

Segment Protection Phone Discussion Minutes
April 22, 2009
Bob Sultan

Attendees:

Bob Sultan (Huawei)
Vinod Kumar (Tejas)
Ken Young (Gridpoint)
Corona Wei (Wei YueHua; ZTE)
Ao Ting (Irene) (ZTE)
Don Fedyk (ALU)
Zehavit Alon (NSN)
Nurit Sprecher (NSN)

Agenda:

- Comments on meeting minutes from last week;
- Presentation from Zehavit Alon **Segment Protection for P2P VLAN connections** (<http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/segprot/files>) or <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/new-alon-segment-protection-for-p2p-vlan-connections-04-09.ppt>

Administrative:

Vinod Kumar asked that files on segprot be copied to the IEEE 802.1 public directory. There were no objections. Bob Sultan will do this.

Zehavit Alon - Segment Protection for P2P VLAN connections:

Don Fedyk asked for a brief description of the proposed method of Segment Protection since Zehavit indicated that this method would be unchanged by the inclusion of point-to-point VLANs. Bob Sultan provided a brief explanation.

Don asked whether the Point-to-Point VLANs described by Zehavit were subject to bridge control protocols (e.g., RSTP) and, if so, how does the Segment Protection method interact with the control protocol? Bob read an email from Steve Haddock raising a similar issue:

[...this proposal is inconsistent with, and incompatible with, RSTP and MVRP which are required protocols on all 802.1Q bridges](#)

Nurit Sprecher suggested that the PtP VLAN would be provisioned in such a way that no port in its path would be blocked by the STP. There was also some discussion that a PtP VLAN might not be associated with a spanning tree, but would instead be assigned the PBB-TE MSTID or other reserved value.

Ken Young suggested that the problem lies in the absence of a definition for a PtP VLAN. Nurit pointed-out that the PtP VLAN is a recognized entity in 802.1Q, as the standard requires learning only on VLANs having more than two ports (ie., not on PtP VLANs).

Ken indicated that additional definition would be needed if the PtP VLAN was to be treated as a distinct provisioned entity. For example, PBB-TE describes how CFM is performed on a TESI. A similar description would be required for a PtP VLAN. Ken suggested that this could be done in a distinct PAR if we wanted to avoid a significant expansion in scope of the Segment Protection PAR.

Bob suggested that it might be possible to view that a PtP VLAN is already a traffic-engineered entity within the scope of PBB-TE. That is, it is represented by a shared forwarding path of the form <*, VID> where the VID is associated with the PBB-TE MSTID. It would be the administrator's responsibility to ensure that this shared forwarding path is provisioned only along a linear path of bridges. This would allow the current PAR to support the PtP VLAN (possibly with a NOTE describing how a PtP VLAN can be represented as a PBB-TE entity).

Nurit stated that, whatever the solution, the PtP VLAN must be supported in the PBN context (ie., not just in the backbone).

There was consensus that the proposed extension of Segment Protection to PtP VLAN is technically feasible and reflects a reasonable requirement. The issue is how to state this requirement in the PAR so that support for the PtP VLAN entity does not require a very significant expansion of the project and does not conflict with existing elements of the 802.1Q standard.

Zehavit will present a proposal addressing this at the May 6 phone meeting. In the meantime, discussion of this issue on the segprot mailing list is encouraged as are additional presentations on the subject.

Next Week:

We will have another phone meeting at the same time next Wednesday April 29 at 9AM New York time (6:30PM India, 9PM China, etc.). On the agenda will be:

- Discussion of material to be presented at the May meeting in support of the PAR.
- Other issues, please suggest.

Minutes:

Please send any comments on these minutes to bsultan@huawei.com or to segprot@yahogroups.com