Cl **108**   *SC* **108.2.2**   *P* **104**   *L* **25**   # 1

Gorshe, Steve   PMC-Sierra

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

Per ALU comment #20136, I find that the rate compensation method is inconsistant with the project objective: "Provide appropriate support for OTN"

SuggestedRemedy

Add CWMs to all 25Gbit/s Ethernet PHYs as proposed in trowbridge_3by_01_0915

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

[Editor changed Clause from 10805 to 108 and Subclause from 10805.2.2 to 108.2.2.]

The task force reviewed the cited presentation in consideration of D2.0 comments 136, 137, 138, 139, and 190 at the September 2015 task force meeting. Based on Motion #4 at the September 2015 Interim meeting there was no consensus to make the proposed changes.

See the September 2015 task force meeting minutes here:
http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Sept15/minutes_01_3by_0915_approved.pdf

Cl **108**   *SC* **108.2.4**   *P* **106**   *L* **1**   # 2

Gorshe, Steve   PMC-Sierra

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

Per ALU comment #20137, I find that having some PMDs use CWMs and others not use CWMs is inconsistant with the project objective: "Provide appropriate support for OTN"

SuggestedRemedy

Add CWMs to all 25Gbit/s Ethernet PHYs as proposed in trowbridge_3by_01_0915

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

[Editor changed Clause from 10805 to 108 and Subclause from 10805.2.4 to 108.2.4.]

See response to comment #1.

Cl **108**   *SC* **108.3.3**   *P* **109**   *L* **47**   # 3

Gorshe, Steve   PMC-Sierra

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

Per ALU comment #20138, I find that having some PMDs use CWMs and others not use CWMs is inconsistant with the project objective: "Provide appropriate support for OTN"

SuggestedRemedy

Add CWMs to all 25Gbit/s Ethernet PHYs as proposed in trowbridge_3by_01_0915

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

[Editor changed Clause from 10805 to 108 and Subclause from 10805.3.3 to 108.3.3.]

See response to comment #1.

Cl **108**   *SC* **108.3.6**   *P* **110**   *L* **27**   # 4

Gorshe, Steve   PMC-Sierra

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

Per ALU comment #20139, I find that the rate compensation method is inconsistant with the project objective: "Provide appropriate support for OTN"

SuggestedRemedy

Add CWMs to all 25Gbit/s Ethernet PHYs as proposed in trowbridge_3by_01_0915

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

[Editor changed Clause from 10805 to 108 and Subclause from 10805.3.6 to 108.3.6.]

See response to comment #1.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **4**

Page 1 of 3
2015-11-12 1:21:33 PM

Cl **108** *SC* **108.5.2.2** *P* **106** *L* **25** # 20136
Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *OTN, BTI*

Doing rate compensation below the PCS precludes developing an OTN mapping for 25GbE which is PCS codeword transparent.

SuggestedRemedy

See trowbridge_3by_01_0915.pdf for proposed remedy. The problem can be solved if all of the PMDs have CWMs, none of the PMDs have CWMs, or if no rate compensation is done to insert CWMs (i.e., overclock to insert CWM). Propose to move the rate compensation to the PCS. Rate compensation should similarly be removed from Figure 108-2.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The task force reviewed the cited presentation.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes. See Motion #4.

See comments 137, 138, 139 and 190.

Cl **108** *SC* **108.5.2.4** *P* **108** *L* **1** # 20137
Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *OTN, BTI*

Some PMDs having CWMs and others not prevents creating a PCS codeword transparent mapping for 25GbE into OTN which can interconnect any pair of 25GbE PMDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to move CWM insertion to the PCS. See trowbridge_3by_01_0915.pdf for details. If CWM insertion is moved to the PCS, Figure 108-3 needs to transcode the CWM from four 66B blocks to the 257B format.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The task force reviewed the cited presentation.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes. See Motion #4.

See comments 136, 138, 139, and 190.

Cl **108** *SC* **108.5.3.3** *P* **111** *L* **47** # 20138
Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *OTN, BTI*

Some PMDs having CWMs and others not prevents developing a PCS codeword transparent mapping into OTN which can interconnect any pair of 25GbE PMDs.

SuggestedRemedy

See trowbridge_3by_01_0915.pdf for details. Move CWM removal to the PCS, and replace this text with how to transcode CWM from the 257B format back to four 66B blocks.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The task force reviewed the cited presentation.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes. See Motion #4.

See comments 136, 137, 139 and 190.

Cl **108** *SC* **108.5.3.6** *P* **112** *L* **15** # 20139
Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *OTN, BTI*

Having rate compensation below the PCS prevents creating a PCS codeword transparent mapping into OTN which can interconnect any pair of 25GbE PMDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Move this rate compensation to the PCS and add CWM to all PMDs. See trowbridge_3by_01_0915.pdf.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The task force reviewed the cited presentation.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes. See Motion #4.

See comments 136, 137, 138, and 190.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **20139** Page 2 of 3
2015-11-12 1:21:33 PM

Cl **000**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 20190
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**   *OTN, BTI*

The current draft contains two different variants of 25 Gb/s Ethernet where idle insertion/deletion has to be performed in order to convert from one type to the other (at the OTN will have to do) due to one containing CWMs and the other not.
While the exact requirements of the objective: "Provide appropriate support for OTN" are somewhat vague, I do not consider that this has been met.

SuggestedRemedy

Add CWMs to all 25 Gb/s Ethernet PHYs as per the proposal in
http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Sep15/trowbridge_3by_01_0915.pdf

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

The task force reviewed the cited presentation.

There is no consensus to make the proposed changes. See Motion #4.

See comments 136, 137, 138, and 139.

Cl **045**   *SC* **45.2.1.97**   *P* **38**   *L* **50**   # 21021
Anslow, Pete   Ciena

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

The title of Register 1.180 is being changed in the subclause title and the first sentence of 45.2.1.97 and in the title of Table 45-77, but not in Table 45-3 which has a row:
Register address = 1.180 through 1.183
Register name = CAUI-4 chip-to-chip transmitter equalization, receive direction, lane 0 through lane 3
Subclause = 45.2.1.97, 45.2.1.98
Also, there are many references to "CAUI-4" in the subclauses of 45.2.1.97 which don't make sense when this register is used for 25GAUI.
There are the same issues with the change of name for register 1.184

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 45-3, change the existing row into two rows:
Register address = 1.180
Register name = CAUI-4 C2C and 25GAUI C2C transmitter equalization, receive direction, lane 0
Subclause = 45.2.1.97

Register address = 1.181 through 1.183
Register name = CAUI-4 chip-to-chip transmitter equalization, receive direction, lane 1 through lane 3
Subclause = 45.2.1.98

Fix the issues with the references to "CAUI-4" in the subclauses of 45.2.1.97
Make equivalent changes for Register 1.184

Response   *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement suggested remedy.

Also, update Table 45-3 to address all changes that have been made in P802.3by.

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **21021**   Page 3 of 3
2015-11-12 1:21:33 PM