

IEEE P802.3ck D1.1 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.1** P **221** L **18** # **95**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**  
 ESMW is TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace TBD with 0.12 UI and see ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0320  
 Response Response Status **C**  
 REJECT.  
 The task force review slide 6 of the following presentation:  
[http://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/20\\_03/ghiasi\\_3ck\\_01\\_0320.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/20_03/ghiasi_3ck_01_0320.pdf)  
 More analysis is required to determine an appropriate value. There is no consensus to implement the suggested remedy at this time.

Cl **120G** SC **120G.3.1** P **221** L **21** # **96**  
 Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A** VEC  
 Vertical eye closure is TBD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace TBD with 10 and see ghiasi\_3ck\_01\_0320  
 Response Response Status **C**  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The task force reviewed the following presentation:  
[http://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/20\\_03/ghiasi\\_3ck\\_01\\_0320.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/20_03/ghiasi_3ck_01_0320.pdf)  
 Based on straw polls #1, #2, and #3 there is consensus to close this comment as follows:  
 Replace TBD with 9 dB.  
 Straw Poll #1 and #2  
 I would support the following value for maximum VEC value at TP1a:  
 A: 7.5 dB  
 B: 8.25 dB  
 C: 9 dB  
 D: 10 dB  
 E: Abstain  
 Straw Poll #1 (Chicago rules)  
 A: 17, B: 17, C: 25, D: 11, E: 16  
 Straw Poll #2 (Pick one)  
 A: 10, B: 7, C: 18, D: 1, E: 15  
 Straw Poll #3  
 I support closing comment #96 using a value for maximum VEC of 9 dB:  
 Yes: 20  
 No: 17  
 Abstain: 12

IEEE P802.3ck D1.1 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 120G SC 120G.4.2 P 232 L 45 # 10165

Li, Mike Intel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R

[Comment resubmitted from Draft 1.0. Subcl. 120G.4.2 - Pg 226 - In 24]

"Dp equal to 3" is not right as there are 3 pre-taps for the host

*SuggestedRemedy*

change "Dp equal to 3" to ""Dp equal to 4".

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Based on discussion at the 802.3ck ad hoc meeting on 2020/2/26 and at the task force meeting, there is no consensus to change the value according to the suggested remedy.

Further analysis is required to determine if changes to the parameter are necessary and beneficial.

Cl 120G SC 120G.4.2 P 232 L 45 # 10166

Li, Mike Intel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R

[Comment resubmitted from Draft 1.0. Subcl. 120G.4.2 - Pg 226 - In 24]

"Np equal to 200" is not appropriate as UI becomes half in second.

*SuggestedRemedy*

"Np equal to 200" to "Np equal to 400"

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Based on discussion at the 802.3ck ad hoc meeting on 2020/2/26 and at the task force meeting, there is no consensus to change the value according to the suggested remedy.

Further analysis is required to determine if changes to the parameter are necessary and beneficial.

Cl 120G SC 120G.4.2 P 233 L 6 # 10066

Dudek, Mike Marvell  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A

[Comment resubmitted from Draft 1.0. Subcl. 120G.4.2 - Pg 226 - In 33]

The paragraph describing what the measured values of Eye height, Eye width and VEC are is difficult to follow.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Consider replacing this paragraph with "The measured values of eye height, eye width and vertical eye closure are the values obtained with the combination of gDC and gDC2 that produces an eye height above the target value and the minimum value of vertical eye closure.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There was discussion that the eye width should also be included in this algorithm. However, some analysis and consensus building is required.

Replace the paragraph with:

"The values of eye height, eye width and vertical eye closure are the values obtained with the combination of gDC and gDC2 that produces the minimum value of vertical eye closure where eye height also meets the target value."

IEEE P802.3ck D1.1 100/200/400 Gb/s Electrical Interfaces Task Force 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 162 SC 162.9.4 P152 L16 # 130

Ghiasi, Ali Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type TR Comment Status R RLCD

ERL is TBD

*SuggestedRemedy*

RLCD=30-30\*f/25.78 dB, from 10 MHz to 12.89 GHz

RLCD=15 dB 12.89 to 53 GHz

See ghiasi\_3ck\_03\_0320

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

[Editor's note: the comment refers to ERL, but actually addresses differential-to-common-mode return loss]

The task force reviewed slides 3 and 6 of

[http://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/20\\_03/ghiasi\\_3ck\\_03\\_0320.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/20_03/ghiasi_3ck_03_0320.pdf)

Per straw poll #4 there is no consensus to implement the suggested remedy.

Straw poll #4.

I support closing comment #130 using the suggested remedy, but with fmax = 50 GHz.

Yes: 10

No: 27