account the difference in reference receiver. With the respective parameters, ERL (which is the relative effect of reflections vs. signal) should have the same limit.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Set channel ERL minimum identical to 163.10.3 where the minimum is 9.7 dB.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Set ERL (min) to 9.7 dB and update PICS.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.1** P **229** L **2** # **16**

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** editorial (bucket1)

135.1.5 does not appear to exist and if it did it is unlikely to include these AUI's

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the reference from 135.1.5 to 135.1.4 and make it a hot link and either remove the reference to a tabke or create a table that summarizes the use of the 100GAUI within 135.1.4

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The reference should be to 80.1.5, not 135.1.5.  
 Change "135.1.5" to "80.1.5" and make it an active cross-reference.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 120G SC 120G.1 P 229 L 3 # 15  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D editorial (bucket1)  
 Clause 116.1.4 is included in the draft and should be a hot link  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make this a hot link.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120G SC 120G.1 P 229 L 5 # 21  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D editorial (bucket1)  
 Annex 135A and 120A are part of this draft.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make these references hot links.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.1 P 231 L 17 # 61  
 Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EH/VEC  
 Due to we adopted the new EH & VEC test methods in D1p4, the specifications of EH & VEC for "Table 120G-1 - Host output characteristics at TP1a" and "Table 120G-10 - Module stressed input parameters" shall be updated to reflect the impact by new method.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Propose to change EH from 15 mV to 8 mV in Table 120G-1 & 120G-10.  
 Propose to change VEC from 9.0 dB to 12.0 dB in Table 120G-1.  
 Propose to change VEC (max) from 9.5 dB to 12.5 dB in Table 120G-10.  
 Propose to change VEC (min) from 9.0 dB to 12.0 dB in Table 120G-10.  
 Detailed analysis is included in wu\_3ck\_01\_0121.pdf  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #40.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.1 P 231 L 17 # 80  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EH/VEC  
 Eye height need to be adjusted to account for the 50 mUI rectangular window  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 See ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0121 and reduce eye height window from 15 mV to 9.5 mV  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #40.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.1 P 231 L 17 # 5  
 Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EH/VEC  
 EH and VEC need be to computed for the histogram window.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change Eye height, differential (min) to 10 mV  
 Change Vertical eye closure (max) to 13 dB  
 Presentation available  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #40.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

CI 120G SC 120G.3.1 P 231 L 18 # 72

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D EH/VEC

The eye height and vertical eye closure limits were based on (simulated) measurements of a vertical slice of the eye at the nominal sampling time. The measurement method for eye height and vertical eye closure in 120G.5.2 has been modified to use a vertical slice of the eye spanning -50 to +50 mUI around the nominal sampling time. Comparison of measurement results implies that the change in the measurement method results in up to a 3 dB increase in vertical eye closure and a similar decrease in eye height.

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 120G-1, change "Eye height, differential (min)" to 10 mV and "Vertical eye closure (max)" to 12 dB.

In Table 120G-3, change "Near-end eye height, differential (min)" and "Far-end eye height, differential (min)" to 17 mV and "Near-end vertical eye closure (max)" and "Far-end vertical eye closure (max)" to 10.5 dB.

In Table 120G-7, change "Near-end eye height" and "Far-end eye height" to 17 mV and "Near-end vertical eye closure" and "Far-end vertical eye closure" to 10.5 dB.

In Table 120G-10, change "Eye height" to 10 mV, "VEC (max)" to 12.5 dB, and "VEC (min)" to 12 dB.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #40.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.1 P 231 L 19 # 81

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EH/VEC

VEC need to be adjusted to account for the 50 mUI rectangular window

SuggestedRemedy

See ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0121 and reduce eye height window from 7.5 dB to 14 dB

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #40.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.1 P 231 L 25 # 83

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP1a transition time

At TP1a it is not possible to get 7.5 ps, please put something reasonable

SuggestedRemedy

A fast ASIC with 7.6 ps output rise time when passes through a mated board with just 5 dB loss produces 12 ps 20-80% rise time. I suggest 12 ps but no less than 10 ps.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. However, there are proposals to other comments relating to technical completeness that include changes to the transition time.  
Resolve using the response to comments 17 and 20.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.1 P 231 L 33 # 32

Brown, Matt Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D CM noise, PP voltage, RLCC

The editor's note written in D1.0 indicates that the specified values for host output AC CM noise, PP output voltage, and RLCC require confirmation. No proposals to change the specified values have been submitted.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Implement the suggested remedy.  
For task force discussion.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.1.5 P 233 L 17 # 62

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek

Comment Type T Comment Status D TP1a EH/VEC EO XTALK

There are some TBDs for crosstalk calibration specs for Host Output test. According to the analysis explored in wu\_3ck\_adhoc\_02\_010621.pdf, the target swing at TP4 shall be aligned with that of Module output spec, which is 900 mV. Similarly, the output voltage swing at TP1a, which is 870 mV now, shall be aligned among Host output, Module output, Host input, & Module input specs.

SuggestedRemedy

Propose the following paragraph to replace the original one  
Host output: 120G.3.1.4 (Page 233, L17)  
"... with target differential peak-to-peak amplitude of 900 mV and slew time of 12 ps between -2.7 V and +2.7 V."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #14.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.1.5 P 233 L 17 # 33

Brown, Matt Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D TP1a EH/VEC EO XTALK

The specified values for the host output EH/VEC crosstalk parameters (4x) are TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide values.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #14.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.1.5 P 233 L 17 # 124

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP1a EH/VEC EO XTALK

"The crosstalk generator is calibrated at TP4 (without the use of a reference receiver) with target differential peak-to-peak amplitude of TBD mV and slew time of TBD ps between -TBD V and +TBD V"

This is the host output test; the crosstalk generator represents the module output. We specify the PtP amplitude and transition time for modules at TP4 in Table 120G-3. The calibration should use the maximum amplitude and minimum transition time values from that table.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the quoted sentence to:

"The crosstalk generator is calibrated at TP4 (without the use of a reference receiver) with targets equal to the Differential peak-to-peak output voltage (max) and Transition time (min, 20% to 80%) in Table 120G-3".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #14.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.1.5 P 233 L 17 # 14

Dudek, Mike Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP1a EH/VEC EO XTALK

The host output signal should be measured with a crosstalk signal equivalent to the largest and fastest signal that a module is allowed to create and the crosstalk signal risetime should be measured from 20% to 80%.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to a target differential peak-to-peak amplitude of 900mV and the slew time to be 7.5ps measured between -270mV and +270mV

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Comments 14, 84, 62, 68, and 124 propose a variation of values.  
Presentation brown\_3ck\_02 provides a summary of the proposals.  
For task force discussion.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.1.5** P **233** L **17** # **84**

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** TP1a EH/VEC EO XTALK

Addressing the TBD in the paragraph

*SuggestedRemedy*

A fast ASIC with 7.6 ps output rise time when passes through a mated board with just 5 dB loss produces 12 ps 20-80% rise time. I suggest 24 ps for the slew from -400 mV to + 400 mV and with amplitude of 800 mV, the reason amplitude is reduced is due assumption that signal will have pre-emphasis on for this measurement otherwise one could go with 900 mV amplitude I don't believe that is reasonable.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #14.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.1.5** P **233** L **17** # **68**

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** TP1a EH/VEC EO XTALK

The target differential peak-to-peak amplitude and slew time of the crosstalk generator, as observed at TP4, are TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Since the crosstalk generator is used to represent near-end aggression from the the module transmitter outputs, the largest amplitude and smallest transition time allowed for a module output (as observed at TP4) should be used to represent worst-case aggression.

Change:  
 "The crosstalk generator is calibrated at TP4 (without the use of a reference receiver) with target differential peak-to-peak amplitude of TBD mV and slew time of TBD ps between -TBD V and +TBD V."  
 To:

"The crosstalk generator is calibrated so that the differential peak-to-peak output voltage and transition time, as measured at TP4, are as close to the limits in Table 120G-3 as practical."

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #14.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2** P **234** L **10** # **145**

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** EH/VEC

For a reasonably clean module (or test equipment in a host stressed eye test), the driver swing has to be aggressively reduced to deliver only 24 mV at near end, short setting. 120E has 70 mV.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Eye height limits should be set sensibly for short and long modes, near and far - not all the same.  
 Change the NEEH from 24 mV to 40 mV.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #40.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2** P **234** L **10** # **13**

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** editorial (bucket1)

The references for both near and far eye measurements in table 120G-3 are to the host output. They should be to the module output

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the reference from 120G.3.1.5 to 120G.3.2.2

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In Table 120G-3, for rows for NE EH, NE VEC, FE EH, and FE VEC change the reference from "120G.3.1.5" to "120G.3.2.2".

