IEEE 802.3 Closing EC Items

David Law
Chair, IEEE 802.3 Working Group
David_Law@3Com.com

ME: IEEE P802.3 (IEEE P802.3bh) Revision PAR to NesCom

IEEE P802.3 (IEEE P802.3bh) revision PAR

- Old title

  IEEE Standard for Information technology--Telecommunications and information exchange between systems--Local and metropolitan area networks—Specific requirements Part 3: Carrier Sense Multiple Access with Collision Detection (CSMA/CD) Access Method and Physical Layer Specifications

- New title

  Standard for Ethernet

- Draft PAR

  http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/public/P802_3_PAR_Draft_110910.pdf

- Changes from pre-circulated version
  - Unchanged from version previously circulated.

IEEE P802.3 (IEEE P802.3bh) revision PAR

- The EC approves the IEEE P802.3 PAR and forwards the PAR to NesCom

  M: D Law, S:

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

  Working Group vote:

  Y: 53, N: 0, A: 0

ME: IEEE P802.3.1 Ethernet MIBs to Sponsor ballot

IEEE P802.3.1 Ethernet MIBs Working Group balloting results

- 3rd Working Group recirculation ballot – draft D2.3
  - Ballot opened 14th October, closed 28th October 2010
  - 98% approval, 0 comments received

	Initial Draft D2.0			1st Recirculation Draft D2.1			2nd Recirculation Draft D2.2			3rd Recirculation Draft D2.3			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	20	23	PASS	20	23	PASS	20	23	PASS	20	23	PASS	< 30
Disapprove with comment	11	-	-	10	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-
Disapprove without comment	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	55	83	PASS	56	85	PASS	65	96	PASS	68	98	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	86	57	PASS	86	57	PASS	88	58	PASS	89	59	PASS	≥ 50
Voters	152	-	-	152	-	-	152	-	-	152	-	-	-

IEEE P802.3.1 Ethernet MIBs Working Group balloting results comments

- No comments received on last recirculation
- 18 remaining unsatisfied comments
  - See file ‘P802_3_1_WG_unresolved_1110.pdf’
- No substantive changes need to be made to the draft as a result of the recirculation
- Copyright
  - Received copyright release letter from IETF Trust
    - Need to request copyright releases from 4 more RFC authors
  - IEEE-SA staff will allow us to seek the remaining releases while we are conducting the sponsor ballot

IEEE P802.3.1 Ethernet MIBs to Sponsor ballot

- The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit IEEE 802.3.1 to Sponsor ballot

  M: D Law, S:

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

  Working Group vote:

  Y: 69, N: 0, A: 0

ME: IEEE P802.3bf Time synchronisation to Sponsor ballot

IEEE P802.3bf Time synchronisation Working Group balloting results

- 1st Working Group recirculation ballot – draft D2.1
  - Ballot opened 5th October, closed 19th October 2010
  - 98.7% approval, 14 comments received

	Initial Draft D2.0			1st Recirculation Draft D2.1			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	9	11.4	PASS	7	8.5	PASS	< 30
Disapprove with comment	11	-	-	1	-	-	-
Disapprove without comment	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	61	85.7	PASS	74	98.7	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	81	54.9	PASS	82	56.9	PASS	≥ 50
Voters	144	-	-	144	-	-	-

IEEE P802.3bf Time synchronisation 1st Working Group recirculation ballot (D2.1) comments

- 14 comments received on last recirculation http://www.ieee802.org/3/bf/comments/
  - 3 TRs, 2 were restatements of D2.0 TRs, one on a change
    - Commenters have indicated satisfaction with responses
  - 2 ERs, both were restatements of D2.0 TRs
    - Commenter indicated satisfaction with responses to one
  - 5 satisfaction at resolution to previous comments
  - 3 on fixing editorial copy-paste error
- 1 remaining unsatisfied ER comment
  - Capitalization convention (see next slide)
- No substantive changes need to be made to the draft as a result of the recirculation
- IEEE 802.3 Working Group approval also given to pre-submit to March RevCom meeting
  - Approval for the submittal to remain on the RevCom agenda will be required in March from the IEEE 802.3 WG and EC

