



# Motion # 1

---

- Move to adopt the response to OIF liaison letter  
“IC\_802p3bm\_oif\_0313\_optx.pdf”
- Mover: Dan Dove                      Seconded: John Abbott
- Procedural 50%
- Passes by voice, without opposition



# Motion # 2

---

- Move to adopt the response to 802.11 PAR review comments “PAR\_Response\_01\_0313\_optx.pdf” and amend our PAR as described on page 6, then resubmit that PAR “P802\_3bm\_PAR\_0313.pdf” to 802.3 and the 802 EC for approval at the March 2013 meeting.
- Mover: Dan Dove                      Seconded: Pete Anslow
- Technical  $\geq 75\%$
- Yes: 61      No: 0      Abstain: 5
- Passes



# Motion # 3

---

- Move to adopt the proposal in slides 4 to 10 of latchman\_02\_0313\_optx as the baseline for “a re-timed 4-lane 100G PMA to PMA electrical interface for chip to chip applications” (with the insertion loss listed as To Be Confirmed)
- Mover: Ryan Latchman   Seconded: Mike Dudek
- Technical  $\geq 75\%$
- Yes: 49      No: 0      Abstain: 20
- Passes
- (Room count = 93)



# Motion # 4

---

- Move to adopt the changes to CAUI naming on slide 5 of anslow\_02\_0313\_optx
- Mover: Pete Anslow      Seconded: John D'Ambrosia
- Technical  $\geq 75\%$
- Yes: 67      No: 2      Abstain: 11
- Passes



# Straw Poll # 1

---

I would support a baseline proposal for a SMF PMD based on:

- a) CWDM
- b) C-BAND
- c) DMT
- d) PSM4
- e) PAMn
- f) none of the above - rely on LR4 with CAUI-4.

Pick one of the above only

a) 15   b) 0   c) 8   d) 25   e) 12   f) 11

Room count = 98



# Straw Poll # 2

---

I would support a baseline proposal for a SMF PMD based on:

- a) CWDM
- b) C-BAND
- c) DMT
- d) PSM4
- e) PAMn
- f) none of the above - rely on LR4 with CAUI-4.

- **Chicago Rules**

- a) 26   b) 0   c) 20   d) 36   e) 22   f) 37



# Straw Poll # 3

---

I would NOT support a baseline proposal for a SMF PMD based on:

- a) CWDM
- b) C-BAND
- c) DMT
- d) PSM4
- e) PAMn
- f) none of the above - rely on LR4 with CAUI-4.

- **Chicago Rules**

- a) 25   b) 60   c) 35   d) 23   e) 30   f) 5



# Straw Poll # 4

---

- Do you believe this proposal is technically feasible:
  - a) CWDM    Y: 55    N: 4
  - b) DMT       Y: 18    N: 38
  - c) PSM4      Y: 59    N: 0
  - d) PAMn      Y: 19    N: 38





# Straw Poll # 5

---

- Do you believe this proposal is economically feasible:

- a) CWDM    Y: 26    N: 21
- b) DMT       Y: 12    N: 35
- c) PSM4     Y: 47    N: 8
- d) PAMn     Y: 18    N: 32
- e) LR4       Y: 26    N: 22



# Straw Poll # 6

---

- Do you believe this proposal has broad market potential :

a) CWDM    Y: 23    N: 27

b) DMT       Y: 11    N: 27

c) PSM4      Y: 32    N: 24

d) PAMn      Y: 18    N: 29

e) LR4        Y: 24    N: 20



# Straw Poll # 7

---

- I believe that the 20 m PMD proposal discussed in king\_01a\_0313\_optx meets the requirements for:

a) Technical feasibility	Y: 19	N: 2
b) Economic feasibility	Y: 11	N: 6
c) Broad market potential	Y: 12	N: 12
d) Distinct identity	Y: 10	N: 12



# Straw Poll # 8

---

- If a 20m PMD proposal were to be adopted, it would have to be interoperable with the 100m PMD for reach  $< 20\text{m}$
- Y: 21
- N: 2
- A: 38



# Straw Poll # 9

---

- Would you support a 20m un-retimed FEC-enabled MMF PHY based upon king\_01a\_0313\_optx
- Y: 13
- N: 6
- A: 42



# Straw Poll # 10

---

- I plan to attend 802.3bm at the following meetings
- May 2013 – Victoria, BC      \_\_\_57\_\_\_
- July 2013 – Geneva, CH      \_\_\_52\_\_\_
- Sept 2013 – York, UK      \_\_\_48\_\_\_
- Nov 2013 – Dallas, TX, USA      \_\_\_61\_\_\_