

# P802.1DG/D1.2 Editor's Report for Ballot Comment Resolution (v9)

by: Craig Gunther  
Craig Gunther Consulting

# P802.1DG/D1.2 Summary

The focus of D1.2 was to introduce profiles and move all tutorial/educational information to informative to Annex E. THANKS TO ALL WHO SUBMITTED COMMENTS! The Editor has one request for commenters new to the 802.1 ballot process: Be sure to include sub-clause numbers (column C) in your comment spreadsheet. One of the techniques for addressing comments is to group them by clause which doesn't work without the sub-clause numbers.

This document sorts comments into discussion topics for ease of comment resolution. The Editor has made a best effort to organize the comments by CommentType (E, ER, T, TR, etc). In case of errors, the comment resolution database is the definitive source.

In those places where comments are grouped together (i.e. enclosed in []), they have been put into the category that is the best fit for that group.

Note: Completed comments and completed slides (titles only) are highlighted in green

# Ballot Statistics

CATEGORY	TOTAL	%
Yes	11	69
No	5	31
Voting Yes or No	16	55
Abs. Time	7	24
Abs. Expertise	5	17
Abs. Other	1	3
Respondents	29	100
Voting members		
Non-voting commenters		
No. of commenters	12	41
No. of comments	160	100
TR	84	53
T	19	12
ER	40	25
E	17	11

# Ballot Comments NOT planned for discussion

These comments will be accepted as-is, or with changes similar in nature to what was in the Suggested Remedy. No discussion is anticipated unless someone requests it.

## Clarification/readability/typos:

- “TR” ACCEPT/ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 30, [36,37], 93
- “T” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 78
- “ER” ACCEPT: 21, 22, 28, 63, 135, 154, 160
- “E” ACCEPT/ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 134

# Ballot Comments that were Rejected-1

## 802.1CB

- 65, 77

## PAR Modifications

- 47, 138

## PAR Scope

- 50, 53

## Cut-through

- 52

# Ballot Comments that were Rejected-2

## Tutorial (Annex E)

- 64

## General

- 61

# Ballot Comments, “DISCUSS” & Presentations

There are several places in the document (e.g. Editor’s note in clause 14.1) where the Editor has asked questions and commenters have provided opinions.

The most effective way to move this standard forward is to create presentations that the group can discuss and, through consensus, give direction to the Editor for inclusion in the draft. The least effective way is for the Editor to add text to the draft and run through a ballot cycle (i.e. months of time); resolve the associated comments and have another ballot cycle (i.e. more months of time); resulting in at least 1/3 of a year for each such item.

Even if a presentation takes two or three weeks to arrive at consensus, we are still months ahead in the process cycle.

Who creates these presentations? YOU! This has already happened with many topics (Thank You to those who have done that) and are much appreciated by the Editor. More contributions are requested.

# Moving the draft forward – Use Cases doc

There are a lot of presentations for DG (see: [https://1.ieee802.org/tsn/802-1dg/#IEEE\\_P8021DG\\_Public\\_Contributions](https://1.ieee802.org/tsn/802-1dg/#IEEE_P8021DG_Public_Contributions)). As the document progresses the Editor would like to pull information from those presentations; however, scanning through 81 documents to extract the contents is a huge task.

We have a Use Cases document (see: <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2019/dg-pannell-automotive-use-cases-0919-v04.pdf>) that creates a single document with a summary of the public presentations. The maintainer of that Use Cases document reads through those presentations to create that summary, and then asks the presentations author(s) to confirm the summary is correct.

In order to progress DG at a reasonable rate we need more participation from the group and follow-up (i.e. approval of the content summary from the original presentation's author) for the Use Cases document.



# Ballot Comments for discussion (10BASE-T1S)

The use of 10BASE-T1S in the vehicle seems to have some strong opinions on both sides of the issue. It would be the Editor's preference to start this discussion early in the project so those proposing to include it in the project can create presentations to educate the TG on 10BASE-T1S.

There are issues to address with running TSN protocols on a shared Ethernet media. Some of the potential solutions might require changes to other TSN standards, which could create the need for amendments to those standards; that work is outside the scope of DG. However, DG could certainly address 10BASE-T1S in an informative annex and discuss what changes would be needed.

It may also be that the entire 802.1 WG would be interested in this topic.

