

IEEE P802.3cm D2.1 400 Gb/s over Multimode Fiber 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

CI FM SC FM P 11 L 40 # 8

Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

The frontmatter of P802.3cn lists 802.3cg and 802.3cq, as before P802.3cm.

SuggestedRemedy

Align list of prior ammendments as necessary for consistency before going to Draft 3.0.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

On page 1, change:

"as amended by IEEE Std 802.3cb-2018, IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018, and IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018" to:

"as amended by IEEE Std 802.3cb-2018, IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018, IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018, IEEE Std 802.3cg-20xx, and IEEE Std 802.3cq-20xx."

On page 11:

Add the summary for IEEE Std 802.3cg-20xx as Amendment 4 after the summary for IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018

Add the summary for IEEE Std 802.3cq-20xx with no amendment number after the summary for IEEE Std 802.3cg-20xx

[Editor's note: Clause changed from Frontmatter to FM]

CI FM SC FM P 11 L 53 # 6

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Though this should be noticed during publication preparation, perhaps you can make this non-substantive change for the next draft. The text "100 m." needs a non-breaking space.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace regular space with a non-breaking space in "100 m."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI FM SC FM P 17 L 41 # 19

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisc

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

The note says that the editing instructions have been written to minimize the probability of changes being lost due to projects running in parallel, but, UNLIKE other 802.3 projects which write instructions, modified text and front matter relative to projects in progress and likely ahead of the project in order, this one doesn't. It could cause a train wreck in the editors office at revision time. Examples include 802.3cg which is already in SA ballot, which modifies Tables 45-9, 45-10, and 78-1 but isn't mentioned in the editing instructions for these tables. (Front matter is more easily updated near the end, but usually is done at this stage. Note that comment on front matter in the previous draft was rejected because the project was not yet finished - contrary to our usual process, but not fatal - this one could be.)

SuggestedRemedy

Editor to review projects ahead of 802.3cm in amendment order, and align/revise editing instructions in common parts of the drafts to acknowledge parallel edits. (I think this is just 802.3cg and 802.3cq - but check with 802.3 Chief Editor)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment #8 for changes to the front matter to reflect amendments expected to be approved ahead of this draft. The only clauses being modified by P802.3cg and P802.3cq that are also being modified by this draft are Clauses 1, 30, 45 and 78 and none of the current changes in P802.3cg and P802.3cq affect the changes being made by this draft.

CI 00 SC 0 P 11 L 48 # 9

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Information for Amendment 4: 802.3cg is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert, "IEEE Std 802.3cg™-20xx Amendment 4—This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and adds Clause 146 through Clause 148 and Annex 146A and Annex 146B. This amendment adds 10 Mb/s Physical Layer specifications and management parameters for operation over a single balanced pair of conductors."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment #8.

IEEE P802.3cm D2.1 400 Gb/s over Multimode Fiber 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

CI 138 SC 138 P 29 L 6 # 7

Laubach, Mark

Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Suggest adding a note of clarification for the readers to the beginning of Clause 138 immediately after the Clause title, similar to what was done in P802.3cn.

SuggestedRemedy

Add: <ital>Clause 138 was added to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 by IEEE Std 803.3cd-2018.</ital>

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cm/D2.1 and IEEE P802.3cm/D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot.

Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, this change is potentially an improvement, so the commenter is encouraged to re-submit at Standards Association ballot.

[Editor's note: Subclause changed from 138.8.10 to 138]

CI 138 SC 138.1 P 29 L 13 # 17

Maguire, Valerie

The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

More than one optical fiber medium is specified. The plural of medium is media.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace, "multimode fiber medium" with "multimode fiber media" showing correct strikethrough and underline marks. Consider making this a global change where appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cm/D2.1 and IEEE P802.3cm/D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot.

Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Also, while there are multiple alternative options specified for the fiber medium, each instantiation of a PMD will operate over one medium, so the wording in the draft is correct as it is. Furthermore, the use of "medium" is consistent with the corresponding text in Clause 95 (100GBASE-SR4), Clause 112 (25GBASE-SR) and Clause 123 (400GBASE-SR16).

CI 138 SC 138.1 P 30 L 2 # 12

Maguire, Valerie

The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Use preferred terminology for mandatory criteria.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace, "a conforming implementation must behave functionally" with, "a conforming implementation shall behave functionally" showing correct strikethrough and underline marks and adjust PICS, if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cm/D2.1 and IEEE P802.3cm/D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot.

Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Also, the text of this footnote is the same in this respect as the footnotes to Tables 84-1, 85-1, 86-1, 87-1, 88-1, 89-1, 92-1, 93-1, 94-1, 95-1, 110-1, 111-1, 112-1, 114-1, 121-1, 122-1, 123-1, 124-1, 136-1, 137-1, 139-1, and 140-1.

