802.3 PARs ad hoc

IEEE 802.3 ad hoc on PARs from other WGs

Robert M. Grow, ad hoc chair

RMG Consulting

March 2023 Hybrid Plenary

28 Feb 2022 (held pre-plenary)

Agenda and notes

- Agenda
  - Welcome
  - PAR review
- Note:
  - Comments reflect a consensus of ad hoc meeting attendees.
  - Ad Hoc Chair tasked to post comments to EC reflector prior to deadline.
  - Ad Hoc Chair tasked to report on responses from other WGs to 802.3 plenary.

P802.1CS-2020/Cor1 - PAR modification

PAR: https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/maint-draft-cs-2020-cor1-PAR-modification-0123-v02.pdf

- No comments

P802.1ASdm – PAR modification and CSD

PAR: https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dm-draft-PAR-modification-0123-v01.pdf

- No comments.

CSD: https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dm-draft-CSD-modification-0123-v01.pdf

- Subtitle — The Subtitle doesn't agree with the PAR modification to the title. It should be aligned with the modified PAR.

P802.1Qdt– PAR modification and CSD

PAR: https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dt-draft-PAR-modification-0123-v01.pdf

- No comments.

CSD: https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dt-draft-CSD-modification-0123-v01.pdf

- No comments.

P802.1Qdx: - amendment PAR and CSD

PAR: https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dx-draft-PAR-0123-v01.pdf

- General — It isn't clear what the difference is between YANG models and YANG modules. This confusion exists in the scope statement of the base standard. This project appears to be for work on what is called modules on the 802.1 web site. Does 802.1 have consistent definitions for models and modules and the difference between them for YANG? Perhaps a simple note added to 8.1 would suffice.

CSD: https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dx-draft-CSD-0123-v01.pdf

- Same general comment on model/modules.

P802.1DU – new standard PAR and CSD

PAR: https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/du-draft-PAR-0123-v01.pdf

- 2.1 – Title typically includes "Standard for…".

- 4.2, 4.3 – One month for SA ballot is insufficient. One of the dates needs to be adjusted to provide the NesCom minimum of 6 months.

- 5.2 – The title contains "Bridged Networks" but this scope statement does not. That is a troubling mismatch.

P802.1DU (2)

CSD: https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/du-draft-CSD-0123-v01.pdf

- 1.2.2 — The answer to the question should be no. There is no foreseeable way that the existing service interfaces in the reference models can be used. The MA_DATA.request and MA_DATA.indicate primitives are atomic and contain complete frames.
  - Because of incompatibility with the reference model, there are potential compatibility issues with existing implementations.
  - CTF operation likely will distort management information.

Post meeting

- After the ad hoc was held, the IEEE 802 Executive Secretary found a PAR that had been submitted before the deadline, but that was not included on the March PARs list until the week before the plenary.

- Mr. Grow has suggested the following comments on this project.

P802.15.4?? – amendment PAR and CSD

PAR: https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/23/15-23-0040-00-0017-propsed-par-for-task-group-privacy.pdf

The following comments are personal (Mr. Grow) initial comments *rather than the output of the ad hoc*

- 1.1 — Amendment projects are identified with letters that follow the base standard number. This PAR does not have such letters. MyProject instructions for creating a draft PAR are very clear that the letters are required. It appears to an outsider that the number should be P802.15.4ac.

- 6.1.2 — The mention in the CSD of possible use of "randomized and changing addresses" would certainly raise RAC concern, not just the possibility of assigning an OUI to the standard. Assignment of an OUI would not be a RAC mandatory coordination issue, but specifications on specifications for use of the MA-L address block and included OUI would be a RAC mandatory coordination concern.

- 7.1 — The sentence in 8.1 would make the correct answer to this question Yes.

- 8.1 — The item to which the note applies should be stated, and grammar could be improved. Suggest: "7.1 — The topic of this project is similar to ongoing work in other IEEE standards, like IEEE Std 802.11 work on enhancing privacy, but this project will specifically address needs for 802.15.4 interfaces. This project where appropriate, will apply what has been learned in those other privacy related activities."

P802.15.4?? – amendment PAR and CSD (2)

CSD: https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/23/15-23-0041-02-0017-draft-csd.docx

The following comments are personal (Mr. Grow) initial comments rather than the output of the ad hoc

- Title in header table — The title here should agree better with with the Amendment Title, either the compete 2.1 "IEEE Standard for Low-Rate Wireless Networks Amendment: Privacy Enhancements", or at a minimum: "Privacy Enhancements".

- Title at top of page 2 — Needs to agree with PAR per previous comment.

- 1.1.1 — The edited answer to "No" now makes the content unresponsive. 1.1.1 asks where the management objects will be developed namely item a, b, or c for most all projects. This needs to be specified.

- 1.1.2,b — With the No answer to item a, an answer needs to be provided for why a CA document isn't required. Possibly (if true), something like: "This project will not be modifying any of the radio properties of IEEE Std 802.15.4 that would affect spectral coexistence."

- 1.2.2,a — It would be appropriate to indicate if the project will be compatible with IEEE Std 802c-2017 (the optional SLAP capability). (It has long been the convention within IEEE SA that a reference to a base standard includes all approved amendments and corrigenda.) This is especially true since the answer to 1.2.1,a hints at the use of random addresses, but proposed project documentation is silent if such random addresses are in the local addresses or globally administered addresses.