

Summary of proposed changes to March and May 2025 unconfirmed minutes:

George Zimmerman, CME Consulting (ADI, APL Group, Cisco, Marvell, OnSemi, Sony)

7/28/2025

As-yet-to-be-confirmed minutes (May 2025 & March 2025):

To be consistent with current guidelines, and to respond to comments, I would like to offer the attached proposed amendments to the March 2025 and May 2025 minutes prior to confirmation. These follow requirements in the P&P for minutes (to provide description of technical discussion and conclusions, without specific transcription or attribution of specific comments) , and additionally aligns with the new guidelines and clarification of the “two drafts” to provide clarity.

Use of “GMSL”, “GMSLE”, and variants

Note that the new guidelines regarding trademarks in contributions relate to contributions and not minutes. Nevertheless, I have scrubbed the March and May minutes per Kamal’s comments and keeping in mind the requirement that the minutes allow one who was not at the meeting to understand what has been discussed. As the new policy will be in effect when the minutes are approved, I have avoided use of the alleged “modified trademarks” in the minutes discussion. They now are used ONLY in the titles of the presentations where they were used, which is necessary – because the presentation titles are what they are – predating the policy – and correct titles are necessary to identify the presentations per the rules, and provide a clear reference to what was presented. In some places these terms show up in straw polls or motions, where the requirement to record motions (and straw polls) as given overrides the guidelines.

Use of the term “draft”

Note I have used the word “draft”, but minimally, as necessary to describe what occurred, and with clarification regarding the approval status of any such text. I have confirmed with the (former) chair of IEEE P802.3ba that a similar process with two drafts prepared, and the term proposed drafts had been used in the past. Additionally, standards bodies in IEEE SA use many forms of draft text, including draft proposals. As a result, I have focused on making the status of the text clear rather than focus purely on a single word.

Process for two drafts

I have responded to the comments about the discussion of “process with a proposed clarification:

In the March 2025 minutes, amending the “Path Forward” discussion to provide additional clarity:

Path Forward

The chair then reported on discussions with the working group chair and the chief editor with how to progress the project. He indicated that he would ask the task force to produce multiple proposed drafts, one for each proposal. Proponents of each proposal would prepare ~~a~~ draft text reflecting their proposal, and he (and the working group chair) asked proponents of competing proposals not to impede the development of the other ~~draft(s) proposals~~. ~~These~~ The proposed drafts would ideally provide clearer options for the task force, and, if the task force could not decide, to be presented as options to the working group.

The Task Force works at the pleasure of the Working Group, and if the task force did not make a selection, the Chair would ask the working group to select a draft proposal for preparation for working group ballot.

In summary, the Chair proposed the following process:

- 2 (or possibly 3) proposed drafts moving forward. Move from pptx to actual proposed baseline text
- Off-cycle teleconference every 2 weeks
- Attempt to select between the two drafts at the May interim
- Attempt to select between the options at the July plenary
- If no selection, the Chair will ask the Working group to select a draft proposal for preparation for WG ballot (in July).
- In preparation for that possibility, a late June/Early July teleconference will be held for the Working Group to review the draft proposals, with pre-circulation ~~of the drafts in~~ June.
- Working Group vote in July unless there is a path forward

Note: The request in July would be for the WG to select a technical path forward if the TF is not able to. There is no expectation to go to WG ballot out of the July meeting. Questions were asked and answered.

And within the May minutes, a similar amendment to provide clarity, near the end, under “FUTURE MEETINGS”:

afternoon through Thursday morning.

A participant asked about the process for maintaining two proposed drafts. The chair responded that he wanted to move the proposed drafts forward by consensus within their support groups, rather than formal motions. He outlined ~~a process that~~ he intended to create to facilitate discussion with an exchange of comments on the proposed text for each ~~draft proposal~~, in the process of building consensus for drafts that could be adopted once the duplexing method was chosen.

The Chair indicated that the agenda had been exhausted.

March Minutes, comments on approved agenda vs. agenda deck 01c

In the March minutes, it seems there was confusion between the "agenda deck" and the "agenda for the meeting" (which is approved), and a lack of understanding that the agenda deck contains more than just the agenda. I offer the proposed clarification below, which I believe explains that the "agenda" which is approved is slide 3 of the "agenda deck". It also explains (after I reviewed in detail) the difference between deck 01b and 01c (the deck was

updated to reflect motions and straw polls). Please let me know whether clarifications on the March minutes (attached) are also needed. Since these are easier, I've shown them below:

Mr. Lewis turned to presentation [agenda 3dm 01b 0325.pdf](#) and reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

Approval of Agenda: The chair asked whether there were additions or corrections to the agenda, which was shown as slide 3 of the presentation agenda 3dm 01b 0325.pdf. and there were none. He then considered the following motion:

Motion #1

Move to approve the agenda

M: Ragnar Jonsson

S: Peter Jones

(Procedural > 50%)

MOTION PASSES WITHOUT OBJECTION

The second mention of the agenda deck changing is at the close of day 1 business, where the "01c" version is mentioned. I have clarified (after comparing the two versions) to indicate what changed in the deck, and specifically that the approved agenda did not change:

Day One Closing Business

The chair briefly reviewed the progress and the revised timeline given the presentations heard. These are shown in a revised version of the agenda deck, [agenda 3dm 01c 0325.pdf](#), which includes an updated order of presentations and (in final form) the technical motions from the meeting, but no change to the approved agenda on slide 3.

He then discussed the current progress on the potential timeline and his view that the standard would extend into 2027. The Chair voiced a concern on progress and stated that the task force needed to make progress and offered a straw poll to assess where the group was on making key technology choices.

May minutes – incomplete sentence correction, Straw Poll #4:

Within the May minutes, there is one other change. Under Straw Poll #4 there was a sentence which had been obviously cut off. I propose completing it as shown:

Straw poll #4:

For both link segments I support:

- a) The propagation delay of a link segment shall not exceed 84 ns at all frequencies between 2 MHz and Fmax MHz
- b) The propagation delay of a link segment shall be ≥ 160 ns at all frequencies between 2 MHz and Fmax MHz.

During discussion, the requestor asked individuals not to respond if they did not support either proposal.

A: 25 B:26 Total in conference tool: 69 potential voters (18 did not respond)

Proposed Revision to the April 17 2025 Minutes

The April 17, 2025 minutes were previously confirmed, these will require a motion to revise.

I propose 2 changes to these. First, to correct an erroneous time in the minutes. 6:01am cannot be correct, even in PDT.

There was no response to the call for patents at 10:13 EDT am.

Other IEEE Policies

Jon Lewis read aloud the slides on the IEEE SA copyright, Participant behavior (ethics), IEEE individual participation, and fair and equitable consideration policies. (6:01 am) There were no questions.

Second, to align the discussion about a reminder to observe decorum with text recommended by IEEE SA. Note this was called out first as an “attribution” (which is not allowed), however, the recommended text from staff omits the participant’s name, and the name serves no purpose in understanding the meeting flow; therefore I propose we align with the recommended text.

During the discussion following the straw poll the Chair had to remind ~~Kamal Dalmia~~the group of the rules concerning decorum for the meeting.