



# IEEE 802.3 Interpretations Report 18<sup>th</sup> March 2010, Orlando, FL

Wael William Diab  
Vice-Chair, IEEE 802.3 Working Group  
[wdiab@broadcom.com](mailto:wdiab@broadcom.com)

# Agenda

---

- Review Process
- Report on late requests
- Review interpretation requests
  - 1-3/10 and 1-3/10

# 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

# Late Interpretation Requests

---

- Requests 1-3/10 and 2-3/10 received Mon (3/15)
- Per direction from WG
  - We will take a vote on consideration
  - Vote is procedural
- Motion
  - Move that
    - Requests 1-3/10 and 2-3/10 be considered at this meeting
    - This will not serve as a precedent
  - M: M. Bennett                      S: M. Hajduczenia
  - Proc (>50%)
  - Y:9      N:6      A:3
  - Motion passes

# 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 1-3/10

---

- Withdrawn

# Interpretation 2-3/10 (TF)

---

- The standard is unambiguous.
- PBO is normatively defined in 55.4.3.1:
- "The minimum power backoff level requested shall comply with the power backoff schedule in Table 55–7."
- Move to accept the above text as a response to Interpretation 2-3/10
  - M: S. Kasturia S: D. Law
  - Y:15 N:0 A:1
  - Tech ( $\geq 75\%$ )
  - Motion Passes



# Interpretation 2-3/10 (WG)

---

- The standard is unambiguous.
- PBO is normatively defined in 55.4.3.1:
- "The minimum power backoff level requested shall comply with the power backoff schedule in Table 55–7."
- Move to accept the above text as a response to Interpretation 2-3/10
  - M: W. Diab on behalf of the Maint TF
  - .3      Y:33   N:1    A:13
  - Tech ( $\geq 75\%$ )
  - 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>