

Recorder(s): John Oberstar (9 AM- 3 PM)  
Matt Traverso (3 PM – close)

[Report from Task 1, channel model](#) Jan 05 Richard Penty University of Cambridge

- No actions recorded.

[Report from TP2 calls](#) Tom Lindsay and 13 others ClariPhy and others

- No actions recorded.

[Report from TP3 Conference Calls](#) Jim McVey and more than 20 others Finisar and others

- No actions recorded.

[IEEE 802.3aq Channel model ad hoc Launch study Summary of progress](#) Jonathan King and six others Big Bear and others

- Kolesar requested further discussion and review of encircled flux specifications as it is his belief that these do not adequately describe OSL.

[FDDI Channel Modeling: understanding OM1 & OM2 fiber distributions](#) John Abbott Corning Incorporated

- No actions recorded.

[PIE-D Analysis of 1998 FDDI Fibers](#) Kasyapa Balemarthy, Ketan Patel, Stephen Ralph, Yi Sun, George Oulundsen, Robert Lingle, Jr., John George Georgia Institute of Technology, OFS

- There was a request to post follow up analysis of fiber #105. Why is there more polarization variation with this fiber than observed in # 101 or 118?

Variation of PIE-D in multimode fibre

Julia Shaw, David Cunningham, Simon Meadowcroft

Agilent Technologies

- J. Abbott request to follow up with Cunningham on OFL bandwidths used (slide 14)
- Aronson requested: Coupled power ratios for ball lens Into SMF versus MMF.

PIE-D statistics Comparison Between Averaged Mode and Individual Mode Computation Method

Yu Sun and five others

Optium and others

- No actions recorded

PIE Metric Simulations vs. Launch Condition

John Ewen, Jonathan Ingham, Richard Penty, Ian White

JDSU, University of Cambridge

- No actions recorded

Transmitter Preemphasis: An Easier Path to 99% Coverage at 300m?Lew Aronson, Jim McVey, The-  
Linh Nguyen

Finisar

- John Abbott requests good reference on pre-emphasis to be sent out to reflector.
- A. Ghiasi requests Aronson to show specific impulse responses of the channel.
- D. Cunningham request Aronson to look carefully at comparing PIE-Ds of NRZ to those of pre-emphasis.
- A. Ghiasi recommends adding some penalty for laser.
- N. Swenson suggests adding a "benign" channel to the TWDP channel model

**COMMENT REVIEW**

Editor proposes motion that email and presentations comments be accepted as non-controversial and be adopted (minus comment 87).

Motion passes by acclamation

**COMMENT 52**

FOR: 31, AGAINST: 0 ABSTAIN: 6

**COMMENT 56**

FOR: 30, AGAINST: 0 ABSTAIN: 10

**COMMENT 51**

Show of Hands – Adopted

**COMMENT 53**

**Withdrawn**

**COMMENT 44**

This is actually a change to the current draft specification

Proposes changing min from 1260 nm to 1270 nm

Several comments that little simulation work been done involving this parameter

- Piers to distribute proposed spec curve to reflector – DONE (01/24/05)
- **Review of Comment Postponed by show of hands**

**COMMENT 55**

- **Withdrawn**

**COMMENT 40**

- **Review postponed** per Dawe

**COMMENT 41**

- Dawe proposed friendly amendment where 400/400 should be reached by multiplying by 0.8 (egg. 400/500). Table now will read:  
50um 500/500 0.5 to 300 2  
50um 400/400 0.4 to 240 2
- **Motion passes by acclamation**

Recorder(s): John Oberstar (9 AM- 6:15 PM)  
David Cunningham (6:15 – close)

[MATLAB code for TWDP Proposed resolution for comment #109](#) Tom Lindsay ClariPhy  
*113 KB*

- MATLAB is currently in the TOOLS area which is a public area
- Tool is currently shown with copyright by ClariPHY
- Some comments about problems with maintenance of code due to MATLAB engine updates
- Copyright must be removed if tool is to remain in public area

[TP3 Stress Test – IPR selection](#) *111 KB* Sudeep Bhoja Big Bear

- Comments about choice of PIE-D range and reference to 3.6 dB of ISI penalty in relation to LX4 specification

[TP3 - ISI Generator Block for Stressed Sensitivity Test](#) *76 KB added 21 Jan 05*

Petre Popescu,  
Sudeep Bhoja, Lew  
Aronson

Quake Technologies, Big  
Bear Networks, Finisar

- No actions recorded.

