# Approved Minutes IEEE P802.3by 25 Gb/s Ethernet Task Force

Interim Meeting October 15, 2015 Milpitas, CA, USA Prepared by Kent Lusted

Table of Contents	
Table of Contents	1
IEEE P802.3by 25 Gb/s Task Force Meeting – October 15, 2015:	2
Attendees	7

## IEEE P802.3by 25 Gb/s Task Force Meeting – October 15, 2015:

Prepared by Kent Lusted

IEEE P802.3by 25 Gb/s Task Force meeting convened at 8:07 a.m., October 15, 2015, by Mark Nowell, IEEE P802.3by Task Force Chair.

Chair displayed the agenda slides: http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Sept15/agenda\_3by\_01\_1015.pdf

Introductions were made. Mark Nowell reviewed agenda in http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Sept15/agenda\_3by\_01\_1015.pdf

#### Motion #1:

Move to approve the agenda:

- Moved by: Rich Mellitz
- Second by: Mike Dudek
- Passed by voice without opposition

Chair reminded participants to observe meeting decorum. Called for members of the press. No one responded. Photography and recording are not permitted.

Chair reviewed the reflector and web information. Chair reviewed the ground rules for the meeting.

Chair reviewed the attendance procedures. Chair noted that there is no IEEE online attendance for this meeting because it is a one day meeting.

Chair reviewed the IEEE structure.

Chair reviewed the Bylaws and Rules slides in -http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Sept15/agenda\_3by\_01\_1015.pdf

**IEEE Patent Policy**: Chair reviewed the Patent related slides on the 4 slides contained in the agenda. Chair calls for potentially essential patents. No one responded. Chair read the Guidelines for IEEE WG meetings. No one responded.

#### Chair advised the WG attendees that:

- The IEEE's patent policy is described in Clause 6 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws;
- Early identification of patent claims which may be essential for the use of standards under development is strongly encouraged;
- There may be Essential Patent Claims of which the IEEE is not aware. Additionally, the IEEE, the WG, nor the WG chair can ensure the accuracy or completeness of any assurance or whether any such assurance is, in fact, of a Patent Claim that is essential for the use of the standard under development.

No one responded.

Chair reviewed the IEEE 802.3 Standards Process and the progress of the Task Force to date.

Chair reviewed a summary of the September 2015 interim meeting.

Chair noted that an initial draft of the D2.1 proposed responses were posted to the website for participant review. Due to the compressed editorial timeline, Chief Editor noted that the proposed responses may not be in sync with the database due to the large amount of editorial activity.

Goals for the meeting:

- D2.1 Comment review and resolution
- Adopt closed comments and generate D2.2
- Motions

Chair reviewed the goals beyond the meeting and the proposed meeting schedule.

Future Meetings:

- November 2015 Plenary
  - o Nov 8-13th, 2015. Dallas, TX, USA,
- Contingent Interim (if necessary)
  - o Dec 14, 2015
- Jan 2016 Interim
  - Week of Jan 18th, 2016. Atlanta, GA, USA
- March 2016 Plenary
  - Week of March 13th, 2016 Macau, China

Anyone interested in hosting a meeting should contact the Chair or Steve Carlson.

### Chief Editor's Report:

By: Matt Brown

See: http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Oct15/D2p1\_comment\_agenda.pdf

- Matt Brown thanked the editorial team for their efforts to generate Draft 2.1. Matt recognized the editors (Adee Ran, Jonathan King, Arthur Marris, Chris Diminico).
- Mark Nowell noted the implications of the cross-clause topic related to the channel definition and asked participants with interest to discuss with Geoff Thompson.

Matt Brown displayed the comments deemed non-controversial and "bucket" worthy. (See <a href="http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Oct15/D2p1\_bucket\_comments.pdf">http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Oct15/D2p1\_bucket\_comments.pdf</a>) Please contact the Chief Editor to have a comment pulled from the list and considered in the Task Force meeting.

Mike Dudek asked for comment #67 to be pulled from the bucket.

Geoff Thompson objected to the idea of a bucket motion for non-controversial comments at the end of the meeting and proposed to review them within the meeting or over email. Chair responded that the proposed responses had been posted to the website for several days for participant review and that bucket comments were indicated in the comment field. Mark Nowell asked if anyone else had the same concern. No one responded. Matt Brown noted that the bucket comment responses are mostly "Accept" or "Accept in Principle" with a correction to the proposed response, mostly editorial. Matt noted that rejections were moved from the bucket to Task Force meeting resolution.

Matt Brown pulled comment #71 from bucket list.

Mark Nowell asked participants to review the comments in the bucket list. (See <a href="http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Oct15/D2p1\_bucket\_comments.pdf">http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Oct15/D2p1\_bucket\_comments.pdf</a>) If there is time at the end of the meeting, the bucket comments will be reviewed in the Task Force meeting.

Matt Brown reviewed the process for withdrawing a comment.

Chair noted that adopting the BTI items could introduce risk to the accelerated Task Force schedule if the responses are not fully comprehensive.

Began comment resolution.

As part of the discussion around comments #59, 47, 49, 50 and 55 (twin-ax cable comments), Straw Polls were suggested to get a sense from the Task Force.

