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The purpose of PARs

• A PAR authorizes a ‘project’, i.e. the writing or amendment of one document
  – Not required for exploratory work

• A PAR scopes a project, defending against
  – Delays due to scope creep
  – Endless argument about what was meant/agreed
  – Mindless horse-trading
Some .1 style observations

• Heavily consensus based and driven
  – Recourse to formal voting to decide issues is rare
  – Never in task groups
  – Years of avoiding short-term manipulation

• The production of the standard is the process
  – The test of consensus is draft balloting
  – The final test of consensus is WG draft ballot
  – Very rarely vote about anything else

• Strong preference for very tightly focused PARs
  – Fundamental project management
  – Avoids fears, public positioning, delays
  – What you see is what you’ll get
  – Continuous step by step development
Objectives for this meeting

• Develop a proposal for 802.1 consideration
  – To support ‘Residential Bridging’ applications
  – What existing 802.1 documents/parts of docs need to be modified
  – What new 802.1 standards are required
  – What additional supporting standards are required or assumed
Some .1 goals

- Broad applicability across applications
  - Clearly identify common base solutions
- Leave no undercutting economic alternative
- Don’t mortgage the future
  - Very wary of architectural oddities that constrain future developments
- Don’t destroy the present and its growth
  - Continuous compatible development
Some related .1 developments

- Rapid reconfiguration (in .1D/.1Q)
  - Minimize complex binding of resources to paths
- P802.1ad & 802.1Q-REV
  - Drop precedence and flow metering
- P802.1AQ Shortest Path Bridging
  - Remove single spanning tree requirement
  - Without complex management
  - May supplant GVRP/MVRP in some areas
- P802.1ag Connectivity Fault Management
  - Simple inband tools for checking connectivity
- P802.1ak Multiple Registration Protocol
- Other potential ‘class of service’ proposals
1 compatible technical architecture

- Strong emphasis on hard shell/soft core network
  - Very simple class-based forwarding functions
  - Admission control / rate control / policing at edge
  - No flow control state within network

- QoS as a set of successive improvements and approximations
  - 100% loading never achievable
  - But performance bounds can be realized
Technical architecture elements

• Bridge
  – Performance
  – Flow metering and drop precedence
    » Admission control and traffic profile enforcement
  – Class-based queuing
  – Queue service algorithms

• End station
  – Class based admission control
  – Frame class/priority marking
  – Admission control / traffic profile enforcement
    » Not heavy tailed or even Poisson
  – ‘Management’ / ‘user’ reporting
.1 compatible document architecture

- Maximize leverage of existing applicable items
  - Piece parts and placeholders already in .1Q

- Set out the whole application and assumptions
  - Possibly a Recommended Practice
  - Possibly a .1Q Informative Annex
  - Clarify the need for non-transport, non-802 elements
  - A possible record of Technical Architecture

- End-station behaviors
  - Possibly in .1Q, possibly separate standard
  - Opportunity to leverage recent .3 rate control work?
Document architecture elements

- Bridge performance
  - .1D 16.1, 16.2 (much to be done)

- Flow metering (and policing)
  - .1Q 8.6.5 and potential Annex addition
  - Include definition of what bandwidth = X means

- Use of classes and class-based queues
  - .1Q Annex G additions and ‘application profiling’

- Queue service (transmission selection) algorithms
  - .1Q 8.6.8 and potential Annex addition

- Residential real-time ‘domain’ identification
  - Document where?

- Admission control protocol
  - Large separable item once metering/policing units decided
Why focus on the documentation

• Until written down, what is to be done is not clear
• Until written and integrated, impacts are not clear
• Until clear, false fears and hopes dominate
• Most of every project that adds or modifies occurs after it is thought technically ‘complete’
• Opportunities for staged completion
• Begin with the end in mind!
Questions
Common currency admission control

- Summing different traffic profiles is difficult
- ‘Synchronous’ networks have it easy
  - One small common unit of bandwidth
  - Units in = units out in short time period
- Learn from this
  - Admit flows with bandwidth $x/t$, no more than $x$ bytes in system wide common interval $t$
  - Police with meter at network edge
  - In interval $t$ at any node, units in $\sim$ units out
  - More bursty flows equivalent to higher bandwidth
  - Simple sums, bounded calculable delays
  - Choose $1/t \sim 8$ kHz (?)