

P802.1Qee

Traffic Engineering for Bridged Networks with Significant Delay Variance

Resolution of Comments on
Project Authorization Request (PAR) and Criteria for Standards Development (CSD)

2025-07-30

802.3 comments on the PAR and their resolution

- Comment:
5.2b Scope. Suggest “This amendment specifies procedures and YANG to...” should be “This amendment specifies procedures and YANG data models to...” (YANG is a data modelling language as described in 8.1, YANG data models are what may be specified...)
- Response:
The suggested change has been made.

802.3 comments on the PAR and their resolution

– cont'd

- Comment:
5.2b Scope. “to extend bridge attributes for traffic engineering for bridged networks with delay variance beyond that supported by the existing specification.” – suggest that SOME boundary on the delay variance targeted or some additional information would be useful. Simply saying anything outside the existing specification, in conjunction with the ability to make technical corrections to the existing specification (next sentence) makes the scope the entire world.
- Response:

802.3 comments on the PAR and their resolution

– cont'd

- Comment:
5.2b Scope. It is noted that the “technical ... corrections to existing IEEE ... functionality”. Is this related to the difference in characteristics between wireless and wireline systems described in 5.5?
- Response:

802.3 comments on the PAR and their resolution – cont'd

- Comment:
5.3. Is the term “roll up” revision a standardized term? Consider removing the term “roll up”.
- Response:
5.3 has been replaced with the following: “This amendment depends on the completion of the ongoing revision of the base standard.”

802.3 comments on the PAR and their resolution – cont'd

- Comment:
6.1.2 Explanation – it is best not to promise future action. While it is FAIRLY SURE that URNs and OUIs will be used, it is better to say “is expected to use”. (the text for CID is fine).
- Response:
The suggested change has been made.

802.3 comments on the CSD and their resolution

- Comment:

1.2.

The way the text of 1.2.1 and 1.2.3 is currently written. It does not explain what specifically the scope of the work is. For example, it isn't clear to use as to whether this project addresses more than just wireless network technologies? Would you please provide specific examples of wired network, if intended to be included?

- Response:

802.3 comments on the CSD and their resolution

– cont'd

- Comment:

1.2.1a

The phrase “these markets” in the last sentence was confusing as to what it specifically refers to. Is it wireless and wired bridged network markets? Or is it a traffic engineering application markets? The suggested change is to combine these into one sentence, such as “The need for supporting wireless and wireline systems in the same bridged network is increasing in markets and applications that use traffic engineering; including professional audio/video and industrial automation for applications such as flexible factory automation”

- Response:

The suggested change has been made.

802.3 comments on the CSD and their resolution

– cont'd

- Comment:

- 1.2.4 Technical Feasibility:

- The responses to technical feasibility speak ONLY to the capabilities in the base standard, yet the amendment seeks to extend those capabilities to links “with more uncertain delays” than those in the base standard, something it claims is not in there. Therefore, these responses are not relevant to the amendment being proposed. Please provide some support that the suggested delays can be supported. (note – this may also be useful in setting some boundary to the scope as suggested above).

- Response:

802.3 comments on the CSD and their resolution

– cont'd

- Comment:

1.2.5 Economic Feasibility:

- (a) to say that it “will not add hardware cost” is to promise future action, and may not be true. For example, management extensions might require additional memory of monitoring functionality. Suggest “are not expected to add”. Also, “beyond the minimal and firmly bounded resources consumed by additional management modules” doesn’t really have meaning. If I take this to an extreme, such resources are not obviously “firmly bounded” or even “minimal”. Suggest delete, or replace by “beyond the resources consumed by management modules required for the existing specification”, or, if this phrasing is needed, additional explanation as to what “minimal” is relative to and what “firm bounds” are meant.
- (b) (c) (d) replace “will” which promises an outcome or future action where possible, suggest “is not expected to” unless it is bounded by the scope. (potentially “c” is)

- Response:

802.3 comments on the CSD and their resolution – cont'd

- Comment:

- 1.2.5 Economic Feasibility:

- (b) (c) (d) replace “will” which promises an outcome or future action where possible, suggest “is not expected to” unless it is bounded by the scope.
(potentially “c” is)

- Response:

- The suggested change has been made.

802.11 comments on the PAR and their resolution

- Comment:
Please Add to 8.1 in the PAR, a reference to applicable network examples as you have in the CSD.
 - Note that the PAR indicates: “traffic engineering for bridged networks with delay variance”
 - But the CSD indicates: a connection of 802.11 WLAN and 3GPP
- Response:
The suggested change has been made.

802.11 comments on the CSD and their resolution

- Comment:
The CSD should be using the updated CSD form – May 2025.
- Response:
The CSD has been moved to the 2025-05-20 template.

802.15 comments on the PAR and CSD and their resolution

- PAR

- Question:

5.2.b Scope of the project: states Additionally, this amendment addresses technical and editorial corrections to existing IEEE Std 802.1Q functionality. But, there is a current roll-up – does this not fix any corrections?

- Response:

- CSD

- No comments.