

IEEE 802.3 Rules change 3-03/07 draft D1.0 comments

Cl 00 SC P L 3 # 2
 Ted K. Woodward Telcordia Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

We should make an effort to make it as easy as possible to locate the referenced LMSC criteria. For on-line documentation, please consider a hyperlink to the appropriate section of LMSC guidelines.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC P L 8 # 3
 Howard Frazier Broadcom Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The reference to the CSMA/CD MAC only serves to perpetuate the misconception that Ethernet is still a half-duplex, contention based protocol.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "CSMA/CD" with "IEEE Std 802.3"

Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC P 8 L # 1
 Wael Diab Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Do we want to refer to our MAC as CSMA/CD in the P&P or Ethernet per the last vote

SuggestedRemedy

Change the words CSMA/CD to Ethernet

Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #3.

Cl 00 SC P L # 19
 John Abbott Corning Incorporated

Comment Type T Comment Status A

The Rationale says the LMSC Five Criteria have minor differences with 802.3 criteria, but it seems that the proposed rules change will obligate us to meet LMSC Five Criteria in the future regardless of whether the differences are minor or not.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

We are already bound by the LMSC Five Criteria since they are defined in a superior document - all we can do is augment.

Cl 00 SC P L 6 # 5
 Howard Frazier Broadcom Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

As a result of this proposed rule change, the compatibility criterion will have a mixture of paragraphs and bullets. It would seem desirable to have one or the other. In the suggested remedy provided below, only the bullets would need to be included on a 5 criteria response slide. The paragraph of text that precedes the bullets would not need to be included.

SuggestedRemedy

Re-write compatibility criterion as follows, and propagate for an 802 rules change:

IEEE 802 defines a family of standards. All standards shall be in conformance with the IEEE 802.1 Architecture, Management, and Interworking documents. If any variances in conformance emerge, they shall be thoroughly disclosed and reviewed with 802.

- a) 802 Overview and Architecture
- b) 802.1D, 802.1Q, and parts of 802.1f
- c) Managed object definitions compatible with SNMP

Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There is a revision of the LMSC P&P underway at this time and the Working Group chair will attempt to remember to recommend the suggested remedy for inclusion in the new LMSC Operation Manual.

Will add an additional item to IEEE 802.3 compatibility list as follows:

- Managed object definitions compatible with SNMP

IEEE 802.3 Rules change 3-03/07 draft D1.0 comments

Cl 00 SC P L7 # 7
 Glen Kramer Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

"-Compatibility with IEEE Standard 802.3"
 This requirement is vague and ambiguous, as no new solution can be compatible with all other existing solutions in the 802.3 standard. Even currently existing solutions are not compatible with each other.

SuggestedRemedy

The ambiguity may be resolved in several ways:

- a) Compatibility with some existing solutions in IEEE Standard 802.3
- or
- b) Compatibility with the scope and general architecture of IEEE Standard 802.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

The purpose of the criteria is to discuss the topic and explain how the proposed new piece fits into the existing IEEE 802.3 architecture and specifications.

Cl 00 SC P L8 # 8
 Glen Kramer Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status A

"-Conformance with the CSMA/CD MAC" ignores the simplified full-duplex MAC added by 802.3ah.

SuggestedRemedy

Change that line to say:
 - Conformance with the CSMA/CD MAC or the simplified full-duplex MAC

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #3.

Cl 00 SC P L9 # 4
 Howard Frazier Broadcom Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

This may be a good place to address the subject of SNMP MIB definitions.

SuggestedRemedy

This could be as simple as adding the words "including SNMP" to the end of the second paragraph of the LMSC compatibility criterion.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #5.

Cl 00 SC P L9 # 6
 Robert Grow Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

I agree with Mr. Frazier's recommendation during the July discussion of this change that we should include an SNMP requirement.

