

IEEE 802.3 motions

IEEE 802 EC Teleconference

Tuesday 7th April 2020

**ME: IEEE P802.3ca 25 Gb/s and 50 Gb/s
Ethernet Passive Optical Networks to RevCom
(unconditional)**

IEEE P802.3ca 25 Gb/s and 50 Gb/s Ethernet Passive Optical Networks to RevCom (unconditional)

Item 1: Date the ballot closed

The 2nd Standards Association recirculation ballot on IEEE P802.3ca 25 Gb/s and 50 Gb/s Ethernet Passive Optical Networks draft D3.1 closed on 12th March 2020 at 23:59 UTC-12

Item 2: Vote tally

	Initial Draft D3.0			1 st Recirculation Draft D3.1			2 nd Recirculation Draft D3.1 ^{Note 1}			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	3	4	PASS	3	4	PASS	3	4	PASS	< 30
Dis with comment	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-
Dis w/o comment	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	62	96	PASS	67	97	PASS	69	97	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	67	81	PASS	72	87	PASS	74	90	PASS	≥ 75
Voters	82	-	-	82	-	-	82	-	-	-
Comments	17	-	-	7	-	-	1	-	-	-
Public comments	0	-	-	Note 1: No changes were made to D3.1 as a result of the 1 st recirculation ballot						

IEEE P802.3ca 25 Gb/s and 50 Gb/s Ethernet Passive Optical Networks to RevCom (unconditional)

Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and WG responses

4 unsatisfied comments (3 ERs and 1 TR) from 2 commenters

Cl 1	SC 1.4	P24	L40	# i-14
Rannow, R K		Myself		
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status R		
Verbose "both" for A and B				
Nearly 25 instances				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Remove the word "both" to help make a more succinct document.				
Response	Response Status C			
REJECT.				
The use of "both" in all of the referenced locations is intentional. The term is used when and if needed to emphasize the fact that indeed both A and B are applicable. Removing 25 words from 270 pages of text does not seem to lead to a more "succinct document".				
Cl 141	SC 141.3.2	P69	L51	# i-17
Thompson, Geoffrey		Independent Consultant		
Comment Type	ER	Comment Status R		
The statement: "these are not readily testable in a system implementation" addresses aspects of an implementation that are outside the scope of the standard and are not definitively known.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Change the text to read: "these may not be readily testable in a system implementation"				
Response	Response Status C			
REJECT.				
Text is already in use in approved IEEE Std 802.3-2018, see 38.2.1, 39.3, 58.2.1, 59.2.1, 60.2.1, 75.3.2, 115.6.2.1				

Cl 0	SC 0	P0	L0	# R1-8
Thompson, Geoffrey		Independent Consultant		
Comment Type	ER	Comment Status R		
While I recognize that the ship has already sailed on this particular decision and group consensus for change is unlikely, I persist in the view that PON with P2MP does not conform to or even align with the legacy Ethernet architecture. While clearly deserving of a standard, I don't believe it belongs within IEEE Std 802.3 Standard for Ethernet.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Move all clauses associated with P2MP into a separate standard with a consistent architectural description and approach which applies to the entire standard.				
Response	Response Status C			
REJECT.				
Such work would be out of scope for the IEEE P802.3ca PAR. Also, the very same request has been brought to the IEEE 802.3 Maintenance Task Force (see http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1337.pdf), and subsequently rejected (see http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/revision_history.html#REQ1337).				
No changes to the draft needed.				

Cl 141	SC 141.3.2	P70	L52	# R1-9
Thompson, Geoffrey		Independent Consultant		
Comment Type	ER	Comment Status R		
The statement "these are not readily testable in a system implementation" addresses an aspect of implementation that is outside the scope of the standard. As stated, it would lead one to believe that making it testable would make an implementation not compliant. Such is definitely not the case. (The DoC for D3.0 doesn't seem to be posted as of 2020-02-15 so I can't check how my D3.0 comment was addressed.)				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Change "are not" to "may not be" -OR- eliminate the parenthetical statement entirely.				
Response	Response Status C			
REJECT.				
The comment responses were available to balloters through the myProject system throughout the ballot recirculation.				
The comment is in support of an unsatisfied previous comment (i-17) associated with a disapprove vote and does not provide substantive additional rationale.				
The statement "these are not readily testable in a system implementation" is not a normative requirement. Rather it is a statement of fact that at least one compliant implementation is envisioned (or already exists) that does not have these test points exposed, though other, also compliant, implementations may have these test points exposed.				
Note that the text in question is identical to the text that already exists in multiple locations in the published IEEE Std 802.3-2018 (see 58.2.1, 59.2.1, 60.2.1, 75.3.2, 115.6.2.1)				
No changes to the draft needed.				

Clause 12 'Procedure for conditional approval to forward a draft standard' of IEEE 802 LMSC Operations Manual includes the text 'Where a voter has accepted some comment resolutions and rejected others, only the comments of which the voter has not accepted resolution should be presented.'

