Motions and Straw Polls

IEEE P802.3cg 10 Mbps Single-Pair Ethernet Task Force

George Zimmerman (Chair P802.3cg) - CME Consulting, Inc.

Vienna, Austria – July 2019

Motion #1

- **<u>Motion #1:</u>   Move to approve the agenda as shown in agenda_3cg_01b_0719.pdf.**

- **M: Valerie Maguire**

- **S: Theo Brillhart**

- **(Approved by voice without opposition) (Procedural > 50%)**

Motion #2

- **Motion #2: Move to approve minutes of IEEE P802.3cg 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Task Force from May 2019 (r1) as posted.**

- **M: Valerie Maguire**

- **S: Bernd Horrmeyer**

- **(Approved by voice without opposition) (Procedural > 50%)**

Motion #3

- **Move to consider 6 comments (r01-228, r01-229, r01-230, r01-231, r01-232, and r01-233) submitted after the P802.3cg draft 3.1 SA ballot deadline and not included with Editor's proposed resolutions.**

- **M: Valerie Maguire**

- **S: Chris Diminico**

- **(Technical >= 75%)**

- **Motion Passes by voice without objection**

Motion #4

- **Accept the resolutions to all P802.3cg d3p1 comments marked with the Topic "EZ" and posted as, "EZ Bucket" comments with proposed resolutions sorted by Comment ID, excluding comments r01-2 and r01-143.**

- **M: Valerie Maguire**

- **S: Stefen Graber**

- **(Technical >= 75%)**

- **Motion Passes by voice without opposition**

Motion #5

- **Accept the resolutions to all P802.3cg d3p1 comments marked with the Topic "Editorial" and posted as, "Editorial" comments with proposed resolutions sorted by Comment ID, excluding comments r01-37, r01-96, r01-97, r01-119, r01-130, r01-132, r01-133, r01-134, r01-135, r01-136, r01-137, r01-139, r01-140, r01-146, and r01-197.**

- **M: Valerie Maguire**

- **S: Piergiorgio Beruto**

- **(Technical >= 75%)**

- **Motion Passes by voice without opposition**

Motion #6

- **Move to: Respond to comments #55/88/89 with ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: Remove both IEC 63171-1 and IEC 63171-6 from the body of the draft as per Resolution 1 in bains_3cg_01c_0719.pdf**
- **M: Peter Jones**
- **S: Lennart Yseboodt**
- **(Technical >= 75%)**
- **Y: 28 N: 3   A: 12**
- **Motion Passes**

Motion #7

- **Move to strike, "The references to 1.1.3.1 and 1.1.4 provide no additional clarity or information. The referenced subclauses refer to the division of 802.3 on architectural lines, but do not provide any information on technical issues specifically in conflict with this draft." from the proposed response to comment r01-227.**

- **M: Geoff Thompson**

- **S: Yong Kim**

- **(Technical >= 75%)**

- **Y: 1   N: 13   A: 19**

- **Motion Fails**

Motion #8

- **Move to reconsider Motion #7.**

- **M: Jon Lewis**
- **S: David Brandt**
- **(Procedural > 50%)**
- **Y: 21   N: 1**
- **Motion Passes**

Motion #9

- **Reconsideration of Motion 7:**
- **Move to strike, "The references to 1.1.3.1 and 1.1.4 provide no additional clarity or information. The referenced subclauses refer to the division of 802.3 on architectural lines, but do not provide any information on technical issues specifically in conflict with this draft." from the proposed response to comment r01-227.**
- **M: Geoff Thompson**
- **S: Yong Kim**
- **(Technical >= 75%)**
- **Y: 3   N: 17   A: 21**
- **Motion Fails**

Motion #10

I move to reject comment r01-227 with the following response:

REJECT.

The CRG disagrees with the commenter. The CRG disagrees with the commenter, and believes the draft is within the PAR scope.

A key responsibility of the ballot pool is to evaluate whether the scope of the draft is within the scope of the PAR, and an affirmative vote indicates your agreement that the work does not exceed the scope of the PAR. The ballot pool has voted in the affirmative.

This comment is essentially a restatement of the arguments in previously rejected comments i-27 and i-270, and are not associated with a new disapprove vote.

The references to 1.1.3.1 and 1.1.4 provide no additional clarity or information. The referenced subclauses refer to the division of 802.3 on architectural lines, but do not provide any information on technical issues specifically in conflict with this draft.

Motion #10 (continued)

The majority of the CRG believes that the functions are appropriately placed in the architecture of IEEE Std. 802.3 and ISO layering model.

- **M: Peter Jones**
- **S: Martin Miller**
- **(Technical >= 75%)**
- **Y: 5**
- **N: 8**
- **A: 22**
- **Motion Fails**

Motion #11

- **Move to reconsider Motion #7.**

- **M: Jon Lewis**
- **S: Chris DiMinico**
- **(Procedural > 50%)**
- **Y: 23   N: 1   A: 7**
- **Motion Passes**

Motion #12

- **Reconsideration of Motion 7:**
- **Move to strike, "The references to 1.1.3.1 and 1.1.4 provide no additional clarity or information. The referenced subclauses refer to the division of 802.3 on architectural lines, but do not provide any information on technical issues specifically in conflict with this draft." from the proposed response to comment r01-227.**
- **(Technical >= 75%)**
- **Y: 18   N: 0   A: 16**
- **Motion Passes**

Motion #13

I move to reject comment r01-227 with the following response:

REJECT.

The CRG disagrees with the commenter. The CRG disagrees with the commenter, and believes the draft is within the PAR scope.

