802.3 ad hoc on PARs from other WGs

Berlin, Germany

Mar 2015

Background

- The 802.3 WG chartered an ad hoc (open to any attendees) to submit comments on behalf of the 802.3 WG.

- Comments labeled "non-substantive", do not require response from the WG, as they are largely editorial in nature. Nonetheless, the 802.3 WG will appreciate consideration of these comments.

P802<unassigned> - PAR

Recommended Practice for Information technology-- Telecommunications and information exchange between systems-- Local and metropolitan area networks: Privacy considerations for IEEE 802 Technologies

- Project number — Agree with suggestion in the EC announcement email that this would fit in 802.1 and should be assigned there with assent of the 802.1 WG.

- 2.1 (non-substantive) — Title doesn't include a period (aka, full stop). (It is unlikely that publication editors would include one independent of the PAR.)

- 4.2, 4.3 — Dates need to be included — lack of dates could suggest the SG does not yet understand the magnitude of the work to be done and resources required to complete the work.

- 5.1 — Please justify the estimate of number of participants, for 802, this shouldn't be the number of people expected to be in the WG ballot group, but the number actively participating in the project (e.g., TF/TG). How many regular ECSG participants is a good indicator. This number is subject to review by the WG and EC at checkpoints, so not inflating this number is wise.

- 5.2.a (non-substantive) — There is a superfluous return in the presumably pasted text.

- 5.4 (non-substantive) — Inappropriate capitalization of attack methods.

- 5.5 (non-substantive) — There are superfluous returns in the presumably pasted text.

P802<unassigned> - CSD (1)

- General — The responses are perfunctory and are generally without substance.

- Managed Objects — A recommended practice can include parameters and management capability. The response needs to be relevant to this proposed project and why the scope of work will not include management capability. If high level management architecture or capability definition is included, (what we expect with threat definition and measurement), that should be stated in the response.

- Broad Market Potential – This response sounds like it is in satisfaction of an existing and well known privacy requirement, (e.g., an encryption protocol), not for determining the need for encryption (e.g., threat assessment).

P802<unassigned> - CSD (2)

- Technical Feasibility — It would be expected for the response to address the technical feasibility to measure each of the multiple threats listed in the Purpose section of the PAR.

- Economic Feasibility — Answer is non-responsive to the list of considerations. It does not address at all the economic feasibility of doing the threat assessment.

- Most security techniques have some impact on system cost (e.g., encryption hardware, software complexity), security overlays have installation costs. While features integral to implementations may have negligible installation impacts, maintenance costs (updating capabilities for new threats) certainly have operational cost implications.

P802c, PAR & CSD

Amendment: Local MAC Address Usage

- PAR, no comments.
- CSD, General — The CSD does not seem to have been updated recognizing the potential for use of the local address space for other needs like privacy. For example, thought not technically the focus of Compatibility, the project as an addition to Std 802 will provide the architecture for compatible operation of multiple local address administration techniques / local address administration functions. Thus, make it easier for other projects to be compatible with Std 802 addressing.
- CSD, Broad Market — While probably sufficient justification, there are other ephemeral devices under consideration perhaps it is considered that these things are encompassed by IoT, but the list of IoT devices are mostly longer lived than single use. Single use examples include things like medication compliance devices, disposable personal sensors, etc., enhance Broad Market, and should be addressed before massive numbers of globally unique addresses are consumed by these devices.
- CSD, Distinct Identity —IEEE Std 802 does not sufficiently describe local address administration (there is less in 2014 there was in 2001). There are small pieces of local address use in limited environments, but not a general architecture. The response should highlight that the amendment will facilitate compatibility and interoperability of emerging recommendations for local address utilization for networking technologies using 802 addressing.

P802.1Qci – PAR & CSD

- PAR, no comments
- CSD, general (non-substantive) — It would be helpful to identify the project in the document (title or heading), as not all reviewers will know the URL (or other context information). Please add something that does this.

P802.1Qcj – PAR & CSD

- PAR, no comments
- CSD, Broad Market, a) — This is an amendment, not a revision.

P802.11ay – PAR & CSD

Amendment: Enhancements for Ultra High Throughput in and around the 60 GHz Band

- PAR, no comments.

- CSD, 1.2.3 — The title of the amendment is temporary and irrelevant to the CSD question so the last sentence of the first paragraph should be deleted.

- CSD, 1.2.4,a) — (Non substantive) An amendment amends the base standard, not another amendment.   Something like "add refinements to" instead of "amend" in the second sentence would be an improvement.

- CSD, 1.2.4,b) — The answer is not really responsive. This question seeks evidence that technology is sufficiently proven to allow a project to be completed in a reasonable amount of time without need for research, fundamental simulation and modeling. The response indicates that these tasks will be done as part of standards development not as proof of feasibility, leading to the conclusion that it is too early to approve a project. (It is unnecessary to indicate that additional simulation and modeling will be used to validate and refine selected specifications.)

P802.15.3e – PAR (1)

Amendment for high-rate close proximity point-to-point communications

- What is the revision plan for IEEE Std 802.15.3-2003? It appears that there are two approved amendments IEEE Std 802.15.3b-2005 and IEEE Std 802.15.3c-2009, plus an existing amendment project. The 4th amendment will be subject to the requirement to revise the standard after three years and three amendments. An extension can be requested, but the PAR should not be approved without knowing the revision plan.

- The P802.15.3d PAR should never have been approved as submitted. The 15.3e PAR fixes these problems but if 15.3e is approved first, these fixes and Scope and Purpose changes would then be backed out by 15.3d.
  - This makes the two projects contingent in some way that the PAR form is ill-equipt to handle.
  - A modified PAR should be submitted for 15.3d to change Scope and Purpose language to refer to the standard, not the project. This could be part of the revision plan (modified PAR or conversion of 15.3d into a revision will be submitted when approval order is clear.)
  - Both PARs should clearly indicate that if 15.3d is approved after 15.3e the scope and purpose should not change from that specified in 15.3e.

P802.15.3e – PAR (2)

- 2.1 (non substantive) — The correct format is "Amendment: <amendment name>", not "Amendment for <amendment name>".

- 5.1 — It would be unusual for participants to increase from 20-30 in pre-PAR activities (as indicated in the CSD) to the 50 indicated in the PAR. For 802, the resonse should relate to the TG doing the work, not the number of WG members.

- 5.6 — There is an interesting gap in the stakeholders. There is significant industry evidence of devices that include RF communication capability using proprietary chips (not a chip vendor) yet the product is manufactured by a contractor (so also not a manufacturer of RF equipment). Technology suppliers would be more general, and would include providers of design libraries.

P802.15.3e - CSD

- 1.2.1,b) — Similar nit to the comment on PAR Stakeholders. The important thing is to get folk participating who are involved in semiconductor and equipment development. It usually doesn't matter who is manufacturing, more important who will be implementing it.

- 1.2.5,a) — The response highlights an imbalance of costs without justification for that being acceptable or expected.