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2** P **234** L **11** # **75**

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** EH/VEC

Given that now we have AUI-S/L near end eye would be AUI-S min eye opening

*SuggestedRemedy*

The eye opening with 50 mUI rectangular window for AUI-S is VEO=20 mV, see ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0121

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #40.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.2 P 234 L 11 # 77

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EH/VEC

Given that now we have AUI-S/L near end VEC need to be defined

SuggestedRemedy

The eye opening with 50 mUI rectangular window for AUI-S is VEC=12.5 dB, see ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0121

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #40.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.2 P 234 L 13 # 76

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EH/VEC

Given that now we have AUI-S/L far end eye would be AUI-S min eye opening

SuggestedRemedy

The eye opening with 50 mUI rectangular window for AUI-L is VEO=11 mV, see ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0121

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #40.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.2 P 234 L 14 # 78

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EH/VEC

Given that now we have AUI-S/L far end VEC need to be defined

SuggestedRemedy

The eye opening with 50 mUI rectangular window for AUI-L is VEC=14.5 dB, see ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0121

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #40.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.2 P 234 L 14 # 146

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP4 EQ settings

As already discussed, the 2-settings method with only two compliance losses doesn't work. If the module is set to the short setting, and the host receiver isn't that near, the eye it is offered is smaller than 24 mV because of loss, and out of tune as well. If the module is set to the long setting and the host isn't that long, the eye is also out of tune. There's no guarantee that either setting is usable.

SuggestedRemedy

There should be 4 EH-VEC limit pairs: short near and far, and long near and far, in Table 120G. In 120G.3.2.2.1, give the four zp values: for short, 0 (as at present) and 184, for long, 61 and 244.7 (as at present).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 [Editor's note: Changed line number from 26.]  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness.  
 The commenter has not provided sufficient evidence to support the proposed changes.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.2 P 234 L 17 # 34

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TP4 ERL

In Table 120G-3, the specified value for ERL at module output (TP4) is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a value and update PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #125.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2** P **234** L **17** # **125**

Ran, Adeo Intel  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** TP4 ERL

(addressing TBD)  
 Module output ERL (min) is TBD

Since it is measured at TP4 the module ERL will be no better than that of a mated test fixture. In another comment I am suggesting setting the minimum ERL of a MTF to 10.3 dB to enable measurement of the internal host circuitry. Based on this proposal, the ERL of a module cannot exceed 10.3 dB.

The proposed value allows 1.3 dB difference for Tx and 1.8 dB for RX for module implementation.

Similarly in 120G.3.4 for module input ERL at TP1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change TBD to 9 dB for Tx ERL and 8.5 dB for Rx ERL.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Two comments propose values for module output ERL (min) as follows:  
 #79: 8.5 dB  
 #125: 9 dB  
 Select a value and use this for both module output (120G.3.2) and module input (120G.3.4).  
 For task force discussion.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2** P **234** L **17** # **79**

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** TP4 ERL

ERL is TBD

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace TBD with 8.5 dB and see ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0121

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #125.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2** P **234** L **20** # **85**

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** TP4 transition time

At TP4 it is no possible to get 7.5 ps, please put something reasonable

*SuggestedRemedy*

A fast ASIC with 7.6 ps output rise time when passes through a mated board with just 5 dB loss produces 12 ps 20-80% rise time, given that real module may have less than min HCB loss then 10 ps would be reasonable rise time.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 [Editor's note: subclause, page, and line changed from 120G.3.1, 231, and 25.]  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. However, there are proposals to other comments relating to technical completeness that include changes to the transition time.  
 Resolve using the response to comments 14 and 19.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2** P **234** L **30** # **126**

Ran, Adeo Intel  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** TP4 AC CM noise

(Addressing editor's note requiring confirmation)  
 Editor's note indicates that AC common-mode specification needs confirmation. It has not been confirmed that the existing limit of 17.5 mV RMS is obtainable, but there is no consensus on another value.

Work is planned to refine the measurement method to allow separation of different sources of common mode signal and fine-tuned specification, but it will likely continue into later phases of P802.3ck.

This should not preclude progressing to WGB with the current method and limit.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2** P **234** L **32** # **35**

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** TP4 AC CM noise

The editor's note indicates that the value specified for the module output AC CM noise requires confirmation. No proposals to change the specified values have been accepted. However, it should be noted that there is ongoing discussion on this topic.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #126.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.3** P **237** L **37** # **138**

Ran, Adeo Intel  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** TP4a/TPRLCD (bucket1)

For module output (120G.3.2, table 120G-3), host input (120G.3.3, table 120G-6), and module input (120G.3.4, table 120G-9), the reference subclause for "Common-mode to differential return loss (min)" is incorrect - 120G.3.1.2 discusses ERL.

There is one subclause that discusses RLCD, 120G.3.1.1, but it is currently specific to host output.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change reference from 120G.3.1.2 to 120G.3.1.1 in the 3 tables.

Rephrase the text in 120G.3.1.1 to refer to both host and module, output and input.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The reference to 120G.3.1.2 is incorrect and should be 120G.3.1.1.  
 By convention, it is common to refer to specifications for different test points without changing the text in the referenced subclause. No changes to the text in 120G.3.1.1 are required.  
 For RLCD in Table 120G-3, Table 120G-6, and Table 120G-9, change the reference to 120G.3.1.1.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2.1** P **234** L **38** # **148**

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** TP4 EQ settings

What the module output is being asked to do is not equalization, but the opposite (emphasis), and it may have to adjust its swing also. The two modes aren't states and there is no state machine.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "two equalization states: short and long." to "two output modes, called short and long." Change subclause title from "Module output transmit equalizer control" to "Module output mode control". Change table title from "Module state mapping" to "Module output modes".

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The two "states" provide signals with a different set of characteristics including shape and amplitude.  
 Change "two equalization states: short and long." to "two output modes: short and long."  
 Change subclause title from "Module output transmit equalizer control" to "Module output mode control".  
 Change table title from "Module state mapping" to "Module output mode mapping".  
 Implement with editorial license.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2.1** P **234** L **38** # **147**

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** TP4 EQ settings

The module output doesn't have to "support" two things (e.g. receive, co-operate, enable, or similar), it has to actually do them.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "The module output shall support two..." to "The module output shall operate in two..."

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The proposed change in wording does not improve the quality of the draft.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2.1 P 234 L 41 # 150

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TP4 EQ settings

I wonder what "control variable" means, as I don't believe it is used anywhere else in this document and in this subclause it's "implementation dependent". Also I wonder whether providing this mapping from S and L to 0 and 1 is helpful - maybe it should be left to CMIS and the SFF committee.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider telling the story without "control variable", 0 and 1, and change the middle column of Table 120G-4 from 0 and 1 to S and L.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Define the two module output modes as "short" and "long", replacing the tx\_eq\_state variable and related 0 and 1 states.  
 Implement with editorial license.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2.1 P 234 L 41 # 149

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP4 EQ settings

The module output is not tx\_anything, it's part of the receive path.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "tx\_eq\_state" to "module output mode".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement suggested remedy with editorial license.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2.1 P 235 L 2 # 151

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP4 EQ settings

The list of module "Host Electrical Interface Codes" is kept in SFF-8024, Rev 4.8, Table 4-5 Host Electrical Interface Codes, and the column is headed "specification". "Application" is something else (a pair of host electrical interface and media interface specifications) as defined in CMIS.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "application name" to "host electrical interface" or "module electrical interface".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Feedback from individuals participating in related updates to SFF-8024 indicate that this naming scheme is under review right now. Update this terminology once SFF-8024 has stabilized.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2.1 P 235 L 8 # 152

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D TP4 EQ settings

"IEEE Interface Type" is too grand: IEEE is much wider than 802.3, and the Capitals Are Unwarranted.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "IEEE 802.3 interface type"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2.1 P 235 L 10 # 74

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP4 EQ settings

In table 120G-4 AUI-short and long are introduced but there is no description what AUI-S and AUI-L are!

SuggestedRemedy

We need to define channel loss range for AUI-S and AUI-L.  
 ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0121 investigates possible channel loss ranges for AUI S/L, the result indicate 10 dB is about optimum but given how close 10 dB is to CR host loss of 10.975 dB the proposal is to use 10.975 dB as the demarcation point for AUI-S/L.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The intent is that the host would select the mode that is most helpful given the combination of characteristics of the host PCB, connector, and device (e.g., package loss, receiver characteristics). It is therefore not necessary or helpful to provide specific guidance as proposed in the suggested remedy.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2.2 P 235 L 33 # 36

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TP4 EO XTALK

The specified values for the module output EH/VEC crosstalk parameters (2x) are TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide values.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #17.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2.2** P **235** L **33** # **63**

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** TP4 EO XTALK

There are some TBDs for crosstalk calibration specs for Host Output test. According to the analysis explored in wu\_3ck\_adhoc\_02\_010621.pdf, the target swing at TP4 shall be aligned with that of Module output spec, which is 900 mV. Similarly, the output voltage swing at TP1a, which is 870 mV now, shall be aligned among Host output, Module output, Host input, & Module input specs.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Propose the following paragraph to replace the original one  
 Module output: 120G.3.2.2 (Page 235, L33)  
 "... with target differential peak-to-peak amplitude of 870 mV and target transition time of 19 ps."

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #17.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2.2** P **235** L **33** # **69**

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** TP4 EO XTALK

The target differential peak-to-peak amplitude and transition time, as observed at TP1a, are TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Since the crosstalk generator is used to represent near-end aggression from the the host transmitter outputs, the largest amplitude and smallest transition time allowed for a host output (as observed at TP1a) should be used to represent worst-case aggression.  
 Change:  
 "The crosstalk generator is calibrated at TP1a (without the use of a reference receiver) with target differential peak-to-peak amplitude of TBD mV and target transition time of TBD ps."  
 To:  
 "The crosstalk generator is calibrated so that the differential peak-to-peak output voltage and transition time, as measured at TP1a, are a close to the limits in Table 120G-1 as practical."