**COMMENT 49**

- **Show of Hands – Pass**

**COMMENT104**

- **Accept**

**COMMENT 81**

- Add v.52 to list of References
- **FOR: 23, AGAINST: 0, ABSTAIN: 8**

**COMMENT 83**

- **Withdrawn** – Similar to 81

**COMMENT 84**

- **Passes on voice vote**

**COMMENT 105**

- 2<sup>7</sup>-1 is mentioned in several areas which should have been covered by earlier pattern acceptance
- **Passes on voice** vote – no Nays

**COMMENT 106**

- Discussion deferred until additional clarification in afternoon.

**COMMENT 107**

- **FOR: 23, AGAINST: 2, ABSTAIN: 18**

**COMMENT 108**

- **Passes by show of hands**

**COMMENT 109**

- Note that copyright will need to be removed per earlier action cited in MATLAB discussion of Tuesday 1/25/05
- Modified response to include “Removing copyright marking”.
- **FOR: 26, AGAINST: 1, ABSTAIN: 16**

**COMMENT 110**

- Edited response to “Change “Laser response” in figure 1 of document to “TP2 transmitter response.”
- **Passes on show of hands**

**COMMENT 111**

- **Withdrawn** and deferred to 106

**Launch Extinction Ratio: 43, 45, 57****Comment 43**

- In favor of 3dB ER: 9
- In favor of 3.5dB ER: 18
- **Lindsay withdraws comment**

**Comment 45**

- **Passes on voice vote.**

**Comment 57**

- **Withdrawn** by Aronson

**Simple Receiver Test – 69, 70, 122**

**Comment 69**

- **Withdrawn** by Sudeep

**Comment 70**

- Time domain show of hands – 6
- Bessel Thomson show of hands – 7
- Edited to include some wording from Comment 122 , removed word “approx.”, modified 3dB to 3dB electrical

**Comment 122**

- Much discussion and long editing of response
- **FOR: 12, AGAINST: 11**

**Comment 62**

- **Passes on voice vote**

**Comment 64**

- **Passes by show of hands**

**Comment 65**

- **Passes by show of hands**

**Comment 118**

- **FOR: 32, Against:0, Abstain: 9**

**Comment 66**

- **FOR: 32, Against:0, Abstain: 9**

**Comment 67**

- **Motion to Table**
  - Proposed: John George
  - Seconded: Paul Koleshar
  - (Procedural Issue – 50% needed)
  - For: 12, Against: 18, Abstain: recorder missed abstain count**
  - Motion: Fails**
- Straw poll for what numbers to insert  
Voting is as many times as allowed  
Three Options for values were proposed
- Petre's #'s: FOR: 14
- Sudeep's #'s: FOR: 19
- Averaging of both: FOR: 10

- **Motion is proposed to adopt the Response as drafted with Sudeep's values.**  
**For: 29, Against: 2, Abstain: 14**

**Comment 74**

- **Withdrawn**

**Comment 75**

- **Passes by voice vote**

**Comment 76**

- **Withdrawn by Dawe**

**Comment 77**

- **Passes by voice vote**

**Comment 68**

- Tom Lindsay desires to find all instances of text before resubmitting
- **Comment is withdrawn**

**Comment 106**

- Modify wording to that proposed by Dawe in remedy to Comment 106
- Modify Figure 68-5 as presented by Lindsay in afternoon presentation (File:Tom106Jan05)
- Dawe agrees that figure meets his request
- **Passes by show of hands**

Comments: 115, 119 resolved.

Adjourned for day at 1845 hrs

Recorder(s): John Oberstar (9 AM - 3 PM)  
David Cunningham (8 – 9 AM, 3PM – close)

The Chair opened the meeting at 0815 hrs.

The Chair reminded the group of the agenda for the day:

- Comment resolution during morning with a target stop time of 12:00 noon.
- The closing plenary would begin at 1300 hrs and end by 1530 hrs.

Nick Weiner restarted comment review session at 0825 hrs.

### **Simple Receiver Test**

#### **Comment 70**

- **Accept by voice**

#### **Noise Comments: 47, 48 , 92-95, 97-99**

#### **Comment 47**

- **Passes** by Voice vote

#### **Comment 48**

Comment resolution database recorded result of discussion.

#### **Comment 92**

- Response as edited by group and entered into Response.
- **Passed** by show of hands.

