

Motions & Strawpolls

John D'Ambrosia

Futurewei, Subsidiary of Huawei

Nov 13, 2018

Monday Strawpolls- 40km Objective Related

Strawpoll #1

- I would support the following nomenclature:
 - A. 50GBASE-ER (50 Gb/s operation over at least 40 km of SMF)
 - B. 200GBASE-ER4 (200 Gb/s operation over four wavelengths capable of at least 40 km of SMF)
 - C. 400GBASE-ER8 (400 Gb/s operation over eight wavelengths capable of at least 40 km of SMF)
- Voice Vote – No opposition to this nomenclature

Strawpoll #2

- I would support adopting the baseline for 50GBASE-ER defined in xu_3cn_01b_1118 .pdf
- Yes – $15+15+16 = 46$
- No - 0
- Abstain – $3+5+2 = 10$

Strawpoll #3

- I would support adopting the baseline for 200GBASE-ER4 defined in xu_3cn_02b_1118 .pdf
- Yes – $16+14+16 = 46$
- No - 0
- Abstain – $3+5+5 = 13$

Strawpoll #4

- I would support adopting the baseline for 400GBASE-ER8 defined in chang_3cn_01b_1118 .pdf
- Yes – $15+14+14 = 43$
- No - 0
- Abstain – $7+7+3 = 17$

Tuesday Strawpolls – 80km Objective Related

Strawpoll #5

- For PHYs targeting “x” Gb/s operation on a single wavelength capable of at least 80 km over a DWDM system” I would support the following nomenclature:

A. 100GBASE-ZR / 400GBASE-ZR	11+ 8 + 17 = 36
B. 100GBASE-AR / 400GBASE-AR	1+2+4 = 7
C. 100GBASE-ZA / 400GBASE-ZA	1+2+0 = 3
D. NONE OF THE ABOVE	0+0 +0

Strawpoll #6

- For the 400 GbE 80km objective - I would support the black link approach, noted in lyubomirsky_3cn_02a_1118 and defined in stassar_b10k_01_0318

a. Yes	16+18+21 = 55
b. No	0
c. Need More Information	2+1 = 3
d. Abstain	1+0+3 = 4

Strawpoll #7

- For the 400 GbE – 80km objective I would support the following channel spacing (Chicago rules)

a. 75 GHz	0
b. 100 GHz	15+16+20 = 51
c. Need more information	2+2+0 = 4
d. Abstain	2+3+4 = 9

Strawpoll #8

- For 100 GbE 80km objectives I would support the following channel spacing (Chicago rules)

a. 50 GHz	$2+1+3 = 6$
b. 75 GHz	0
c. 100 GHz	$14+11+12 = 37$
d. Need more information	$3+4+4 = 11$
e. Abstain	$3+4+2 = 9$

Strawpoll #9

- I would support the following modulation format for the 400 GbE 80km objective
 - a. DP-16QAM $12+18+20 = 50$
 - b. Need more information $2+0+0 = 2$
 - c. Abstain $4+1+4 = 9$

Strawpoll #10

- I would support the FEC assumptions made in lyubomirsky_3cn_02a_1118 (CFEC) for 400GbE 80km Objective

a. Yes	9+18+15 = 42
b. No	0
c. Need more information	1+4+2 = 7
d. Abstain	3+3+6= 12

Strawpoll #11

- I would support the frame assumptions made in lyubomirsky_3cn_02a_1118 (400ZR Frame, GMP, 20ppm, DSP Frame) for 400GbE 80km Objective

a. Yes	10+15+13 = 38
b. No	0
c. Need more information	1+3+3 = 7
d. Abstain	3+2+4 = 9

Motions - Tuesday

Motion #4

Motion	Move to adopt the following nomenclature <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 50GBASE-ER 50 Gb/s operation over at least 40 km of SMF• 200GBASE-ER4 200 Gb/s operation over four wavelengths capable of at least 40 km of SMF• 400GBASE-ER8 400 Gb/s operation over eight wavelengths capable of at least 40 km of SMF• 100GBASE-ZR - 100 Gb/s operation on a single wavelength capable of at least 80 km over a DWDM system• 400GBASE-ZR - 400 Gb/s operation on a single wavelength capable of at least 80 km over a DWDM system		
Mover	Steve Sekel		
Seconder	Frank Chang		
Requirement	Technical ($\geq 75\%$)		
Results	Y: 11+18+19 = 48	N: 0	Abstain: 1+2+0 = 3
Motion	Passes		

