
Agenda and General Information

IEEE P802.3cu 100 Gb/s and 400 Gb/s over SMF
at 100 Gb/s per Wavelength Task Force

Mark Nowell, Cisco

Ad hoc meeting

May 5th, 2020

P802.3cu Task Force

Draft Agenda

- Approve agenda
- Approval minutes
- Review IEEE Policies (<http://ieee802.org/3/policies.html>)
 - IEEE SA Patent Policy
 - IEEE SA Copyright Policy
 - IEEE SA Participation Policy
- Task Force update
- Task Force meeting plans
- Presentations
- Adjourn

Attendance

- Attendance will be captured from the Webex meeting usage report. If you attend by audio only, please send email to chair with name, employer, affiliation for record of attendance
- Please log into the Webex application with **BOTH** your name and affiliation in the NAME field.
 - E.g. Name: “Mark Nowell (Cisco)”
- Missing affiliations will be filled in before posting minutes based on previous affiliations provided in earlier meetings. Participants are encouraged to review the minutes to ensure correct information is included.

Participants have a duty to inform the IEEE

- Participants shall inform the IEEE (or cause the IEEE to be informed) of the identity of each holder of any potential Essential Patent Claims of which they are personally aware if the claims are owned or controlled by the participant or the entity the participant is from, employed by, or otherwise represents
- Participants should inform the IEEE (or cause the IEEE to be informed) of the identity of any other holders of potential Essential Patent Claims
- Early identification of holders of potential Essential Patent Claims is encouraged

Ways to inform IEEE

- Cause an LOA to be submitted to the IEEE-SA (patcom@ieee.org); or
- Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible; or
- Speak up now and respond to this Call for Potentially Essential Patents
If anyone in this meeting is personally aware of the holder of any patent claims that are potentially essential to implementation of the proposed standard(s) under consideration by this group and that are not already the subject of an Accepted Letter of Assurance, please respond at this time by providing relevant information to the WG Chair

Presentations today

Agenda:

- “Considerations on how to express receiver sensitivity in P802.3cu” Peter Stassar, Huawei
- “802.3cu D2.1 PMD Spec Proposed Changes” Chris Cole, II-VI

802.3cu Task Force Update


D2.1 Recirculation Ballot underway now:

- Ballot Open 4/25 to 5/10
- See: <http://www.ieee802.org/3/cu/email/msg00236.html>

Task Force plans:

- May and July Face-to-face meetings have been cancelled
- Continue to use interim teleconferences to progress work
- Next sequence starts Tues May 19th @ 7am PT
- Outlook/Webex invites sent until 6/23.
- For details see: <http://www.ieee802.org/3/cu/email/msg00230.html>
- Also see:
 - <http://www.ieee802.org/3/calendar.html>
 - http://www.ieee802.org/3/cu/public/May20/call_info.html

IEEE P802.3cu Task Force draft Timeline



Legend

- ▲ IEEE 802 Plenary
- IEEE 802.3 Interim
- IEEE-SA Standards Board

Timeline of Drafts and Reviews:

- 2019: D1.0 (TF Reviews), D1.1 (TF Reviews)
- 2020: D2.0 (WG Ballots), D2.1 (WG Ballots), D2.2 (WG Ballots), D3.0 (IEEE-SA Ballots), D3.1 (IEEE-SA Ballots), D3.2 (IEEE-SA Ballots)

RevCom Submittal dates
 • 13 Oct 2020

Thank You!

Straw Polls

Straw polls related to technical changes to the draft

Straw Poll #1:

I would support changing the TDECQ(max), TECQ(max) and SECQ(max) values for 400GBASE-LR4-6 from 3.5dB to 3.4dB as proposed in slide 3 of cole_3cu_adhoc_050520_v4.

Yes: 19 No: 4

Straw Poll #2:

I would support changing to a single extinction ratio range for the specification of TxOMA for 400GBASE-FR4 and 400GBASE-LR4-6, with values consistent with those defined for ER<4.5 in the D2.1 draft.

Yes: 17 No: 5

Straw Poll #3:

I would support changing to a single extinction ratio range for the specification of TxOMA for 100GBASE-FR1 and 100GBASE-LR1, with values consistent with those defined for ER<4.5 in the D2.1 draft.

Yes: 16 No: 5

Straw Polls

Straw polls associated with editorial changes to the draft:

Straw Poll #4:

For representing TxOMA requirements in the “transmit characteristics” tables, I would prefer:

A: Editorial Alternative 1 in slide 4 of cole_3cu_adhoc_050520_v4,

B: Editorial Alternative 2 in slide 4 of cole_3cu_adhoc_050520_v4

C: No strong opinion

A: 6 B:14 C: 8

Straw Poll #5:

For representing RS requirements in the “receive characteristics” tables, I would prefer the editorial approach shown:

A: Editorial Alternative 1 in slide 5 of cole_3cu_adhoc_050520_v4

B: Editorial Alternative 2 in slide 5 of cole_3cu_adhoc_050520_v4

C: No strong opinion

A: 5 B: 16 C: 7

Straw Poll #6:

For representing RS requirements in the “receive characteristics” tables, I would prefer to use TECQ or SECQ in the tables:

A: TECQ

B: SECQ

A: 18 B: 8