

# DCB Status

Pat Thaler

March 18, 2010

# DCB projects in ballot

- Qau – Sponsor ballot finished in January
  - Request EC forwarding to RevCom
- Qaz – Issues resolved
  - WG recirculation needed, may need two
  - Sponsor ballot after May interim (EC email ballot)
- Qbb – WG ballot results: 25-1-30
  - Recirculation for minor changes to satisfy disapproves
  - Ask EC for Conditional approval for sponsor ballot
- .3bd – WG ballot results: 28-0-24
  - Ask EC for Sponsor ballot

PFC Disapprove comments

## PFC Statistics

- **CI 12 SC 12.18 P 9 L 11 # 15**
- It would be more informative to know the number of PFCRequestsSent and PFCIndicationsReceived per priority.
- *SuggestedRemedy*
- Define PFCRequestsSent and PFCIndicationsReceived to be per priority. Modify the MIB accordingly.
- REJECT.
- See comment #12
- Having the statistics per priority is not so useful because many implementations always set the e[n] bits to one and just use the time value to pause or unpause a priority.

## PFC response time at 10 Gig

- *Comment Type TR*
- The PFC response time definition is still not satisfactory. The relaxation of the constraint to 12 pause quanta from 8 for 10Gb/s may result in unusable buffering requirements for implementations.
- *SuggestedRemedy*
- Change the PFC response time for 10Gb/s to 8 pause quanta
- REJECT.
- The group decided to keep the delay as is.
  - See <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2010/bb-lakshmikantha-PFCResponseTime.pdf>

# PFC response time above 10 Gig

- *Comment Type TR*
- The PFC response time should take into account the speed (i.e. 10, 40, 100 Gb/s). However, picking either an absolute time or absolute pause quanta for all speeds shouldn't be necessary. Picking an absolute pause quanta decreases the response time by the multiple of the speed increase and may place unreasonable constraints on implementation clocks (per past comment ballots). On the other hand, picking an absolute time assumes implementations will not increase their clock speeds at all and may result in requiring excessive buffering for handling this upper layer response delay.
- *SuggestedRemedy*
- Instead of selecting a single number for all speeds, specify a delay value that is appropriate for each speed - which takes into account implementation approaches as well as reasonable buffering requirements.  
For example, consider a delay factor which increases by a factor of one half of the link speed increase, then, given a response delay of 8 PQ at 10Gb/s,
  - For 40G, it gives  $16PQ = 8PQ \times 4/2$ , as speed increased by a factor of 4 from 10G.
  - For 100G it gives  $20PQ = 16PQ \times 2.5/2$ , as speed increased by a factor of 2.5 from 40G.
- ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
- Add an editor's note: "Potential concerns have been expressed about the delay constraint for the 100G speed. The DCB group is seeking input based on real designs."
- There were no responses on recirculation to the editor's note except to ask that we remove the note so no change to the specification.

# EVB projects

- Qbg – reviewed proposals for architecture, discovery and configuration
  - Ready to produce draft
  - Task group ballot after May interim
- Qbh – reviewed draft
  - Revise draft based on input from March meeting
  - Task group ballot