

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 A EO method (bucket?)

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

Response Response Status C

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 162B SC 162B.1 P 259 L 17 # 6

Dudek, Mike

Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 262 L 41 # 7

Dudek, Mike

Marvell

Comment Type T Comment Status A MTF ERL reference (bucket1)

Table 162B-2 is related to crosstalk parameters not ERL

SuggestedRemedy

Change 162B-2 to 162B-1 (two places)

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

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

Dudek, Mike

Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status A MTF ERL (bucket2)

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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response comment #112.

CI 162D SC 162D.1.1 P 283 L 31 # 9

Dudek, Mike

Marvell

Comment Type T Comment Status A editorial (bucket1)

The 100GBASE-CR2 in the Title of Table 162D-3 should be 200GBASE-CR2.

SuggestedRemedy

Change it

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change Title of Table 162D-3 to "200GBASE-CR2".

CI 162D SC 162D.1.1 P 283 L 50 # 10

Dudek, Mike

Marvell

Comment Type E Comment Status D withdrawn

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 Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

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

Cl 163A SC 163A.4.1.2 P 289 L 46 # 11
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type E Comment Status A editorial (bucket1)
 missing space between "in" and "93A.5"
 SuggestedRemedy
 fix it
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 163B SC 163B.2 P 291 L 9 # 12
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A P0v/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"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 120G SC 120G.3.2 P 234 L 10 # 13
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status A 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
 Response Response Status C
 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.3.1.5 P 233 L 17 # 14
 Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comments 14, 84, 62, 68, and 124 propose a variation of values.
 The following presentation provides a summary of the proposals:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/jan20_21/brown_3ck_adhoc_02a_012021.pdf
 Implement the following with editorial license.
 Calibrate the host output and module stressed input crosstalk parameters using transition time with peak to peak voltage of 900 mV and transition time of 8.5 ps.
 Straw poll #14
 For TP1a, I support using the following basis for crosstalk calibration:
 A: transition time (per Annex 120E)
 B: slew time (time between specified voltage thresholds)
 A: 28 B: 2

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

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 2 # 16

Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A editorial (bucket?)

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 whithin 135.1.4

Response Response Status C

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.
 Import Table 80-4a from 802.3cu and update with columns for 100GAUI-1 C2M and C2C.
 Implement with editorial license.

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

Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comments 17, 63, 69, 86, 127 propose values for these parameters.

The following presentation provides a summary of the proposals:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/jan20_21/brown_3ck_adhoc_02a_012021.pdf

The following additional presentation was reviewed by the task force:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/dudek_3ck_01_0121.pdf

Implement the following with editorial license.

Calibrate the module output and host stressed input crosstalk parameters using transition time with peak to peak voltage of 870 mV and transition time of 10 ps.

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

Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status A 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"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

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

However, it would be helpful to point out the same in this normative statement as well to avoid confusion.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl 120G SC 120G.1 P 229 L 5 # 21

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

Annex 135A and 120A are part of this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Make these references hot links.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

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

CI 162B SC 162B.1 P 259 L 17 # 22

Dudek, Mike

Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status A test fixture (bucket?)

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

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the first two sentences of 162B.1 as follows:
Transmitter and receiver measurements at TP2 or TP3 for the 100GBASE-CR1, 200GBASE-CR2, and 400GBASE-CR4 hosts (see Annex 162D) and at TP1a or TP4a for the 100GAUI-1, 200GAUI-2, and 400GAUI-4 C2M hosts (see Annex 120G), are made utilizing the test fixture specified in 162B.1.1. Cable assembly measurements for the cable assembly types (see Annex 162D) are made between TP1 and TP4 with test fixtures as specified in 162B.1.2 on both ends.

CI 162 SC 162.9.3 P 152 L 30 # 23

Brown, Matt

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #118.

CI 162 SC 162.9.4 P 158 L 16 # 24

Brown, Matt

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #119.