SuggestedRemedy

Compatibility with SNMP management systems

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #5.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L1 # 18
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type E Comment Status A

"When a study group presents a request to the WG for them to forward a draft PAR to the LMSC EC for approval, they shall in addition present"
 First, WG and SG are collective but singular nouns, as is clear from 802.3 rules 1. Overview: "The IEEE 802.3 Ethernet Working Group (WG) is responsible" and 4.2 Formation "A SG is formed when". There is no "they". Second, this should be more explicit: who is forwarding? Who is presenting?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "When a SG presents a request to the WG for the WG to forward a draft PAR to the LMSC EC for approval, the SG shall in addition present"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE 802.3 Rules change 3-03/07 draft D1.0 comments

CI 00 SC 0 P L 10 # 11
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status R

The proposed distinct identity criterion would effectively be:
 17.5.3 Distinct Identity
 Each IEEE 802 standard shall have a distinct identity. To achieve this, each authorized project shall be:
 a) Substantially different from other IEEE 802 standards.
 b) One unique solution per problem (not two solutions to a problem).
 c) Easy for the document reader to select the relevant specification.
 A project shall also address:
 -Substantially different from other 802.3 specifications/solutions.
 The English here isn't ideal: "project shall be easy for the document reader to..."

SuggestedRemedy

Write it out in full in 802.3 rules. Here's a wordsmithing attempt:
 17.5.3 Distinct Identity
 IEEE Std 802.3 shall maintain its distinct identity. To achieve this, each authorized project shall address:
 a) Substantially different from other IEEE 802 standards and substantially different from other 802.3 specifications/solutions;
 b) One unique solution per problem (not two solutions to a problem);
 c) Easy for the document reader to select the relevant specification.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

We reference rather than duplicate the text found in the superior document.

CI 00 SC 0 P L 3 # 9
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status R

We cannot just reference the 802 five criteria without qualification; and it's reasonable that criteria for new 802.3 projects differ from criteria for a new dot. I am not convinced that we should hand over control of our five criteria, which are very important, to anyone. For example, 802 might remove some criteria to suit circumstances e.g. in wireless, and it may be inappropriate or impossible for 802.3 to stop them.

SuggestedRemedy

Rather than referring to the LMSC P&P's five criteria, modify 802.3's criteria 1 (Broad Market Potential) and 5 (Economic Feasibility) to be identical to the equivalent current LMSC P&P's criteria. Modify 802.3's criterion 4 (Technical Feasibility) to be identical to LMSC P&P 17.5.4 without 17.5.4.1. Add an informative note saying that these three are identical to those in LMSC P&P 17.5 (edition referenced) with the exception of wireless coexistence which is not considered to be relevant to 802.3. Criteria 2 (Compatibility) and 3 (Distinct Identity) differ anyway: write them out in full in 802.3's rules.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

According to good standards principles we reference rather than duplicate the text found in the superior document. The Chair of 802.3 would always vote upon any change to the superior rules that define the IEEE 802 five criteria.

CI 00 SC 0 P L 3 # 12
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status A

802.3's rules refer to LMSC P&P <http://www.ieee802.org/policies-and-procedures.pdf> which say "Revised effective January 4, 2006" while <http://ieee802.org/devdocs.html> refers to <http://standards.ieee.org/board/aud/LMSC.pdf> "Revised as of July 20, 2007".

SuggestedRemedy

If we refer to a specific dated reference, that's clear enough for 802.3's purposes - but the 802.3 rules should declare the revision date they refer to in the references (which should get a mention in the contents). But from 802's point of view, having two different files claiming to be the LMSC P&P is not satisfactory.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The only set of IEEE 802 P&P are those found on the AudCom web site. The IEEE 802.3 rules will be updated to reflect this. This is an editorial change to the rules.

IEEE 802.3 Rules change 3-03/07 draft D1.0 comments

CI 00 SC 0 P L3 # 13
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status A

Need traceable references: 802.3's rules refer to LMSC P&P (either version) which refer to other documents which take preference. The newer LMSC P&P file lacks URLs for the regulating documents in the introduction. The older has URLs but they are embedded in the soft copy, not written out. Some documents have no reference at all, not even an old style librarian's reference, which isn't satisfactory; one cannot obey rules that one can't find.

SuggestedRemedy

Submit a request to have the LMSC P&P references made explicit.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The references are explicit, the Working Group chair will encourage consistent use of hot links as part of the current effort to split out a IEEE 802 Operations manual.

