

IEEE P802.3ct D2.0 100 Gb/s over DWDM systems Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 153 SC 153.2.3.2.4 P83 L20 # 31

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

No Annex which provides a sample FEC frame is provided like 91A and 119A

SuggestedRemedy

Add an Annex that provides a sample SC-FEC frame

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

Insufficient remedy proposed. Commenter is invited to submit proposed text for the type of Annex envisioned.

A challenge is that the FEC codewords for RS(528,514) is 5280 bits, and for RS(544,514) are 5440 bits, whereas a FEC codeword for SC-FEC is 261120 bits, so it is less clear that a text sequence of numeric values for a full FEC codeword is meaningful or useful for the reader in the form of text in the published standard.

While test vectors are known to exist for this FEC code, none are currently published in a place where they can be referenced.

G.709.2, which is referenced, provides significant detail on the structure of the code, the way the block interleavers work, and the permutation factor tables.

Commentor is invited to submit an alternate form eg a test vector file or code to generate the test vectors that can be published separate from this standard.

Cl 152 SC 152.6 P72 L15 # 67

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Insert IFEC enable functionality that is currently specified in IEEE Draft P802.3ck/D1.2

SuggestedRemedy

Incorporate the 802.3ck modifications to 152.6 and 45.2.1.186aa in 802.3ct. Also make it so IFEC is enabled by setting the variable to one (not zero) "When the IFEC_Enable variable is set to one, the Inverse RS-FEC sublayer performs the transmit function as specified in 152.5.2 and the receive function as specified in 152.5.3. When the variable is set to a zero, the transmit and receive functions are disabled, and the Inverse RS-FEC sublayer is bypassed,"

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

P802.3ct is ahead of P802.3ck in the process, and will likely be approved first.

In the context of P802.3ck, clause 152 IFEC would always be back-to-back with clause 161 interleaved FEC, and both sublayers would be enabled or disabled as a pair. In the context of P802.3ct, there is no case where the Inverse RS-FEC sublayer can ever be (or ever needs to be) disabled, and in fact this would make no sense as this would feed the RS(544) format directly to the clause 153 SC-FEC sublayer. P802.3ck can add this configurability to the mechanism produced by P802.3ct when needed.

Cl 154 SC 154.8.16 P112 L46 # 140

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

While G.698.2 gives the concept of receiver OSNR tolerance and says what's in and what's out, it is normal in Ethernet optical PMD specifications to have a more specific definition "Stressed receiver sensitivity" to avoid ambiguity and give an example of how one might actually assure that a receiver complies. I don't see why this PMD should not need it too. Writing the stressed receiver sensitivity section can be painful because it makes one clarify what one means - it's where the rubber hits the road.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a stressed receiver sensitivity section, following other clauses

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

The commenter has not demonstrated that the current specification is broken or incomplete and not demonstrated that adding a definition and specification of "stressed receiver sensitivity" would improve the quality of the draft.

Furthermore the remedy does not contain a specific proposal to modify the draft in such a way that it would improve it on the basis of evidence provided.

The commenter is invited to develop a detailed proposal for stressed receiver sensitivity with evidence that adding such a requirement will improve the quality of the draft.