IEEE 802.3 Closing EC Items

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

IEEE P802.3at
DTE Power Enhancements PAR extension

IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements PAR extension

- Draft pre-circulated under 48 hour rule

  http://www.ieee802.org/secmail/pdfmIBRe6I0i0.pdf

- Why is an extension required?

  Although IEEE P802.3at sponsor balloting is nearly complete, IEEE P802.3at is contingent on IEEE P802.3bc which has only just recently started sponsor balloting. This could result in the situation where sponsor balloting of IEEE P802.3at is complete, yet IEEE P802.3at can not be submitted to RevCom as it will have to await the completion of sponsor balloting of IEEE P802.3bc.

  The extension is therefore being requested to guarantee project continuity should either unexpected delays occur during the IEEE P802.3at sponsor ballot process, or the completion of the IEEE P802.3bc project delay the submission of IEEE P802.3at beyond December 2009.

IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements PAR extension

- The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit the IEEE P802.3at PAR extension to NesCom

M: D Law, S:

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

Working Group vote:

Y: 86, N: 0, A: 0

IEEE P802.3at
DTE Power Enhancements to RevCom

IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements Sponsor balloting results

- ## 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot – draft D4.2
  - Ballot opened 5th June 2009, closed 20th July 2009
  - 98% approval, three comments received

Comments received: 3	Initial Draft D4.0			1st Recirculation Draft D4.1			2nd Recirculation Draft D4.2			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	4	4	PASS	4	4	PASS	4	4	PASS	< 30
Disapprove with comment	12	-	-	10	-	-	1 Note 1	-	-	-
Disapprove without comment	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	72	85	PASS	77	88	PASS	88	98	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	88	75	PASS	91	78	PASS	93	80	PASS	≥ 75
Voters	116	-	-	116	-	-	116	-	-	-

Note 1 – One ballot change from Disapprove with Comment to Approve with Comment by email after ballot close.

IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements 2nd Recirculation ballot (D4.2) comments

- 3 comments received on last recirculation

  http://www.ieee802.org/3/at/comments/D4.2/P802d3at_D4p2_postmtg_by_ID.pdf

  - Editorial coordination comment
    - Draft met all requirements
  - Comment from approve voter
    - Out of scope as on unchanged text
  - Comment from remaining disapprove voter
    - Recirculation not required as it is a restatement of this voters previous unsatisfied negative comments submitted against initial sponsor ballot (a pile-on to own comment)
    - Original comments and 2nd Recirculation ballot comment on following slides

IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements 2nd Recirculation ballot (D4.2) Comment #1

CI **33**   SC **33.4.1**   P **87**   L **26**   # 1

Maytum, Michael   Bourns, Inc.

Comment Type   **TR**   Comment Status **R**

*** Comment submitted with the file 33723600024-T09-SG05-090525-TD-GEN-0137MSW-E.doc attached ***

Illogical
The a) 1500 V rms AC voltage is 2121 V peak. Thus the impulse should not be 1500 V, but at least 2121 V.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 1500 V to least 2121 V, 2400 V preferred.
See Annex C of the attached

Response   Response Status **W**

REJECT.

This comment is out of scope as it does not relate to text that was changed in the last recirculation and is a restatement of a previously rejected comment from the same commentor.

This is the response to the previously rejected comment: "These are well established parameters set forth by the IEEE as minimum functional requirements and are not replacements for safety (or other) requirements that may need to be met by a specific product in a specific jurisdiction. IEC 60950-1 is only referenced for the methodologies."

Furthermore, accepting this comment for this amendment may make existing devices which are compliant to IEEE Std 802.3-2008 non-compliant.

IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements Initial ballot (D4.0) Comment #177

CI **33**   SC **33.4.1**   P **82**   L **34**   # 177

Maytum, Michael   Bourns, Inc.

Comment Type   **TR**   Comment Status **R**

Subclause 5.2.2 of IEC 60950-1 specifies an insulation test voltage of a)1500 V rms or a DC voltage at least equal to the peak AC voltage e.g. b)2250 V dc. Impulse test of c)1500 V, 10/700 completely fails to reach the 2250 V peak stress voltage of tests a) and b). The TNV-1 CIRCUIT or a TNV-3 CIRCUIT voltage level of 1.5 kV is based on ITU-T K.21 Resistibility of telecommunication equipment installed in customer premises to overvoltages and overcurrents. In K.21 the assumed primary protector let-through voltage of 1.5 kV sets the 1.5 kV test level of K.21 test 2.1.1.b (basic). In the case of Ethernet circuits primary protectors are not installed, which will increase the inherent impulse voltage level. Conversely most Ethernet wiring is internal, which will decrease the impulse voltage level. For unprotected TNV-1 interfaces ITU-T K.21 specifies a higher level 6 kV (enhanced). A US telecommunication supplier has found it necessary to increase internal port withstand test level from 1.5 kV to 6 kV for their fibre to the home installations to reduce failures.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the option c) 1500 V 10/700 test level to 2250 V 10/700

Response   Response Status **W**

REJECT.

