

---

# 802.3 PARs ad hoc report

IEEE 802.3 ad hoc on PARs from other WGs

Robert M. Grow, ad hoc chair  
RMG Consulting

Waikoloa Village, Hawaii, USA

14 November 2019

# Agenda and notes

- Agenda
  - Welcome
  - Comment review
- Comments
  - Comments reflect a consensus of ad hoc meeting attendees.
  - Ad Hoc Chair tasked to post comments to EC reflector prior to Tuesday deadline.
  - Ad Hoc Chair tasked to include responses from other WGs prior to 802.3 closing plenary.

# P802f (1)

Amendment : YANG Data Model for EtherTypes

*Comments on P802f may be treated as comments from the RAC Chair.*

## PAR

- General – Working offline the RAC Chair, the 802.1 Chair, IEEE Risk Management and IEEE Legal agreed that definition of “friendly names” for old EtherType assignments would be defined with a standards project (e.g., P802f). For new EtherType assignments, the IEEE RA will request the “friendly name” from the applicant. Going forward, any names not provided by the customer will have to be defined by a standards project. The PAR needs to be modified to reflect this.
- Response: Accept in principle – Update the PAR to reflect the requested changes regarding the definition of an initial set of “friendly names”. While we agree with the direction not all of these details are appropriate for the PAR.

# P802f (2)

- 5.2.b (project scope) — The first sentence is awkward and could be parsed inaccurately. Propose rewrite from: "This amendment specifies a procedure to generate YANG modules that contain the full EtherType information, including a compact human-readable name, found in the IEEE Registration Authority EtherType public listing.", to: This amendment specifies a procedure to generate YANG modules that contain full EtherType identified protocol information (typically as found in the IEEE Registration Authority EtherType public listing), and adds a compact human- readable name (also to be added to the EtherType public listing)."
- Response: Accept in principle – New Scope:  
5.2.b. Scope of the project: This amendment specifies YANG modules that contain the EtherType information, including a compact human-readable name and description. The name and description for an initial set of EtherTypes are defined for inclusion in the IEEE Registration Authority EtherType public listing. This amendment also addresses errors and omissions in IEEE Std 802 description of existing functionality.

# P802f (3)

- 5.2.b (project scope) — The second sentence is ambiguous, are the errors and omissions in the EtherType public listing or in Std 802? Assuming this is a catch all for maintenance items on Std 802, it should clearly state that is the case. Possibly: "This amendment also addresses errors and omissions in IEEE Std 802 descriptions of existing functionality."
  - Response: Accept in principle – See New Scope.
- 5.2.b (project scope) — Assuming the second sentence allows maintenance tasks to be performed, the group may want to include in those maintenance changes making Std 802 consistent in its capitalization of EtherType. While EtherType is dominant in Std 802, the existing standard also uses Ethertype. Other 802.1 standards predominantly use Ethertype. Certainly only one capitalization should be used in any given standard, but it would also be nice if 802.1 picked one for gradual enforcement as its standards are revised. No change to the PAR is requested.
  - Response: Accept in principle – We agree that making capitalization of EtherType consistent should be considered during the course of the project..

# P802f (4)

- 5.5 (need) — This description doesn't clearly record rationale in discussion leading up to proposing this PAR. One important omission is that the IEEE RA listing may be misleading because assignees have not updated the information provided on their application for the EtherType. A standards project is the most efficient way to create an accurate listing of the common names within the industry for the protocols identified by a particular EtherType when contact information is unreliable.
- Response: Accept in principle  
5.5 Need for the Project: The IEEE Registration Authority EtherTypes public listing may be misleading because assignees, whose contact information is often unreliable, have not updated the information provided on their application for the EtherType. This project is the most efficient way to create an accurate listing of the common names and descriptions used within the industry for the protocols identified by a particular EtherType. YANG (Request for Comment (RFC) 7950) is a formalized data modeling language that is widely accepted and can be used to simplify network configuration. A YANG module with an authoritative list of EtherTypes enhances compatibility of modern networks and aids in the efficiency of managing them.

# P802f (5)

- 6.1.a – The fact that the project will be based on and likely include content from RFC 8519 should be mentioned and copyright release should accompany the contribution to add said RFC 8519 content. It could be noted that the project is being done at the encouragement of IETF so permission is not expected to be a problem.
  - Response: Accept in Principle
- 6.1.a. Is the Sponsor aware of any copyright permissions needed for this project?: Yes  
If yes please explain: The project will be based on and possibly include content from RFC 8519. The project is being done at the encouragement of IETF, so copyright permission is not expected to be a problem.
- 6.1.b (registration activity) — The project being dependent on enhancement of the EtherType public listing is not practical, or it is poorly stated. If approved, the project will require update to the EtherType tutorial, the EtherType Public Listing, the EtherType applications and perhaps other registry documents and processes.
  - Response: – Accept in Principle
- If yes please explain: The YANG Data Model will be assigned a Uniform Resource Name (URN) based on the IEEE Registration Authority URN tutorial and IEEE Std 802d. The project will require coordination with the IEEE Registration Authority Committee and the IEEE Registration Authority to update the EtherType tutorial, the EtherType Public Listing, the application for EtherType assignments, and perhaps other registry documents and processes.

