

Consolidated comments on 802.1CQ PAR

10 Nov 2015

Comments from James Gilb

- 802.1CQ
- - Editorial: 5.2 Join the lines in the Scope statement.
- Accept
- - 5.2: The scope is pretty light on description. Later in the purpose it refers to "Peer-to-peer address claiming and address server capabilities will be included to serve the needs of smaller (e.g. home) and larger (e.g. industrial plants and building control) networks." Add to the scope "Peer-to-peer address claiming and address server capabilities are defined."
- Accept, but use "specified" in place of "defined"

802.11 comments PAR

- 2.1 change “Addresses” to “Address”
- Accept
- 5.6 change last sentence to read: “This includes software developers, networking equipment vendors ~~IC developers, bridge and NIC vendors,~~ and users.
- Accept

802.11 comments CSD

- CSD: Slide 9: spell out “CIDs” – “Company Identifier (CID)”
- Will expand to Company ID which is the RAC name for the identifiers.
- CSD: Slide 9: identify properly where the address is coming from.. Change “RAC” to “IEEE-SA Registration Authority”.
- Accept

802.16 PAR 2.1 (Title) comment

- change as follows: “Multicast and Local Address~~es~~ Assignment”
- reason: more conventional wording
- Accept

802.16 PAR 5.2 (Scope) comment

- change as follows: “~~to ports~~”
- reason 1: It is not clear from the PAR that ports may be virtual, though this is stated in the CSD.
- reason 2: Some expected assignments (that is, in the multicast case) are not to ports at all.
- Accept

802.16 PAR 5.3 (dependency)

- change as follows: “Local Media Access Control (MAC) Addressing Usage”
- reason: To reflect the true title of the P802c project.
- Accept

CSD Change: Title Slide

- change as follows: “ CSD for P802.1CQ
Multicast and Local Address assignment
~~protocol~~
- reason: To match the title of the proposed
P802.1CQ PAR.
- Accept

802.3 PAR comment

- General: This PAR ignores the problems of multicast in wireless networks. This is a major concern for IOT and should be addressed. (Everything on this PAR is true for wired, but not necessarily for wireless.)
- This comment is vague and provides no suggested remedy. We do not find anything in the PAR that is untrue for wireless. Multicast is available in wireless. Specific problems identified would be best discussed with wireless groups.

802.3 CSD comments

- Coexistence – The stock answer used for a wired environment given is not really correct. The project does not specify a PHY, and a CA document would not address the problems with multicast in wireless environments.
- The answer is correct. This project will not affect wireless coexistence. See Clause 21 of the 802 P&P for a definition of what CA covers.
- Economic Feasibility — Expand CIDs. The RAC does not assign CIDs, the RA does. Context for CIDs also is not known for the project documents. Perhaps: A local address distribution protocol utilizing a Company ID (CID) is a possible capability, and CIDs are available from the IEEE Registration Authority for a known cost.
- Accept. Will use:
- A local address distribution protocol utilizing a Company ID (CID) is a possible capability, and CIDs are available from the IEEE Registration Authority for a known cost.
- Insert: “Local address space usage is being specified in 802c (see 5.3 of the PAR). Such usage may include use of Company ID (CID) “ before “CIDs are available ...”