CSD for P802.1AS-REV

802.1 WG

Wednesday, 05 November 2014

Project process requirements

- ***Managed objects***
  - *Describe the plan for developing a definition of managed objects. The plan shall specify one of the following:*
    a) *The definitions will be part of this project.*
    b) *The definitions will be part of a different project and provide the plan for that project or anticipated future project.*
    c) *The definitions will not be developed and explain why such definitions are not needed.*

a) The definitions are part of the project.

Project process requirements

- ***Coexistence***
  - *A WG proposing a wireless project shall demonstrate coexistence through the preparation of a Coexistence Assurance (CA) document unless it is not applicable.*
    a) *Will the WG create a CA document as part of the WG balloting process as described in Clause 13? (yes/no)*
    b) *If not, explain why the CA document is not applicable.*
- Not applicable – this is not a wireless project.

5C requirements

- ***Broad market potential***
  - *Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall have broad market potential. At a minimum, address the following areas:*
    - *a) Broad sets of applicability.*
    - *b) Multiple vendors and numerous users.*

a) The proposed revision would apply to all 802 networks composed of full duplex IEEE 802.3, IEEE 802.11, IEEE 802.3 EPON, and other IEEE 802 networks identified in the scope, as a means of providing timing and synchronization for time-sensitive applications. The proposed revision would also apply to Coordinated Shared Networks (CSN).

b) Many vendors and users have continually expressed their support for this standard and there are a number of implementations in the field.

5C requirements

- ***Compatibility***
  - *Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard should be in conformance with IEEE Std 802, IEEE 802.1AC, and IEEE 802.1Q. If any variances in conformance emerge, they shall be thoroughly disclosed and reviewed with IEEE 802.1 WG prior to submitting a PAR to the Sponsor.*
    - *a) Will the proposed standard comply with IEEE Std 802, IEEE Std 802.1AC and IEEE Std 802.1Q?*
    - *b) If the answer to a) is no, supply the response from the IEEE 802.1 WG.*
  - *The review and response is not required if the proposed standard is an amendment or revision to an existing standard for which it has been previously determined that compliance with the above IEEE 802 standards is not possible. In this case, the CSD statement shall state that this is the case.*

a) Yes.

5C requirements

- ***Distinct Identity***
  - *Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence of a distinct identity. Identify standards and standards projects with similar scopes and for each one describe why the proposed project is substantially different.*
- There is no other 802 standard or approved project that provides the same functionality for bridges or end stations.

5C requirements

- ***Technical Feasibility***
  - *Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence that the project is technically feasible within the time frame of the project. At a minimum, address the following items to demonstrate technical feasibility:*
    a) *Demonstrated system feasibility.*
    b) *Proven similar technology via testing, modeling, simulation, etc.*

a) There are numerous implementations of the 802.1AS-2011 standard.

b) The technology has been proven in the field and in compatibility testing carried out in public testing labs.

5C requirements

- ***Economic Feasibility***
  - *Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence of economic feasibility. Demonstrate, as far as can reasonably be estimated, the economic feasibility of the proposed project for its intended applications. Among the areas that may be addressed in the cost for performance analysis are the following:*
    - *a) Balanced costs (infrastructure versus attached stations).*
    - *b) Known cost factors.*
    - *c) Consideration of installation costs.*
    - *d) Consideration of operational costs (e.g., energy consumption).*
    - *e) Other areas, as appropriate.*

a) The functionality needed to provide the features specified in this standard is essentially the same in bridges and end stations. The cost of providing these features in each type of device will not be significant, given the expected large volumes.

b) The cost factors are well known from implementations of 802.1AS-2011.

c) There are no incremental installation costs relative to the existing costs associated with 802.1AS-2011.

d) There are no incremental operational costs relative to the existing costs associated with 802.1AS-2011.

e) No other areas have been identified.