

# 802.1 motions and supporting material for EC - 11/2008

# MOTION

- 802.1 requests approval of the EC to submit 802.1ap to RevCom.
- Proposed: haddock Second: lemon
- For: 28 Against: 0 Abstain: 10
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

# P802.1ap – supporting material

- Pre-submitted to RevCom before close of recirculation ballot
- Recirculation ballot of D4.3 was extended due to file problems; ballot closed 10 Nov
- 73 in pool, 89% (65) response, 98% (61) approval, 4% (3) abstention
- 1 outstanding negative ballot from Satoshi Obara, 1 comment:  
“I understood the information of Clause 17.4 should be normative part of 802.1ap. But I still state that Clause 17.4 defines nothing and there are just informations for readers of 802.1ap.”
- Proposed change:  
“All Clause 17.4 should be moved to "Normative Annex".”
- Resolution detail:
- “REJECT. As indicated in the previous ballot, the ballot resolution group reiterates: "Security considerations are a normative part of MIB definitions in the IETF. This section contains important groupings of objects that would be vulnerable, as well as potential implications of these objects being compromised. From the IEEE perspective, this information is viewed as significant and worthy of being in the normative section of the standard." It is most appropriate for this information to be in the MIB clause since it contains security considerations for these MIB modules. Further, the 802.1Q practice is that Annexes (besides the PICS) are informative, so creating a normative Annex would be outside current practice.”

# MOTION

- 802.1 requests conditional approval of the EC, as per current P&P, to forward P802.1Qaw to Sponsor Ballot following completion of recirculation balloting.
- Proposed: Haddock Second: Dunbar
- For: 28 Against: 0 Abstain: 16
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:
-

# P802.1Qaw – supporting material

- D3.2 recirculation ballot closed Oct 27
- 106 balloters, 90 responders (85%), 31 approve (97%), 1 disapprove, 58 abstain (64%)
- 1 outstanding comment from disapprove voter (Glenn Parsons):  
“Where did the definition for "A member port of Link Aggregation Group" go? I thought we were going to use "LAG member port" or "LAG port" or "aggregated port" as in 802.1ag Instead”
- Suggested Remedy:  
“Put back the definition. Or indicate where it is. And then use the term throughout the document. There are still uses of "a Bridge Port or a member port of a LAG within a Bridge Port" in clause 17”
- Committee response:  
“ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
remove the reference to LAG in clause 17.  
It was decided at the last ballot to remove the definition and use 802.1ag phrase, i.e "an aggregated IEEE802.3 port within a Bridge Port"  
Steve stated this phrase will be replaced by a more proper term in the Q-rev together with 802.1ag”
- Recirc ballot in Nov/Dec timeframe; resolution if needed at Jan interim

# MOTION

- 802.1 requests conditional approval of the EC, as per current P&P, to forward P802.1Qay to Sponsor Ballot following completion of recirculation balloting.
- Proposed: Haddock Second: Saltsidis
- For: 40 Against: 0 Abstain: 8
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:
-

# P802.1Qay – supporting material

- Recirculation ballot of D4.5 closed Nov 6
- Total responses: 77, Total number of voters: 107, Response rate: 72%
- Approve: 27 (93%) Disapprove: 2 (7%)  
Abstain: 48 (62%)
- Outstanding comments:  
<http://ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2008/ay->
- Recirc ballot in Nov/Dec timeframe;  
resolution if needed at Jan interim

# Motions

- 802.1 approves the following text as a response to the interpretation request on 802.1ah (re: L2GP operation)

The P802.1ah amendment changes and additions to IEEE Std 802.1Q subclauses 13.1 through 13.37 are not consistent with the other provisions of Clause 13. Specifying the necessary corrections is beyond the scope of a response to an interpretation request. The corrections suggested in the interpretation request will be considered as part of an amendment under development (P802.1aq).

