

# IEEE 1722 – Revision PAR Draft 0.4

Dave Olsen  
dave.olsen@harman.com

## Title (2.1)

- IEEE Standard for a Transport Protocol for Time Sensitive Applications in a Bridged Local Area Network

## Misc.

- Number of people expected to work on standard (5.1)
  - 20
- Stakeholders (5.6)
  - Developers and users of bridged LANs and end stations supporting audio, video and other time sensitive applications

# PAR Scope (5.2)

- This standard extends IEEE 1722 - 2011 to add extensible transport formats that support new and existing media types. This standard ~~will also specify new synchronization services and diagnostic counters. This standard will maintain backwards compatibility with 1722-2011.~~
- This standard specifies the protocol, data encapsulations, and synchronization procedures used to enable interoperability between time sensitive audio, video and control applications using the quality of service capabilities provided by IEEE 802 Time Sensitive Networking standards.

## PAR Scope (5.3)

- Is the completion of this document contingent upon the completion of another document?
  - No

# New PAR Purpose (5.4)

- This standard facilitates interoperability between end stations that transport time-sensitive media across LANs providing time synchronization, latency and bandwidth services by defining packet format protocols, synchronization mechanisms and diagnostic counters.

# New Need (5.5)

- IEEE 1722 - 2011 has experienced rapid adoption in applications that stream audio and video. There is significant end-user and vendor interest in providing additional media formats that are not currently in the IEEE 1722 defined set of supported formats. These new media formats also address limitations related to format changes, channel count and encoder/decoder complexity that are imposed by the current standard.
- Additional functionality is also needed to provide services that are not currently addressed in IEEE 1722 such as system wide clock distribution and synchronization, and additional diagnostic information.
- These additional features and formats are necessary to promote continued vendor adoption and interoperability, among devices that support IEEE 1722.
- ~~Addition of these new media formats has required a restructuring of the the previous content from IEEE Std. 1722-2011 such that a entire revision of the previous standard is needed.~~

# Additional Notes (8.1)

- The group would like it to be known that we are maintaining backwards compatibility. Is there a place in the PAR for this information?
- ~~The IEEE 1722a workgroup has been working on an amendment to IEEE Std. 1722-2011 for several years. As consumer demand has driven the number of supported transport formats higher it has become impossible to maintain the document structure from the original 1722-2011.~~
- ~~While we are making no technical changes to the transports included in 1722-2011 the number of edits required to be documented in an amendment would make both the original document and the new document unreadable.~~
- ~~Therefore it is the opinion of the 1722a workgroup that we change to working under a revision PAR. This would allow the workgroup to produce a new document that replaces 1722-2011 with a document that is more easily readable and better suited to future enhancement~~

3/25/2014

# Received Comments

- I have the following suggestions (Which I would/will make if this PAR was presented for consideration).
- 1. As this is a revision PAR, the statement in the scope that it will maintain backward compatibility is unnecessary. The resultant Standard will replace the old version.
- 2. The New Scope Statement (as Geoff pointed out) is out of place and just wrong. The original Scope statement would be a better starting point, and then amend to include any expansion of the scope.
- 3. 5.4 seems to be an improvement.
- 4. The text in 8.1 and 5.5 should be combined in 5.5. The text in 8.1 is just continuing on the explanation, and if it is thought that there is too much in 5.5, then don't keep all the text.
- 5. For the Scope, it should be in present tense and reflect what the expected Standard will contain. The balloters will be looking at the draft in this respect to see if it indeed does fit within the scope.
- Best Regards,
- Jon
- 2011-2014 NesCom Chair
- 2014 NesCom Member

# Received Comments

- The scope statement as revised is not suitable for "as written" inclusion in the revised standard (which is the requirement).
- It is a perfectly reasonable statement of the intention and scope of the project but (as I understand the rules) it needs to be stated in a manner that is suitable for the entire standard once the revision is done and published. Thus the scope statement should reflect the scope of the anticipated end product, not what is being done to the original standard to change it.