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #17.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2.2** P **235** L **34** # **127**

Ran, Adeo Intel  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** TP4 EO XTALK

(addressing TBD)  
 "The crosstalk generator is calibrated at TP1a (without the use of a reference receiver) with target differential peak-to-peak amplitude of TBD mV and target transition time of TBD ps"

This is the module output test; the crosstalk generator represents the host output. We specify the PtP amplitude and transition time for hosts at TP1a in Table 120G-1. The calibration should use the maximum amplitude and minimum transition time values from that table.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the quoted sentence to:

"The crosstalk generator is calibrated at TP1a (without the use of a reference receiver) with targets equal to the Differential peak-to-peak output voltage (max) and Transition time (min, 20% to 80%) in Table 120G-1".

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #17.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.2.2** P **235** L **34** # **17**

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** TP4 EO XTALK

The module near-end output signal should be measured with a crosstalk signal equivalent to the largest and fastest signal that the host can supply. The risetime for the far -end signal can be slower.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "The crosstalk generator is calibrated at TP1a (without the use of a reference receiver) with target differential peak-to-peak amplitude of TBD mV and target transition time of TBD ps." to "The crosstalk generator is calibrated at TP1a (without the use of a reference receiver) with target differential peak-to-peak amplitude of 870 mV and target transition time of 7.5 ps for the near end measurement and target transition time of 15 ps for the far-end measurement."

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Comments 17, 63, 69, 86, 127 propose values for these parameters.  
 Presentation brown\_3ck\_02 provides a summary of the proposals.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.2.2 P 235 L 34 # 86

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP4 EO XTALK

Addressing the TBD in the paragraph

*SuggestedRemedy*

A fast ASIC with 7.6 ps output rise time when passes through a mated board with just 5 dB loss produces 12 ps 20-80% rise time, the full swing is about 2x. But given that module PCB may have lower than HCB loss, then I suggest 20 ps for the slew from -350 mV to +350 mV and with amplitude of 700 mV, the reason amplitude is reduced is due assumption that signal will have pre-emphasis on for this measurement otherwise one could go with 900 mV amplitude I don't believe that is reasonable.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #17.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.3.2 P 238 L 6 # 18

Dudek, Mike Marvell

Comment Type T Comment Status D TP4a SIT

The host only needs to meet either the near-end or far-end parameters. This should be clear in this "shall" statement.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change " The input shall satisfy the input tolerance with the parameters in Table 120G-7" to " The input shall satisfy the input tolerance with either the near-end or the far-end parameters in Table 120G-7"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
A statement later in the subclause indicates that the host input need only meet one of the two stressors. See page 239 line 38.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.3.2.1 P 238 L 54 # 128

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP4a SIT XTALK

(addressing TBD)

"The counter propagating crosstalk signals during calibration of the stressed signal are asynchronous with target amplitude of TBD mV peak-to-peak differential and 20% to 80% target transition time of TBD ps"

This is the host stressed input test; the actual counter-propagating signals are from the host's own transmitter. For calibration purposes we can assume that the host uses the maximum amplitude and minimum transition time. If the host does not reach the limits, then it may benefit from less crosstalk during the actual test - but as long as it meets the host output specifications, it is acceptable.

We specify the PtP amplitude and transition time for hosts at TP1a in Table 120G-1. The calibration should use the maximum amplitude and minimum transition time values from that table.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the quoted sentence to:

"The counter-propagating crosstalk signals are asynchronous with respect to the input signal and are calibrated at TP1a (without the use of a reference receiver) with targets equal to the Differential peak-to-peak output voltage (max) and Transition time (min, 20% to 80%) in Table 120G-1".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Resolve using the response to comment #19.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

CI 120G SC 120G.3.3.2.1 P 238 L 54 # 70

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TP4a SIT XTALK

The target differential peak-to-peak amplitude and transition time, as observed at TP1a, are TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Since the crosstalk generator is used as a proxy for the host transmitter(s) during stressed input signal calibration, the amplitude and transition times should be set to agree with the values measured at the output of the host under test (TP1a).

Change:

"The counter propagating crosstalk signals during calibration of the stressed signal are asynchronous with target amplitude of TBD mV peak-to-peak differential and 20% to 80% target transition time of TBD ps as measured at TP1a (without the use of a reference receiver)."

To:

"The counter propagating crosstalk signals are asynchronous during calibration of the stressed signal. The crosstalk generator is calibrated so that the differential peak-to-peak output voltage and transition time, as measured at TP1a, are as close as practical to the values measured at the output of the host under test (at TP1a) without the use of a reference receiver."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #19.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.3.2.1 P 238 L 54 # 19

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP4a SIT XTALK

The crosstalk used in the calibration of the host stressed signal should match the crosstalk used for the test for the module output

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "The counter propagating crosstalk signals during calibration of the stressed signal are asynchronous with target amplitude of TBD mV peak-to-peak differential and 20% to 80% target transition time of TBD ps." to "The counter propagating crosstalk signals during calibration of the stressed signal are asynchronous with target differential peak-to-peak amplitude of 870 mV and target transition time of 7.5 ps for the near end calibration and target transition time of 15 ps for the far-end calibration"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Comments 19, 87, 64, 70, 128, 37 propose new values for EH and VEC based on the new measurement methodology.  
 For task force discussion.  
 Presentation brown\_3ck\_02 provides a summary of the proposals.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.3.2.1 P 238 L 54 # 64

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TP4a SIT XTALK

There are some TBDs for crosstalk calibration specs for Host Output test. According to the analysis explored in wu\_3ck\_adhoc\_02\_010621.pdf, the target swing at TP4 shall be aligned with that of Module output spec, which is 900 mV. Similarly, the output voltage swing at TP1a, which is 870 mV now, shall be aligned among Host output, Module output, Host input, & Module input specs.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Propose the following paragraph to replace the original one  
 Host input: 120G.3.3.2.1 (Page 238, L54)  
 "... with target amplitude of 870 mV peak-to-peak differential and 20% to 80% target transition time of 19 ps as measured at TP1a ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #19.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.3.2.1 P 238 L 54 # 37

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TP4a SIT XTALK

The specified values for the host stressed input crosstalk parameters (2x) are TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Provide values.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #19.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.3.2.1 P 238 L 54 # 87

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP4a SIT XTALK

Addressing the TBD in the paragraph

*SuggestedRemedy*

A fast ASIC with 7.6 ps output rise time when passes through a mated board with just 5 dB loss produces 12 ps 20-80% rise time. I suggest 12 ps rise time and possibly as fast as 10 ps but would be difficult to generate such fast rise time through mated board. Given that the signal will have pre-emphasis enabled getting more than 800 mV could be difficult. I suggest to go with 800 mV

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #19.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

CI 120G SC 120G.3.3.2.1 P 239 L 40 # 67

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D TP4a SIT levels

The stressed input signal calibration procedure states that "random jitter and the pattern generator output levels are adjusted (without exceeding the differential peak-to-peak input voltage tolerance specification as shown in Table 120G-6) to result in the eye height for all three eyes given in Table 120G-7 with the setting of the CTLE that minimizes the vertical eye closure." The term "output levels" is ambiguous. It could be interpreted to be "pattern generator output amplitude" or "individual PAM-4 signal levels". It seems that the latter is intended but the individual PAM-4 signal levels should not be allowed to be adjusted so far that the level separation mismatch ratio ("RLM") is too low.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the sentence with the following text:

"The pattern generator output is adjusted so that the height of the smallest eye matches the value in Table 120G-7, and the height of all three eyes agree to the largest extent possible, for the CTLE setting that minimizes vertical eye closure. The differential peak-to-peak input voltage tolerance given in Table 120G-6 is not exceeded. Individual PAM-4 signal levels may be adjusted to improve the agreement of the three eye heights but the level separation mismatch ratio (RLM) is at least 0.95. RLM is defined in 120D.3.1.2 and is calculated using VM0, VM1, VM2, and VM3 as defined in 120G.5.2 in place of V0, V1, V2, and V3 respectively. Random jitter amplitude may also be adjusted to achieve the eye height targets.

A similar change is suggested for 120G.3.4.1.1 (page 242, line 17).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy in 120G.3.3.2.1 and a similar change in 12G.3.4.1.1 with editorial license.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.4 P 240 L 17 # 38

Brown, Matt Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D TP1 ERL

In table 120G-9, the specified value for module input ERL (min) is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a value.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #125.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.4.1 P 240 L 46 # 88

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EH/VEC

Table 120G-10 needs to be updated now that measurements are with 50 mUI window

SuggestedRemedy

See ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0121 and reduce eye height window from 15 mV to 9.5 mV  
See ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0121 and reduce eye height window from 7.5 dB to 14+/- 0.5 dB

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #40.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.4.1.1 P 242 L 2 # 71

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D TP1 EH/VEC XTALK

The target differential peak-to-peak amplitude and slew time of the crosstalk generator, as observed at TP4, are TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Since the crosstalk generator is used as a proxy for the module transmitter(s) during stressed input signal calibration, the amplitude and transition times should be set to agree with the values measured at the output of the module under test (TP4).