- Proposed: Seaman Second: haddock
- For: 24 Against: 0 Abstain: 16
- **EC motion:** EC approves the above interpretation response.
- Proposed: Jeffree Second:



# Original interp request:

- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/int-10.html>

# Motions

- 802.1 approves the following text as a response to the interpretation request on 802.1Q (re: MST Region definition)

The clause 13.8 specification of MST Region takes precedence over the 3.87 definition. The latter will be changed in a future amendment or revision of 802.1Q.

- Proposed: Seaman Second: haddock
- For: 26      Against: 1      Abstain: 16
- **EC motion:** EC approves the above interpretation response.
- Proposed: Jeffree Second:

# Original interp request:

- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/private/email2/msg10719.html>

# Motions

- 802.1 approves the text of the liaison to MEF “Reply to MEF 27033-001”
- Proposed: Finn Second: haddock
- For: 26      Against: 0      Abstain: 12

Reply to MEF 27033-001 (From MEF NID)

The IEEE 802.1 Interworking Task Group thanks the MEF for the liaison, and encourages 802.1 members to continue to contribute to this work.

The question of the MIP has been considered by the Interworking Task Group as a ballot comment on P802.1aj D3.1 at the IEEE 802 plenary meeting in Dallas, Texas, this week. The purpose of the default MIP is to permit a MEP in a non-TPMR to easily explore an entire network, perhaps including chains of TPMRs, using an 802.1ag Linktrace Message. The default configuration for an MEF NID is, of course, a matter to be settled by the MEF.

The disposition of this comment is that Draft 3.2 of P802.1aj will specify a default configuration for a TPMR Maintenance Domain at MD Level 0, with MIPs enabled at MD Level 0 on both ports. This default configuration can always be overridden by explicit reconfiguration of Connectivity Fault Management in a TPMR.

IEEE Std. 802.1ag-2007 Clause 22.1.7 addresses "Maintenance Points and non-VLAN aware Bridges". Figure 22-7 shows the position of Maintenance Points on an 802.1D bridge, which is VLAN unaware, and very similar to an 802.1aj TPMR. This figure and the text of 22.1.7 indicate that:

1. Up MEPs, MIPs, and Down MEPs can all be created above the Support of the MAC Service (Figure 22-7).
2. Only Down MEPs can be created below the Support of the MAC Service.

The implication is that, since there are no VLAN tags, all Down MEPs in the upper position are configured at higher MD Levels than those in the lower position.

The next draft of P802.1aj, Draft 3.2, will include an explanation of the relationship between the MAC Status shim and Maintenance Point shims, along with one or more figures to clarify the positions of Maintenance Points and the MAC Status shim in a Two Port MAC Relay.

Thank you for pointing out these issues.

# Motions

- 802.1 approves the text of the liaison to MEF “Reply to MEF 27028-002”
- Proposed: Finn Second: haddock
- For: 27 Against: 0 Abstain: 9

Reply to MEF 27028-002 (from MEF NID group)

The IEEE 802.1 Interworking Task Group thanks the MEF for the liaison, and encourages 802.1 members to continue to contribute to the work of the MEF.

The Flow Metering function in 802.1Q and 802.1ag meters frames by input port, not output port, as stated by the first sentence of IEEE 802.1Q-2005 Clause 8.6.5. The position Flow Metering, near the end of the Frame Forwarding chain (clause 8.6, Figure 8-9) means that it meters only those input frames that are actually queued for transmission on at least one output port.

The 802.1 IWTG understands that both input and output flow metering are useful, and regrets that 802.1Q Figure 8-9, and 802.1ag Figures 22-2 and 22-4 can confuse the reader as to whether metering is applied on input or output ports. These issues can be addressed when 802.1Q is next revised.

The issues raised by your liaison on P802.1aj Draft 3.1 have been processed as a ballot comment on Draft 3.1 at the IEEE 802 plenary meeting in Dallas, Texas, this week. The disposition of this comment is that the next draft of P802.1aj, Draft 3.2, will include an explanation of the relationship between the MAC Status shim and Maintenance Point shims, along with one or more figures to clarify the positions of Maintenance Points and the MAC Status shim in a Two Port MAC Relay.

Thank you for pointing out these two issues.