CI 00 SC 0 P L3 # 15
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status R

" All standards shall be in conformance with ... If any variances in conformance emerge" Either they SHALL or not. Which is it?

SuggestedRemedy

Should it say that all project _proposals_ shall be in conformance with ... ? Or that it is strongly desired that all standards should be fully in conformance with ... ?

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Out of scope as it is a comment on the IEEE 802 P&P. Contact the LMSC 1st Vice Chair if you wish to see these changes made to the LMSC Five Criteria.

CI 00 SC 0 P L3 # 16
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status R

"All standards shall be in conformance with ... parts of 802.1f" (except if it emerges that they're not). Which parts? You can't have a shall that's undefined.

SuggestedRemedy

Define which parts. Should this definition be combined with or replace the sentence "Each standard in the IEEE 802 family of standards shall include a definition of managed objects that are compatible with systems management standards."?

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Out of scope as it is a comment on the IEEE 802 P&P. Contact the LMSC 1st Vice Chair if you wish to see these changes made to the LMSC Five Criteria.

CI 00 SC 0 P L3 # 17
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status R

"802.1f": I observe that 802.1 uses sometimes lower case and sometimes upper case. Presumably the difference means something. I did not find an 802.1f but I found an 802.1F.

SuggestedRemedy

If LMSC P&P mean 802.1F they should say so. This mix of upper and lower case is too arcane anyway - it would be preferable if 802.1 didn't do it.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Out of scope as it is a comment on the IEEE 802 P&P. Contact the LMSC 1st Vice Chair if you wish to see these changes made to the LMSC Five Criteria.

IEEE 802.3 Rules change 3-03/07 draft D1.0 comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P L 6 # 14
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status R

New criterion 2, Compatibility

SuggestedRemedy

If no other changes made (see other comments), write it out in full in 802.3's rules:
 IEEE 802 defines a family of standards. All standards shall be in conformance with the IEEE 802.1 Architecture, Management, and Interworking documents as follows: 802. Overview and Architecture, 802.1D, 802.1Q, and parts of 802.1f. If any variances in conformance emerge, they shall be thoroughly disclosed and reviewed with 802. Each standard in the IEEE 802 family of standards shall include a definition of managed objects that are compatible with systems management standards.
 A project shall also address the following:
 -Compatibility with IEEE Standard 802.3;
 -Conformance with the CSMA/CD MAC.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

According to good standards principles we reference rather than duplicate the text found in the superior document.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L 6 # 10
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status R

The proposed compatibility criterion would effectively be:
 IEEE 802 defines a family of standards. All standards shall be in conformance with the IEEE 802.1 Architecture, Management, and Interworking documents as follows: 802. Overview and Architecture, 802.1D, 802.1Q, and parts of 802.1f. If any variances in conformance emerge, they shall be thoroughly disclosed and reviewed with 802. Each standard in the IEEE 802 family of standards shall include a definition of managed objects that are compatible with systems management standards.
 A project shall also address the following:
 -Compatibility with IEEE Standard 802.3
 -Conformance with the CSMA/CD MAC
 There are several differences. Conformance with PLS, 802.2 and 802 Functional Requirements would disappear, conformance with 802 Overview and Architecture, 802.1D, 802.1Q, and "parts of 802.1f" would appear, and then the requirement for conformance be made optional by "If any variances in conformance emerge, they shall be thoroughly disclosed and reviewed with 802.". A requirement for a definition of managed objects compatible with systems management standards would appear.

SuggestedRemedy

These proposed changes seems more substantial than just tidying up. Do we want all these changes? It looks like 802 Overview and Architecture replaces 802 Functional Requirements. Removing PLS - OK by me. Does conformance with 802.2 matter? And the other references?

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

These are not new - we have always been bound by these since they are stated in the a superior document. In respect to conformance with PLS, 802.2 and 802 Functional Requirements, these are obsolete. These previously appeared in the 802 Five Criteria however have long since been deleted and are thus illustrative of the problem of copying rather than referencing.