#### Straw Poll #1.

Choose one of the following to implement in D2.2:
A. Leave CA-25G-S specification as is.
B. "Increase" CA-25G-S specifications (e.g., dudek\_100715\_25ge\_adhoc)
C. Eliminate CA-25G-S cable type.
Pick one.
A: 10 B: 6 C: 14
See comment database comment #59 for details.

Straw Poll #2. (In regards to CA-25G-S)

Open to considering in sponsor ballot:

A. Leave CA-25G-S specification as is.

B. "Increase" CA-25G-S specifications (e.g., dudek\_100715\_25ge\_adhoc)

C. Change CA-25G-S cable type to informative specification (e.g, informative annex).

D. Eliminate CA-25G-S cable type completely.

Chicago rules.

A: 11 B: 7 C: 23 D: 13

See comment database comment #59 for details.

Mike Dudek withdrew comment #59.

Tom Palkert withdrew comment #47, 49, and 50.

Adam Healey withdrew comment #55.

Break at ~10:20 a.m. Resume at ~10:35 a.m.

In regards to comment #12, Chair asked for a show of hands for generally supporting the simplification to one PHY type. Chair announced that more than half the room indicated in favor. No one indicated objection. Chair asked for show of hands to make the change to one PHY type for sponsor vs. now. Chair announced that more people indicated support for the change in sponsor ballot.

Mike Dudek asked the editorial team for a pre-review draft of the specification with the implementation of a single PHY type to facilitate a review of the scope of the changes. Matt Brown agreed to investigate the feasibility.

Comment resolution continued.

Rich Mellitz withdrew comment #36.

Kumeran Krishnasamy withdrew comment #93.

Rich Mellitz withdrew comment #35.

Break at ~12:30 p.m. Resume at 1:45 p.m.

#### **Presentation #1:**

Title: Tutorial – What is the correct terminology for the media path?

By: Geoff Thompson

See: http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Oct15/thompson\_3by\_01\_1015.pdf

- Clarifying questions were asked and answered.
- Discussed the use of "channel" in the specification. Mark Nowell summarized that there seems to be consensus to make the change for the term "channel".
- Discussed the use of "link segment" and "cable assembly" in the specification.

Comment resolution continued.

Break at ~3:25 p.m. Resume at 3:45 p.m.

Chair noted that the comments deemed non-controversial and "bucket" worthy are posted on the website for participant review. (See

http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/Oct15/D2p1\_bucket\_comments.pdf) Please contact the Chief Editor to have a comment pulled from the list and considered in the Task Force meeting.

Chair noted that the meeting will likely run past 6:00 p.m.

Rich Mellitz withdrew comment #35.

Comment resolution continued.

Chair asked the participants if there were any comments to pull from the bucket. No one responded. Chair asked if there was objection to adopting the bucket responses as part of the final motion. No one objected.

### Motion #2:

Move to:

- Accept the proposed responses to comments listed in D2p1\_bucket\_comments.pdf
- Generate Draft 2.2 for Working Group recirculation from Draft 2.1 and the closed comments.
- M: Chris Diminico
- S: Rich Mellitz
- Technical (>= 75%)
- Result: passed by voice without opposition. 6:54pm

### Motion #3:

Move to Adjourn:

- Moved by: Chris Diminico
- Second by: Kapil Shrikhande
- Passed by voice vote without opposition

Meeting ended at 6:54 p.m.

# <u>Attendees</u>

IEEE 25Gb/s Task Force, Oct 2015			
Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Thursday
Andrewartha	Mike	Microsoft	X
Bacasubramonian	Venu	Marvell	x
Balasubramanian	Vittal	Dell Force10	x
Balasubramonian	Venugopal	Marvell	x
Bolig	Matt	Broadcom	x
Booth	Brad	Microsoft	x
Brown	Matt	Applied Micro	x
Choi	Hyun	Nvidia	x
Cunningham	Daniel	Arista Networks	x
DiMinico	Christopher	MC Communications/Panduit	x
Dudek	Mike	QLogic	x
Ghiasi	Ali	Ghiasi Quantum	x
Gustlin	Mark	Xilinx	x
Healey	Adam	Avago Technologies	x
Hidaka	Yasuo	Fujitsu Laboratories of America	x
Horner	Rita	Synopsys	x
Jiang	Michael	Montage Technology	x
Jiu	Robert	Montage Technology	x
	Upen		
Kareti	Reddy	Cisco	x
Krishnasamy	Kumaran	Broadcom	x
Li	Mike	Altera	x
Lusted	Kent	Intel	x
Maki	Jeffery	Juniper Networks	x
Malicoat	David	HP	x
Matoglu	Erdem	Amphenol	х
Mellitz	Richard	Intel	x
Nelson	John	Arista Networks	x
Nowell	Mark	Cisco	x
Palkert	Tom	Luxtera - Molex - MoSys	х
Rabinovich	Rick	ALE USA	х
Shanbhag	Megha	TE Connectivity	х
Shrikhande	Kapil	Dell	х
Slavick	Jeff	Avago Technologies	x
Stone	Rob	Broadcom	x
Sun	Phil	Marvell Semiconductor	x
Thompson	Geoff	Independent	x
Vaiyanathan	srinivas	Mellanox	x
White	Martin	Cavium	x
Yan	Gang	Montage Technology	x