IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
| PAR Minutes – May 2020 |
| Date: 2020-05-22 |
| Author(s): |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Michael Montemurro | BlackBerry | 4701 Tahoe Blvd, Mississauga, ON. Canada L4W0B4 | +1 289-261-4183 | mmontemurro@blackberry.com |

Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the PAR Standing Committee session that was held by teleconferences on May 11 and May 22.

# Monday May 11, 11:00-13:00

### Jon Rosdahl, Qualcomm – Chair

**Michael Montemurro, BlackBerry – Vice-Chair**

**Dorothy Stanley, HPE**

**Amelia Andersdotter, Self**

**Stephen McCann, BlackBerry**

**Jonathan Goldberg, IEEE**

**Joseph Levy, InterDigital**

Attendance: 6

1. Meeting called to order at 11:07
2. Process is different from what is followed at face-to-face meetings. We will provide comments on the PARs submitted for the March 2020 plenary.
3. Agenda Review – approved as document 11-20/264r2
	* Agenda is approved unanimously
4. PAR and CSD comments are captured in 11-20/264r3
* **802.1ASdm Amendment: Hot Standby,**[**PAR**](http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2020/dm-draft-PAR-0120-v01.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2020/dm-draft-CSD-0120-v01.pdf)
	+ PAR:

5.2b: Best Master Clock Algorithm (BMCA) was explicitly called out because it was included in the base standard.

5.3:

The CSD implies that there is no dependency on P802.1DG. If this is the case, it should be noted.

 The dependency should be noted.

* + - * + CSD:

1.2.1 b): There is a conditional in the second paragraph. It looks as though this project is dependent on P802.1DG.

5.3 of the PAR lists no dependencies.

The second paragraph seems to discus the requirements and not market potential. This seems to imply that there is a dependency that was not clear in the PAR form. Consider clarification of the paragraph.

1.2.4 a): This is a general statement that restates the question. Please provide an example or explanation on the demonstrated system feasibility.

1.2.4 b) Useful to include an example of “what” technology is being proven in the first sentence.

* **802.3cy Amendment: Greater than 10 Gb/s Automotive Ethernet Electrical PHYs,**[**PAR**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0008-01-00EC-ieee-p802-3cy-draft-par-response.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0009-00-00EC-ieee-p802-3cy-draft-csd-response.pdf)
	+ PAR:

5.2 b)

Add “architectures” after “zonal”. Change “(centralized architecture)” to “(centralized)”

* + - * + 2.1:

The use of “electrical Ethernet” is confusing in the title.

The use of “Automotive Electrical Ethernet: was undefined. Should this just be “Automotive Ethernet”? Or should this be defined in the scope of the project.

5.6:

delete “Tier 1 and below (top-level and below” this seems to include all “automotive suppliers”.. Would this be better stated “Tier 1 and dependent automotive suppliers”

Tier 1 is a common term for automotive suppliers.

It would be better to just state “automotive suppliers”?

Delete “(top-level and below)”; or change “automotive Originial Equipment Manufacturers (car makers), automotive suppliers”

* + - * CSD:

1.2.1:

(Broad Market Potential): Change “(zonal or central architecture)” to “(from central to zonal architecture).

After review, no comment is required.

The references to “Zonal (centralized) architecture” vs “(zonal or centralized architecture)” vs in the PAR “zonal (centralized architecture). The references should be consistent.

* **802.3cz Amendment: Multi-Gigabit Automotive Optical PHYs,**[**PAR**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0010-01-00EC-ieee-p802-3cz-draft-par-response.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0011-00-00EC-ieee-p802-3cz-draft-csd-response.pdf)
	+ PAR:

2.1:

This PAR’s title: “Optical Automotive Etherenet” is not consistent with 802.3cy, which was “Automotive Electrical Ethernet” – suggest making the titles more consistent – both TF would need to be involved in the discussion.

