

Study Groups Procedural Progress

Mark Nowell – Cisco

Study Group Chair

Jan 20th-22nd , 2016

(an earlier version of this was presented at ad hoc)

Topics

- Background & Assumptions
- Options
- Discussion

Study Group Work

- Goal of any Study Group is to study the problem and develop the following:
 - Objectives
 - Responses to The Criteria for Standard Development (CSD) – aka 5 Criteria
 - PAR
- Solving the problem, developing solutions, writing specifications are all Task Force activities


From 802.3 Operating rules: *The main responsibility of the TF Chair is to ensure the production, and to guide through the approval and publication process, a draft standard, recommended practice or guideline, or revision to an existing document as defined by the relevant PAR.*

Background

- Current SGs scopes (as defined by chartering motions).
 - **50 Gigabit/s Ethernet over a single lane (50 Gb/s SG)**
 - **Next Generation 100 Gb/s Ethernet & 200 Gigabit/s Ethernet (NGOATH SG)**
- Strong interest in moving forward with single-lane and multi-lane specifications building off the 802.3bs 50Gb/s electrical IO work.
- Single, well supported CFI generated two Study groups partitioning the scope between single-lane and multi-lane efforts.
- Since then, work in ad hoc meetings has suggested different directions are possible for the work partitioning – which we are going to work through in January.

How we started...

The original proposed approach



Assumptions

Key assumptions:

- If SGs complete work (objectives, CSDs, PARs) in January, WG & EC approval should happen in March and first Task Force meeting(s) should happen in May 2016.
 - If SGs do not complete work in January, the first Task Force meetings won't happen until Sept 2016 at earliest. 1st Assumption is that the group's preference is May 2016 to begin technical work.
- The SGs will need to refine their documentation before WG approval in March based on feedback received. This allows the SG to actively work to refine their January output ahead of March approval if necessary
 - See next slide


Path to Working Group approval (e.g. March)

- Adopt Objectives, CSD & PAR in January SG
- CSD and PAR get pre-submitted to Exec Council ahead of March meeting
- Objectives DON'T get pre-submitted
- CSD & PAR modified by SG at Plenary based on feedback
- Objectives can be modified up to the 802.3 WG approval at closing plenary. For this group this means this is possible **for example**:
 - Jan meeting: Adopt objective of the form: Define a one-lane 50 Gb/s PHY for operation over copper twinaxial cables.
 - Jan-> March: lots of SG ad hoc work
 - March: Study Group **must** modify objective to include a technical target. E.g. Define a one-lane 50 Gb/s PHY for operation over copper twinaxial cables with lengths up to at least 3m.
 - Then 802.3 WG adopts final objectives

Three things that add some complexity to moving forward

1. Initial scope of SGs assumed that one was focused only on single-lane work and the other was focused on multi-lane work
 - Further ad hoc discussions revealed that some single-lane and multi-lane work would make sense to be done together
2. Interest has been raised that 200 Gb/s Ethernet SMF objectives may make sense to be handled by the 802.3bs TF
 - Further schedule urgency if this happens in order to not substantially impact the 802.3bs schedule
 - NGOATH SG will cease to exist after a PAR (modification) is approved
3. On-line straw poll (see last week's caveat) indicated that 100 Gb/s objectives that were polled have weakest consensus
 - How to handle time to build consensus on these vs. interest in moving forward


Moving forward – an approximate plan for Wed/Thurs this week...



Study Group Scope Changes

- Until the SGs define the objectives it wants to do it is hard to propose what changes need to be made.
 - It is clear though that we can not generate objectives from two different SGs into the same PAR
- Since we have a WG meeting on Thursday evening we can address this then
 - But we need to know what we want to ask for !!

Moving forward – an approximate plan for Friday this week...



The decision to submit a .3bs PAR modification for WG & EC approval is the NGOATHs decision. However, without some .3bs indication that they would accept, it makes no point to try.

Adding 200G SMF objectives to 802.3bs

Support for:

- Technical similarity should enable significant leveragability
- Minimal schedule impact to 802.3bs resulting in accelerated availability of 200GE SMF specifications

Argument against:

- Schedule impact concerns for 802.3bs
- Risk of creating two 200GE FEC/PCS architectures if 802.3bs solution is not sufficient for all eventual 200GE PMDs (e.g. Twinax)
- 200GE justification based on 50GE server IO so why put on different timelines

Handling decisions in joint study group meeting

- Ground rules reminder:
 - Anyone in the room can speak
 - Anyone in the room can vote
- Plan to run the two Study Groups jointly and, as such:
 - In the Joint 50G and NGOATH Study Groups meeting, motions can be taken for decisions within either Study group's scope while in the joint session.
- Checkpoint – any isolated interest by any participants?

Summary

- Fairly complicated meeting ahead to try and achieve indicated interests on pace of moving forward and partitioning of work
- SG scope changes will need to happen in WG session
- Understood path to:
 - New TF including 50Gb/s objectives and 200Gb/s multi-lane media PMDs
 - Two options for 200GE SMF objectives possible and understood
 - As part of .3bs
 - As part of new 50G/200G TF
- Unclear consensus on 100G objectives and impact on any other consensus