

IEEE P802.3ct D2.1 100 Gb/s over DWDM systems 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Cl 1 SC 1.4.180a P23 L18 # 1 [redacted]  
 Anslow, Pete Independent  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "channel spacing" comes after "Channel Operating Margin (COM)"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the editing instruction to:  
 Insert the following new definition after 1.4.181 "Channel Operating Margin (COM)"  
 Renumber the new definition to 1.181a  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 154 SC 154.11.4.3 P121 L7 # 2 [redacted]  
 Anslow, Pete Independent  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 PICS items with Status "M" just have "Y [ ]" in the Support column  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove "N/A [ ]" from items ZR1 and ZR2  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.227a P23 L25 # 3 [redacted]  
 Anslow, Pete Independent  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "Dense Wave Division Multiplexing" should be "dense wavelength division multiplexing" to match the entry in 1.5.  
 This is also consistent with the rest of 802.3, which has "wavelength division multiplex" 23 times and "wave division multiplex" 0 times.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "Dense Wave Division Multiplexing:" to "dense wavelength division multiplexing (DWDM):"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl FM SC FM P8 L20 # 4 [redacted]  
 Issenhuth, Tom Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Missing list of working group participants  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Insert list of working group participants  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.133e.1 P33 L27 # 5 [redacted]  
 Issenhuth, Tom Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Incorrect capitalization of TX  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Modify paragraph title from " TX Rx" to "Tx Rx"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 153 SC 153.2.3.2.6 P88 L10 # 6 [redacted]  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Missing arrow?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add arrow from the reset line to the box containing p3, same as the others, moving two squiggle-breaks to the right.  
 Also, make the thick or slanting nearly-horizontal arrow at the top of the figure the same as the others.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Implement the proposed remedy with editorial license to clean up the figure.

IEEE P802.3ct D2.1 100 Gb/s over DWDM systems 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Cl 154 SC 154.11.4.6 P122 L1 # 7  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 Blank Link  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 black link  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 153 SC 153.3.2.2.1 P96 L43 # 8  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 This 4-lane interface format is referred to in ITU-T G.709 and ITU-T G.709.2 as OTL4.4.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 In ITU-T G.709 and ITU-T G.709.2, this 4-lane interface format is called OTL4.4.  
 Also in 153.3.2.3.1  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Commenter has not identified any problem with the current wording.  
 The current and proposed replacement wording are equally correct, and making a change would increase the scope of subsequent recirculation ballots without improving the quality of the draft.

Cl 153 SC 153.3.2.2.1 P96 L43 # 9  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 This 4-lane interface format is referred to in ITU-T G.709 and ITU-T G.709.2 as OTL4.4.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 In ITU-T G.709 and ITU-T G.709.2, this 4-lane interface format is called OTL4.4.  
 Also in 153.3.2.3.1  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Duplicate of comment #8. See response to comment #8.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.35b P22 L8 # 10  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 The discussion around what encoding this PHY uses and a review of Clause 153. SC-FEC and... leads me to the conclusion that this is not a BASE-R PHY at all. What's on the line is in a telecoms style wrapper - in this case OTN, while for 10GBASE-LW it was "compatible with SONET STS-192c".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the name to 100GBASE-ZW  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The commentor has not demonstrated how the current name is incorrect or how changing it would improve the quality of the draft. During the November 2018 plenary the .cn task force conducted strawpoll 5 on nomenclature preferences, 100GBASE-ZR had a count of 36, 100GBASE-AR had 7, 100GBASE-ZA had 3 and none of the above had 0 which showed clear support for -ZR. -ZW was not brought up for consideration. The -ZR nomenclature was adopted via motion 4 in the same meeting 48/0/3. This nomenclature was reaffirmed in .ct in the March 2019 plenary meeting via motion 4 by voice vote without opposition.

Cl 154 SC 154.7.3 P111 L45 # 11  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 802.3 writes interoperability specifications. The definitions of transmitter, receiver and channel must each be independently complete enough so that any compliant transmitter, receiver and channel will interoperate. The transmitter and receiver have specified power ranges; the channel must have specifications that control the loss or gain for compliant transmitted signals so that the power window at TP3 is met. In G.698.2, 7.4.1 Maximum and minimum mean input power "This parameter (together with the maximum and minimum mean channel output power) also places a requirement on the maximum and minimum channel insertion loss (or gain) of the black link." Here, with the three pieces specified separately, channel loss/gain spec has got lost.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add specifications to Table 154-10 so that a black link will deliver the right power at TP3. Different for amplified and non-amplified cases.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The commentor has not demonstrated that there is an issue with the draft. The commentor apparently does not understand the concept of a black link based specification. The requested power levels are shown in Table 154-9. Furthermore the proposed 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.

IEEE P802.3ct D2.1 100 Gb/s over DWDM systems 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Cl 154 SC 154.5.2 P105 L41 # 12  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 to phase changes to each of the DQPSK optical signals  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 to phase changes of each of the DQPSK optical signals  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 154 SC 154.5.3 P105 L49 # 13  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 the phase changes on each of the retrieved DQPSK signals  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 To match 154.5.3: the phase changes of each of the retrieved DQPSK signals  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 154 SC 154.5.3 P106 L5 # 14  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bucket  
 Radians  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 radians  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 154 SC 154.8.12 P114 L34 # 15  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 With regard to D2.0 comment 140, stressed sensitivity: two ways forward are: add a traditional WDM stressed sensitivity (extreme input power, chromatic dispersion, adjacent channel and SJ) with EVM and OSNR, or follow G.698.2 where extreme chromatic dispersion and OSNR, jitter are in separate specifications, while e.g. EVM are in both.

SuggestedRemedy  
 In 154.8.12, 154.8.13 and 154.8.16, write out clearly what impairments are included and what aren't; give an indication of how such a measurement could be done, with a block diagram. Include the appropriate SJ (see 121.8.9.4 for an example, but the parameters will be different here), but preferably with 5 or 6 spot frequencies instead of a mask (see Table 120E-6 for an example).

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This is a similar comment as rejected comment #140 to D2.0. The response to previous comment stated "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." The comment does not provide a specific proposal or provide evidence the suggested change will improve the quality of the draft.