Possible title: Physical Layer Specification and Management Parameters for Multi-Gigabit Optical Ethernet for the Automotive Environment”

5.6:

The stakeholders list is better in this document compared with 802.3cy

Update the comments for 802.3cy to suggest wording from 802.3cz.

Comment for 802.3cy PAR – 5.6:

* + - * + CSD:

Version submitted was watermarked “DRAFT”. Consider updating when submitting to the IEEE 802 LMSC

* **802.3da Amendment: 10Mb/s Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Enhancements,**[**PAR**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0012-01-00EC-ieee-p802-3da-draft-par-response.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0013-00-00EC-ieee-p802-3da-draft-csd-response.pdf)
	+ PAR:
	+ 2.1: Missing the word “network” - suggest add to title: “Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation over Single Balanced Pair Multidrop Network Enhancements”
	+ 5.2.b: Suggest add text from the CSD “This amendment specifies optional power delivery supporting multiple powered devices on the mixing segment.”
	+ 5.5: “from legacy networks to Ethernet” what are “legacy networks in this context? “legacy non-Ethernet”
	+ CSD:
	+ 1.2.2 Broad Market Potential:
	+ Suggest same change as is PAR 5.5
* **802.3db Amendment: 100 Gb/s Wavelength Short Reach PHYs,**[**PAR**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0014-01-00EC-ieee-p802-3db-draft-par-response.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0015-00-00EC-ieee-p802-3db-draft-csd-response.pdf)
	+ PAR:
	+ Not sure why “server attachment” is not included in the title.
	+ Its actually server attachment and other data center applications.
	+ CSD:
	+ This looks like a cut and paste from other CSDs. It looks as though there is a consistency issue between the Technical Feasibilty and Economic Feasibility responses:
	+ CSD Technical Feasibility: “IEEE 802.3 has already established 100 Gb/s, 200 Gb/s, and 400 Gb/s MAC specifications suitable for 100 Gb/s per wavelength PHY operation in IEEE Std 802.3bs-2017 and IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018.” and Economic Feasibility “Higher speed 100 Gb/s signaling leads to reduced lane counts, reduced fiber and component counts, reduced complexity, and lower cost than previously standardized PMDs based on 50 Gb/s signaling”. One points out that it is already done, and one points out that it is being developed. Is there a consistency issue?
* **PAR 802.15.7a - Amendment - Defining High Data Rate Optical Camera Communications (OCC),**[**PAR**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/19/15-19-0296-02-0vat-par-for-high-rate-occ-task-group.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/19/15-19-0297-02-0vat-csd-for-high-rate-occ-task-group.docx)
	+ PAR:
	+ 2.1 Title: change ”Amendment defining High Data Rate Optical Camera Communications (OCC)” to “Amendment: Definitions for High Data Rate Optical Camera Communications (OCC)”.
	+ 6.1.b: “The RAC has requested routine review of PHY oriented projects, although no special registration activity is expected.”
	+ CSD:
	+ Is 802 OWC a common term? Should it be 802.15 OWC?
	+ OWC is Optical Wireless Communications
	+ 1.2.4 – spell out first use of OWC. Also 802 OWC vs 802.15 OWC?
1. No objection to submitting these PAR and CSD comments to the IEEE 802 LMSC Executive Committee
	* There is no guarantee to see groups respoinding to the PAR comments.
	* Proposed process:
		+ Other WGs provide comments on announced PARs by May 14th
		+ PARs are announced here <http://ieee802.org/PARs.shtml>
			1. We will develop any comments on the May 12th Maintenance TG call
			2. Proposing WG provides response and updated PAR/CSD by May 21st. TSN TG will review .1ASdm PAR comments received on May 18th
			3. EC approval vote on May 28th. WG ePoll approving the .1ASdm PAR/CSD and sending to NesCom will be initiated on May 18th
* Chair will post the PAR/SC output to the 802 WG reflector and submit the result to the EC.
* Comment responses will be received on May 22.
* Schedule a call for 9am ET on May 22
* The call on Tuesday May 12 is not required and is canceled.
1. Adjourn until next teleconference on Friday May 22 at 09:00

