
P802.3 PARs ad hoc

IEEE P802.3 ad hoc on pars from other WGs

Robert M. Grow, ad hoc chair

RMG Consulting

Macau, China

15 March 2016

IEEE 802.15.12 - New Standard PAR

Upper Layer Interface (ULI) for IEEE 802.15.4 Low-Rate Wireless Networks draft PAR and CSD

PAR, 5.1 - 100 active participants seems a bit optimistic, though the PAR instruction has moved back to a very liberal wording (our WGs are different than the WGs in most of IEEE-SA). How many will be actively involved in development of the draft (perhaps starting with anticipated TG members), not including those submitting a meaningless WG ballot to keep working group voting rights.

IEEE 802.15.12 (p2)

PAR, 5.2 - The scope is uses language and a reference architecture that does not appear to be in IEEE Std 802.15.4. As an upper layer protocol for 802.15.4, it should use terminology consistent with that standard's Figure-3 LP-WPAN device architecture. The scope should also indicate how it relates to the service interfaces defined in that standard. As written, it is very difficult to relate the proposed work to the architecture of 802.15.4. If the proposed project will also better map 802.15.4 architectural blocks to the OSI reference model, that needs to be stated somewhere (not in the scope).

The term regulation requirements is very loaded and left very undefined. Regulation of what, or how is it related to radio frequency regulation?

The phrase "Furthermore, the ULI integrates upper Layer 2 sub-layer (L2+) functionalities . . ." is unnecessarily loaded with jargon for an unspecified architecture. How about "Furthermore, the ULI integrates upper Layer 2 functionalities . . .".

IEEE 802.15.12 (p3)

PAR, 5.2, continued

How does "L2 routing (L2R) protocols" relate to IEEE 802 bridging?

The number of acronyms in the scope makes it very difficult to read. It is noted that 5.5 Need reuses many of the terms, but a cleaner reading Scope is recommended as it appears in the standard, and catalog listings for the standard.

IEEE 802.15.12 (p4)

PAR, 5.5 - The bulleted list seems to be two level with the last five belonging nested under the sixth from last bullet. Consider an outline format and proper use of capitalization and punctuation for lists (first three items as sentences and the last six items as a single sentence with each list item except last ending with a semicolon). Text formatting that is not supported by the PAR tool should not be used.

PAR 5.6 - Missing full stop.

IEEE 802.15.12 (p5)

PAR, 6.1.b - The compression of higher layer protocols is unrelated to registration activities. If it needs to be said, say it somewhere else. If the only registration activity is use of EtherTypes, or being allocated an EtherType, just say that. If the standard will have other registration components, those should be explained.

Members of the RAC participating in the ad hoc are worried if you will attempt to get EtherType assignments to use as subtypes. This would be an improper use! Please engage the RAC early (before mandatory coordination) to make sure there will not be a problem.

IEEE 802.15.12 (p6)

CSD, 1.1.2 - This seems to be in possible conflict with the PAR scope including "regulation requirements". (PAR, 5.2 comment notes this term is undefined and consequently fixing the scope may clarify the relationship to "regulation" so that this answer is valid.)

CSD, 1.2.1,a - The Internet of Things is more than wireless sensors. (Wireless sensors would generally be considered some of the things in the IOT.) Minor grammar: line 6 should read the IOT marketplace,

CSD, 1.2.1,b - Minor readability: line 4, remove "and many more".

IEEE P802.1Qcr - Amendment

Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks--Bridges and Bridged Networks Asynchronous Traffic Shaping draft PAR and CSD

PAR, 5.5 - The first sentence implies that this standard will provide zero loss due to congestion. Near zero perhaps, but absolutely zero unlikely.

PAR, 8,1 - The item number that the note addresses is not provided. Should this reference project purpose or need? Please provide item reference as the form indicates is expected.

CSD, 1.2.1 - Excessive capitalization: Mission critical, Automotive Systems, Automotive and Industrial network.

CSD, 1.2.4 - The term "dedicated analysis" is arguably jargon, unlikely to be universally understood as a common technique. (The referenced document in the next sentence provides no help.) Please expand this answer using more generic language.

IEEE P802.15.4v - Amendment

*Standard for Low-Rate Wireless Personal Area Networks Amendment
enabling/updating the use of Regional Sub-GHz bands draft PAR and CSD*

PAR, 5.1 - 100 active participants seems a bit optimistic, though the PAR instruction has moved back to a very liberal wording (our WGs are different than the WGs in most of IEEE-SA). How many will be actively involved in development of the draft (perhaps starting with anticipated TG members), don't include those submitting a meaningless WG ballot just to keep working group voting rights.

CSD, 1.1.1 – I you are adding a new PHY you probably are at least adding enumerations to managed objects. I management doesn't know which PHY is attached, why not.

CSD, 1.2.1,b - Minor readability: line 4, remove "and many more".

CSD, 1.2.5,c - The answer is unresponsive. Manufacturing methods are not installation cost. Please answer the question.

IEEE P802.16s - Amendment

Air Interface for Broadband Wireless Access: Amendment Fixed and Mobile Wireless Access in Channel Sizes up to 1.25 MHz

PAR. 4.3 - Completion of Sponsor ballot in four months seems a bit aggressive and will likely draw NesCom comment. (There is no penalty for beating PAR dates, but often there is NesCom pushback for aggressive dates.)

PAR, 5.3 - If a revision of 802.16 has been approved, it is complete, then it shouldn't be listed. If the 802.16 revision is not approved, it is inappropriate to include the year (e.g., use IEEE Std 802.16-201x)

PAR, 7.2 - A joint sponsor (3.3) but not joint development may raise questions. Please explain, it may be appropriate to explain in 8.1.