Change:

"The counter propagating crosstalk signals during calibration of the stressed signal are asynchronous with target amplitude of TBD mV peak-to-peak differential and target slew time between -TBD mV and TBD mV of TBD ps as measured at TP4 (without the use of a reference equalizer)."

To:

"The counter propagating crosstalk signals are asynchronous during calibration of the stressed signal. The crosstalk generator is calibrated so that the differential peak-to-peak output voltage and transition time, as measured at TP4, are as close as practical to the values measured at the output of the module under test (at TP4) without the use of a reference receiver."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #20.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

CI 120G SC 120G.3.4.1.1 P 242 L 2 # 65

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek

Comment Type T Comment Status D TP1 EH/VEC XTALK

There are some TBDs for crosstalk calibration specs for Host Output test. According to the analysis explored in wu\_3ck\_adhoc\_02\_010621.pdf, the target swing at TP4 shall be aligned with that of Module output spec, which is 900 mV. Similarly, the output voltage swing at TP1a, which is 870 mV now, shall be aligned among Host output, Module output, Host input, & Module input specs.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Propose the following paragraph to replace the original one  
 Module input: 120G.3.4.1.1 (Page 242, L2)  
 "... with target amplitude of 900 mV peak-to-peak differential and target slew time between -2.7 V and +2.7 V of 12 ps as measured at TP4 ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #20.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.4.1.1 P 242 L 2 # 20

Dudek, Mike Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP1 EH/VEC XTALK

The crosstalk used in the calibration of the module stressed signal should match the crosstalk used for the test for the host output

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "a target amplitude of 900mV differential peak-to-peak and target slew time between -270mV and +270mV of 7.5ps"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The following comments propose values for the missing parameters: 20, 65, 71, 129, 89. Presentation brown\_3ck\_02 provides a summary of the proposals.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.4.1.1 P 242 L 2 # 39

Brown, Matt Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D TP1 EH/VEC XTALK

The specified values for the module stressed input crosstalk parameters (4x) are TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Provide values.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #20.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.4.1.1 P 242 L 2 # 129

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP1 EH/VEC XTALK

(addressing TBD)  
 "The counter propagating crosstalk signals during calibration of the stressed signal are asynchronous with target amplitude of TBD mV peak-to-peak differential and target slew time between -TBD mV and TBD mV of TBD ps as measured at TP4"

This is the module stressed input test; the actual counter-propagating signals are from the module's own transmitter. For calibration purposes we can assume that the module uses the maximum amplitude and minimum transition time. If the module does not reach the limits, then it may benefit from less crosstalk during the actual test - but as long as it meets the module output specifications, it is acceptable.

We specify the PtP amplitude and transition time for modules at TP4 in Table 120G-3. The calibration should use the maximum amplitude and minimum transition time values from that table.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the quoted sentence to:

"The counter-propagating crosstalk signals are asynchronous with respect to the input signal and are calibrated at TP4 (without the use of a reference receiver) with targets equal to the Differential peak-to-peak output voltage (max) and Transition time (min, 20% to 80%) in Table 120G-3".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #20.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.4.1.1 P 242 L 3 # 89

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP1 EH/VEC XTALK

Addressing the TBD in the paragraph

*SuggestedRemedy*

A fast ASIC with 7.6 ps output rise time when passes through a mated board with just 5 dB loss produces 12 ps 20-80% rise time, the full swing is about 2x. But given that module PCB may have lower than HCB loss, then I suggest 20 ps for the slew from -350 mV to +350 mV and with amplitude of 700 mV, the reason amplitude is reduced is due assumption that signal will have pre-emphasis on for this measurement otherwise one could go with 900 mV amplitude I don't believe that is reasonable.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #20.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl **120G** SC **120G.5.2** P **245** L **9** # **153**

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** TP1a gDC (WG)

By allowing stronger gDC with stronger gDC2, we can have up to 12 dB of peaking for gCD2 = -1 but up to 16 dB for gDC2 = -3 - yet we don't expect the maximum channel loss to vary like that.

*SuggestedRemedy*

For TP1a, change the second -12 to -11, and -13 to -10 (so the strongest "CTLE peaking" is 13).

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.5.2** P **245** L **18** # **90**

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** TP4 gDC (WG)

gDC near end of -2 dB result in some cases VEC to increase by more than 10 dB when TX FIR is optimized about in the middle and when that module is plugged into low loss host then you end up with excessive peaking!

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please reduce gDC for TP4 near end from -2 dB to -1 dB

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.5.2** P **245** L **18** # **73**

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** TP4 NE/FE names

In table 120G-11 we refer to TP4 near end and TP4 far end, but table 120G-4 we refer to AUI-S and AUI-L short and long. It would be helpful to be consistent with the terminology.

*SuggestedRemedy*

I suggest replacing TP4 near end with TP4-S or short and TP4 far end with TP4-L or long to align with AUI-S/L..  
 The AUI short covers from TP4 near end up to 10.975 dB, and AUI long covers from >10.975 dB to 16 dB channels.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the responses to comments #74 and #148.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.5.2** P **246** L **23** # **154**

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** EO method

Of all the options in daw\_e\_3ck\_01a\_1020, this draft has the most primitive (rectangular eye mask) although it is described as a histogram. It's an inefficient/inaccurate way of measuring a signal and provides weak and uncertain protection against too much jitter. This will get worse if we relax the VEC limits, and is a particular concern for very short host channels (see Mike Dudek's work).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change from a 4-cornered mask with corners at  $t = ts \pm 0.05$ ,  $V = \pm H_{min}/2$  to a 10-cornered mask with corners at  $t = ts \pm 0.05$ ,  $ts \pm 0.07$ ,  $ts \pm 0.1$ ,  $V = \pm H_{min}/2$ ,  $\pm H_{min} * 0.4$ ,  $\pm 0$ .  
 (In case it's not clear, Hmin, already specified, is the greater of EH and Eye Amplitude - VEC. There will be discussion about changing those limits from other comments, but this is a simple scalable method that can remain as the EH and VEC limits are revised.)

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness.  
 The comment does not provide sufficient evidence to support the proposed changes.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

CI 120G SC 120G.5.2 P 246 L 23 # 4

Mellitz, Richard

Samtec

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EO method (bucket1)

Step h and j in 120G.5.2 Eye opening measurement method indicate "over the time interval  $t_s \pm 0.05$  UI and not "within 0.025 UI of time TCmid"  
 Comment 41 was resolved with "Alt. 2" with TBD = 50 mUI from healey\_3ck\_02\_1020 indicating 1 window around Ts for histogram measurements.

SuggestedRemedy

remove "and not within 0.025 UI of time Tcmid from steps h and j in 120G.5.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The reference text is intended to point out that the phrase "within 0.025 UI of time TCmid" is no longer relevant. However, as written it is somewhat ambiguous.  
 Change: 'and not "within 0.025 UI of time TCmid"  
 To: 'instead of "within 0.025 UI of time TCmid"'

CI 120G SC 120G.5.2 P 246 L 38 # 40

Brown, Matt

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D EH/VEC

The editor's note indicates that the specified values for EH/VEC value may need to be updated due to measurement method being updated in D1.4.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide updated values for host output, module output, host input, and module input if necessary and remove editor's note.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Many comments propose new values for EH and VEC at TP1a, TP1, TP4, and TP4 as summarized in the presentation brown\_3ck\_01\_0120.  
 For task force discussion.

CI 136 SC 136.8.11.7.1 P 114 L 37 # 48

Lusted, Kent

Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D training (bucket1)

Based on the link training change proposed in [https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/20\\_10/lusted\\_3ck\\_02\\_1020.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/20_10/lusted_3ck_02_1020.pdf), a new variable "use\_quiet\_in\_training" was defined in Clause 136.8.11.7.1. This variable has an explicit setting of FALSE for 50 Gb/s per lane PHYs. However, no specific mention of the variable value is made for 100 Gb/s per lane PHYs. This could lead to confusion in the industry as some vendors may interpret the "use\_quiet\_in\_training" capability as optional to implement, while it was intended to be mandatory for 100 Gb/s per lane PHYs.

SuggestedRemedy

In CI 162.8.11, add a new entry to the list as follows:  
 h) the variable "use\_quiet\_in\_training" (see 136.8.11.7.1) is always set to TRUE for 100 Gb/s per lane PHYs."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #53.

CI 136 SC 136.8.11.7.1 P 114 L 39 # 52

Slavick, Jeff

Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D training (bucket1)

The use\_quiet\_in\_training variable controls access to certain states. When TRUE it indicates access to the state is allowed. So the "and is set to FALSE otherwise" is just confusing since a boolean is either TRUE or FALSE and the first sentence is defining what happens when it's TRUE not what makes it TRUE

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "and is set to FALSE otherwise" from the first sentence in the definition of use\_quiet\_in\_training

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 136 SC 136.8.11.7.1 P 114 L 39 # 53

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D training (bucket1)

The intent of the new QUIET state is to make it so all newly developed PHYs will use this features to avoid the deadlock situation. So the QUIET state should mandatory except for 50G PHY types.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the last sentence of the use\_quiet\_in\_training definition to read as "This variable is always set to FALSE for 50 Gb/s per lane PHYs, otherwise it's set to TRUE..