IEEE P802.3ca 25 Gb/s and 50 Gb/s Ethernet Passive Optical Networks to RevCom (unconditional)

Motion

Approve sending IEEE P802.3ca 25 Gb/s and 50 Gb/s Ethernet Passive Optical Networks draft D3.1 to RevCom

Approve CSD documentation in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/18/ec-18-0247-00-ACSD-p802-3ca.pdf>

M: Law, S: D'Ambrosia

Y: ??, N: ?, A: ?

Working Group vote

Y: 120, N: 1, A: 3

ME: IEEE P802.3ch Multi-Gig Automotive Ethernet PHY to RevCom (unconditional)

IEEE P802.3ch Multi-Gig Automotive Ethernet PHY to RevCom (unconditional)

Item 1: Date the ballot closed

The 2nd Standards Association recirculation ballot on IEEE 802.3ch Multi-Gig Automotive Ethernet PHY draft D3.2 closed on 13th March 2020 at 23:59 UTC-12

Item 2: Vote tally

	Initial Draft D3.0			1 st Recirculation Draft D3.1			2 nd Recirculation Draft D3.2			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	5	5	PASS	5	5	PASS	5	5	PASS	< 30
Dis with comment	5	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-
Dis w/o comment	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	85	94	PASS	91	98	PASS	92	98	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	95	81	PASS	97	82	PASS	98	83	PASS	≥ 75
Voters	117	-	-	117	-	-	117	-	-	-
Comments	100	-	-	13	-	-	1	-	-	-
Public comments	0	-	-							

IEEE P802.3ch Multi-Gig Automotive Ethernet PHY to RevCom (unconditional)

Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and WG responses

1 unsatisfied GR comment from 1 commenter

<i>Cl</i> 45	<i>SC</i> 45.2.1.195.4	<i>P</i> 40	<i>L</i> 36	# [REDACTED]
Rannow, R K		IEEE/SELF		
<i>Comment Type</i>	GR	<i>Comment Status</i>	R	<i>Editorial</i>
using the term "both" appears verbose in nearly 20 instances.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Remove the work "both"				
<i>Response</i>	<i>Response Status</i> W			
REJECT.				
<p>The word "both" is found 24 times in the document. The proposed change in the comment does not contain sufficient detail so that the CRG can understand the specific changes that satisfy the commenter. The commenter does not specify which "nearly 20" instances should be deleted. This is used in the front matter 3 times and 21 times in the "new text". A search of 802.3-2018 shows that the word "both" is found 938 times. This is a word commonly used in this specification to indicate that there are two conditions or two actions.</p>				
<p>Regarding the specific instance cited in the comment at page 40 line 36, the CRG disagrees with the commenter. The use of 'both' in this instance is not extraneous and clarifies that MultiGBASE-T1 OAM capability requires support by both the local PHY and its link partner.</p>				

Clause 12 'Procedure for conditional approval to forward a draft standard' of IEEE 802 LMSC Operations Manual includes the text 'Where a voter has accepted some comment resolutions and rejected others, only the comments of which the voter has not accepted resolution should be presented.'

IEEE P802.3ch Multi-Gig Automotive Ethernet PHY to RevCom (unconditional)

Motion

Approve sending IEEE P802.3ch Multi-Gig Automotive Ethernet PHY draft D3.2 to RevCom

Approve CSD documentation in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/17/ec-17-0069-00-ACSD-802-3ch.pdf>

M: Law, S: D'Ambrosia

Y: ??, N: ?, A: ?

Working Group vote

Y: 120, N: 0, A: 4

MI: IEEE 802.3 Multi Gigabit Automotive Optical PHYs Study Group six month extension

IEEE 802.3 Multi Gigabit Automotive Optical PHYs Study Group six month extension

Motion

Grant the six month extension of the IEEE 802.3 Multi Gigabit Automotive Optical PHYs Study Group

M: Law S: D'Ambrosia

Y: ??, N: ??, A: ??

Working Group vote

Y: 122, N: 0, A: 2

Rationale: This Study Group is being extended due to the cancelation of the IEEE 802 March 2020 plenary which means that the draft IEEE P802.3cz draft PAR, and supporting material, cannot now be considered until the July 2020 plenary.

**MI: IEEE 802.3 10 Mb/s Single Pair Ethernet
(SPE) Multidrop Enhancements (SPMD) Study
Group six month extension**

IEEE 802.3 10 Mb/s Single Pair Ethernet (SPE) Multidrop Enhancements (SPMD) Study Group six month extension

Motion

Grant the six month extension of the IEEE 802.3 10 Mb/s Single Pair Ethernet (SPE) Multidrop Enhancements (SPMD) Study Group

M: Law S: D'Ambrosia

Y: ??, N: ??, A: ??

Working Group vote

Y: 118, N: 0, A: 6

Rationale: This Study Group is being extended due to the cancelation of the IEEE 802 March 2020 plenary which means that the draft IEEE P802.3da draft PAR, and supporting material, cannot now be considered until the July 2020 plenary.