

# Greater than 10 Mb/s Long-Reach Single-Pair Ethernet (GT10MSPE) Study Group Closing Report

George Zimmerman

CME Consulting/ADI, APL Group, Cisco,  
CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe

Electronic Plenary

March 2022

# IEEE 802.3 SPEP2P Study Group

## Study Group information

---

### Study Group Organization

George Zimmerman, IEEE 802.3 GT10MSPE Study Group Chair

Steve Carlson, IEEE 802.3 GT10MSPE Study Group Vice Chair

### Study Group charter

Develop a Project Authorization Request (PAR) and Criteria for Standards Development (CSD) responses for Greater than 10 Mb/s long-reach point-to-point Single-Pair Ethernet PHYs and Associated Powering

### Study Group web and reflector information

Reflector information: <https://www.ieee802.org/3/GT10MSPE/reflector.html>

Home page: <https://www.ieee802.org/3/GT10MSPE/index.html>

(No private area)

# IEEE 802.3 SPEP2P Study Group Activities during March 2022 plenary

---

Held meeting March 16, 2022

Major items discussed, decisions made and actions

- Considered comments on PAR/CSDs from Nescom, 802.1, and 802.11

- Responded to comments from 802.1 and 802.11

- Discussed potential objective for low-latency mode

Draft PAR: <https://www.ieee802.org/3/GT10MSPE/P802.3dg.pdf>

Draft CSDs: [https://www.ieee802.org/3/GT10MSPE/CSD\\_3GT10M\\_01\\_11102021\\_out.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/GT10MSPE/CSD_3GT10M_01_11102021_out.pdf)

Draft Objectives:

[https://www.ieee802.org/3/GT10MSPE/Objectives\\_11102021\\_SGadopted.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/GT10MSPE/Objectives_11102021_SGadopted.pdf)

# Comments - Nescom

---

1. In the title, insert non-breaking space between "100" and "Mb/s".

Response: Accept

2a. In 5.2b, who is the entity that specifies?

Replace "Specify additions to and appropriate modifications of IEEE Std 802.3 to add 100 Mb/s Physical Layer (PHY) specifications and management parameters for operation, and associated optional provision of power, using a single balanced pair of conductors."

With "This standard [specifies/provides/adds/describes] modifications of IEEE Std 802.3 to add 100 Mb/s Physical Layer (PHY) specifications and management parameters for operation, and associated optional provision of power, using a single balanced pair of conductors."

Response: Thank you for your comment. I would note that item 5.2b is 'Scope of the project' while item 5.2a is 'Scope of the complete standard'. As a result, I suggest that item 5.2b be changed to read 'This project will specify additions to and appropriate modifications of IEEE Std 802.3 to add 100 Mb/s Physical Layer (PHY) specifications and management parameters for operation, and associated optional provision of power, using a single balanced pair of conductors.'

# Comments - Nescom

---

2b. 5.2b should begin with "This project specifies [...]" because future tense is prohibited in the scope, see 5) of

<https://standards.ieee.org/about/sasb/nescom/conv/>

Response: I believe that the use of future tense is only with respect to the document scope statement provided in item 5.2a. The reason for this is the text in item 5.2a will be published in the document, the item 5.2.a help starts 'The Scope should appear as it will in the draft standard.'. I believe that this is confirmed by NesCom convention 5 as its title is 'Document Scope and Document Purpose' and references IEEE SA Standards Style Manual subclause 12.2.3 'Scope' which starts 'The scope of the standard shall explain in statements of fact what is covered in the standard ...'.

I therefore don't believe the use of future tense applies to the project scope provided in item 5.3a as this text is not the document scope, is not published in the standard and is only provided for amendment and corrigendum PARs. The help text for item 5.2.b reads 'State what the Amendment is changing or adding.'.

# Comments - Nescom

---

3. In 5.2.a, is "Physical Layer entities (PHY)" a definition? In 5.2.b, is it re-defined?

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correct expansion for the abbreviation 'PHY' is 'Physical Layer entity' as found in the IEEE Std 802.3 scope statement in item 5.2.a. As a result, the text '... Physical Layer (PHY) specifications ...' in item 5.3.b is not the correct use of the abbreviation 'PHY' and therefore the text '... Physical Layer (PHY) specifications ...' in item 5.3.b should be changed to read '... Physical Layer specifications ...'. I will ask the NesCom administrator to make this change.