These are well established parameters set forth by the IEEE as minimum functional requirements and are not replacements for safety (or other) requirements that may need to be met by a specific product in a specific jurisdiction. IEC 60950-1 is only referenced for the methodologies.

See 178, which is the identical comment without a remedy.

IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements Initial ballot (D4.0) Comment #178

CI **00** SC **0** P L # 178

Maytum, Michael Bourns, Inc.

Comment Type **GR** Comment Status **R**

The impulse value of 1.5 kV 10/700 is too low for the above reasons. Compliance only to the lower 1.5 kV 10/700 condition allows manufacturers to reduce insulation withstand voltage and potentially expose users to greater hazards.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status **W**

REJECT.

Comment makes reference to another comment and offers no solution. Contextually, this is a duplicate of comment 177 (the referred to comment) and therefore this comment is unneccessary.

IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements to RevCom

- The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit IEEE P802.3at/D4.2 to RevCom

M: D Law, S:

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

Working Group vote:
Y: 84, N: 0, A: 0

IEEE P802.3av
10 Gb/s Passive Optical Networks to RevCom

IEEE 802.3av 10 Gb/s Passive Optical Networks Sponsor balloting results

- 3rd Sponsor recirculation ballot – draft D3.4
  - Ballot opened 20th June 2009, closed 5th July 2009
  - 100% approval, zero comments received

Comments received: 0	Initial Draft D3.0			1st Recirculation Draft D3.2			2nd Recirculation Draft D3.3			3rd Recirculation Draft D3.4			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	8	8	PASS	9	9	PASS	9	9	PASS	9	9	PASS	< 30
Disapprove with comment	3	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Disapprove without comment	1	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	82	96	PASS	86	97	PASS	89	100	PASS	89	100	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	94	82	PASS	97	85	PASS	98	85	PASS	98	85	PASS	≥ 75
Voters	114	-	-	114	-	-	114	-	-	114	-	-	-

IEEE 802.3av 10 Gb/s Passive Optical Networks to RevCom

- The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit IEEE P802.3av/D3.4 to RevCom

    M: D Law, S:
    Y: ??, N: ??, A: ??

    Working Group vote:
    Y: 89, N: 0, A: 2

IEEE P802.3-2008/Cor 1 (IEEE 802.3bb) Pause Reaction Delay Corrigendum to Sponsor ballot

IEEE 802.3bb Pause Reaction Delay Corrigendum Working Group balloting results

- 1st Working Group recirculation ballot – draft D1.2
  - Ballot opened 22nd May 2009, closed 5th June 2009 11:59PM AOE
  - 98% approval, 10 comments received

Comments received: 10	Initial Draft D1.1			1st Recirculation Draft D1.2			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	18	15	PASS	18	15	PASS	< 30
Disapprove with comment	3	-	-	2	-	-	-
Disapprove without comment	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	95	97	PASS	98	98	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	116	50	PASS	118	51	PASS	≥ 50
Voters	229	-	-	229	-	-	-

IEEE 802.3bb Pause Reaction Delay Corrigendum 1st Recirculation ballot (D1.2) comments

- **10 comments received on last recirculation**
  http://www.ieee802.org/3/bb/comments/d1.2/P802d3bb_d1p2.pdf
  - 6 Comments on the front matter
  - 2 Editorial comments on a missing space
  - 2 TRs which were restatements of TRs
    - Commenter has indicated he is satisfied with responses
    - No unresolved negative comments
  - No substantive changes need to be made to the draft as a result of the recirculation

IEEE 802.3bb Pause Reaction Delay Corrigendum to Sponsor ballot

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

    M: D Law, S:

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

    Working Group vote:

    Y: 77, N: 1, A: 2

IEEE P802.3bc Ethernet Organizationally Specific TLVs conditional to RevCom

IEEE P802.3bc Ethernet Organizationally Specific TLVs Conditional to RevCom

- Item 1 - Date the Sponsor ballot closed:
  - IEEE 802.3 initial Sponsor ballot on D3.0 of IEEE P802.3bc closed Tuesday, 13th July 2009.

- Item 2 - Vote tally:

Comments: 22

	Initial Draft D3.0			Req %
	#	%	Status	
Abstain	5	5	PASS	< 30
Disapprove with comment	3	-	-	-
Disapprove without comment	0	-	-	-
Approve	83	96	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	91	90	PASS	≥ 75
Voters	101	-	-	-

IEEE P802.3bc Ethernet Organizationally Specific TLVs Conditional to RevCom

- Item 3 - Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and WG responses.
  - 3 unsatisfied negative comments
    http://www.ieee802.org/3/bc/comments/D3.0/P802d3bc_D3p0_unsatisfied.pdf
- Item 4 - Schedule for recirculation ballot and resolution meeting.
  - Draft 3.1 of IEEE P802.3bc will begin a recirculation ballot on or before 27th July 2009
  - RevCom submittal on 31st July
  - Recirculation will close no later than 10th August 2009
  - Comment resolution to be conducted on 12th August 2009
  - If pulled from RevCom agenda conduct another recirculation ballot to complete by 18th September
  - Comment resolution to be conducted week of 21st September 2009
  - RevCom submittal 19th October

IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements Initial ballot (D3.0) Comments #1 and 12

CI **00**   SC **0**   P   L   # 1

Messina, Don

Comment Type   **ER**   Comment Status   **A**

This draft meets all editorial requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Response   Response Status   **W**

ACCEPT.

