

P802.3cu D3.0

Comment Resolution Agenda

P802.3cu Editorial Team

IEEE P802.3cu Task Force Conf Call, 29 September 2020

Comment Resolution Process

Goal is to resolve all comments against Draft 3.0

Any presentations associated with comments will be reviewed during comment resolution session.

If there is no disagreement on the final proposed response, the comment will be closed as proposed.

If there is disagreement on the final proposed response from anyone other than the commenter, a measure of consensus will be taken and the majority position will decide the final response.

Comment Resolution Process

Editors have identified non-controversial comments as candidates for a bucket motion.

- The initial list of comments for the bucket motion are shown later in this deck (and also identified as “topic=bucket” in the comment reports)
- Please review this and ask for a comment to be taken off the list if you don’t agree with the proposed response.
- These comments will not be reviewed individually, but will be resolved as proposed via a single motion

Comments bracketed together with [] cover a common topic.

Where a comment is underlined it contains the proposed response for the group of comments.

The order in which the comments are reviewed and the schedule are subject to change.

Comment Resolution Process

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 a “Closed” comment from the prior meeting only be considered for re-opening
- 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 cannot be re-opened after meeting where responses are adopted by TF

Editorial Team

Editor	Clauses/Annexes
Gary Nicholl Editor-in-Chief	FM, 1, 30, 45, 78, 80, 91, 116
David Lewis	140, 151
Mark Kimber	Advisor and reviewer for optical clauses

Status Update (Sept 29)

- Reviewed 4 presentations and closed 8 comments closed during the Sept 22 conf call
- Comment i-59 withdrawn by commenter
- 32 comments still to be closed (excluding bucket).
- Bucket list:
 - 41 comments in the bucket
 - Deadline for requesting comments to be removed from the bucket has been extended to the Sept 29 interim conference call.

Plan for Sept 29 Interim Conference Call

Presentations:

- ~~nicholl_3cu_092920 (in support of i-32)~~

Comment order:

Topic	Comment #	Commenters
Measurement (CC: Referencing subclauses versus duplicate material)	87, lewis_01_092220}	Piers Dawe
Average Power footnote (CC)	69	Piers Dawe
Additional Insertion loss (GL 151)	32, nicholl_3cu_092920	Mike Dudek
PMD_fault_function description (GL 151)	33, 34	Mike Dudek
Link power budget (CC)	71, 91	Piers Dawe, Chris Cole
Editing Instruction (GL 30/78)	50, 51	Adee Ran
Measurement: peak-to-peak power, overshoot (CC)	[78, 89, 93, 94], 76	Piers Dawe,
Parameter definitions: overshoot, peak-to-peak (CC)	75, 77, 79	Piers Dawe
+ other comments if time permits		

FM and Clause 1 to Clause 116 comments

Clause	Topic	Comment #	Count
30	Editing Instruction	50	4
78	Editing Instruction	51	4
	Total		2

Legend: [##,##,##] = process together, ## = pivot comment, ##* = cross-clause comment, [##,##,author_nn] = related presentation

Cross-Clause comments

Topic	Clause	Comment #	Count
Interop	140, 151	22, 35, 36	3
Tx specifications (10LogCeq, transition time)	140, 151	[64, 65, 66], 67	4
Tx specifications (average power)	140, 151	69	1
Link power budget	140, 151	71, 91	2
Parameter definitions (overshoot, peak-to-peak)	140, 151	73, 75, 77 , 79	4
Measurement (SRS test signal compliance)	140, 151	[29, 81, lewis_01a_091520]	2
Measurement (Referencing subclauses versus duplicate material)	140, 151	[85, 86, 87, 90, lewis_01a_091520, lewis_01_092220]	4
Measurement (peak-to-peak power, overshoot)	140, 151	[78, 89, 93, 94], 76	5
Editorial	140, 151	74, 82, 48, 88	4
Total			29

Legend: [##,##,##] = process together, ## = pivot comment, [##,##,author_nn] = related presentation

Clause 140 (100G optical) comments

Clause	Topic	Comment #	Count
140	Measurement (TDEGQ channel requirements)	[37, 47, lewis_01a_091520]	2
140	Wavelength Range	[60, 61, 62, chuang_01a_091520, chuang_01_092220, welch_01b_092220]	3
140	Tx specifications	63, 68, 70	3
140	Measurement (Rx sen, TEGQ versus SEGQ)	80, lewis_01a_091520	4
140	Editorial	28, 52	2
	Total		11

Legend: [##,##,##] = process together, ## = pivot comment, ##* = cross-clause comment, [##,##,author_nn] = related presentation

Clause 151 (400G optical) comments

Clause	Topic	Comment #	Count
151	PICS (PMD_fault_function_description)	33, 34	2
151	Tx specifications	[95, rodes_01_092220], [84, lewis_01a_091520]	2
151	Channel characteristics (insertion loss)	32	4
151	Editorial	31, 57	2
	Total		7

Legend: [##,##,##] = process together, ## = pivot comment, ##* = cross-clause comment, [##,##,author_nn] = related presentation

Bucket comments

Clause	Comment #	Count
00	5, 6, 91	3
FM	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 58	15
1		
30		
45		
78		
80		
91		
116		
140	17*, 23*, 24*, 25, 26*, 27*, 41*, 43*, 44*, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 72	15
151	30, 38*, 39*, 40*, 42*, 45*, 46*, 83	8
	Total	41

Requests to remove:

Legend: ##* = updated proposed response (also identified as "Topic=bucket (updated mmdd)" where mm=month and dd=day

Withdrawn comments

Clause	Comment #	Count
00		
FM		
1		
30		
45		
78		
80		
91		
116		
140	59	1
151		
	Total	1