CI 162 SC 162.11 P 163 L 17 # 25

Brown, Matt

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status A CA ERL (bucket2)

In Table 162-16, the specified value for cable assembly ERL is TBD

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a value or equation and update PICS.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using response to comment#103

CI 163 SC 163.9.3 P 187 L 41 # 26

Brown, Matt

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using response to comment #121

CI 163 SC 163.10.4 P 192 L 44 # 27

Brown, Matt

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status A channel ILDC

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

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a value or equation and update PICS.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #122

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 33 # 32

Brown, Matt

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2 P 234 L 32 # 35

Brown, Matt

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response to comment #126.

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

Brown, Matt

Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

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.

Comment #146 adopted EH/VEC values with two PCB lengths for each module output setting.

Implement the following with editorial license:

For the host stressed input:

- For test with module output long setting requested, for calibration use PCB length 244.7 mm with EH of 15 mV and VEC range of 12 dB to 12.5 dB.
- For test with module output short setting requested, for calibration use PCB length 160 mm with EH of 15 mV and VEC range of 12 dB to 12.5 dB.

For the host output, set values as follows:

EH (min) = 10 mV
VEC (max) = 12 dB

For the module stressed input test calibration, set values as follows:

EH = 10 mV
VEC range of 12 dB to 12.5 dB

Straw poll #1:

For TP1a EH, I support the following value:

A: 9 mV
B: 9.5 mV
C: 10 mV
Chicago rules.
A: 7 B: 4 C: 29

Straw poll #2:

For TP1a VEC, I support the following value:

A: 12 dB
B: 12.6 dB
C: 14 dB

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

Chicago rules.
A: 28 B: 14 C: 6

Straw poll #3:
For TP4 NE/FE EH, I support the following value:
A: 17/17 mV
B: 22/11 mV
C: 25/15 mV
Chicago rules.
A: 7 B: 4 C: 17

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 262 L 43 # 42

Brown, Matt Huawei
Comment Type T Comment Status A MTF ERL (bucket2)
The specified value for MTF ERL is TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a value and update PICS.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response comment #112.

Cl 162C SC 162C.2.2 P 275 L 12 # 43

Brown, Matt Huawei
Comment Type T Comment Status A MDI graphic (bucket?)
The graphics in Figure 162C-3 and Figure 162C-44 are missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide graphics.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert graphics provided in the following presentation:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/diminico_3ck_03_0121.pdf

Cl 162 SC 162.9.4.1 P 158 L 23 # 46

Brown, Matt Huawei
Comment Type T Comment Status A 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".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 120F SC 120F.3.1 P 212 L 50 # 47

Brown, Matt Huawei
Comment Type T Comment Status A editorial (bucket?)

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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note (to be removed prior to closing comment): 2021/2/1 Updated response. Removed from bucket #1.]

The suggested remedy should refer to 120F.3.1, not 120G.3.1.
The wording of the sentence in 120F.3.1 and 120F.3.1.2 is not identical, however both sentences are intended to convey the same message and both are not required.

In 120F.3.1 "The transmit output waveform may be manipulated via the transmitter control interface described in 120F.3.1.4."

In 120F.3.1.2 "The state of the transmitter equalizer may be configured via the transmitter control interface described in 120F.3.1.4."

Delete the sentence in 120F.3.1.

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

CI 136 SC 136.8.11.7.1 P 114 L 37 # 48

Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A training (bucket1)

Based on the link training change proposed in 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."

Response Response Status C

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

CI 162 SC 162.8.11 P 150 L 34 # 49

Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 1 SC 1.3 P 32 L 14 # 50

Lusted, Kent Intel Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status A 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

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 136 SC 136.8.11.7.1 P 114 L 39 # 52

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A training (bucket?)

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

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 136 SC 136.8.11.7.1 P 114 L 39 # 53

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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 is set to TRUE."

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

Cl 120 SC 120.5.7.2 P 102 L 45 # 54

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A editorial (bucket?)