# Comments - Nescom

---

4. In 5.2.a, change "media access control (MAC)" to "Media Access Control (MAC)" to make it consistent.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The text in item 5.2.a is from the published IEEE Std 802.3 scope statement, so I believe the capitalisation of 'media access control' is correct. I understand that the reason for this capitalisation is that 'media access control', and for that matter 'management information base', are both common nouns in the first sentence of the scope statement (i.e., '... a ... media access control ... and management information base'). In the following sentence 'Carrier Sense Multiple Access with Collision Detection (CSMA/CD) MAC' is a proper noun and is therefore capitalised (i.e., 'The Carrier Sense Multiple ...'). I will be the first to admit that capitalisation rules are not one of my strong points, so I did confirm my above understand with a member of the IEEE-SA professional editor team.

All NesCom responses approved by Study Group without objection 3/16/2022 (54 on the call)

# Comments from 802.1

---

## PAR: 5.2.b Scope of the project:

Distinct identity is not justified in the scope of the PAR. The scope is lacking the distinguishing characteristic of length. How does this differ from 100BASE-T1? Suggest the following additions (or similar) to the scope:

Specify additions to and appropriate modifications of IEEE Std 802.3 to add 100 Mb/s Physical Layer (PHY) specifications and management parameters for operation, and associated optional provision of power using a single balanced pair of conductors longer than 40m.

We understand scope is restricted to single pair. We don't understand the maximum distance. Is the intent purely to bound the scope by stating minimum distance?

## Suggested Response:

It is the 802 CSD that places a constraint on IEEE 802.3 as far as distinct identity. The CSDs state an ability to reach greater than 40m under distinct identity. Further, the suggested modification would seemingly prevent specifying operation on links under 40m.

In answer to the question, the intent is a PHY suitable for industrial and building automation, mobile machinery, and non-automotive transportation (e.g., buses, trains, aircraft, and ships), as specified in the PAR stakeholders section.

Approved by Study Group without objection 3/16/2022 (52 on the call)



# Comments from 802.11

---

1.2 Title – need space between 100 and Mb/s. “100 Mb/s”

We accept this comment (redundant to Nescom #1)

1.2 Title – remove “IEEE” from first word.

We accept this comment

5.2b – remove unwarranted “PHY” Acronym: suggest change to “Specify additions to and appropriate modifications of IEEE Std 802.3 to add 100 Mb/s Physical Layer (~~PHY~~) specifications and management parameters for operation, and associated optional provision of power, using a single balanced pair of conductors.

We accept this comment (redundant to Nescom #3)

5.4 – Change “IEEE 802.3” to “IEEE Std 802.3” and add full name to list in 8.1

We accept this comment

8.1 list names of standards cited.

We accept this comment - add “IEEE Std 802.3 – Standard for Ethernet” to 8.1

Approved by Study Group without objection 3/16/2022 (54 on the call)

# Motion

---

Move that the IEEE 802.3 Working Group approve the IEEE 802.3dg Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for 100Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair of Conductors PAR as in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/22/ec-22-0017-03-00EC-draft-ieee-p802-3dg-par.pdf>

M: G. Zimmerman

S: B. Voss

# Motion

---

Move that the IEEE 802.3 Working Group approve the IEEE 802.3dg Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for 100Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair of Conductors CSD responses as in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/22/ec-22-0018-00-00EC-draft-ieee-p802-3dg-csd.pdf>

M: G. Zimmerman

S: S. Carlson

# Motion

---

Move that the IEEE 802.3 Working Group approve the IEEE 802.3dg Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for 100Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair of Conductors Objectives as in

[https://www.ieee802.org/3/GT10MSPE/Objectives\\_11102021\\_SGadopted.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/GT10MSPE/Objectives_11102021_SGadopted.pdf)

M: G. Zimmerman

S: B. Voss

# Motion

---

Move that the IEEE 802.3 Working Group requests the second rechartering and six-month extension of the IEEE 802.3 Greater than 10 Mb/s Long-Reach Single Pair Ethernet study group

M: G. Zimmerman

S: C. Jones

Rationale for the extension request: Approval has been sought to forward the IEEE P802.3dg PAR to NesCom which was developed by this Study Group. This request for extension is only to address any issues during the approval process for the IEEE P802.3dg PAR.

Questions?

Thank you!