IEEE P802.3bf Time synchronisation 1st Working Group recirculation ballot (D2.1) unsatisfied comment #327

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 327

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R**

RE: D1.0 Comment #269
The response as it shows up in D2.0 does not satisfactorily addresses my concern expressed in my D1.0 Comment #269.
The rationale provided says that because this (poor) capitalization convention is used outside and we have occasion to use such terms then that is the reason we should adopt such poor conventions within our own standards for all of the terms that we create within our own standards. We can do better

SuggestedRemedy

Implement my original recommendation as expressed in D1.0 comment #269

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
This comment is a restatement of comment #269 D2.0, which was previously rejected and has already been re-circulated.
The comment resolution committee has given this comment due consideration during resolution of D2.0 comments and decided the existing acronym did not raise any concerns in terms of capitalization. MEC on D2.1 also returned no concerns from IEEE staff editor.

IEEE P802.3bf Time synchronisation to Sponsor ballot

- The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit IEEE 802.3bf to Sponsor ballot

  M: D Law, S:

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

  Working Group vote:

  Y: 66, N: 0, A: 0

ME: IEEE P802.3bg 40Gb/s Single-mode Fibre PMD to Sponsor ballot

IEEE P802.3bg Single-mode Fibre PMD Working Group balloting results

- 1st Working Group recirculation ballot – draft D2.1
  - Ballot opened 4th October, closed 23th October 2010
  - 98.7% approval, 2 comments received

	Initial Draft D2.0			1st Recirculation Draft D2.1			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	3	3.6	PASS	3	3.5	PASS	< 30
Disapprove with comment	9	-	-	1	-	-	-
Disapprove without comment	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	71	88.7	PASS	82	97.6	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	83	57.6	PASS	86	59.7	PASS	≥ 50
Voters	144	-	-	144	-	-	-

IEEE P802.3bg Single-mode Fibre PMD Working Group recirculation ballot (D2.1) comments

- 2 comments received on last recirculation
  http://www.ieee802.org/3/bg/comments/
  - No TR or ER comments
- 2 remaining unsatisfied TR comments (see next slide)
  - Link budge methodology
- No substantive changes need to be made to the draft as a result of the recirculation
- IEEE 802.3 Working Group approval also given to pre-submit to March RevCom meeting
  - Approval for the submittal to remain on the RevCom agenda will be required in March from the IEEE 802.3 WG and EC

IEEE P802.3bg Single-mode Fibre PMD Working Group recirculation ballot unsatisfied comment D2.0 #60

Cl 00 *SC* 0 *P* 1 *L* 30 # 60

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type TR *Comment Status* R

An objective is "Provide Physical Layer specification which support 40 Gb/s operation over at least 2 km on SMF" and from the PAR, "5.4 Purpose: This project will define a 40 Gb/s serial PMD that supports a link distance of at least 2km over single-mode fiber ... which will enable interconnection ...". This draft allows excessive penalties and I do not believe it provides a robust interoperability spec. The transmitter can pass the draft and be poor, and the receiver can pass the draft and fail to receive that transmitter after the fibre. Some changes are needed to come up to 802.3's traditional standards for an interoperability spec.

SuggestedRemedy

See other comments for remedies

Response *Response Status* U

REJECT.
The level of interoperability provided by the specifications for VSR2000-3R2 in G.693 has not been demonstrated to be inadequate by industry use and Clause 89 follows this methodology.
This comment does not propose any specific changes to the draft, for these see the other comment responses.