Motion #5

Motion	Move to adopt a baseline for the “50 Gb/s operation over at least 40 km of SMF” objective based on the proposal in xu_3cn_01b_1118.		
Mover	Yu Xu		
Seconder	Pete Anslow		
Requirement	Technical ($\geq 75\%$)		
Results	Y: 18+24+15 = 57	N: 0	A: 2+1+0 = 3
Motion	Passes		

Motion #6

Motion	Move to adopt a baseline for the “200 Gb/s operation over four wavelengths capable of at least 40 km of SMF” objective based on the proposal in xu_3cn_02b_1118.		
Mover	Yu Xu		
Seconder	Pete Anslow		
Requirement	Technical ($\geq 75\%$)		
Results	Y: 23+19+19 = 61	N: 0	A: 2+1+0 = 3
Motion	Passes		

Motion #7

Motion	Move to adopt a baseline for the “400 Gb/s operation over eight wavelengths capable of at least 40 km of SMF” objective based on the proposal in chang_3cn_01b_1118 .pdf		
Mover	Frank Chang		
Seconder	Pete Anslow		
Requirement	Technical ($\geq 75\%$)		
Results	Y: 24+16+23 = 63	N: 0	A: 2+1+4 = 7
Motion	Passes		

Motion #8

Motion	I support adopting DP-16QAM modulation format for the 400 GbE 80km objective		
Mover	Ilya Lyubomirsky		
Seconder	Mark Nowell		
Requirement	Technical ($\geq 75\%$)		
Results	Y: 19+25+21 = 65	N: 0	A: 1+6+0 = 7
Motion	Passes		

Motion #9

Motion	I support adopting the FEC proposal made in lyubomirsky_3cn_02a_1118 (CFEC) for 400GbE 80km Objective		
Mover	Ilya Lyubomirsky		
Seconder	Mark Nowell		
Requirement	Technical ($\geq 75\%$)		
Results	Y: 14+16+21 = 51	N: 0	A: 5+6+4 = 15
Motion	Passes		

Motion #10

Motion	Move to adopt the Framing proposal made in lyubomirsky_3cn_02a_1118 for 400GbE 80km Objective
Mover	Ilya Lyubomirsky
Seconder	Mark Nowell
Requirement	Technical ($\geq 75\%$)
Results	Y: N: A:
Motion	Withdrawn, M/S Agree to withdraw

Motion #11

Motion	Move that the IEEE P802.3cn Task Force develop a modification of the IEEE P802.3cn PAR to address “Objectives related to “at least 40 km of SMF” and create a new IEEE P802.3ct PAR to address “Objectives related to “at least 80 km over a DWDM system”		
Mover	Jeff Maki		
Seconder	Pete Anslow		
Requirement	Procedural > 50%		
Results	Y: 51	N: 5	A: 19
Motion	Passes		

Motion #12

Motion	Move to adopt <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the objectives stated on Slide #3 of dambrosia_3cn_01b_1118 for the modified IEEE P802.3cn Project• The objectives stated on Slide #3 of dambrosia_3cn_02b_1118 for the IEEE P802.3ct Project		
Mover	Steve Trowbridge		
Seconder	Pete Anslow		
Requirement	Technical ($\geq 75\%$)		
Results	Y: 14+24+24= 62	N 1	A 2+4+1 = 7
Motion	Passes		

Motion #13

Motion	Move to adopt <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For the modified IEEE P802.3cn PAR<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The PAR responses in P802_3cn_PAR_131118.pdf• The CSD “Managed Objects”, “Coexistence”, “Broad Market Potential”, “Compatibility”, “Distinct Identity”, “Technical Feasibility”, and “Economic Feasibility” responses, as per slides 6 – 13 of dambrosia_3cn_01b_1118• For the new IEEE P802.3ct PAR<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The PAR responses in P802_3ct_PAR_131118.pdf• The CSD “Managed Objects”, “Coexistence”, “Broad Market Potential”, “Compatibility”, “Distinct Identity”, “Technical Feasibility”, and “Economic Feasibility” responses, as per slides 6 – 13 of dambrosia_3cn_02b_1118		
Mover	Pete Anslow		
Seconder	Frank Chang		
Requirement	Technical ($\geq 75\%$)		
Results	Y: 7+15+21 = 43	N: 0	A: 1
Motion	Passes		