

# Comments on P802.3dt PAR & CSD

From IEEE 802.1

IEEE 802.1 Working Group Chair: [Glenn Parsons](#)

IEEE 802.1 Maintenance Task Group Chair: [Mark Hantel](#)

- These comments are on the PAR and CSD found in:
  - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/25/ec-25-0218-00-LMSC-draft-ieee-p802-3dt-par.pdf>
  - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/25/ec-25-0219-00-LMSC-draft-ieee-p802-3dt-csd.pdf>

# PAR

- 2.1 Project Title
  - Does this project intend to define a service or does it intend to define a metadata-based mechanism in support of such service?
  - The title mentions metadata services, yet the scope does not elaborate on what those services are and 8.1 does not provide additional information.
  - Is the inclusion of “service” intended to reflect service access points in 802 and 802.1AC?
- 5.2.b Scope
  - Please revise the scope to make it bounded and clear.
    - With respect to item 1, it is not clear where the metadata would reside in an Ethernet packet. For distinct identity from IEEE 802.1 to be preserved, our expectation is that this metadata would not be part of the frame?
    - Is the metadata intended to be visible above the MAC sublayer?
    - Does the entire scope apply to 50Gb/s and above, or only point number 2?
  - Suggest adding more detail. The Broad Market Potential slide on page 4 of the CSD appears to denote that Link Layer Retry and Credit-Based Flow Control are the initial intended applications for this project. If that's the case, these should be included in the scope of the PAR, along with enough information to denote what they are and how they are used. If this is intended to be truly a generic service, that service has not been described in enough detail.
- 5.5 Need for the project
  - This section identifies potential opportunities but no specific need is included.
  - It is not clear what interoperable mechanisms are needed, which mechanisms they are, in what way they are interoperable, and in what way they relate to metadata services.
  - This is written in the future tense and can promise future action, which may not be true

# CSD

- Broad Market Potential Slide 4.
  - Please provide references to the specifications of the referenced technologies of Link Layer Retry and Credit-Based Flow Control.
- Compatibility Slide 5.
  - How can it be ensured that other standards organizations and future projects which use this metadata maintain conformance with IEEE Std 802, IEEE Std 802.1AC and IEEE Std 802.1Q?
  - Insufficient technical information has been provided to determine conformance to IEEE Std 802, IEEE Std 802.1AC and IEEE Std 802.1Q.
- Distinct Identity Slide 6.
  - While it may be true that this is substantially different from other IEEE 802.3 specifications/solutions, metadata-based services exist throughout other IEEE 802 standards.
  - The distinct identity aspect of the proposed metadata is not clear. For instance, frame-encapsulated metadata already exists in tags (e.g., VLAN Tag, R-Tag, etc.) that have been specified by the IEEE 802.1 WG.
- Technical Feasibility Slide 7.
  - Do metadata or metadata-based services introduce new attack vectors to 802 networks?
  - How do metadata or metadata-based services interact with security mechanisms such as MACsec? Are there other analogous mechanisms to secure this metadata?