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162 SC 162.8.11 P 150 L 34 # 49

Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D training (bucket1)

The requirement to "assert local\_tf\_lock ... provided that there is a compliant signal containing training frames at the PMD input" is insufficiently detailed. It is unclear if a receiver should react to a signal that is compliant with respect to amplitude, jitter, etc but does not have a valid training frame format. It is possible that a few of the first training frames during startup are malformed logically yet meet the electrical compliance requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Change item g) to be "... provided that there is a compliant signal containing valid training frames at the PMD input."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3 P 152 L 30 # 23

Brown, Matt Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D TX RLCD

In Table 162-10, the specified value for transmitter common-mode to differential mode return loss is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a value or equation and update PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #118.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3 P 152 L 30 # 118

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D TX RLCD

(addressing TBD)  
Tx CM to differential return loss refers to 92.8.3.3 with equation TBD.

In clause 92 the RLCD of Tx and Rx have the same specifications - eq (92-2) in 92.8.3.3 and eq (92-21) in 92.8.4.3, respectively, which are identical; and there is no RLCD for cable assembly.

The conversion loss specifications may need more work, but for the purpose of technical completeness, it is suggested to use the same equation used for the cable assembly, since in both cases the measurement involves mated connectors and results should be comparable.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a subclause for Tx differential to common mode return loss, with equation identical to equation (162-9), or point to (162-9).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

For task force discussion.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3 P 152 L 35 # 141

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status D pulse peak (WG)

Clumsy "x vf" way of defining linear fit pulse peak (min)

SuggestedRemedy

Use "Linear fit pulse peak ratio" as in 163 and 163A.3.2.1. Note the unit in the table changes to V/V.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3 P 152 L 35 # 140

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D asymmetric hosts (WG)

The recommended maximum insertion loss allocation for the host traces plus BGA footprint and host connector footprint, of 6.875 dB, compares very poorly with C2M's host insertion loss up to 11.9 dB, making passive copper expensive and unattractive for a switch, while 6.875 dB is overkill for a NIC. Server-switch links will get made with an asymmetric loss budget, so it would be better for the standard to regularise what will happen anyway. By the way, many server-switch cables will be asymmetric too (different form factors at server and switch ends), and that's already allowed in this draft.

*SuggestedRemedy*

As we have done for C2M, create two kinds of CR ports. Host loss allocations of 3.75 dB and 10 dB. Short can connect to short or long; long to long is not supported. Add entries in Clause 73 Auto-Negotiation to advertise short and long to the other end. In Table 162-10, provide separate limits for Linear fit pulse peak (min). In Table 162-14, provide separate rows for Test channel insertion loss: for testing the short host input the values for Test 2 are 10-6.875 = 3.125 dB higher (26.75 dB and 27.75 dB), while for the long host input the values for Test 2 are 6.875-3.75 = 3.125 dB lower (20.5 dB and 21.5 dB). No change needed for Test 1. In 162A.4, provide two equations for IL\_PCBmax and for ILHostMax and show them in Fig 162A-1 and 2. Provide two Value columns in Table 162A-1. Adjust figures 162-3 and 4.

In 162.11.7.1.1, zp, representing the extra loss a host has above an MCB, could be made asymmetric but I believe that would not bring an improvement in accuracy. There could be a third kind of CR port with 6.875 dB but this would be useful for only a subset of switch-switch links, for which passive copper is a subset anyway, so it doesn't seem worthwhile.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3.1 P 154 L 6 # 51

Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D LF resolution (WG)

Samples per UI, M, may not be as straight forward for measurement equipment because architectures may vary amongst instruments. All things being ideal, as in simulation, specification of M would seem straight forward. However, what seems most important is the confidence of the results especially when we are evaluating sigma\_e, sigma\_n, and values extracted from histograms. For the example of histogram measurement, and good argument could be made for M to be at least 100. Setting M to at least 32 might be sufficient for V\_f r c(i) measurements.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a line to line 7. Interpolations and raw measurement adjustments shall be sufficient to support a least a 95% confidence of all derived values for voltage and noise specifications.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3.1.4 P 155 L 46 # 59

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TX EQ (bucket1)

The step size of TX EQ coefficient had been changed from 2% to 2.5%. The "coefficient step size" shall be modified from 0.02 to 0.025.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change <... to a request to "increment" shall be between 0.005 and 0.02, ...> to <... to a request to "increment" shall be between 0.005 and 0.025, ...>.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3.1.4 P 155 L 47 # 60

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TX EQ (bucket1)

The step size of TX EQ coefficient had been changed from 2% to 2.5%. The "coefficient step size" shall be modified from -0.02 to -0.025.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change <... to a request to "decrement" shall be between -0.02 and -0.005.> to <... to a request to "decrement" shall be between -0.025 and -0.005.>.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3.4 P 156 L 46 # 110

Hidaka, Yasuo Credo Semiconductor, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D PRBS9Q (WG)

A detail definition of twelve edges in PRBS9Q is recommended to improve reproducibility of even-odd jitter measurement.

*Suggested Remedy*

Add a new table "PRBS9Q pattern symbols used for even-odd jitter measurements" similar to Table 120D-4, but replacing the values as follows:

Label: Description : Gray coded PAM4 symbol : first : TR begins : TR ends : last

REF	: Reference	: 33333	: 1	: -	: -	: 5
R03	: 0 to 3 rise	: 1000 331	: 260	: 263	: 264	: 266
F30	: 3 to 0 fall	: 233333 001	: 511	: 5	: 6	: 8
R12	: 1 to 2 rise	: 3111 23	: 265	: 268	: 269	: 270
F21	: 2 to 1 fall	: 1222 10	: 466	: 469	: 470	: 471
R01	: 0 to 1 rise	: 2000 13	: 195	: 198	: 199	: 200
F10	: 1 to 0 fall	: 21111 0003	: 256	: 260	: 261	: 264
R23	: 2 to 3 rise	: 3222 330	: 210	: 213	: 214	: 216
F32	: 3 to 2 fall	: 0333 20	: 401	: 404	: 405	: 406
R02	: 0 to 2 rise	: 2000 23	: 275	: 278	: 279	: 280
F20	: 2 to 0 fall	: 12222 001	: 321	: 325	: 326	: 328
R13	: 1 to 3 rise	: 0111 331	: 166	: 169	: 170	: 172
F31	: 3 to 1 fall	: 0333 10	: 107	: 110	: 111	: 112

Add an exception to use the new table instead of Table 120D-4, when PRBS9Q is used as the test pattern for even-odd jitter measurement.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that is not necessary for technical completeness. However, adding information as provided in the comment may improve the quality of the draft. The commenter is encouraged to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3.4 P 156 L 46 # 109

Hidaka, Yasuo Credo Semiconductor, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D PRBS9Q (WG)

A detail definition of PRBS9Q with the entire sequence is recommended to avoid implementation errors.

*Suggested Remedy*

Define PRBS9Q as a new clause in clause 120.5.11.2 using clause 120.5.11.2.1 as a template.

Modify the second paragraph of 120.5.11.2.1 as follows:

When the PRBS9Q test pattern enabled, it replaces the signal on the output lane(s) for which it is enabled. The PRBS9Q test pattern is a repeating 511-symbol sequence formed by Gray coding pairs of bits from two repetitions of the PRBS9 pattern into PAM4 symbols as described in 120.5.7. The PRBS pattern generator produces the same result as the implementation shown in Figure XX-X, which implements the generator polynomial shown in Equation (YY-Y). Since the PRBS9 pattern is an odd number of bits in length, bits which are mapped as the first bit of a PAM4 symbol during one repetition of the PRBS9 sequence are mapped as the second bit of a PAM4 symbol during the next repetition of the PRBS9 sequence, and bits which are mapped as the second bit of a PAM4 symbol are mapped as the first bit of the following symbol in the next repetition of the PRBS9 sequence. For example, if the PRBS9 generator used to create the PRBS9Q sequence is initialized to a seed value of 111111111 (with the leftmost bit in S0 and the rightmost in S8), the PRBS9Q sequence is the following Gray coded PAM4 symbols, transmitted left to right:  
 0012322303231310010331213302202231320111030230213332303130303000  
 1003020031203332002123313231011003321022213103113222031333131300  
 0201311013311222101130233203202201221210013321323200113322333330  
 0110332203232300120233102211211010301312003221320210023220022223  
 0022122011202030031102321012312202130333101201321112010201010000  
 3010130102311113013221021203033011133122320310321223102110202000  
 1302033021032223303201211311312302232330021132121300321122111100  
 033111231121200023121031233233303100202301123213133012123012222.

Draw Figure XX-X "PRBS9 pattern generator" similar to Figure 94-6 but according to polynomial  $1 + x^5 + x^9$ .

Define Equation (YY-Y) as  $G(x) = 1 + x^5 + x^9$  or make a reference to the polynomial in Table 68-6.

Make a reference to the new clause from 162.9.3.4.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that is not necessary for technical completeness. However, adding information as provided in the comment may improve the quality of the draft. The commenter is encouraged to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.

## IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

CI 162 SC 162.9.3.6 P 157 L 30 # 143

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D RX RLCC (WG)

1. This paragraph claims that the minimum common-mode to common-mode return loss is specified to reduce reflections of signals that were generated originally as differential and end up as differential. This is not the case: it is included to contain a gross build-up of CM voltage on the line that is otherwise unbounded. If it were intended to address mixed-mode issues it would be a tighter spec, but that's not viable for front-panel connectors. Other specs such as Rx Differential to common-mode return loss and Tx Common-mode to differential mode return loss address the problem stated.

