

Comments on P802c CSD

Document: lasg-marks-p802c-csd-comments

Date Submitted:

2015-03-09

Source:

Roger B. Marks

EthAirNet Associates

4040 Montview Blvd

Denver, CO 80207 USA

Voice:

+1 802 capable

E-mail:

roger@ethair.net

*<http://standards.ieee.org/faqs/affiliationFAQ.html>>

Re: CSD for Proposed P802c PAR

Venue:

Local Address Study Group, IEEE 802.1 WG, IEEE 802 Plenary, Berlin, Germany

Purpose:

To provide comments regarding the presubmitted CSD (lasg-mjt-802c-CSD-0115-v02) for the P802c PAR.

Notice:

This document represents the views of the author and is offered as a basis for discussion.

Comments on P802c CSD

Roger B. Marks
EthAirNet Associates

Abstract

This contribution offers comments regarding the presubmitted CSD:

- lasg-mjt-802c-CSD-0115-v02

for the proposed P802c PAR

- new-addresses-thaler-local-address-usage-par-0115-v1.pdf

Comment: Coexistence

- The response “A CA document is not applicable because this project does not use wireless spectrum.” could be understood to mean that the standard is not applicable to wireless networks.
- Proposed change:
 - A CA document is not applicable because this ~~project~~ **standard** does not use **specify** wireless ~~spectrum~~ **operation**.

Comment: Broad Market Potential (1)

- The slide refers to:
 - the local address space
 - the Local MAC address space
 - the MAC address space
 - the Local Address space
- It would be better to use consistent language.
- Should follow the language of the PAR, which does not refer to “the local address space” as if there were only one of these; many local spaces exist, each of these being local.
- Suggested remedy: change each of the four instances to “local address space”.

Comment: Broad Market Potential (2)

- The final paragraph is orthogonal to the topic of broad market potential and does not support it. Also, it is out of sync with the PAR in stating a priority (“first step”) on Company ID arrangements.
- Suggested remedy: delete final paragraph of CSD Broad Market Potential.

Comment: Distinct Identity (1)

- “Distinct Identity” says “There is no other standard that defines a guideline for use of the Local Address space.”
- However, CSD says “Fibre Channel over Ethernet (FCoE) has standardized a protocol...”
- Suggested remedy: change “standard” to “IEEE standard”.

Comment: Distinct Identity (2)

- “Distinct Identity” says “There is no other standard that defines a guideline for use of the Local Address space.”
- Suggested remedy: change “the Local Address space” to “local address space” to match language in the PAR.

Comment: Technical Feasibility

- The response twice refers to:
 - the Local Address space
- Suggested remedy: change “the Local Address space” to “local address space” to match language in the PAR.
- Note: The response focuses on the technical feasibility of an assignment protocol and sidesteps the feasibility of the PAR topic. The same is true of the Economic Feasibility response.