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 sentence 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)"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Update the second sentence 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 136.8.11.7.5 and Figure 136-7)"

Cl 120 SC 120.5.7.2 P 102 L 30 # 55

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A editorial (bucket1)

In the change to the first paragh 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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 120 SC 120.5.7.2 P 102 L 44 # 56

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A editorial (bucket1)

In the change to the fourth paragh it has removed the requirement of this paragraph for 50G copper PMDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Add 200GBASE-KR4/CR4 to the list in the first sentence.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: Changed page from 103.]

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

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

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

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3.1.4 P 155 L 46 # 59

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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, ...>.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

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

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3.1.4 P 155 L 47 # 60

Wu, Mau-Lin

MediaTek

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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.>.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 163 SC 163.9.2.3 P 187 L 16 # 66

Healey, Adam

Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A (bucket1)

Subclause title is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

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

Ghiasi, Ali

Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A TP1a transition time

At TP1a 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. I suggest 12 ps but no less than 10 ps.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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.

The following presentations were review by the task force:

https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/dudek_3ck_01_0121.pdf

https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/jan13_21/ghiasi_3ck_adhoc_01_011321.pdf

Change the host output transition time to 10 ps.

Straw poll #10 (pick one) and #11 (chicago)

I support changing the value of host output transition time (min) to:

A: 7.5 ps (current value)

B: 9.5 ps

C: 10 ps

#10 A: 7 B: 12 C: 14

#11 A: 6 B: 23 C: 25

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 P 234 L 20 # 85

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[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.

The following presentations were review by the task force:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/dudek_3ck_01_0121.pdf
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/jan13_21/ghiasi_3ck_adhoc_01_011321.pdf

Change the module output transition time (min) to 8.5 ps.

CI 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.

CI 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.

CI 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.

CI 162 SC 162.11 P 163 L 18 # 94

Haser, Alex Molex

Comment Type TR Comment Status A CA ERL (bucket2)

Fill in TBD for CA ERL limit

SuggestedRemedy

Replace TBD with 7.4 dB based on champion_3ck_02_1020.pdf slide 6

Response Response Status C

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 162.11.7.2 P 171 L 1 # 95

Haser, Alex

Molex

Comment Type E Comment Status A 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..."

Response Response Status C

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 Z

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 262 L 43 # 98

Haser, Alex

Molex

Comment Type TR Comment Status A MTF ERL (bucket2)

Fill in TBD for MTF ERL limi

SuggestedRemedy

Replace TBD with 9 dB based on diminico_3ck_03a_1020.pdf slide 7

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolve using the response comment #112.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 263 L 16 # 99

Haser, Alex

Molex

Comment Type ER Comment Status A 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 to electrical characteristics of the entire test fixture, including the test connector and test fixture transmission line in its entirety."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add note to Tfx as follows:

"NOTE—The mated test fixture test connector and transmission line are not time-gated in order to include the entire test fixture."

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.6 P 265 L 36 # 100

Haser, Alex

Molex

Comment Type ER Comment Status A 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

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

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

Cl 162 SC 162.11.4 P 165 L 8 # 101

Champion, Bruce

TE Connectivity

Comment Type T Comment Status R 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

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

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

The following presentation was reviewed by the task force:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/champion_3ck_02a_0121.pdf

There was no consensus on a single remedy. The commenter is encouraged to provide further evidence how system performance is impacted.

Cl 162 SC 162.11.6 P 166 L 37 # 102

Champion, Bruce

TE Connectivity

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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) ≥ 1.8 for $0.05 \leq f \leq 40$

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The following presentation was reviewed by the task force:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/champion_3ck_01a_0121.pdf

Implement suggested remedy.

