

# 802.1 Motions for EC agenda, including supporting material

Closing IEEE 802 EC  
November 2017, Orlando

# Agenda

---

- Drafts to Sponsor ballot (ME)
  - IEEE 802.1CM – *conditional* – TSN for Fronthaul
  - IEEE 802.1Qcn – *conditional* – VSI VDP Extension to Support NVO3
- Liaisons (II)
  - Liaison response to NGMN - Xhaul
  - Liaison response to BBF - CFM OAM YANG
  - Liaison response to ITU-T SG15 LS68 – CFM OAM YANG
  - Liaison response to EtherCAT
  - Liaison response to PI
  - Liaison to WFA
- Liaisons (ME)
  - Liaison response from IEEE 802 to WBA

# Drafts to Sponsor ballot

---

## 5.044 - Motion

---

- Conditionally approve sending P802.1CM D2.0 to Sponsor Ballot
- Confirm the CSD for P802.1CM in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/15/ec-15-0073-00-ACSD-802-1cm.pdf>
- P802.1CM D1.0 had 84 % approval at the end of the last WG ballot
- In the WG (y/n/a): 27, 0, 2
  - Proposed: János Farkas      Second: David Chen
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons      Second: Pat Thaler
  - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>

# Supporting information P802.1CM

- WG ballot closed: 23 October 2017
- 7 votes changed during the ballot comment resolution resulting in
  - 3 outstanding Disapprove votes, 6 outstanding Must Be Satisfied comments
- Comment resolution available here: <http://ieee802.org/1/files/private/cm-drafts/d1/802-1CM-d1-0-dis-v03.pdf>
- Recirculation ballot will be conducted during December with comment resolution during January Interim and on the TSN TG calls. A possible final recirculation in February if required with comment resolution on the TSN TG calls.

## Ballot results:

CATEGORY	All respondents	
	TOTAL	%
Yes	16	84.21
No	3	15.79
Voting Yes or No	19	100
Abs. Time	4	
Abs. Expertise	16	
Abs. Other	2	
No. of voting members	52	100
Voters responding	39	75
Non-voter Commenters	3	
No. of commenting contributors	18	
No. of comments	187	
TR	54	
T	26	
ER	33	

# Supporting information P802.1CM

---

- 3 voters with outstanding Disapprove votes:
  - Bao, Shenghua
  - Cheng, Weiying
  - Garner, Geoffrey

# Supporting information P802.1CM

## P802.1CM/D1.0 TSN for Fronthaul Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 6 SC 6.2 P 13 L 53 # 15  
 Bao, Shenghua Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"eCPRI [B6] bit rates between the eRE and the eREC are smaller than CPRI [B5] bit rates due to the flexible functional decomposition of eCPRI"

not always smaller because of the split E.

Be aware that split E is also included in eCPRI scope. So this sentence is not right.

SuggestedRemedy  
 should add a premise to get rid of split E

Response Response Status U  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #61 and #62.

This sentence is based on "Compared to the CPRI [1], eCPRI makes it possible to decrease the data rate demands between eREC and 10 eRE via a flexible functional decomposition while limiting the complexity of the eRE." in section 1 of [B6].

Cl 7 SC 7.4 P 21 L 38 # 20  
 Bao, Shenghua Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"Point-to-point synchronization distribution" is talking about TDM based CPRI, is out of the scope of 802.1cm. And it is about the RE (not eRE).

And from the last sentence of "The actual link could be a point-to-point Ethernet link that carries fronthaul traffic." it seems talking about CPRI over ETH? this usecase has been verified useless and it is not included in the eCPRI specification scope.

SuggestedRemedy  
 delete it

Response Response Status U  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Update to:  
 "In this method, a 2-way protocol is used for time alignment. The eREs that need to be time or phase aligned do not have to be co-located. The actual link could be a point-to-point Ethernet link that carries fronthaul traffic and PTP."

Cl 7 SC 7.4 P 21 L 46 # 21  
 Bao, Shenghua Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"The main difference between b) and a) is that the eREs are co-located and the common master is co-located with the eREs in case b), whereas, the eREs do not need to be co-located (the common master is remote) in case a)."

I really don't think it is the main difference between a) and b). They not totally not the same category of usecase, one is based on TDM CPRI, the other is based on ETH

and I really don't find out the purpose to describe this difference.

SuggestedRemedy  
 delete the difference

Response Response Status U  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Related to comment #20.

Update the structure to clarify, e.g., combine items a) and b).

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general  
 COMMENT STATUS: D/Dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn  
 SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID 21

Page 1 of 2  
 11/9/2017 8:48:02 PM



# Supporting information P802.1CM

## P802.1CM/D1.0 TSN for Fronthaul Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 6 SC 6.1 & 6.2 P 12 & 13 L 20 # 32

Bao, Shenghua Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Now eCPRI has been published, and as we all know that both Class I and Class II are all included in eCPRI specification scope. And the requirements of these two Classes are all the same.

So I don't think there is any necessity to separate into 2 different chapters like 6.1 and 6.2. They can be combined into one chapter, only the split descriptions have some differences. Others such as Latency and FLR and C&M requirements are all the same !!