CI **79**   SC **79.3.1**   P **25**   L **30**   # 12

Thaler, Patricia   Broadcom

Comment Type   **GR**   Comment Status   **A**

This TLV seems rather out of date. There are 3 types of auto-negotiation in 802.3 and auto-negotiation support status fails to indicate which one is supported. This is rather out of date as the RFC 4836 ifMauAutoNegCapAdvertisedBits don't include 10GBASE-T nor any of the backplane PHYs all of which are covered by auto negotiation. These PHYs are also not covered for operational MAU type since they aren't in RFC 4836.

SuggestedRemedy

This TLV should probably be deprecated at some point and replaced with one that indicates which type of auto-neg is supported and either has a larger advertised capability field with enough bits for all capabilities or where the capability bits are specific to the autonegotiation type so they fit in the 16 bit field.

Response   Response Status   **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

While deprecating and replacing this TLV as suggested is beyond the scope of this project, it would be a reasonable thing to do in the future.

See also comment #13.

IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements Initial ballot (D3.0) Comment #18

CI **00**   SC **0**   *P*   *L*   # 18

Thompson, Geoffrey   Nortel Networks

Comment Type **GR**   *Comment Status* **R**

This is a general disapprove for the methodology of the project and the many detailed manifestations of that methodology that show up throughout the text. This project seeks to incorporate specifications that were developed in other groups (802.1 and the IETF) that were supposed to track our underlying hardware specifications and produce the management software specifications for that management.

All of this would be perfectly reasonable if (1) they had appropriate input from us at the front end and kept in line with that guidance and (2) they had been willing to maintain responsibility for management standards on an ongoing basis.

Neither has proved to be the case. It now turns out that the IETF did not utilize the device lists and identifications that we provided but, rather went off on their own. 802.1 initiated a project to do 802.3 management (the roots of this project) without participation from 802.3. Now we are being asked (for the sake of expediency and compatibility with legacy implementations) to accept this work as the normative reference foundation for our standard AND to take over the maintenance of what they did outside of our process.

In full recognition of the difficulty of getting management standards skillfully written and adequately reviewed in 802.3, this all seems like a terribly bad idea. It is effectively bypassing the 802.3 balloting/review process for a major chunk of this important process and then telling us that we can't fix it.

Further, recent input from Bert Wijnen has indicated that this course of trying to maintain backward compatibility is a bad idea. As I understand the rules for management standards in this area, once you establish a MIB it can never be be "changed", only amended or fully replaced. This seems like an inappropriate constraint to place on these 802.3 projects considering.

IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements Initial ballot (D3.0) Comment #18 (cont)

SuggestedRemedy

That the draft be modified so that the external reference material that is specific to the 802.3 implementations (as opposed to the protocol itself) from either 802.1 or any RFC be pulled into the body of this draft and that the resulting draft be returned to review at the Working Group level.

(This might well be accompanied by not deprecating the 802.3 portion of 802.1AX for some length of time in order to support the extended redevelopment and review of this document. I would suggest that 802.3 take over the editorial pen of that document in the meantime in order of not hold 802.3 projects hostage to this important project in the meantime.)

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

REJECT.

The IEEE P802.3.1 project is already working on incorporating, updating and maintaining the RFC that are referenced in IEEE P802.3bc. Replicating this activity in IEEE P802.3bc would be outside the scope of the PAR. Once the IEEE P802.3.1 project is complete the references in IEEE 802.3 can be updated as a maintenance activity.

These external references define not only the values found in the MIBs, but in this case also the values sent in the TLVs. It is for this reason that backward compatibility is important as the only way to change the values sent in the TLVs would be to deprecate the

IEEE P802.3bc Ethernet Organizationally Specific TLVs Conditional to RevCom

- The LMSC Executive Committee grant Conditional Approval for IEEE P802.3bc RevCom submittal per Procedure 13.

  M: D Law, S:
  Y: ??, N: ??, A: ??

  Working Group vote:
  Y: 75, N: 1, A: 5

Ethernet support for the IEEE P802.1AS time synchronization protocol Study Group Extension request (1st Extension)

Ethernet support for the IEEE P802.1AS time synchronization protocol Study Group

Motion:

> The LMSC grants approval to extent (1st extension) of the IEEE P802.1AS time synchronization protocol Study Group within 802.3

M: D Law, S:

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

Working Group Motion

> Request that the IEEE 802.3 Working Group extend the Time Synchronization Study Group to the next IEEE 802 Plenary meeting.

Y: 72 N: 0 A: 0