

802.3 PARs ad hoc report

IEEE 802.3 ad hoc on PARs from other WGs

Robert M. Grow, ad hoc chair

RMG Consulting

March Virtual Plenary

24 February 2022

Agenda and notes (24 Feb 2022)

- Agenda
 - Welcome
 - PAR review
- Note:
 - Comments reflect a consensus of ad hoc meeting attendees.
 - Ad Hoc Chair tasked to post comments to EC reflector prior to deadline.
 - Ad Hoc Chair tasked to report on responses from other WGs during 802.3 plenary.

Draft P802.1Qdt (1)

Amendment: Priority-based Flow Control Enhancements

PAR: <https://ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2022/dt-draft-PAR-0122-v01.pdf>

- No comments.

CSD: <https://ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2022/dt-draft-CSD-0122-v01.pdf>

- The CSD should be readable on its own. It does not include the expansion of a number of acronyms, nor the helpful information in 8.1 of the PAR pointing at the standards specifying the protocols identified only by an acronym.
- Response –

Draft P802.1Qdt (2)

- 1.2.1,a — This is the first occurrence of PFC. The only place where Priority-based Flow Control occurs is in the title which does not include the acronym. Please change the last sentence to “Priority-based Flow Control (PFC) ...”.
- Response –
- 1.2.1,b — MACsec is not expanded/defined. At a minimum, replace “MACsec” with MACsec (802.1AE specified MAC security)”.
- Response –
- 1.2.4,b — DCBX is not expanded/defined. Please do so. Similar for PTP, not expanded/defined.
- Response –

Draft P802.1DU (1)

New Standard: Cut-Through Forwarding Bridges and Bridged Networks

PAR : <https://ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2022/du-draft-PAR-0122-v01.pdf>

- 5.2 — "This standard also specifies requirements and recommendations..." So this project intends to include both mandatory requirements as well as informative recommendations? Said another way it intends to be both a Standard and a Recommended Practice contrary to what is specified in 1.2. Recommend the scope read:

“This standard specifies Cut-Through Forwarding (CTF) Bridges based on the IEEE Std 802.1Q Bridge architecture. CTF Bridges interconnect individual IEEE 802 Local Area Networks (LANs) via different or identical Media Access Control (MAC) methods. This standard also includes information for application of CTF bridges.”

- Response –

Draft P802.1DU (2)

CSD : <https://ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2022/du-draft-CSD-0122-v01.pdf>

- General – The use of continuous lettered list across separate criteria is confusing. Note 1.2.2, i) where the sub criterion references “a)” yet what is “a)” in the LMSC Operations Manual here is lettered “h)”. Please restart at “a)” on each criterion.
- Response –
- 1.2.2, h – At a time when IEEE 802 is attempting to develop greater consistency on architectural alignment, a “No” response will detract from this effort. A “No” response is inconsistent with the use of an 802.3 MAC (or other 802 MAC) because those MACs include service interfaces that match the 802.1AC service interface.
- Response –

Draft P802.1DU (3)

- 1.2.2, i — On reading, it isn't clear that this is an approved response from the 802.1 WG. It reads more like a response proposed by the proponents of the CSD to 802.1. Perhaps quotes for what text was approved and a recorded vote of the 802.1 WG would be helpful to understand what the 802.1 response really is. There needs to be very specific text that 802.1 as a WG approved, indicating awareness of the lack of conformance to the criteria and what the deviation to the criteria was that was approved by the WG. It is preferred that this sub-criterion be shown with the motion and vote of 802.1.
- Response –

Draft P802.1DU (4)

- 1.2.5, p — CTF bridges violate the 802.3 MAC Service interface where a transmission request is an atomic action. CTF starts a transmission before an entire frame is received and error checked. The CSD ignores the impact CTF bridges have on individual 802 MAC specifications and therefore are not compatible with the MAC models and therefore may not be compatible with other IEEE 802 MAC standards also.

The CSD also ignores the impact on management. Please indicate in this item that specifications will require features that minimize distortion of various management attributes or behaviours.

➤ Response –

Draft P802 (1)

Revision: Overview and Architecture

PAR: <https://ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2022/802-rev-draft-PAR-0122-v02.pdf>

- 5.3 Contingencies — The term “prior base standard” is ambiguous and technically inaccurate (it presumes approval of this revision which hasn’t occurred yet). The proposed P802 revision is unambiguously a revision of IEEE Std 802-2014 as noted at the top of the PAR (included amendments implied by IEEE SA rules). Perhaps change to read "IEEE P802f is progressing as an amendment to IEEE Std 802-2014. This revision is dependent on the approval of IEEE Std 802f-20xx.”
- Response –

Draft P802 (2)

- 6.1.2, Explanation — There are a lot of unexpanded acronyms here. NesCom might ask for their expansion in 8.1. (Though the RAC will be familiar with them without expansion.)
- Response –

Draft P802.15.12

Withdraw: IEEE Standard for Low-Rate Wireless Networks: Enhanced Ultra Wide-Band (UWB) Physical Layers (PHYs) and Associated MAC Enhancements

PAR: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/22/15-22-0048-00-0000-p802-15-12-par-withdraw.pdf>

Background Information: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/22/15-22-0049-00-0000-p802-15-12-par-withdraw-overview.pptx>

- No comments.

Draft P802.15.6a

Withdraw Amendment: Dependable Human and Vehicle Body Area Networks

PAR: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/22/15-22-0067-00-0000-p802-15-6a-par-withdraw.pdf>

CSD: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/21/ec-21-0192-00-ACSD-p802-15-6a.pdf>

- No comments.

Draft P802.15.6 (802.15.6ma) (1)

Revision: IEEE Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks - Part 15.6: Wireless Body Area Networks : Dependable Human and Vehicle Body Area Networks

PAR: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/22/15-22-0088-00-006a-par-revision-draft.pdf>

- 5.2 — BAN is an unexpanded acronym. Recommend an 8.1 note explaining that BAN is body area network, which covers both VBAN and HBAN.
- Response –

Draft P802.15.6 (802.15.6ma) (2)

- 6.1.2 — IEEE Std 802.15.6-2012 does include registry content (OUI at a minimum). Answer should be Yes, with an explanation something like: "The Registration Authority Committee may wish to review to assure usage of registries and registry terms are consistent with current usage." Obviously if the new content will use or define any registry, then the explanation might differ.
- Response –

Draft P802.15.6 (802.15.6ma) (3)

CSD: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/22/15-22-0087-01-006a-ieee-802-criteria-for-standards-development-for-p802-15-6ma-revision.docx>

- General — Thank you for your careful adherence to LMSC procedures and for supplying a CSD for the revision when the intent is to add significant new functionality (not just a revision to roll up amendments and maintenance items).
- Response —