2. This is a standard, not an attempt at a textbook. We don't give any justifications for most other specs; there is no reason that this one should be different.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the paragraph

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.

CI 162 SC 162.9.4 P 158 L 16 # 24

Brown, Matt

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D RX RLCD

In Table 162-13, the specified value for receiver differential to common-mode return loss is TBD

*SuggestedRemedy*

Provide a value or equation and update PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #119.

CI 162 SC 162.9.4 P 158 L 16 # 119

Ran, Adeel

Intel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D RX RLCD

(addressing TBD)

Rx differential to common-mode (conversion) input return loss refers to 92.8.4.3 with value TBD.

In clause 92 the RLCD of Tx and Rx have the same specifications - eq (92-2) in 92.8.3.3 and eq (92-21) in 92.8.4.3, respectively, which are identical; and there is no RLCD for cable assembly.

The conversion loss specifications may need more work, but for the purpose of technical completeness, it is suggested to use the same equation used for the cable assembly, since in both cases the measurement involves mated connectors and results should be comparable.

As an alternative consider removing this specification (the Rx owns its performance).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a subclause for Rx differential to common mode return loss, with equation identical to equation (162-9), or point to (162-9).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy.

For task force discussion.

CI 162 SC 162.9.4.1 P 158 L 23 # 46

Brown, Matt

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D rate tolerance (bucket1)

The list of related subclauses should include 162.9.4.2.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "162.9.4.3 and 162.9.4.4" to "162.9.4.2, 162.9.4.3, and 162.9.4.4".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 162 SC 162.11 P 162 L 36 # 91  
 Haser, Alex Molex  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D withdrawn  
 "Cable assembly supports... achievable cable length of at least 2 m"; spec is written around a 1.75 m cable  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change text to "...achievable cable length of at least 1.75 m"  
 Proposed Response Response Status Z  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 162 SC 162.11 P 162 L 38 # 92  
 Haser, Alex Molex  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D withdrawn  
 "Cable assembly supports... achievable cable length of at least 2 m"; spec is written around a 1.75 m cable  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change text to "...achievable cable length of at least 1.75 m"  
 Proposed Response Response Status Z  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 162 SC 162.11 P 162 L 40 # 93  
 Haser, Alex Molex  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D withdrawn  
 "Cable assembly supports... achievable cable length of at least 2 m"; spec is written around a 1.75 m cable  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change text to "...achievable cable length of at least 1.75 m"  
 Proposed Response Response Status Z  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 162 SC 162.11 P 163 L 17 # 113  
 Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D CA ERL  
 CA ERL requirement is TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace TBD with 9dB  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment#103

Cl 162 SC 162.11 P 163 L 17 # 25  
 Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D CA ERL  
 In Table 162-16, the specified value for cable assembly ERL is TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Provide a value or equation and update PICS.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment#103

Cl 162 SC 162.11 P 163 L 17 # 120  
 Ran, Adee Intel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D CA ERL  
 (addressing TBD)  
 Minimum cable assembly ERL is TBD.  
 In another comment I am suggesting setting the minimum ERL of a MTF to 10.3 dB to enable measurement of the internal host circuitry. Based on this proposal, the ERL of a cable assembly cannot exceed 10.3 dB.  
 It can be assumed that the cable has more uniform impedance than the host board, so its ERL will be closer to that of a MTF.  
 The suggested value allows 1.3 dB difference for cable assembly implementation.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change TBD to 9 dB.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment#103

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 162 SC 162.11 P 163 L 18 # 94  
 Haser, Alex Molex  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** CA ERL  
 Fill in TBD for CA ERL limit  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace TBD with 7.4 dB based on champion\_3ck\_02\_1020.pdf slide 6  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment#103

Cl 162 SC 162.11 P 163 L 18 # 103  
 Champion, Bruce TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** CA ERL  
 Cable Assembly ERL listed as TBD in Table 162-16  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 TBD to be changed to 7.4 dB. See champion\_3ck\_02\_1020.pdf  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The comment proposes 7.4 dB; see champion\_3ck\_02\_1020.pdf, comment#94 proposes 7.4 dB, comment#25 proposes a value or equation, comment#120 proposes 9 dB, comment#113 proposes 9 dB.  
 For task force discussion.  
 Update PICS with accepted value.

Cl 162 SC 162.11.4 P 165 L 8 # 101  
 Champion, Bruce TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** CA RLCD  
 Cable Assembly Diff-to-Common Mode Return loss is too tight for high volume production testing at the higher frequencies. Failures are occurring because of testing artifacts and not because of poor cable assemblies. A slight relaxation of the limit is requested to account for this.

SuggestedRemedy  
 It is recommended to use the following equation for this limit:  
 Return Loss(f)  $\geq 22 - 10(f/26.56)$  for  $0.05 \leq f < 26.56$   
 Return Loss(f)  $\geq 19 - 7(f/26.56)$  for  $26.56 \leq f \leq 40$  GHz  
 See presentation  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement suggested remedy.  
 Pending review of cited presentation.  
[https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21\\_01/champion\\_3ck\\_02\\_0121.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/champion_3ck_02_0121.pdf)

Cl 162 SC 162.11.6 P 166 L 37 # 102  
 Champion, Bruce TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** CA RLCC  
 There is a discrepancy between what is specified for the MTF CM-to-CM RL and the cable assembly CM-to-CM RL.  
 The MTF CM-to-CM RL limit is set to -3 dB. When MTFs designed close to this limit are used in cable assembly Tp1-Tp4 channels, the Tp1-Tp4 CM-to-CM RL will fail the -2 dB limit.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 It is recommended to use the following equation to take into account the worst case MTF design.  
 Return Loss(f)  $\geq 1.8$  for  $0.05 \leq f \leq 40$

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement suggested remedy. Pending review of cited presentation.  
[https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21\\_01/champion\\_3ck\\_01\\_0121.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/champion_3ck_01_0121.pdf)

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 162 SC 162.11.7 P 167 L 21 # 115

Li, Mike Intel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D COM Cp (CC) (WG)

Cp of 8.7x1e-5 nF could be improved to provide the needed channel/link solution margin and it is supported by the latest package technology/product (see oif2020.224.01). Moreover, such an improvement would be aligned with the latest CEI-112G-LR-PAM4 spec, and benefiting the ecosystem at large.

SuggestedRemedy

change Cp to 6.0x1e-5 nF

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.  
 Resolve with comments #116 (Clause 163) and #117 (Annex 120F).  
 Note that CEI-112G-LR-PAM4 Version 11 provided in the OIF liaison to IEEE data 7 January 2021 specifies 60 nF for Cp.  
[https://www.ieee802.org/3/private/liaison\\_docs/OIF/0121\\_OIF\\_liaison\\_IEEE\\_CEI\\_Projects\\_cover\\_drafts\\_07Jan21.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/private/liaison_docs/OIF/0121_OIF_liaison_IEEE_CEI_Projects_cover_drafts_07Jan21.pdf)  
 [Editor's note: CC: 120F, 162, 163.]

Cl 162 SC 162.11.7.2 P 171 L 1 # 95

Haser, Alex Molex  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D COM XTALK (bucket1)

"The crosstalk paths for each MDI type are given in Table..."; the table specifies the number of crosstalk paths, not the paths themselves

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to "The number of crosstalk paths of each MDI..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3.3 P 156 L 31 # 142

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TX SNDR (bucket1)

The transmitter SNDR measurement uses the method described in

SuggestedRemedy

Transmitter SNDR is defined by the [measurement] method {of | described in}

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change:

"The transmitter SNDR measurement uses the method described in 120D.3.1.6 with the exception that the linear fit procedure in 162.9.3.1.1 is used."

To:

"The transmitter SNDR is defined by the the measurement method described in 120D.3.1.6 with the exception that the linear fit procedure in 162.9.3.1.1 is used."

Cl 162A SC 162A.2 P 253 L 24 # 57

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D editorial (bucket1)

TP0a had been replaced by TP0v in Clause 163.9.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The recommended transmitter characteristics at TP0 as measured at TP0a are described in 163.9.2." shall be changed to "The recommended transmitter characteristics at TP0 as measured at TP0v are described in 163.9.2."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162A SC 162A.3 P 253 L 29 # 58

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D editorial (bucket1)

TP5a had been replaced by TP5v in Clause 163.9.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The recommended receiver characteristics at TP5 as measured at TP5a are described in 163.9.3." shall be changed to "The recommended receiver characteristics at TP5 as measured at TP5v are described in 163.9.3."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 162B SC 162B.1 P 259 L 17 # 22  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D test fixture (bucket1)  
 The measurements at TP2 or TP3 etc. are made with the Test fixture (162B.1.1) not the mated test fixture (162B.1.3)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 On line 17 change 162B.1.3 to 162B.1.1  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1 P 259 L 17 # 6  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D test fixture (bucket1)  
 The measurements at TP1 or TP4 etc. are made with the Cable Assembly Test fixture (162B.1.2) not the mated test fixture (162B.1.3)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 On line 18 change 162B.1.3 to 162B.1.2  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1 P 259 L 20 # 96  
 Haser, Alex Molex  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF IL  
 The reference MTF IL at 26.56 GHz is 6.66 dB  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change text from 6.6 dB to 6.7 dB to capture rounding correctly  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 MTF 6.6 dB. CA 19.75 dB, Host 10.975 dB consistent with channel algebra =  $19.75+(2*10.975)-(2*6.6)= 28.5$  dB

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3 P 262 L 36 # 111  
 Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF FOMILD  
 MTF FOM\_ILD requirement is TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace TBD with 0.18dB  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Comments 111, 97 and 104, propose 0.18 dB, comment 107 proposes 0.18 dB with Tr=9.6 ps, comment 130 proposes deletion, comment 40 requests a value. Update PICS if specification is not deleted  
[https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/jan13\\_21/kocsis\\_3ck\\_adhoc\\_01\\_011321.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/jan13_21/kocsis_3ck_adhoc_01_011321.pdf)

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.1 P 262 L 36 # 130  
 Ran, Adeo Intel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF FOMILD  
 (addressing TBD)  
 "FOMILD shall be less than (TBD) dB"  
 The importance of this parameter for quality of test fixtures in the context of this project has not been presented. ERL likely covers what FOMILD originally intended to cover.

