

IEEE 802 LAN/MAN STANDARDS COMMITTEE (LMSC)

CRITERIA FOR STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT (CSD)

IEEE P802.1Qci Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks--  
Bridges and Bridged Networks Amendment: Per-Stream Filtering and Policing, and Cyclic Queuing and Forwarding

Based on IEEE 802 LMSC Operations Manuals approved 15 November 2013

Last edited 20 January 2014

1. IEEE 802 criteria for standards development (CSD)

The CSD documents an agreement between the WG and the Sponsor that provides a description of the project and the Sponsor's requirements more detailed than required in the PAR. The CSD consists of the project process requirements, 1.1, and the 5C requirements, 1.2.

1.1 Project process requirements

1.1.1 Managed objects

Describe the plan for developing a definition of managed objects. The plan shall specify one of the following:

- a) The definitions will be part of this project.
- b) The definitions will be part of a different project and provide the plan for that project or anticipated future project.
- c) The definitions will not be developed and explain why such definitions are not needed.

This project will use method a, adding to or modifying the managed objects already in IEEE Std 802.1Q-2014.

1.1.2 Coexistence

A WG proposing a wireless project shall demonstrate coexistence through the preparation of a Coexistence Assurance (CA) document unless it is not applicable.

- a) Will the WG create a CA document as part of the WG balloting process as described in Clause 13? (yes/no)
- b) If not, explain why the CA document is not applicable.

This project is not a wireless project.

1.2 5C requirements

1.2.1 Broad market potential

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall have broad market potential. At a minimum, address the following areas:

- a) Broad sets of applicability.
- b) Multiple vendors and numerous users.

While the initiation of this project was triggered by a specific market segment (Time-Sensitive Networking), some of its capabilities will be adopted in most bridges—specifically, those that provide standardized controls for commonly-available features typically referred to as “Access Control Lists (ACLs)”. Other capabilities are limited to the TSN market, which has certainly proven broad enough to justify TSN standards. A large fraction of the vendors participating in TSN are offering and/or developing products in this area. Automotive control domain systems and broad industrial network control systems use or will use stream reservation mechanisms defined in

IEEE 802.1Q. Both of these market segments are in the order of hundreds of millions nodes, similar in size to that of information technology segments.

### 1.2.2 Compatibility

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard should be in conformance with IEEE Std 802, IEEE 802.1AC, and IEEE 802.1Q. If any variances in conformance emerge, they shall be thoroughly disclosed and reviewed with IEEE 802.1 WG prior to submitting a PAR to the Sponsor.

- a) Will the proposed standard comply with IEEE Std 802, IEEE Std 802.1AC and IEEE Std 802.1Q?
- b) If the answer to a) is no, supply the response from the IEEE 802.1 WG.

As an amendment to 802.1Q, compatibility is assured.

The review and response is not required if the proposed standard is an amendment or revision to an existing standard for which it has been previously determined that compliance with the above IEEE 802 standards is not possible. In this case, the CSD statement shall state that this is the case.

### 1.2.3 Distinct Identity

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence of a distinct identity. Identify standards and standards projects with similar scopes and for each one describe why the proposed project is substantially different.

As a straightforward extension of 802.1Q VLAN Bridge capabilities, its distinct identity is assured. No similar standard capabilities are known to IEEE 802.1.

### 1.2.4 Technical Feasibility

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence that the project is technically feasible within the time frame of the project. At a minimum, address the following items to demonstrate technical feasibility:

- a) Demonstrated system feasibility.
- b) Proven similar technology via testing, modeling, simulation, etc.

Many of the proposed capabilities of this project are widely available from vendors, but without standardized controls, demonstrating their feasibility. The others are similar in principle to techniques used by existing deployed technologies in life-critical cyber-physical systems. Some ingress policing and filtering mechanisms have been implemented using proprietary means to serve similar needs, thus the proposed project has been demonstrated to be feasible.

### 1.2.5 Economic Feasibility

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence of economic feasibility. Demonstrate, as far as can reasonably be estimated, the economic feasibility of the proposed project for its intended applications. Among the areas that may be addressed in the cost for performance analysis are the following:

- a) Balanced costs (infrastructure versus attached stations).
- b) Known cost factors.
- c) Consideration of installation costs.
- d) Consideration of operational costs (e.g., energy consumption).
- e) Other areas, as appropriate.

The well-established balance between infrastructure and attached stations will not be changed by this enhancement.

The cost factors, including installation and operational factors, are well known from similar technologies and proportional to the benefits gained.

Adding automatic detection of misbehaving systems promises to significantly reduce the operational costs of a cyber-physical system.