# P802f (6)

## CSD

- 1.1.1 (Managed objects) — The response is somewhat inaccurate. "This project is primarily a management project providing a YANG data model that contains compact human-readable names for the EtherType information found in the IEEE Registration Authority EtherType public listing." Would better read "This project is primarily a management project providing a YANG data model that defines compact human-readable names for selected EtherType assignments found in the IEEE Registration Authority EtherType public listing."
- Response: Accept in principle. Update CSD 1.1.1 as follows:  
This project is primarily a management project providing a YANG data model that defines compact human-readable names and descriptions for selected EtherType assignments found in the IEEE Registration Authority EtherType public listing.



# P802.1AEdk (1)

Amendment: MAC Privacy protection

## PAR

- 5.2.b (project scope) — The last sentence is a bit obtuse (perhaps intentionally). Assuming this is a catch all for maintenance items on Std 802.1AE, it should clearly state that is the case. Possibly: "This amendment also addresses errors and omissions in IEEE Std 802.1AE descriptions of existing functionality."
- Response: Accept  
"descriptions of existing IEEE Std 802.1AE functionality".

# 802.1AEdk (2)

- 8.1 (additional explanation) — The last sentence references #7.3 which doesn't appear in the PAR. Probably need a yes answer in 7.3 to get it to appear. Perhaps it would be better to reference a job responsibility title rather than a person.
- Response: Accept  
The required information (updated as provided by Jodi Haasz) has been included in 7.3 and the 8.1 note removed.  
FYI 7.3 is not required by NesCom and therefore (by design) the pdf download provided by myProject does not show 7.3. The information now wholly in 7.3 shows the intention to submit to ISO/IEC JTC1 under the PSDO agreement (as is done with the base standard).

## CSD

- No comment.

# 802.1CS (1)

## Link-local Registration Protocol

### PAR modification

- 4.2 (initial Sponsor Ballot) — Assuming the PAR is recent output of myProject, the PAR form hasn't been updated to use new names (e.g., Standards Committee Ballot). Nothing you can do about that rather than complain via the 802 Task Force. The date though may not be realistic or will require special attention on the ballot. With the SASB meeting before 802 this year, it is unlikely that the PAR modification will be approved by January 2020.
  - Response: Change ballot to March 2020, change RevCom submittal to October 2020.
- 5.2 (scope) — missing space after full stop at end of third from last sentence.
  - Response: Accept.
- 8.1 (additional explanation) — The note should reference a specific PAR item, in this case #5.2.
  - Response: Accept.

# 802.1CS (2)

## CSD modification

- General — There is no way to be sure the right CSD is being looked at (until a long way down where LPR is finally mentioned). Please add project identification in the title area..
  - Response: Reject. There was no change to the contents of the CSD. 802.1 apologizes for failing to put the document designation in the original CSD, but we feel that leaving the document intact is the best way to indicate that it did not change.
- General — There is no way within the document to determine what in the CSD is being modified.
  - Response: There is no change to the CSD.

# 802.15.7a

Amendment - Defining High Data Rate Optical Camera Communications (OCC)

***Withdrawn from Nov. 2019 consideration***

## PAR

- General — This PAR includes multiple unexpanded acronyms, e.g., V2X, ADAS, RF, MIMO, MIMO-OFDM, traditionally comment bait for NesCom members. May as well expand now rather than in response to NesCom comment.
- 5.2.b (project scope) — The use of “10000” without any thousands separator is inconsistent with IEEE style and with the existing project scope. Suggest using “10,000” for consistency with the base standard scope.
- 6.1.b (registration activity) — Just creating additional work for the RAC (triggering their review when there isn’t registration activity anticipated isn’t a good reason for answering Yes. This is supposed to be a filter and nothing in the scope, purpose, need or other fields (nor in the CSD) indicates any registration activity.

# 802.15.7a (2)

## CSD

- General — The CSD also uses unexpanded acronyms (it is much better than the PAR). Though many may be familiar to most 802 participants please be kind to the others and expand first use of all acronyms (e.g., MIMO, OWC).
- 1.2.5 (economic feasibility) — The answers are rather terse and in some cases not really responsive. Item b, what does market size have to do with known cost factors, there is no real response to the question. Item c, adding optical transmitters and receivers to a system isn't firmware, it isn't obvious what firmware would need to be upgraded when new hardware (perhaps with its OCC relevant firmware included) is added to a system. Item d, if radio equipment isn't replaced, operational cost are somewhat affected particularly in the infrastructure end of communication (the infrastructure has to support legacy radio communication and new OCC communication).

# 802.16t

Amendment - Fixed and Mobile Wireless Access in Channel Bandwidth up to 100 kHz

## PAR

- 2.1 (Title) — Why is “Amendment:” missing at the beginning of the second line?
  - Response: Fixed in PAR version 802.24-19-0029r5
- 8.1 (additional explanation) — Is it correct to infer that providing expansions for acronyms in 5.2.a means that the acronyms weren’t properly expanded when the last revision of the scope was done? The 8.1 expansion of TDD in 5.2.b is unnecessary because it is properly expanded in 5.2.b.
  - Response: The PHY references in 5.2.a are proper names for the PHYs specified in 802.16, so the explanations are provided only for convenience. TDD is expanded in 5.2.b and is not referenced in 8.1.

## CSD

- 1.2.4.a (proven technology) — minor grammar problem in third line “have are”, delete “have”, or is more wordy language like the first line of 1.2.4.b what was intended?
  - Response: Accepted. The extraneous “have” was deleted in CSD 802.24-19-0030r1