

# P802.1DU draft PAR&CSD - Comments from other WGs

**Johannes Specht**

(Self; Analog Devices, Inc.; Mitsubishi Electric Corporation; Phoenix Contact GmbH & Co. KG; PROFIBUS Nutzerorganisation e.V.; Siemens AG; Texas Instruments, Inc.)

DCN 1-23-0002-00-ICne

# WG 802.3 on 2.1 (PAR)

## Comment<sup>1)</sup>

2.1 – Title typically includes “Standard for...”.

## Proposed Response

Change 2.1 to “Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks – Cut-Through Forwarding Bridges and Bridged Networks”

1) Source: <https://www.ieee802.org/secmail/msg28155.html>

# WG 802.3 and WG 802.11 on 4.2 and 4.3 (PAR)

## Comment

### 802.3<sup>1)</sup>

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.

### 802.11<sup>2)</sup>

4.2 and 4.3 are only one month apart. Please change one or both dates.

## Proposed Response

- a) Change “Nov 2026” in 4.2 to “Mar 2026”.
- b) Change “Dec 2026” in 4.3 to “Mar 2027”.

1) Source: <https://www.ieee802.org/secmail/msg28155.html>

2) Source: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0187-02-OPAR-par-review-sc-meeting-agenda-and-comment-slides-march-2023-mixed-mode-plenary.pptx>

# WG 802.3 on 4.2 and 4.3 (PAR)

## Comment<sup>1)</sup>

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

## Proposed Response

Change “This standard also details the usage of CTF bridges.” in 5.2 to “This standard also details the usage of CTF bridges in bridged networks.”

1) Source: <https://www.ieee802.org/secmail/msg28155.html>

# WG 802.11 on 5.4 (PAR)

## Comment<sup>1)</sup>

5.4 “lower latency” may be better expressed as “reduced latency”. What is the quantitative metric of the “lower/reduced” that is being identified.

## Proposed Response

- a) Low/lower/ultra-low/etc. latency is often used in 802.1 TSN.
- b) TBD: Is the second sentence meant as a question? If yes, providing a pointer to the tutorial on CTF may be helpful.

1) Source: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0187-02-0PAR-par-review-sc-meeting-agenda-and-comment-slides-march-2023-mixed-mode-plenary.pptx>

# WG 802.11 on 5.5 (PAR)

## Comment<sup>1)</sup>

5.5 please revisit the 5.5 text as it seems to give more of a solution, without identify the problem “i.e. the need”.

## Proposed Response

TBD

1) Source: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0187-02-0PAR-par-review-sc-meeting-agenda-and-comment-slides-march-2023-mixed-mode-plenary.pptx>

# WG 802.3 on 1.2.2 (CSD)

## Comment<sup>1)</sup>

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.

## Proposed Response

MA\_DATA.request, MA\_DATA.indication definitions are in IEEE Std 802.3, not IEEE Stds 802, 802.1AC or 802.1Q [the standards cited in 1.2.2 (CSD)]:

- The PAR scope covers interconnection of MAC methods without support for CTF (e.g., IEEE 802.3 per IEEE 802.3 NEA conclusion of 2022-15-07<sup>2)</sup>) and MAC methods with support for CTF.
- Changing IEEE Std 802.3 is not part of the proposed bridging project. IEEE 802.1 TSN intends to maintain the traditional MAC demarcation between IEEE 802.1 and other IEEE 802.xx WGs<sup>3)</sup>.

1) Source: <https://www.ieee802.org/secmail/msg28155.html>

2) Source: [https://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul22/0722\\_NEA\\_close\\_report.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul22/0722_NEA_close_report.pdf)

3) Source: <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2022/du-cut-through-summary-1122-v04.pdf>