



IEEE 802.3 Interpretations Report 15th July 2010, San Diego, CA

Wael William Diab
Vice-Chair, IEEE 802.3 Working Group
wdiab@broadcom.com

Agenda

- Review Process
- Review interpretation request
 - 1-7/10

Process

- Present response recommended by the Maintenance Task Force
- Three way vote
 - Approve proposed response
 - Reject proposed response
 - Send proposed response out for WG Ballot
- Note: Motion to do a WG Ballot takes precedent if requested

Standards Companion Text

Interpretations are a unique form of commentary on the standard. They are not statements of what the standard should have done or meant to say. Interpretations cannot change the meaning of a standard as it currently stands. Even if the request points out an error in the standard, the interpretation cannot fix that error. The interpretation can suggest that this will be brought up for consideration in a revision or amendment (or, depending on the nature of the error, an errata sheet might be issued).

However, an interpretation has no authority to do any of this. It can only discuss, address, and clarify what the standard currently says. The challenge for the interpreters is to distinguish between their expertise on what "should be," their interests in what they 'would like the standard to be," and what the standard says. Interpretations are often valuable, though, because the request will point out problems that might otherwise have gone unaddressed.

Standards Companion Guidelines

- 1) The standard is what it says. If the words are substantively wrong, then a corrective corrigenda via the balloting process is the correct response.
- 2) If the standard is ambiguous, then the interpretation must favor a looser requirement rather than a more restrictive one. Again, a corrective corrigenda can be initiated if needed.
- 3) If two parts of the standard contradict one another, then a rationale should be created and the IEEE errata process should be applied to correct the contradiction.

Interpretation 1-7/10 (TF)

- Response to Interpretation Request #1
 - Your interpretation request referenced text in Clause 32. Clause 32 is not recommended for new installations. However, the standard is unambiguous. Further, the standard references the IEC 60060 documents for the waveform shape (e.g. the meaning of virtual front which is not defined in IEEE Std 802.3-2008) and not intended for the values.
- Response to Interpretation Request #2
 - See response to interpretation request #1 above.
- Response to Interpretation Request #3
 - This request is being returned to you because the question asked does not constitute a request for interpretation but instead a request for consultation. Generally, an interpretation request is submitted when the wording of a specific clause or portion of a standard is ambiguous or incomplete. The request should state the two or more possible interpretations or the lack of completeness of the text.

Interpretation 1-7/10 Motion (TF)

- Move to approve the response to the interpretation request 1-7/10 as captured in diab_1_0710.pdf.
- M: G. Zimmerman
- S: H. Frazier
- Y: 13 N: 0 A: 0
- Tech (75%)

Interpretation 1-7/10 Motion (WG)

- Move to approve the response to the interpretation request 1-7/10 as captured in diab_1_0710.pdf.
- M: W. Diab on behalf of the Maint TF
- .3: Y:26 N: 0 A: 0
- Tech (75%)
- Motion Passes

Interpretations Web Information

- IEEE 802.3 Maintenance web site:
<http://www.ieee802.org/3/interp/index.html>
- IEEE Standards Companion text and guidelines on interpretations:
<http://standards.ieee.org/guides/companion/part2.html#interpret>