IEEE P802.3bg Single-mode Fibre PMD 1st Working Group recirculation ballot unsatisfied comment D2.0 #61

Cl 89 *SC* 89.6.1 *P* 37 *L* 14 # 61

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type TR *Comment Status* R

I do not believe that this draft is "optically compatible with existing carrier 40Gb/s client interfaces" (from the PAR and objectives).
An implementer could make a very slow transmitter with excessive transmitter penalty as long as he got the dispersion penalty OK, and call it compliant. I don't believe that existing VSR2000-3R2 transmitters are that bad, and I don't believe that existing VSR2000-3R2 receivers could receive this worst allowed signal with confidence, and I doubt that folks want to redesign their receivers.
A motion in Geneva doesn't fix this.
Notice that TDP uses the same with/without dispersion measurement that this draft uses already. After the sensitivity to the reference transmitter has been established as a one-off, using a TDP spec will be a cost-effective way to plug the gap and avoid interoperability problems.

SuggestedRemedy

As TDP uses the same tests as DP, after the reference transmitter/sensitivity has been established as a one-off, using a TDP spec will be a cost-effective way to plug the gap and avoid interoperability problems. Suggested TDP limit 3.3 dB (the largest limit in 802.3ae less the polarisation penalty here).

IEEE P802.3bg Single-mode Fibre PMD 1st Working Group recirculation ballot unsatisfied comment D2.0 #61 (cont)

Response *Response Status* U

REJECT.
Including TDP in the transmitter spec would be inconsistent with Motion #1 from the Geneva Task Force meeting in May 2010.
Move to adopt the ITU-T style of optical power budget specification as proposed in slide 4 of anslow_03_0510.
Y: 32, N: 0, A: 0
There is an eye mask requirement to protect against exessively slow transmitter waveforms. The dispersion penalty is measured with the actual transmitter and therefore takes in to account any effect of a slow transmitter waveform and includes the effect of reflections. The PMD penalty has been significantly reduced due to the response to comment #62 which has changed DGD_max to 3ps.
This means that a TDP test is not required to ensure interoperability.

The level of interoperability provided by the specifications for VSR2000-3R2 in G.693 has not been demonstrated to be inadequate by industry use and Clause 89 follows this methodology.

IEEE P802.3bg Single-mode Fibre PMD to Sponsor ballot

- The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit IEEE 802.3bg to Sponsor ballot

  M: D Law, S:

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

  Working Group vote:

  Y: 56, N: 0, A: 0

ME: 100Gb/s Ethernet Electrical Backplane and Twinaxial Copper Cable Assemblies Study Group

IEEE 802.3 100Gb/s Ethernet Electrical Backplane and Twinaxial Copper Cable Assemblies Study Group

Motion:

The LMSC Executive Committee grants approval for the formation of the 100Gb/s Ethernet Electrical Backplane and Twinaxial Copper Cable Assemblies Study Group within 802.3

M: D Law, S:

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

120 CFI attendees, 64 interested in participating

Working Group vote:

Y: 59 N: 0 A: 1

ME:* IEEE 802.3 Liaison response to ITU-T SG15 on OTNT standardisation work plan

IEEE 802.3 Liaison response to ITU-T SG15 on OTNT standardisation work plan

- The LMSC Executive Committee approves the letter IEEE802d3_to_ITU_SG15_01_1110.pdf, with editorial license granted to the Chair (or his appointed agent), as a liaison communication from the IEEE 802.3 working group to ITU-T Study Group 15 on the Optical Transport Networks & Technologies (OTNT) Standardization Work Plan.

M: D Law, S: ??

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

Working Group vote:

Y: 65, N: 0, A: 3

ME: IEEE 802.3 Liaison to ISO/IEC JTC1 SC6 WG1 with respect to ISO/IEC 8802-3:2000

IEEE 802.3 Liaison to ISO/IEC JTC1 SC6 WG1 with respect to ISO/IEC 8802-3:2000

- The LMSC Executive Committee approves the letter IEEE802d3_to_JTC1_SC6_01_1110.pdf, with editorial license granted to the Chair (or his appointed agent), as a liaison communication from the IEEE 802.3 working group ISO/IEC JTC1 SC6 WG1 with respect to ISO/IEC 8802-3:2000.

M: D Law, S: ??

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

Working Group vote:

Y: 44, N: 0, A: 2