The specification should be deleted without loss of technical completeness.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete the quoted sentence.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #111.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.1 P 262 L 36 # 41  
 Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF FOMILD  
 The specified value for MTF FOM\_ILD upper limit is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Provide a value.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #111.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.1 P 262 L 36 # 107

DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF FOMILD

Provide value for mated test fixture FOMILD TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

See diminico\_3ck\_adhoc\_01a\_121620  
 Update PICS

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #111.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.1 P 262 L 36 # 104

Champion, Bruce TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF FOMILD

FOM\_ILD is listed at TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

TBD to be changed to 0.18 dB

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using comment #111.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.1 P 262 L 36 # 97

Haser, Alex Molex  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF FOMILD

Fill in TBD for MTF FOM\_ILD limit

SuggestedRemedy

Fill in a value of 0.18 dBrms based on haser\_3ck\_adhoc\_01c\_062420.pdf slide 7

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #111.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 262 L 43 # 8

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF ERL

The ERL of the mated test fixture should be significantly better than the specification for the ERL of the device under test. The ERL of the QSFP-DD improved connector used for channel modeling in e.g Didel\_3ck\_01\_0320. has an ERL of 15.7dB.

SuggestedRemedy

Change TBD to 14dB. Also put this in TF2 of the PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response comment #112.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 262 L 43 # 106

DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF ERL

Provide value for mated test fixture ERL TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

The mated test fixture ERL shall be greater than or equal to 9 dB.  
 Update PICS.

See diminico\_3ck\_adhoc\_01a\_121620 slide 6.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response comment #112.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 262 L 43 # 112

Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF ERL

MTF ERL requirement is TBD (also in PICS TF2)

SuggestedRemedy

Replace TBD with 10dB

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Comment #112 proposes 10 dB, comment#105 and #106 propose 9 dB, comment#8 proposes 14 dB, comment#131 proposes 10.3 dB.  
 For committee discussion of cited presentations. Update PICS.  
[https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/jan13\\_21/kocsis\\_3ck\\_adhoc\\_01\\_011321.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/jan13_21/kocsis_3ck_adhoc_01_011321.pdf)

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

CI 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 262 L 43 # 42  
 Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF ERL  
 The specified value for MTF ERL is TBD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Provide a value and update PICS.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response comment #112.

CI 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 262 L 43 # 105  
 Champion, Bruce TE Connectivity  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MTF ERL  
 MTF ERL is listed at TBD in draft  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 TBD to be changed to 9 dB. See diminico\_3ck\_03a\_1020.pdf  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response comment #112.

CI 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 262 L 43 # 131  
 Ran, Adeel Intel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF ERL  
 (addressing TBD)  
 "The mated test fixture ERL shall be greater than or equal to TBD dB"  
 We have adopted a minimum of 7.3 dB for a host ERL in Table 162-10 (with parameters in 162.9.3.5). The parameters for MTF are the same, except that "Time-gated propagation delay" is 0 instead of 0.2 ns.  
 The value 0 was accepted explicitly (comment #122 against D1.3) but the difference does not seem to be justified, since the MTF includes the test fixture used for host ERL measurement (where the connector is time gated). Different time gating creates difference in the meaning of ERL.  
 The ERL from a high-quality MTF is the upper bound for any measurement of a DUT which uses any one of the test fixtures. Therefore, it should be significantly higher than 7.3 dB.  
 It is suggested to divide the budget evenly to allow about the same reflection power from the DUT's internal circuitry as from the mated connectors; if each one is 10.3 dB then their combination (RSS, since reflections are independently distributed) would be 7.3 dB.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change minimum ERL from TBD to 10.3 dB.  
 In Table 162B-1, change T\_fx from 0 to 0.2 ns.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response comment #112.

CI 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 262 L 43 # 98  
 Haser, Alex Molex  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MTF ERL  
 Fill in TBD for MTF ERL limi  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace TBD with 9 dB based on diminico\_3ck\_03a\_1020.pdf slide 7  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response comment #112.  
 CI 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 263 L 16 # 99  
 Haser, Alex Molex  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D MTF ERL Tfx  
 The other ERL parameter tables throughout the specification include a note explaining the value for T\_fx; we should add one here too, especially since it's different than the other T\_fx values used in ERL calculations  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add a note to Table 162B-1 containing the following text: "The specified T\_fx value represents a propagation delay of zero which captures the electrical characteristics of the entire test fixture, including the test connector and test fixture transmission line in its entirety."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add note to Tfx as follows:  
 "NOTE—The mated test fixture test connector and transmission line are not time-gated."

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl **162B** SC **162B.1.3.3** P **263** L **34** # **114**  
 Kocsis, Sam Amphenol  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** MTF RL mask  
 Recommended MTF RL mask does not provide useful information to the reader  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the mask from the spec  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Delete subclause 162B.1.3.3 Mated test fixtures differential return loss.

Cl **162B** SC **162B.1.3.6** P **265** L **36** # **100**  
 Haser, Alex Molex  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** MTF RLDC name (bucket?)  
 CMDRL(f) is defined as common-mode return loss; this is incorrect  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Define CMDRL(f) as common-mode to differential mode return loss  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162B** SC **162B.1.3.2** P **262** L **41** # **7**  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** MTF ERL reference (bucket1)  
 Table 162B-2 is related to crosstalk parameters not ERL  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 162B-2 to 162B-1 (two places)  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162C** SC **162C.2.2** P **275** L **12** # **43**  
 Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** MDI graphic (bucket1)  
 The graphics in Figure 162C-3 and Figure 162C-44 are missing.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Provide graphics.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Insert graphics provided in the following presentation:  
 diminico\_3ck\_02\_0120.

Cl **162D** SC **162D.1.1** P **283** L **31** # **9**  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** editorial (bucket1)  
 The 100GBASE-CR2 in the Title of Table 162D-3 should be 200GBASE-CR2.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change it  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change Title of Table 162D-3 to "200GBASE-CR2".

Cl **162D** SC **162D.1.1** P **283** L **50** # **10**  
 Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** formatting (bucket1)  
 There is an unfortunate page break in the middle of Table 162D-3  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Adjust formatting so that this table is all on one page  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 There is a trade-off between large tables spanning pages and leaving big holes; leave as is; also the tables are going to be shifting around until the text becomes stable; wait for SA ballot to refine.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 163 SC 163.9.2 P 185 L 28 # 133

Ran, Adeel Intel  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D withdrawn

The editor's note states that "In Table 163-5, common-mode to common-mode return loss reference is not appropriate". But it is appropriate; comment #228 against D1.3 was referring to the frequency range of the test fixture's specification and did not request any change to this reference (the problem is in the response).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the editor's note, without any change to the table.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 163 SC 163.9.2.3 P 187 L 16 # 66

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D (bucket1)

Subclause title is incorrect.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change subclause title to "Difference steady-state voltage".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 163 SC 163.9.3 P 187 L 41 # 26

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D RX RLCD

In Table 163-8, the specified value for receiver differential to common-mode return loss is TBD

*SuggestedRemedy*

Provide a value or equation and update PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using response to comment #121

Cl 163 SC 163.9.3 P 187 L 41 # 121

Ran, Adeel Intel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D RX RLCD

(addressing TBD)  
 Rx Differential to common-mode (conversion) input return loss refers to 93.8.1.4 with value TBD. This subclause uses equation (93-5) to define the limit.

The conversion loss specifications may need more work, but for the purpose of technical completeness, it is suggested to use a piecewise-linear equation similar to (93-5). Boundary lines are suggested to match the ones used in OIF CEI-112G-LR for the 53.125 GHz signaling frequency.

As an alternative consider removing this specification (the Rx owns its performance).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a new subclause for Rx differential to common mode return loss with the equation:

$RL_{dc}(f) \geq 25-20*(f/f_b)$  for  $0.05 \leq f \leq f_b/2$   
 $RL_{dc}(f) \geq 15$  for  $f_b/2 < f \leq 40$   
 where f is the frequency in GHz and  $f_b=53.125$ .

