

IEEE P802.3cp D2.0 BiDi 10/25/50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 157 SC 157.2.4 P44 L35 # 237

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

The statement "The PMA also may provide an observable electrical interface for the 25GAUI or 50GAUI chip-to-chip 35 (C2C) or chip-to-module (C2M)." has no meaning within the scope of the standard. Anything that is not forbidden in the standard may be provided.

SuggestedRemedy

If optional standardized test points are specified or called out then say so. If that is not the case then delete the text.

Response Response Status **U**

REJECT.
This follows last sentence in 105.3.4

Cl 157 SC 157.4 P45 L18 # 238

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

I believe that PAUSE operation is not the only reason that demands that there be an upper bound on the propagation delays through the network. I am given to understand that both maximum and minimum transit time need to be specified to support TSN.

SuggestedRemedy

Generalize the reasons for specifying delay and include specification of minimum delay as well.

Response Response Status **U**

REJECT.
Remedy is not specific enough.
Can you please provide an 802.3 reference clause for the minimum delay constraint spec?

Cl 158 SC 158.9 P55 L6 # 94

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

An indirect reference like this should not be used because of the difficulty of properly maintaining the document. Because the subclauses of 52.10 specifically reference port types, it could be argued that the requirements do not apply because clause 52 does not reference 10BASE-BRx port types.

SuggestedRemedy

A general safety subclause should copy P802.3cr 52.10.1, and the other clauses can copy the relevant subclauses of the latest revision or amendment that changes the text of the relevant subclause.

If indirection is still desired, the port type lists in Clause 52 need to be deleted (preferred) or expanded to include 10GBASE-BRx.

Response Response Status **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See #184, editorial license to add safety requirements as .3cu, .3ct

Cl 158 SC 158.12.4.9 P63 L8 # 96

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

E1 is not properly written. P802.3cr is eliminating references to IEC 60950-1.

SuggestedRemedy

The PICs should point to J.2 which is being inserted by P802.3cr. If indirection is retained, the PICs could be written more like E1 in Clause 159 to eliminate a contradiction to P8023cr.

Response Response Status **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See #184, follow .3cu D3.0 to refer to J.2, apply same statement to Clauses 159 and 160.

Cl 159 SC 159.8 P73 L33 # 97

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

The indirection is getting a bit absurd. This points to 114.8, and 114.8 points to 112.8. Then you have the same problem of 112.8 specifications being specific to 25GBASE-SR.

SuggestedRemedy

If still using indirection, remove the two levels of indirection and point to 112.8. Fix corresponding PICS items in 159.11.4.8.

Response Response Status **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Editorial license to use content in 802.3cu D2.2 Clause 151.9 for .3cp 159.8

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general

COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Pa 73

Li 33

Page 1 of 2

11/17/2020 7:51:30 PM

IEEE P802.3cp D2.0 BiDi 10/25/50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 160 SC 160.8 P92 L6 # 98

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Another example of indirection problems. Laser safety descriptions include port types in the description. General safety is changed by P802.3cr, etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Change (or not) consistent with changes made to 158 and 159.

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See#184, follow .3cu D3.0 to refer to J.2, apply same statement to Clauses 159 and 160.

Cl 158	SC 158.6.2	P54	L30	# 37
Dawe, Piers		Nvidia		
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status	R	FEC
10GBASE-BR20 uses FEC so VECP, which was chosen for a no-FEC situation, may not work as a way of calibrating the SRS for this PMD.				
SuggestedRemedy				
Consider using SEC (see 95.8.8.2 and 95.8.5, but choose a limit appropriate for this PMD)				
Response	Response Status U			
REJECT.				
Maintain the optical measurement test for 10GBASE-R. Tests for 10GBASE-R are more conservative than SEC. the link should be able to close.				

Note: Comment 37 was satisfied on Nov 19

Cl 160	SC 160.7.4	P111	L37	# 44
Dawe, Piers		Nvidia		
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status	R	refer-copy
Too much repetition				
SuggestedRemedy				
Refer to other clauses, for several subclauses here				
Response	Response Status U			
REJECT.				
This material is included in Clause 139. It follows the recent style of the subclause of definition of optical parameters and measurement methods				

P802.3cp D2.2 BiDi 10, 25, and 50 Gb/s Optical Access PHYs 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot com

CI 160 SC 160.6.1 P113 L28 # 14

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

It is very unwise to delete the limit on $K = 10\log_{10}(\text{Ceq})$, and also unwise to add the over/under-shoot and transmitter power excursion (max) limits (see the latest P802.3cu draft). These three limits protect the receiver from different stressful signals that the ideal reference receiver with infinite resolution and perfect linearity reports have acceptable TDECQ, but real receivers designed to realistic cost and power objectives struggle with.

SuggestedRemedy

Reinstate the limit on $K = 10\log_{10}(\text{Ceq})$.

Add over/under-shoot and transmitter power excursion (max) limits as in the latest P802.3cu draft.

Response

Response Status U

REJECT.

For the first suggested remedy of "Reinstate the limit on $K = 10\log_{10}(\text{Ceq})$ ", cp follows the removal of " $K = 10\log_{10}(\text{Ceq})$ " in P802.3cu. The latest decision from P802.3cu supports removal of K. In the case it will be necessary to include full references:

- In P802.3cu resolution to comment #2 to D1.1 it was agreed to remove $K = 10\log_{10}(\text{Ceq})$ and replace with several other parameters like TECQ and TDECQ – TECQ.
- In P802.3cu resolution to comment #87 to D2.0, a proposal to reinstate $K = 10\log_{10}(\text{Ceq})$ was rejected.
- In P802.3cu resolution to comment #30 to D2.1, another proposal to reinstate $K = 10\log_{10}(\text{Ceq})$ was rejected, referring to comment #87 to D2.0.

For the second suggested remedy of "Add over/under-shoot and transmitter power excursion (max) limits as in the latest P802.3cu draft", the commenter has not provided any evidence that these requirements are necessary for 50 Gb/s PAM4 applications and that adding those would increase the quality of the draft.

CI 160 SC 160.7.4 P118 L25 # 4

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Too much duplication

SuggestedRemedy

Refer to other clauses, for several subclauses here

Response

Response Status U

REJECT.

This is the same as D2.1 Comment #44.

This material is included in Clause 139. It follows the recent style of the subclause of definition of optical parameters and measurement methods.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general

COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

CI 160

SC 160.7.4

Page 1 of 1

11/17/2020 7:41:01 PM