A key responsibility of the ballot pool is to evaluate whether the scope of the draft is within the scope of the PAR, and an affirmative vote indicates your agreement that the work does not exceed the scope of the PAR. The ballot pool has voted in the affirmative.

This comment is essentially a restatement of the arguments in previously rejected comments i-27 and i-270, and are not associated with a new disapprove vote.

The majority of the CRG believes that the functions are appropriately placed in the architecture of IEEE Std. 802.3 and ISO layering model.

Motion #13 (continued)

- **M: Jon Lewis**
- **S: Tim Baggett**
- **(Technical >= 75%)**
- **Y: 19**
- **N: 2**
- **A: 11**
- **Motion Passes**

Motion #14

Move to REJECT comments r01-90 and r01-91 with the (same) following response:

The comment is out of scope of the recirculation, bringing new text, unrelated to changed text into the draft on the recirculation.

This change would introduce new functionality into the draft beyond the existing text or approved project objectives.

- **M: G. Thompson**
- **S: J. Lewis**
- **Technical (>= 75%)**
- **Y:13   N: 3   A: 21**
- **Motion Passes**

Motion #15

- **Move to accept the text of IEEE_802d3_to_IEC_SC31G_0719_draft2.docx as proposed liaison communication from IEEE 802.3 to IEC SC31G.**

- **M: Jon Lewis**

- **S: Steffen Graber**

- **Approved by voice without opposition**

Motion #16

- **Move to: Confirm the ad hoc minutes from July 3 2019 as posted.**

- **M: Peter Jones**

- **S: Piergiorgio Beruto**

- **(Procedural > 50%)**

- **Approved by voice without opposition**

Motion #17

- **Move to grant the Task Force editors license to editorially conform the comment responses to RevCom guidelines**

- **M: Valerie Maguire**

- **S: Bob Grow**

- **Approved by Voice without opposition**

Motion #18

- **Move to instruct the Task Force editors to generate draft 3.2 from draft 3.1 and closed comments, with editorial license to update PICS as needed, and conduct a 15-day second SA Recirculation ballot**
- **M: Valerie Maguire**
- **S: Jon Lewis**
- **(Technical >= 75%)**
- **Y: 31 N: 0   A: 1**
- **Motion Passes**

Motion #19

- Adjourn the meeting.
- M: G. Thompson
- S: T. Brillhart
- Approved by voice without opposition

Straw Polls

Straw Poll #1

I support:

A. Making False Carrier Indication for 10BASE-T1S Optional as in Beruto_3cg_false_carrier_1p2.pdf

B. Deleting False Carrier Indications in draft 3.2 of 802.3cg clause 147.

C. No change

A: 23　　　B: 2　　　　C: 0　No Opinion: 12

Straw Poll #2

- I support the 802.3cg Task Force asking the 802.3 Working Group Chair to consider making the proposed change in comment i-207 on an administrative basis in the next revision of IEEE Std 802.3, and make no change to the draft of P802.3cg.

- Y: 30

- N: 1

- A: 10

Straw Poll #3

A. We work on the connector description as it is in the document and correct it and finalize it.

B. We remove reference to any specific connector type from the document.

- (pick one)
- A: 9
- B: 24

Straw Poll #4 (Chicago Rules)

I support the following proposed resolution for comments #55/88/89

- AIP #55/88/89: Resolution 1 in bains_3cg_01c_0719, remove both IEC 63171-1 and IEC 63171-6 from the draft.

Y: 21

- AIP #55/88/89: Resolution 2 in bains_3cg_01c_0719, retain IEC 63171-1 and remove IEC 63171-6 from the draft.

Y: 12

- Reject #55/88/89: No consensus for change.

Y: 8

Straw Poll #5

(pick one)

- AIP #55/88/89: Remove both IEC 63171-1 and IEC 63171-6 from the draft as per Resolution 1 in bains_3cg_01c_0719
  - Yes 25
  - No 3
  - Abstain 13

Straw Poll #6

(pick one)

- AIP #55/88/89: Retain IEC 63171-1 and remove IEC 63171-6 from the draft as per Resolution 2 in bains_3cg_01c_0719
  - Yes 9
  - No 12
  - Abstain 15

Straw Poll #7

(pick one)

- Reject #55/88/89: No consensus to change.
  - Yes 6
  - No 18
  - Abstain 15

Straw Poll #8

- I support the above proposed REJECT response to comment r01-226:
- Y: 23
- N: 2
- A: 13

Straw Poll #9

I support the following response to comments r01-90 and r01-91:

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE the resolution of comments #r01-90 and r01-91 as shown in jones_3cg_02a_0719.pdf.

Y: 8

N: 14

A: 15

Straw Poll #10

I support the following proposed response:

"PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE:

Add the following final sentence to 1st paragraph of 148.1:

"When PLCA is disabled, the reconciliation sublayer mapping is identical to that specified in clause 22."

Y: 17   N: 1   A: 19

Future Meetings

- August OOC interim (Aug 14-15, Milwaukee WI)

- Y: 12 N: 17 Maybe: 5

- September 2019 Interim
  - Indianapolis, IN, USA , Sept 9-13

    Y: 16
    N: 10
    Maybe: 10

- November 2019 Plenary
  - Waikoloa Village, HI USA, Nov 11-14

    Y: 12
    N: 5
    Maybe: 15

Future Meetings / possible SG

- For the Proposed 10SPE Multidrop Enhancements Study Group

- September 2019 Interim
  - Indianapolis, IN, USA , Sept 9-13
  - Y: 10
  - N: 10
  - Maybe: 9

- November 2019 Plenary
  - Waikoloa Village, HI USA, Nov 11-14
  - Y: 8
  - N: 10
  - Maybe: 13

Thank You!