#### **Comment 93**

- Response as edited by group and entered into Response.
- **Passed** by show of hands

#### **Comment 94**

- Response as edited by group and entered into Response.
- **Passed** by show of hands

#### **Comment 95**

- Response as edited by group and entered into Response.
- **Passed** by show of hands

#### **Comment 96**

- **Passed** by show of hands



**Comment 97**

- Response as edited by group and entered into Response.
- **Passed** by show of hands

**Comment 98**

- **Passed** by show of hands
- 

**Comment 40**

- Many comments that 300m with CL on OM3 was not a problem.
- **Withdrawn by Dawe**

**Test Pattern Comments – 79 , 80 , 87****Comment 87**

- **Passed** by show of hands

**Comment 79**

- **Passed** by show of hands

**Comment 87**

- **Withdrawn** ..covered by 79

**Comment 80**

- **Withdrawn** ..covered by 79

**Comment 90**

- **Passed** by show of hands

**Comment 103**

- **Passed** by show of hands

**Comment 59**

- **Passed** by show of hands

**Comment 44**

- Piers Dawe accepted action from John Abbott to provide reflector with references to how analysis and conclusion were arrived at. References to prior work by Fiber Channel and GbE were mentioned by the group
- .FOR: 23 , AGAINST: 1 , Abstain: 3

**Comment 125**

- **Passes** by show of hand

**Comment 126**

- **Passes**
- Editor to confirm that the reference to MMF is correct.

**Comment 116**

- Editor will resolve..Editorial issue.

**Comment 22**

- **Withdrawn**

**Comment 103**

- **Passes** by show of hands
- Document Tom103Jan05.

**Comment 33**

- **Passes** by show of hands

**Comment 35**

**Passes** by show of hands

This leaves the editor with comments 1-21 to deal with.

Chair asked if group willing to accept Editor inputs on these (most appear to be editorial)

**Voice vote – Passes...no NAYs**

**Jim McVey – TBD Review**

- 13 found and (1) “probably requiring TBD”
- Pg 5..closed by 41 and Dawe acceptance of OM3 today

- **Conclusion: TBDs are all addressed by Comments**

#### Jim McVey – Editor’s Notes Review

- Pg 12. line 43...
- Editor has definition of encircled flux from Clause 52 and MCP definitions from Clause 38.
- **Voice vote confirms this is editorial issue.**
- **Remove Editor note from 68.9.1**  
Kolesar and Swanson can in future readdress.
- **McVey concludes all other Editor Notes appear to be covered by Comments.**

**Minutes from this meeting will be reviewed and approved by next meeting.**

#### \* Channel Modelling Ad Hoc

##### **Motion 1** (Technical)

“Confirm adoption of 108 fiber set with 9 kink positions as presented in penty\_1\_0904 and adopt the MC67 Monte Carlo fiber set as presented in abbott\_1\_1104 as baseline distributions for 62.5µm FDDI-grade fiber models for 10GBASE-LRM specifications.”  
Can be found on Tools Page: <http://www.ieee802.org/3/aq/public/tools/index.html>

##### **Abbott Proposes, Petar P Seconds**

**Vote...Y: 36, N: 0, A: 3**

**Passed**

##### **Motion 2** (Technical)

“Confirm adoption of OM3 Monte Carlo set as presented in ewen\_1\_0904.pdf as baseline distribution for OM3-grade fiber models for 10GBASE-LRM specifications.”  
Can be found on Tools Page:  
<http://www.ieee802.org/3/aq/public/tools/index.html>

##### **Petar Proposes, Abbott Seconds**

**Vote...Y: 27, N: 0, A: 2**

**Passed**

##### **Motion 3** (Technical)

“Confirm adoption of the connector transfer matrices as presented in pepeljugoski\_1\_0104.pdf, ewen\_1\_09\_04.pdf and ewen\_2\_1104.pdf as baseline connector models for 50um and 62.5um fiber links using connectors for the development of 10GBASE-LRM specifications.”

Can be found on Tools Page: <http://www.ieee802.org/3/aq/public/tools/index.html>

**Ewen Proposes, Petar P Seconds**

**Vote...Y: 24, N: 0, A: 2**

**Passed**

**Motion 4** (Technical)

- 10GBASE-LRM accepts changes and edits to D1.0 per comment review and motions at this meeting.
- 10GBASE-LRM directs the editor to create draft D1.1.
- The editor is given permission to address the comments that were agreed to be editorial.

**Mover: McVey, Second: Jaeger**

**Vote...Y: 29, N: 0, A:0**

**Passed**

**Motion 5** (Technical)

- By the 10<sup>th</sup> of Feb, which is at least 30 days before the March Plenary the Chair/Editor to post D1.1 for preview by IEEE 802.3 in anticipation of requesting Working Group ballot of D1.2(D2.0).
- D1.1 to be sent for 15 day TF review: TF comment deadline 25<sup>th</sup> Feb.

**Mover:Bhoja, Second: Lindsay**

**Vote...Y: 27, N: 0, A:0**

**Passed**

**Motion to adjourn passed by acclamation.**