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

Cl 162 SC 162.11 P163 L18 # 103
 Champion, Bruce TE Connectivity
Comment Type T Comment Status A 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
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 The task force reviewed the following presentation:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/champion_3ck_03_0121.pdf
 Straw poll #5 indicated no clear consensus on a value.
 Commenters agreed to settle on middle value of 8.25 dB as compromise.
 Set the value of cable assembly ERL to 8.25 dB.
 Straw Poll #5
 I support the following value for the cable assembly ERL.
 A: 7.4 dB
 B: 8.0 dB
 C: 8.5 dB
 D: 9 dB
 A: 15 B: 14 C: 15 D: 15
 Chicago rules

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P262 L43 # 105
 Champion, Bruce TE Connectivity
Comment Type T Comment Status A MTF ERL (bucket2)
 MTF ERL is listed at TBD in draft
SuggestedRemedy
 TBD to be changed to 9 dB. See diminico_3ck_03a_1020.pdf
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Resolve using the response comment #112.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P262 L43 # 106
 DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications
Comment Type TR Comment Status A MTF ERL (bucket2)
 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.
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Resolve using the response comment #112.

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3 P262 L36 # 111
 Kocsis, Sam Amphenol
Comment Type TR Comment Status A MTF FOMILD
 MTF FOM_ILD requirement is TBD
SuggestedRemedy
 Replace TBD with 0.18dB
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change the transition time T_t to 8.5 ps and set the FOMILD (max) value to 0.13 dB.

Straw poll #12 (chicago rules)
 Straw poll #13 (pick one)
 I support the following proposal to address MTF FOMILD:
 A: FOMILD (max) = 0.18 dB, T_t = 8.5 ps
 B: FOMILD (max) = 0.13 dB, T_t = 8.5 ps
 C: FOMILD (max) = 0.18 dB, T_t = 7.5 ps
 SP12: A: 15 B: 21 C: 21
 SP13: A: 7 B: 17 C: 11
 Straw poll #6 (chicago rules)
 Straw poll #7 (pick one)
 I support the following value for the FOMILD transition time (T_t) parameter:
 A: 7.5 ps (currently in D1.4)
 B: 9 ps
 C: 9.6 ps
 D: 10 ps
 SP6: A: 12 B: 16 C: 14 D: 11
 SP7: A: 8 B: 5 C: 5 D: 7

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

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

Kocsis, Sam Amphenol

Comment Type TR Comment Status A MTF ERL

MTF ERL requirement is TBD (also in PICS TF2)

SuggestedRemedy

Replace TBD with 10dB

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Adopt the value of 10.3 dB using the ERL parameters on slide 5 of the following presentation:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/diminico_3ck_01a_0121.pdf
 Implement with editorial license.

Straw poll #4

I support using the following value for the MTF ERL.

- A: 9 dB
 - B: 10.3 dB
 - A: 6 B: 26
- Choose one.

Cl 162 SC 162.11 P 163 L 17 # 113

Kocsis, Sam Amphenol

Comment Type TR Comment Status A CA ERL (bucket2)

CA ERL requirement is TBD

SuggestedRemedy

Replace TBD with 9dB

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Resolve using response to comment#103

Cl 162B SC 162B.1.3.3 P 263 L 34 # 114

Kocsis, Sam Amphenol

Comment Type TR Comment Status A MTF RL mask

Recommended MTF RL mask does not provide useful information to the reader

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the mask from the spec

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete subclause 162B.1.3.3 Mated test fixtures differential return loss.

Cl 162 SC 162.9.3 P 152 L 30 # 118

Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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).

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

Implement with editorial license.

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

CI 162 SC 162.9.4 P 158 L 16 # 119

Ran, Adee

Intel

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A** 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).

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Also, add "(min)" to the end of the parameter name.

CI 162 SC 162.11 P 163 L 17 # 120

Ran, Adee

Intel

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A** CA ERL (bucket2)

(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.

Response Response Status **C**

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

CI 163 SC 163.9.3 P 187 L 41 # 121

Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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 $f_b=53.125$.

Response Response Status C

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.

CI 163 SC 163.10.4 P 192 L 44 # 122

Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Specify both ILDC and ILCD based on 162.11.5, substituting "TP0 to TP5 channel" for "cable assembly". Implement with editorial license.