- “TR” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 150
- “ER” DISCUSS: 115

# Ballot Comments for discussion (Concepts)-1

## **Trusted vs Untrusted, gateway**

- “TR” DISCUSS: [7,8,120,157]
- “E” DISCUSS: 133, 147

## **Topology and Testing/Debugging/Diagnosis**

- “T” DISCUSS: [126,137]

# Ballot Comments for discussion (Concepts)-2

## **Terms, definitions, wording, clarification, structure**

- “TR” ACCEPT/ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 3, 4, [14,121,123,156], [16,90], 17, 18, 40
- “TR” DISCUSS: 92
- “T” DISCUSS: 139, 152
- “ER” DISCUSS: 88, 91, 130, 132, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145
- “ER” ACCEPT/ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 1, [15,122], 44, [45,141], 48, 49, 85, 86, 87, 89, 97, 110, 153, 155
- “E” DISCUSS: 111, 124, 125, 131
- “E” ACCEPT/ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 125, 127, 148

# Ballot Comments for discussion (802.1AS)-1

## 802.1AS Reliability:

- “TR” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: [6,51]
- “ER” ACCEPT/ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: [13,41]

## 802.1AS Requirements

- “TR” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 33, 96, 100 (Avnu), 151
- “T” DISCUSS: 95

## 802.1AS BMCA

- “TR” DISCUSS: [55,58,71]

## 802.1AS Multiple Domains

- “TR” DISCUSS: 32, 56

# Ballot Comments for discussion (802.1AS)-2

## 802.1AS Message Interval Request TLV:

- “TR” ACCEPT/ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 31, 43

## 802.1AS neighborRateRatio & rateRatio:

- “T” ACCEPT: 34

## 802.1AS Pdelay:

- “TR” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 23, 24, 26, 46
- “T” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 35

## 802.1AS Sync:

- “TR” ACCEPT/ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 27
- “TR” DISCUSS: 116 (Avnu), 117 (Avnu), 118

# Ballot Comments for discussion (802.1AS)-3

## 802.1AS Generic:

- “TR” ACCEPT/ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 19, [20,39], 29, 42
- “T” DISCUSS: 128
- “ER” ACCEPT/ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 57
- “ER” DISCUSS: 25

# Ballot Comments for discussion (802.1CB)-1

## **802.1CB Compound Stream:**

- “TR” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 68\*

## **802.1CB Counters**

- “T” DISCUSS: 81

## **802.1CB Questions**

- “T” DISCUSS: 70, 82, 83

## **802.1CB Stream Identification**

- “T” DISCUSS: 60, 74, 84

## **802.1CB Missing packet recovery**

- “TR” ACCEPT/ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 79, 80

# Ballot Comments for discussion (802.1CB)-2

## **802.1CB Bulk Streams, duplicate elimination, in-order and out-of-order packet delivery**

- “TR” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: [66,67,112,113], 101
- “TR” DISCUSS: 69, 103
- “T” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 75
- “ER” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 102

## **802.1CB Redundant Streams**

- “TR” DISCUSS: 76, 104

## **802.1CB Sequence Numbers**

- “TR” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 114



# Ballot Comments for discussion (Profiles)-1

## **Base profile:**

- “TR” ACCEPT: [59,158]
- “E” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 129
- “E” DISCUSS: 136

## **Base profile (Qci Per-Stream Filtering and Policing-PSFP):**

- “TR” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 98, 99, 119
- “TR” DISCUSS: 72, 159

## **Extended profile (Qbv-Scheduled Traffic):**

- “TR” DISCUSS: 105

# Ballot Comments for discussion (Profiles)-2

## **Extended profile (Qch-Cyclic Queuing and Forwarding-CQF):**

- “TR” DISCUSS: 106

## **Extended profile (Qcr-Asynchronous Traffic Shaping-ATS):**

- “TR” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: [107,146]

## **Extended profile (Qbu-Frame Preemption):**

- “TR” DISCUSS: 73, 108

## **Audio profile:**

- “TR” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 109

# Ballot Comments for discussion (general topics)

## **PAR Scope:**

- “TR” DISCUSS: 54

## **Bibliography:**

- “E” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 62

## **Organization:**

- “E” DISCUSS: 149

## **Security:**

- “TR” ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE: 9, 10, 11, 12

# What happens next with DG?

Draft 1.1 & 1.2 were intended to establish a framework and direction for the project. That has been accomplished.

Draft 1.3 will be created based on comments from Draft 1.2. It is NOT the Editor's intent to send D1.3 to ballot. Instead, the group will use D1.3 as a base to begin adding details to the various clauses and profiles. The Editor expects presentations from the group to help drive the next ballotable draft, D1.4, forward. The Editor will also work with the Use Cases document to add requirements and other content to D1.4.

From this point forward the project will progress as fast as the contributions and presentations drive it.

Thank you!