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add a new subclause for RLCD  
 $RL_{cd}(f) = 25-20*(f/f_b)$  for  $0.05 \leq f \leq f_b/2$   
 $RL_{cd}(f) = 15$  for  $f_b/2 < f \leq 40$   
 where f is the frequency in GHz and  $f_b=53.125$ .  
 Update PICS  
 Implement with editorial license.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 163 SC 163.10 P 190 L 28 # 139

Ran, Adeel Intel  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D channel RLDC (CC)

There is no specification for RLDC for the KR channel.

Without such specification, a channel can cause a strong common mode reflection signal that will be fed into the Tx - and since Tx RLDC/RLCC are not defined either, a differential or common mode signal can be reflected back without control.

The conversion loss specifications may need more work, but for the purpose of technical completeness, the channel RLDC from 162.11.4 can be used.

Also in missing 120F.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a new subclause for channel differential to common mode return loss, based on 162.11.4 with the same limits, with editorial license.

Apply similarly in 120F.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the suggested remedy.  
 For task force discussion.  
 [Editor's note: CC 163, 120F]

Cl 163 SC 163.10.1 P 190 L 26 # 137

Ran, Adeel Intel  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D editorial (bucket1)

This subclause is titled "Channel Operating margin" so it should only discuss COM, not recommended IL limits and ERL requirements.

There are additional requirements not listed here (e.g. mode conversion loss, 163.10.4)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move the second paragraph (which points to 163.10.2 and 163.10.3) to the parent subclause 163.10.

Consider adding a summary table in 163.10 as in the Tx and Rx characteristics.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Move the second paragraph (which points to 163.10.2 and 163.10.3) to the parent subclause 163.10. Implement with editorial license.  
 Adding a summary table may be an improvement to the draft, but is not necessary for technical completeness.

Cl 163 SC 163.10.1 P 190 L 46 # 116

Li, Mike Intel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D COM Cp (CC) (WG)

Cp of 8.7x1e-5 nF could be improved to provide the needed channel/link solution margin and it is supported by the latest package technology/product (see oif2020.224.01).  
 Moreover, such an improvement would be aligned with the latest CEI-112G-LR-PAM4 spec, and benefiting the ecosystem at large.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change Cp to 6.0x1e-5 nF

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.  
 Resolve with comments #115 (Clause 162) and #117 (Annex 120F).  
 Note that CEI-112G-LR-PAM4 Version 11 provided in the OIF liaison to IEEE data 7 January 2021 specifies 60 nF for Cp.  
[https://www.ieee802.org/3/private/liaison\\_docs/OIF/0121\\_OIF\\_liaison\\_IEEE\\_CEI\\_Projects\\_cover\\_drafts\\_07Jan21.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/private/liaison_docs/OIF/0121_OIF_liaison_IEEE_CEI_Projects_cover_drafts_07Jan21.pdf)  
 [Editor's note: CC: 120F, 162, 163.]

Cl 163 SC 163.10.2 P 192 L 28 # 144

Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D channel IL

The limit at 40 GHz (not 45 as in the figure) excludes some acceptable channels.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace the straight part of the limit with one that curves down. (with an f<sup>2</sup> term). Correct the fmax in Figure 163-5.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 There was an error in creating the figure that should be corrected.  
 Change figure 163-5 so curve ends at 40 GHz to match the equation.  
 The suggested remedy has not provided sufficient details to change the insertion loss curve. Also, the change is not required for technical completeness.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 163 SC 163.10.4 P 192 L 44 # 122

Ran, Adeel Intel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D channel ILDC

(addressing TBD)  
 For the KR PHY, the channel "differential to common-mode conversion loss of TP0 and TP5" is TBD.

For the CR PHY this parameter is specified in 162.11.5 as "The difference between the cable assembly differential to common-mode conversion loss and the cable assembly insertion loss" with equation (162-10).

For the purpose of technical completeness, a similar equation can be used for KR.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Rewrite this subclause based on 162.11.5, substituting "TP0 to TP5 channel" for "cable assembly" with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 163 SC 163.10.4 P 192 L 44 # 27

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D channel ILDC

The specified value for channel differential to common-mode conversion loss is TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Provide a value or equation and update PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #122

Cl 163A SC 163A.3.1 P 286 L 16 # 2

Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP0v/TP5v method (WG)

Figure 163A-3 is confusing and not entirely correct for ERL. The filter used for ERL is F<sub>r</sub> not F<sub>BT</sub>. The ifft is for a reflection and hard to show in the diagram.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Omit reference to ERL in the first sentence of 163A.3.1 and figure 163A-2.

Add a line at end of 163-A-3.1.

The differential return loss at TP0v is used to compute ERL. The channel used to compute ERL is the reference channel S<sup>(0)</sup> cascaded with the parallel circuit for Rd.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.

Cl 163A SC 163A.3.1.1 P 287 L 21 # 1

Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP0v/TP5v method (WG)

Equation 163A-3 seems incorrect for a pulse response, h(t). V<sub>ref</sub> is intended to be a scalar not a vector function of t. I believe the idea is to be just add up Nv UI(T<sub>b</sub>) shifted pulse responses.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In Equation 163A-3:  
 Replace V<sub>f</sub><sup>(ref)</sup> with V<sub>f</sub>Nv(t).  
 V<sub>f</sub><sup>(ref)</sup> is the last value of v(t).  
 Or  
 $V_f^{(ref)} = V_f N_v(T_s + nV * T_b)$   
 This would require defining T<sub>s</sub> in the prior paragraph as the time where h(t) reaches the peak value.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl 163A SC 163A.4.1 P 289 L 1 # 3

Mellitz, Richard Samtec  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP0v/TP5v method (WG)

Figure 164A-3 is confusing and not entirely correct for ERL. The filter used for ERL is F\_r not F\_BT. The iff is for a reflection and hard to show in the diagram.

SuggestedRemedy

Omit reference to ERL in the first sentence of 164A.3.1 and figure 164A-2.

Add a line at end of 164-A-3.1.

The differential return loss at TP5v is used to compute ERL. The channel used to compute ERL is the reference channel S^(0) cascaded with the parallel circuit for Rd.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness. The commenter is invited to resubmit this comment during working group ballot.

Cl 163A SC 163A.4.1.2 P 289 L 46 # 11

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D editorial (bucket1)

missing space between "in" and "93A.5"

SuggestedRemedy

fix it

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 163B SC 163B.2 P 291 L 9 # 12

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP0v/TP5v example (bucket1)

With this example test fixture moved to an Annex it is necessary to refer to the relevant clause that provides the package parameters etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "For this test fixture, the reference values determined according to the methodology in 163A.3 are listed in Table 163B-1" to "For this test fixture, the reference values determined according to the methodology in 163A.3 using the parameters supplied in Clause 163 are listed in Table 163B-1"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 163B SC 163B.2 P 290 L 16 # 132

Ran, Adeo Intel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TP0v/TP5v example

(addressing TBD)

The example test fixture is defined only by the magnitude of its insertion loss. Therefore it is impossible for a reader to calculate reference values at TP0a, and this example does not help.

The lack of full channel information also prevents calculation of consensus values to replace the TBDs in Table 163B-1.

It is suggested to replace the definition to a full s-parameters model based on the equations in 162.11.7.1.1 with the same z\_p, creating an IL of 4.33 dB at 26.56 GHz. This will enable calculation of the reference values.

Alternatively, use a smaller value for z\_p to create an IL of 2.8 dB.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the text of this paragraph with text referring to 162.11.7.1.1 and equation 162-12 and update the reference values (currently TBD) accordingly.

A presentation with a more detailed proposal is planned.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness.

Although this Annex is informative, this subclause is incomplete as written.

Phase information is missing for the existing test fixture specification. The suggested remedy does not provide sufficient details for implementation.

However, the comment mentions that a presentation may be provided.

IEEE P802.3ck D1.4 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 5th Task Force review comments

Cl **163B** SC **163B.2** P **290** L **23** # **82**

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** TP0v/TP5v example

Example TP0V should be better defined

*SuggestedRemedy*

See ghiasi\_3ck\_02\_0121  
 The DUT trace is constructed from 2 mm section of PCB trace with 102 Ohms (via model), followed by 66.8 mm 92.5 Ohms strip line, followed by 2 mm section of PCB trace with 102 ohms (via model) the total loss of this model at 26.55 GHz is 2.8 dB. The PCB model is per table 93-12. The equation for the loss =0.006+0.25\*SQRT(f)+0.057\*f, where f is in GHz.

*Proposed Response* Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness.  
 This suggested remedy provides more accurate IL than equation 163B-1. Phase information is still missing for the test fixture.  
 Pending review of the following presentation and task force review.  
[https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21\\_01/ghiasi\\_3ck\\_02\\_0121.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/ghiasi_3ck_02_0121.pdf)  
 Resolve with comment #132.

Cl **163B** SC **163B.2** P **291** L **18** # **44**

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** TP0v/TP5v example

For the example test fixture, the reference value in Table 163B-1 for transmitter steady-state voltage is TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Provide a value.

*Proposed Response* Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #132.

Cl **163B** SC **163B.2** P **291** L **20** # **45**

Brown, Matt Huawei  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** TP0v/TP5v example

For the example test fixture, the reference value for transmitter linear fit pulse peak voltage is TBD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Provide a value.

*Proposed Response* Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 This comment proposes a technical change to the draft that does not address technical completeness.  
 Resolve using the response to comment #132.