SuggestedRemedy

Combine to one chapter

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

Class 1 and Class 2 correspond to two very different splits. Class 1 is Split E, which is a split between the Radio Function (RF) and the Phy. Whereas Class 2 is Split (ID;IU;U), which is an Intra-PHY split. The eCPRI specification [B6] makes it very clear that they are different splits, e.g., Figure 5 and Figure 32. As a consequence of having the split between different functional blocks of the RBS, different data is transmitted via the fronthaul interface. Furthermore, as section 1 of [6] describes: "Compared to the CPRI [1], eCPRI makes it possible to decrease the data rate demands between eREC and 10 eRE via a flexible functional decomposition while limiting the complexity of the eRE." Clearly, Class 1 and Class 2 correspond to two very different fronthaul interfaces, they are not the same. Therefore, subclauses 6.1 and 6.2 should not be merged. Such a merge would confuse a lot of readers of the 802.1CM specification.

Common requirements towards the bridge network comes from the application of CPRI and eCPRI to the same radio interface, i.e., E-UTRA in particular. That is, the requirements are common because they come from E-UTRA. However, common requirements do not make two very different fronthaul interfaces the same.

Combining Class 1 and Class 2 would cause confusion in the industry.

Cl A SC A.11 P 42 L 28 # 58

Cheng, Welyng Coriant

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

This table implies that those items can be selected independently. However, some features must be used together. For example, if B-S-7 is used, then B-S-4 must be used. This table does not show this.

SuggestedRemedy

B-S-4 should be B-S-7:M

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See comment #43.

Cl A SC A.13 P 43 L 27 # 69

Cheng, Welyng Coriant

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Same as comment 11

SuggestedRemedy

E-S-4 should be E-S-7:M

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Refers to comment #68.

The end station has to recover time, which implies T-TSC. It will be updated to make the relationship clear.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general  
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn  
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID 69

Page 2 of 2  
11/9/2017 8:48:04 PM





# 5.045 - Motion

---

- Conditionally approve sending P802.1Qcn\* to Sponsor Ballot
- Confirm the CSD for P802.1Qcn in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/15/ec-15-0072-00-ACSD-802-1qcn.pdf>
- P802.1Qcn D1.0 had 100% approval at the end of the last WG ballot
- In the WG (y/n/a): 32, 0, 0
  - Proposed: Pat Thaler      Second:
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons    Second: Pat Thaler
  - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>

\* Note that a change of designation to P802.1Qcy has been requested because of confusion of Qcn with the acronym for Quantized Congestion Notification (QCN).

# Supporting information P802.1Qcn

- WG ballot closed: 9 October 2017
- 3 Disapprove votes converted to approve for a final result of  
10 Yes  
0 No
- No outstanding Disapprove votes,

## Initial Ballot Results

CATEGORY	ALL RESPONDENTS	
	TOTAL	%
Yes	7	70
No	3	30
Voting Yes or No	10	27
Abs. Time	4	11
Abs. Expertise	23	62
Abs. Other	0	0
Respondents	37	37
Voters	43	83
Liaisons responding	0	
No. of commenters	5	14
No of comments	43	

# Schedule for recirculation

---

- Nov 28 – Dec 13      First recirculation
- Jan 2 at 5PM Pacific call to resolve comments
- Dec 6 - NesCom/SB change designation to Qcy
- Dec 10 - Initiate Sponsor ballot pool formation after SB
- Jan 5 – Jan 20      Second recirculation
- Resolve comments at January interim to Sponsor ballot

# Liaisons (II)

---

# 7.054 - Motion

---

- Approve liaison of the following response to Next Generation Mobile Networks
  - <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2017/liaison-on-response-NGMN-RAN-functional-split-1117-v01.pdf>
- In the WG (y/n/a): 30, 0, 0
- Proposed: János Farkas Second: Karl Weber

# 7.054 - Motion

---

- Approve liaison of the following response to Broadband Forum
  - <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2017/liaison-on-response-BBF-84-1117-v01.pdf>
- In the WG (y/n/a): 30, 0, 0
- Proposed: Jessy Rouyer                      Second: János Farkas

# 7.054 - Motion

---

- Approve liaison of the following response (to LS 68) to ITU-T SG15
  - <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2017/liaison-on-response-ITU-T-SG15-LS68-1117-v01.pdf>
- In the WG (y/n/a): 30, 0, 0
  - Proposed: Jessy Rouyer      Second: János Farkas

# 7.054 - Motion

---

- Approve liaison of the following response to EtherCAT Technology Group
  - <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2017/liaison-response-ETG-1117-v01.pdf>
- In the WG (y/n/a): 32, 0, 0
  - Proposed: Karl Weber                      Second: János Farkas
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons      Second: Pat Thaler
  - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>



# 7.054 - Motion

---

- Approve liaison of the following response to PROFIBUS and PROFINET International
  - <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2017/liaison-response-PI-1117-v01.pdf>
- In the WG (y/n/a): 32,0,0
- Proposed: John Messenger      Second: János Farkas

# 7.056 - Motion

---

- Approve liaison of the following letter to Wi-Fi Alliance
  - <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2017/liaison-WFA-1117-v01.pdf>
- In the WG (y/n/a): 30, 0, 1
- Proposed: John Messenger      Second: János Farkas

# Liaisons (ME)

---

# 7.055 - Motion

---

- Approve <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/17/ec-17-0208-04-00EC-draft-response-to-wba-liaison.docx> as communication to Wireless Broadband Alliance granting the IEEE LMSC chair (or his delegate) editorial license.
  - This approval is under LMSC OM “Procedure for coordination with other standards bodies”
- In the WG (y/n/a): 28, 0, 3
- Proposed: Pat Thaler Second: Max Riegel
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons Second: Pat Thaler
  - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>