# Friday May 22, 09:00-10:00

### Attendees:

### Jon Rosdahl, Qualcomm – Chair

**Michael Montemurro, BlackBerry – Vice-Chair**

**Stephen McCann, BlackBerry**

Attendance: 3

1. Meeting called to order at 09:21
2. Agenda Review – approved as document 11-20/264r4
3. Minutes Approval from November 2019 – document 11-19/2019r0

MOTION: **Move to approve previous meeting minutes: doc 11-19/2019r0** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2019-01-0PAR-par-minutes-november-2019-session.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2019-01-0PAR-par-minutes-november-2019-session.docx) **as the minutes for PAR Review SC from November 2019 meetings in Waikoloa, HI**.

Mover: Michael Montemurro

Second: Stephen McCann

Result: **Passes Unanimously**

1. Continue with the approved PAR SC agenda
2. Summary of responses received and are summarized in 11-20/264r4
* **802.1ASdm Amendment: Hot Standby,**[**PAR**](http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2020/dm-draft-PAR-0120-v01.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2020/dm-draft-CSD-0120-v01.pdf)
	+ PAR:

5.3: Response: There is no dependency on IEEE 802.1DG. References to P802.1DG have been removed from this and other documents.

* + - * + CSD:

1.2.1b: Added clarification to address the comment.

1.2.4a: Added an example to address the comment.

1.2.4b: Agreed to add a reference to address the comment.

* **802.3cy Amendment: Greater than 10 Gb/s Automotive Ethernet Electrical PHYs,**[**PAR**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0008-01-00EC-ieee-p802-3cy-draft-par-response.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0009-00-00EC-ieee-p802-3cy-draft-csd-response.pdf)
	+ PAR:

For PAR Titles for 3cy and 3cz: Changed terms to “Electrical Automotive Ethernet” and “Optical Automotive Ethernet”

The document was updated to refer to “zonal architecture”

Updated the wording the use of Tier X and clarified the definition in section 8.1

* **802.3cz Amendment: Multi-Gigabit Automotive Optical PHYs,**[**PAR**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0010-01-00EC-ieee-p802-3cz-draft-par-response.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0011-00-00EC-ieee-p802-3cz-draft-csd-response.pdf)
	+ Reviewed comment responses on PAR and CSD
	+ No issues found.
* **802.3da Amendment: 10Mb/s Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Enhancements,**[**PAR**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0012-01-00EC-ieee-p802-3da-draft-par-response.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0013-00-00EC-ieee-p802-3da-draft-csd-response.pdf)
	+ Reviewed comment responses on PAR and CSD
	+ No issues found.
* **802.3db Amendment: 100 Gb/s Wavelength Short Reach PHYs,**[**PAR**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0014-01-00EC-ieee-p802-3db-draft-par-response.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0015-00-00EC-ieee-p802-3db-draft-csd-response.pdf)
	+ Reviewed comment responses on PAR and CSD
	+ No issues found.
* **PAR 802.15.7a - Amendment - Defining High Data Rate Optical Camera Communications (OCC),**[**PAR**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/19/15-19-0296-02-0vat-par-for-high-rate-occ-task-group.pdf)**and**[**CSD**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/19/15-19-0297-02-0vat-csd-for-high-rate-occ-task-group.docx)
	+ Reviewed comment responses on PAR and CSD
	+ No issues found.
1. Approval of PAR Review SC report

MOTION:

**Move to accept 11-20/264r4 as the report from PAR Review SC for May 2020, giving the Chair editorial license to clean-up the format of the responses.**

Moved: Michael Montemurro

2nd: Stephen McCann

Results: 2 – Yes; 0 – No; 0 – Abstain. **Motion Passes.**

1. Adjourn at 10:02