May 28th, 2024

# Editor's Report: IEEE P802.1DG

Editor: Max Turner (max.turner@ieee.org)

Draft Version: D3.0

Report Version: V6.0

Contribution to: IEEE

ETHERNOVIA

# Timeline

- We have gone trough 5 Task Group Ballots in just under 10 months:
  - D2.0 closed on 2023-06-13
  - D2.4 closed on 2024-03-08
- 1st Working Group Ballot closed on 2024-05-02
  - *pass*es: *Approval Percent* >=75 % ***and*** *Working Group Participation* >= 50 %
  - Comment resolution concluded on 2024-05-28
- Recirculation Working Group Ballot (2nd WG) to close before the July 2024 Plenary.
- Planning a motion to go for SA Ballot at the November 2024 Plenary (latest!).
- The PAR expires on Dec. 31st 2025

# Comment resolution progress

- 2024-05-13: 56, 42, 18, 39, 20, 8, 22, 23
- 2024-05-16: 51, 9, 59, 50, 16, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 43, 41, 44, 46, 48, 49, 17, 5, 1, 2, 6, 38, 3, 19, 21, 15, 40, 34, 35
- 2024-05-16: 24, 25 , 26, 27, 28, 31, 29, 30, 33, 36, 45, 37, 4, 47, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58
- 2024-05-28: 15, 11, 32, 45

# Ballot History (at 1st Working Group Ballot)




**D3.0**

Table 2—Results§

| CATEGORY§ | All respondents§ | |
|---|---|---|
| | TOTAL§ | %§ |
| Yes§ | 26§ | 83.9§ |
| No§ | 5§ | 16.1§ |
| Voting Yes or No§ | 32§ | 73.8§ |
| Abs. Time§ | 0§ | 0.0§ |
| Abs. Expertise§ | 11§ | 26.2§ |
| Abs. Other§ | 0§ | 0.0§ |
| Respondents§ | 43§ | n/a§ |
| Voting members§ | 42§ | 63.6§ |
| Non-voting commenters§ | 1§ | 2.3§ |
| No. of commenters§ | 9§ | 21.4§ |
| No. of comments§ | 59§ | 100§ |
| TR§ | 22§ | 37.3§ |
| T§ | 9§ | 15.3§ |
| ER§ | 13§ | 22.0§ |

# Late votes

- We received 2 late votes:
  1. Karen Randal – Abstain, Lack of Expertise
  2. Marius Stanica – Approve
- Both are part of the statistics!

- We received one response from a non-voter:
  1. Rajeev Roy – Disapprove
- This is not included in the statistics but the attached comments are part of the data-base

# IEEE P802.1DG – TSN Profile for Automotive In-Vehicle Ethernet Communications



# Potential rouge comment

From Marius-Petru Stanica with a late Approve vote.

I have one question though and maybe this is my misunderstanding: in the PCS annex section and Chapter 5 Conformance module, I see 'the so-called TSN-related traffic shapers' as all in Optional. Also, clock synch is Optional, both for bridges and for end stations. And now, I am not an automotive Ethernet expert, given that in Automotive in-car you had also many other non-Ethernet data transport mechanisms, as far as I know.

So the question is: have you approached the specification wrt traffic shaping like having several options either basic shaping (whatever mostly what .1Q offered before TSN-features arrival), basic shaping (CBS and ATS) and more advanced shaping (TAS and one module for frame preemption)? This is somehow different than the approach we chose for 60802, where we created two classes of 'stations' (be it end stations, IA stations or bridges) where we kind-of mandated some traffic shapers, especially in the higher class of 'stations'. or 'bridges'. This was meant to insure that we have a base for interoperability and not just a set of options, which may be differently chosen, by different manufacturers.

Clarification: Given that I am not so much into automotive in-car, then I cannot really comment on the usage pattern of traffic shaping in such networks, so your approach is most probably the best. I am just a bit wondering about the difference to the industrial automation profile. And again, it may be my misunderstanding.

# Comment Classification

- Should discuss at Interim:
  - 56, 42, 18, 39, 20, 8, 22, 23, 24, 51, 9, 11, 25 , 59, 26, 27, 28, 31
- Discuss:
  - 50, 16, 7, 10, 12, 13, 29, 30, 14, 32, 33, 43, 36, 41, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 37
- Editorial or otherwise trivial:
  - 17, 5, 1, 2, 6, 38, 3, 19, 21, 15, 40, 34, 35, 4, 47, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58

Contribution to IEEE by:

**Max Turner**
Utrechtseweg 75
NL-3702AA Zeist
The Netherlands
**+49 177 863 7804**
**max.turner@ethernovia.com**