P802.1ASdm PAR and CSD Amendment: Hot Standby

Resolution of Comments on

Project Authorization Request (PAR)

and

Criteria for Standards Development (CSD)

2020-05-18

802.3 Comment on PAR

- Comment:
  6.1.2, YANG is currently the management protocol of choice, will the project include that if so the use of URN should be noted.
- Response:
  IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020 (base for this amendment) does not specify YANG. Nevertheless, another PAR/CSD is in work to specify YANG (P802.1ASdn). If P802.1ASdn completes prior to this amendment, it will be convenient to specify YANG as suggested. Regarding project scope (5.2.b), "managed objects" allows both MIB and YANG.
  - In 6.1.2, update the Explanation to read: "The Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) MIB will be assigned an Object Identifier (OID) based on the IEEE Registration Authority (RA) OID tutorial and IEEE Std 802. The YANG Data Model will be assigned a Uniform Resource Name (URN) based on the IEEE RA URN tutorial and IEEE Std 802d.“
  - In 8.1, add: “IEEE RA URN tutorial: http://standards.ieee.org/develop/regauth/tut/ieeeurn.pdf“ and replace “6.1.b” with “6.1.2”

802.3 Comment on CSD

- Comment:
  1.1.1, You mention SNMP in the PAR, but not YANG. A more specific answer here on which protocols will be included would be appreciated.
- Response:
  Add the following as a new paragraph to 1.1.1:
  "IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020 specifies MIB, and this amendment will specify MIB for its managed objects. IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020 does not specify YANG. Nevertheless, another PAR/CSD is in work to specify YANG (P802.1ASdn). There is no formal dependency, but if P802.1ASdn completes prior to this amendment, this amendment will specify both MIB and YANG for its managed objects."

802.3 Comment on CSD

- Comment:
  1.2.1,b, 2nd paragraph, 3rd sentence through end – This indicates that the automotive requirements are not well understood and therefore doing automotive at this time is presumably premature. Justify the market on industrial alone where such uncertainties do not exist, or make it more clear why automotive requirements though they may evolve are sufficiently understood.
- Response:
  Hot-standby is a use case for automotive, and the P802.1DG project is still gathering requirements for that use case. Automotive requirements will be considered during this amendment, but the justification for this amendment is focused on timely delivery for the industrial automation profile (IEC/IEEE 60802).
  To clarify:
  - Add "provides a basis for" to 1.2.1a.
  - Remove the 2nd paragraph of 1.2.1b.

802.11 Comment on PAR

- Comment:
  5.3 the CSD implies that there is a dependency on IEEE P802.1DG. If this is the case, dependency should be noted.
- Response:
  The project has no dependency on IEEE P802.1DG or IEC/IEEE 60802. Also, due to responses to other comments, references to IEEE P802.1DG have been removed.

802.11 Comment on CSD

- Comment:
  1.2.1 b)– The second paragraph seems to discuss the requirements, and not market potential. This seems to imply that there is a dependency that was not clear in the PAR form. Consider clarification of the paragraph.
- Response:
  Hot-standby is a use case for automotive, and the P802.1DG project is still gathering requirements for that use case. Automotive requirements will be considered during this amendment, but the justification for this amendment is focused on timely delivery for the industrial automation profile (IEC/IEEE 60802).
  To clarify:
  - Add "provides a basis for" to 1.2.1a.
  - Remove the 2nd paragraph of 1.2.1b.

802.11 Comment on CSD

- Comment:
  1.2.4 a) this is general statement, that restates the question, please provide an example or explanation on the demonstrated system feasibility.
- Response:
  The comment is correct. The intent is to explain that existing standards are in use, but we do not want to provide a list that would imply that the project is selecting favorites (or dependencies). We'll add a single example, which hopefully avoids any implication:
  - Replace 1.2.4a with "Hot-standby techniques have been feasibly used in existing standards for fieldbus applications (e.g., IEC 61784-2)."

802.11 Comment on CSD

- Comment:
  1.2.4 b) Useful to include an example of “what” technology is being proven in the first sentence.
- Response:
  To clarify the intent:
  - Add to the end of 1.2.4b: "See item a) for references."