

P802.1ASdm PAR and CSD Amendment: Hot Standby

Resolution of Comments on
Project Authorization Request (PAR)
and
Criteria for Standards Development (CSD)

2020-05-18

802.3 Comment on PAR

- **Comment:**
6.1.2, YANG is currently the management protocol of choice, will the project include that if so the use of URN should be noted.
- **Response:**
IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020 (base for this amendment) does not specify YANG. Nevertheless, another PAR/CSD is in work to specify YANG (P802.1ASdn). If P802.1ASdn completes prior to this amendment, it will be convenient to specify YANG as suggested. Regarding project scope (5.2.b), "managed objects" covers both MIB and YANG.
 - In 6.1.2, update the Explanation to read: "The Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) MIB will be assigned an Object Identifier (OID) based on the IEEE Registration Authority (RA) OID tutorial and IEEE Std 802. The YANG Data Model will be assigned a Uniform Resource Name (URN) based on the IEEE RA URN tutorial and IEEE Std 802d."
 - In 8.1, add: "IEEE RA URN tutorial: <http://standards.ieee.org/develop/regauth/tut/ieeeeurn.pdf>" and replace "6.1.b" with "6.1.2"

802.3 Comment on CSD

- **Comment:**
1.1.1, You mention SNMP in the PAR, but not YANG. A more specific answer here on which protocols will be included would be appreciated.
- **Response:**
Add the following as a new paragraph to 1.1.1:
"IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020 specifies MIB, and this amendment will specify MIB for its managed objects. IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020 does not specify YANG. Nevertheless, another PAR/CSD is in work to specify YANG (P802.1ASdn). If P802.1ASdn completes prior to this amendment, this amendment will specify YANG for its managed objects."

802.3 Comment on CSD

- **Comment:**

1.2.1,b, 2nd paragraph, 3rd sentence through end – This indicates that the automotive requirements are not well understood and therefore doing automotive at this time is presumably premature. Justify the market on industrial alone where such uncertainties do not exist, or make it more clear why automotive requirements though they may evolve are sufficiently understood.

- **Response:**

The first sentence of the comment is correct. The overall intent of the 2nd paragraph of 1.2.1b was to provide an informal description of how future automotive requirements might be incorporated. The 802.3 commenters are correct that the CSD should focus on what is known. In order to justify the market on industrial alone:

- Remove the 2nd paragraph of 1.2.1b (but keep automotive in 1.2.1a).

802.11 Comment on PAR

- **Comment:**

5.3 the CSD implies that there is a dependency on IEEE P802.1DG. If this is the case, dependency should be noted.

- **Response:**

The project has no dependency on IEEE P802.1DG or IEC/IEEE 60802.

802.11 Comment on CSD

- **Comment:**

1.2.1 b)– The second paragraph seems to discuss the requirements, and not market potential. This seems to imply that there is a dependency that was not clear in the PAR form. Consider clarification of the paragraph.

- **Response:**

The comment is correct. The overall intent of the 2nd paragraph of 1.2.1b was to provide an informal description of how future automotive requirements might be incorporated. Since the CSD should focus on what is known, it is best to justify the market on industrial alone:

- Remove the 2nd paragraph of 1.2.1b (but keep automotive in 1.2.1a).

802.11 Comment on CSD

- **Comment:**

1.2.4 a) this is general statement, that restates the question, please provide an example or explanation on the demonstrated system feasibility.

- **Response:**

The comment is correct. The intent is to explain that existing standards are in use, but we do not want to provide a list that would imply that the project is selecting favorites (or dependencies). We'll add a single example, which hopefully avoids any implication:

- Replace 1.2.4a with "Hot-standby techniques have been feasibly used in existing standards for a wide variety of applications (e.g., IEC 62439-3:2016, Annex A)."

802.11 Comment on CSD

- **Comment:**

1.2.4 b) Useful to include an example of “what” technology is being proven in the first sentence.

- **Response:**

The preference is to avoid a list of examples (see previous comment). The intent of 1.2.4b is that if you do a web search for "hot standby", you find technologies, but not necessarily everything that is relevant. If you do a web search for the other terms, you find additional relevant technologies. To clarify the intent:

- Add to the end of 1.2.4b: "A web search for these terms can be used to find information on proven technologies."