CI 120F SC 120F.4.3 P 223 L 5 # 123

Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

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

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 P 234 L 17 # 125

Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Two comments propose values for module output ERL (min) as follows:

#79: 8.5 dB
 #125: 9 dB

Set the value to 8.5 dB for both module output (120G.3.2) and module input (120G.3.4).

CI 120G SC 120G.3.2 P 234 L 30 # 126

Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type ER Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 162B SC 162B.1.3.2 P 262 L 43 # 131

Ran, Adeo Intel
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A MTF ERL (bucket2)

(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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Resolve using the response comment #112.

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 16 # 132

Ran, Adee

Intel

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A** 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.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The task force reviewed the following presentation:

https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/ran_3ck_01_0121.pdf

https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/ghiasi_3ck_02_0121.pdf

Implement the proposal on slide 9 of ran_3ck_01_0121 with editorial license. Update Equation 163B-1 to describe the insertion loss model. Update the Figure 163B-1 showing the new insertion loss curve.

Cl 163 SC 163.9.2 P 185 L 28 # 133

Ran, Adee

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 120F SC 120F.3.1.2 P 214 L 34 # 134

Ran, Adee

Intel

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A** 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.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

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

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

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status A 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 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.

Response Response Status C

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 16 # 136

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 163 SC 163.10.1 P 190 L 26 # 137

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status C

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.

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 P 237 L 37 # 138

Ran, Adeo

Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status A TP4a/TPRLCD

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.

Response Response Status C

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.

However the specification for module input and host input should be differential to common-mode (RLCD).

Also, the variable in 120G.3.1.1 should be RLDC, not RLCD).

For common-mode to differential return loss in Table 120G-3, change the reference to 120G.3.1.1.

In 120G.3.1.1, change RLCD to RLDC.

For Host Input and Module input change the parameter to differential to common-mode return loss and specify based on 120G.3.1.1.

Implement with editorial license.

CI 163 SC 163.10 P 190 L 28 # 139

Ran, Adeo

Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status A channel RLCD (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 RLCD/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.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

[Editor's note: CC 163, 120F]

CI 162 SC 162.9.3.3 P 156 L 31 # 142

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status A TX SNDR (bucket1)

The transmitter SNDR measurement uses the method described in

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response Response Status C

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."

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

CI 163 SC 163.10.2 P 192 L 28 # 144

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status A 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^2 term). Correct the f_{max} in Figure 163-5.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The 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.

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

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status A TP4 EH/VEC

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).

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Editor's note: Changed line number from 26.]

The following presentation was reviewed by the task force:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/dawe_3ck_01_0121.pdf

Implement the following with editorial license.

Module output short setting:

0 mm: EH (min) = 15 mV, VEC (max) = 12 dB

160 mm: EH (min) = 15 mV, VEC (max) = 12 dB

Module output long setting:

80 mm: EH (min) = 15 mV, VEC (max) = 12 dB

244.7 mm: EH (min) = 15 mV, VEC (max) = 12 dB

Straw poll #8 (direction)

I support adding one extra EH/VEC test for each of near-end and far-end module output tests.

Yes: 26

No: 1

Straw poll #9 (direction)

I support adding one extra EH/VEC test for each of near-end and far-end module output tests for D1.5.

Yes: 18

No: 7

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 246 L 23 # 154

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status R EO method

Of all the options in daw_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 $t = ts \pm 0.05$, $ts \pm 0.07$, $ts \pm 0.1$, $V = \pm H_{min}/2$, $\pm H_{min} \cdot 0.4$, ± 0 .

(In case it's not clear, H_{min} , 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.)

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

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

The following presentation was reviewed by the task force:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/dawe_3ck_01_0121.pdf

Also, the slide 3 of the following presentation was reviewed by the task force:
https://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/21_01/brown_3ck_04_0121.pdf

The currently methodology was chosen over an eye mask method like that being proposed in this comment.

The comment does not provide sufficient evidence to support the proposed changes.

There was no concensus to make the proposed change.