CI 150 SC 150.1 P 47 L 41 # 10

Maguire, Valerie

The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Use preferred terminology for mandatory criteria.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace, "a conforming implementation must behave functionally" with, "a conforming implementation shall behave functionally" and adjust PICS, if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cm/D2.1 and IEEE P802.3cm/D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot.

Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Also, the text of this footnote is the same in this respect as the footnotes to Tables 84-1, 85-1, 86-1, 87-1, 88-1, 89-1, 92-1, 93-1, 94-1, 95-1, 110-1, 111-1, 112-1, 114-1, 121-1, 122-1, 123-1, 124-1, 136-1, 137-1, 138-1, 139-1, and 140-1.

IEEE P802.3cm D2.1 400 Gb/s over Multimode Fiber 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

CI 150 SC 150.3.2 P 49 L 44 # 11

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Use preferred terminology for mandatory criteria.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace, "between the PCS lanes must be kept" with, "between the PCS lanes shall be kept" and adjust PICS, if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cm/D2.1 and IEEE P802.3cm/D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Also, this text is the same in this respect as the text in 80.5, 83.5.3, 84.5, 85.5, 86.3.2, 87.3.2, 88.3.2, 89.3.2, 92.5, 93.5, 94.3.4, 95.3.2, 124.3.2, 116.5, 120.5.3, 121.3.2, 122.3.2, 123.3.2, 131.5, 135.5.3, 136.6, 137.6, 138.3.2, 139.3.2, and 140.3.2.

CI 150 SC 150.3.2 P 49 L 45 # 13

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Use preferred terminology for mandatory criteria.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace, "Skew Variation must also be limited" with, "Skew Variation shall be limited" and adjust PICS, if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cm/D2.1 and IEEE P802.3cm/D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Also, this text is the same in this respect as the text in 80.5, 83.5.3, 84.5, 85.5, 86.3.2, 87.3.2, 88.3.2, 89.3.2, 92.5, 93.5, 94.3.4, 95.3.2, 124.3.2, 116.5, 120.5.3, 121.3.2, 122.3.2, 123.3.2, 131.5, 135.5.3, 136.6, 137.6, 138.3.2, 139.3.2, and 140.3.2.

CI 150 SC 150.5.1 P 51 L 10 # 18

Pimpinella, Rick Panduit Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket

The current figure does not adequately illustrate bi-directional transmission. The figure does not depict two wavelengths nor the transmit/receive pair assignments for bi-directional transmission on 4 discrete fiber pairs. This would be important to for breakout connectivity scenarios.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace figure 150-2 with the proposed figure presented in pimpinella_3cm_0119, and append the text "For clarity, test points are shown for one direction of transmission only, which is from left to right in this figure," with the following:
For purpose of illustration, one possible bi-directional lane assignment is shown. It is understood that lanes assignments are arbitrary.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cm/D2.1 and IEEE P802.3cm/D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

There was considerable discussion regarding the replacement figure proposed in http://www.ieee802.org/3/cm/public/March19/pimpinella_3cm_01_0319.pdf without achieving a consensus for a change. The commenter is invited to gain consensus on a replacement figure and then re-submit during Standards Association ballot.

[Editor's note: Line changed from "Figure 150-2, lines 10-30" to "10"]

CI 150 SC 150.5.4 P 52 L 44 # 14

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Use preferred terminology for mandatory criteria.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace, "implementations must provide adequate margin" with, "implementations shall provide adequate margin" and adjust PICS, if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cm/D2.1 and IEEE P802.3cm/D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Also, this text is the same in this respect as the text in 84.5, 85.5, 86.3.2, 87.3.2, 88.3.2, 89.3.2, and 140.3.2.

IEEE P802.3cm D2.1 400 Gb/s over Multimode Fiber 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

CI 150 SC 150.7.1 P 55 L 37 # 15

Maguire, Valerie

The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket

Use preferred terminology for mandatory criteria.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace, "the OMA (min) must exceed" with, "the OMA (min) shall exceed" and adjust PICS, if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cm/D2.1 and IEEE P802.3cm/D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Also, the text of this footnote is the same in this respect as the footnotes to Tables 86-6, 87-7, 88-7, 95-6, 114-6, 121-6, 122-9, 122-10, 124-6, 138-8, 139-6, and 140-6.

CI 150 SC 150.10.2.1 P 65 L 25 # 16

Maguire, Valerie

The Siemon Company

Comment Type T Comment Status D Bucket

EMB at 953 nm is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert, " and 2470 MHz·km at 953 nm" after, "3100 MHz·km at 910 nm"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cm/D2.1 and IEEE P802.3cm/D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Also, the footnote is correct as it stands. OM5 is formally specified at 953 nm (see line 11 on page 65), hence informative guidance is unnecessary at that wavelength.