

# Chief Editor's opening report

Tom Issenhuth, Huawei, P802.3cw Chief Editor

IEEE P802.3cw Task Force, 23 May 2022  
Interim Teleconference Meeting

# 802.3cw Editorial team

Tom Issenhuth, Huawei

- Chief Editor and Editor for Clauses 00, 1, 30, 45, 78, 116, 119, 156, Annex 120A and Annex 156A

Dave Lewis, Lumentum

- Editor for Clause 155

# Status


## P802.3cw D1.5 Task Force ballot

- Opened on April 7, 2022, closed on May 4, 2022
- 28 day comment period
- Thanks to all those that commented


Description	Clause	T	TR	E	ER	Total
Front Matter	00			6	6	12
Introduction	1				1	1
Mgmt	30				1	1
Mgmt (MDIO)	45				1	1
EEE	78				1	1
Introduction 20/400	116			3	1	4
PCS	119					0
400GBASE-ZR PCS/PMA	155		2		1	3
400GBASE-ZR PMD	156	8	1	1		10
PMA sublayer partitioning	Annex 120A					0
400GBASE-ZR Applications	Annex 156A					0
Total Comments		8	3	10	12	33

Note: includes 10 late comments (See slide 6)

# Comment Distribution



# Comment History



# Clause Comments

Topic	Clause	Comment #	Count
Front Matter	FM	[ <u>1</u> , 4], [7, 2], 3, 6	6
Introduction	1	15	1
Mgmt	30	16	1
MDIO	45	17	1
200/400Gb Intro	116	18, [20, 21]	3
PCS	119		
PCS/PMA	155	23, 32	2
Optical Channels	156	22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33	10
Annexes	120A, 156A		

Note: 10 late comments highlighted in red

# Bucket Comments

C/A	Comment #	Count
FM	5, [8, <u>9</u> , 10, 11], 12, 13, 14	8
1		
30		
45		
116	19	1
119		
155		
156		
Annexes 120A, 156A		

# Meeting Schedule

- May 16<sup>th</sup>
  - Presentation
    - Williams\_3cw\_01\_220516.pdf (supporting comment 24)
- Any requests to remove comments from the bucket must be submitted by end of day AOE May 19<sup>th</sup>.
- May 23<sup>rd</sup>
  - Presentation
    - Sluyski\_3cw\_01\_220523.pdf (supporting comment 23)
  - Comment resolution
- Future dates if required to be announced.

# Comment Resolution Process

- Resolve comments against Draft 1.5
  - Any presentations associated with comments will be reviewed during comment resolution session.
  - TRs and ERs do not require signoff as to whether commenter is satisfied
- If there is no disagreement on the final proposed response the comment will be closed as proposed.
- If more than 2 people disagree, a straw poll on the area of concern will be taken and the majority position will decide the final response.
  - If the straw poll contains more than 2 choices, the choice with the lowest number of supporters will be removed. This process will continue until there are only 2 choices.

# Comment Resolution Process

- The order in which the comments are reviewed on a given call are subject to change
- Comments bracketed together with [ ] cover a common topic
- Where a comment number is underlined (e.g., 59) it contains the proposed response for the group of comments
- Comments colored blue have associated hyperlinked presentations

# Comment Resolution Process (.3ck,.3cu,.3ct,.3cw)

- **Baseline Terminology**
  - “Open” comments – comments that Task Force have not agreed upon a remedy
  - “Closed” comments – comments that Task Force have agreed upon a remedy
  - “Final” comments – Task Force has approved motion to adopt the responses to the closed comments
- **Post updated comment database after each meeting**
  - Allow individuals (other than commenter) two business days (AoE) to request on the reflector reconsideration of a “Closed” comment from the prior meeting
  - Individual needs to be present at next meeting to address
  - Normal procedures within the group will apply to determine if comment will be re-opened
- **After all comments closed – normal procedures to adopt responses and generate next draft will be followed**
  - Comments can not be re-opened after meeting where responses are adopted by TF

# Note about Comment Resolutions Going Forward

- Consensus building will be key
  - Rule #1 – Use the Reflector
  - Rule #2 – See Rule #1
- Reference: IEEE SA Balloting and Comment Resolution Process Guidelines (<https://standards.ieee.org/content/dam/ieee-standards/standards/web/governance/revcom/guidelines.pdf>)
  - Multiple reasons possible for rejecting comment given –
    - a statement that the CRG could not reach consensus on the changes necessary to address the comment;

# Comment Resolution – May 23

- Resolve the following comments
  - Hear supporting presentations Sluyski\_3cw\_01\_220523.pdf and Maniloff\_3cw\_01\_220523.pdf

Topic	Clause	Comment #	Count
Front Matter	FM	[ <u>1</u> , 4], [7, 2], 3, 6	6
Introduction	1	15	1
Mgmt	30	16	1
MDIO	45	17	1
200/400Gb Intro	116	18, [20, 21]	3
PCS	119		
PCS/PMA	155	23, 32	2
Optical Channels	156	22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33	10
Annexes	120A, 156A		

Thanks!