Maintenance Task Group Meetings

September 12, 2012

Glenn Parsons

September 12 Agenda

- Patents
- Status
- AB-Cor1 Ballot Resolution - Tony
- Existing Maintenance items
- New Maintenance items

Instructions for the WG Chair

The IEEE-SA strongly recommends that at each WG meeting the chair or a designee:

- **Show slides #1 through #4 of this presentation**
- **Advise the WG attendees that:**
  - The IEEE's patent policy is consistent with the ANSI patent policy and is described in Clause 6 of the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws*;
  - Early identification of patent claims which may be essential for the use of standards under development is strongly encouraged;
  - There may be Essential Patent Claims of which the IEEE is not aware. Additionally, neither the IEEE, the WG, nor the WG chair can ensure the accuracy or completeness of any assurance or whether any such assurance is, in fact, of a Patent Claim that is essential for the use of the standard under development.

- **Instruct the WG Secretary to record in the minutes of the relevant WG meeting:**
  - That the foregoing information was provided and that slides 1 through 4 (and this slide 0, if applicable) were shown;
  - That the chair or designee provided an opportunity for participants to identify patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) and/or the holder of patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) of which the participant is personally aware and that may be essential for the use of that standard
  - Any responses that were given, specifically the patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) and/or the holder of the patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) that were identified (if any) and by whom.

- The WG Chair shall ensure that a request is made to any identified holders of potential essential patent claim(s) to complete and submit a Letter of Assurance.
- It is recommended that the WG chair review the guidance in *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual* 6.3.5 and in FAQs 12 and 12a on inclusion of potential Essential Patent Claims by incorporation or by reference.

Note: **WG** includes Working Groups, Task Groups, and other standards-developing committees with a PAR approved by the IEEE-SA Standards Board.

◆IEEE

25 March 2008

(Optional to be shown)

Participants, Patents, and Duty to Inform

All participants in this meeting have certain obligations under the IEEE-SA Patent Policy. Participants:

- "Shall inform the IEEE (or cause the IEEE to be informed)" of the identity of each "holder of any potential Essential Patent Claims of which they are personally aware" if the claims are owned or controlled by the participant or the entity the participant is from, employed by, or otherwise represents
    - "Personal awareness" means that the participant "is personally aware that the holder may have a potential Essential Patent Claim," even if the participant is not personally aware of the specific patents or patent claims
- "Should inform the IEEE (or cause the IEEE to be informed)" of the identity of "any other holders of such potential Essential Patent Claims" (that is, third parties that are not affiliated with the participant, with the participant's employer, or with anyone else that the participant is from or otherwise represents)
- The above does not apply if the patent claim is already the subject of an Accepted Letter of Assurance that applies to the proposed standard(s) under consideration by this group

    Quoted text excerpted from IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws subclause 6.2

- Early identification of holders of potential Essential Patent Claims is strongly encouraged
- No duty to perform a patent search

◆IEEE

Patent Related Links

All participants should be familiar with their obligations under the IEEE-SA Policies & Procedures for standards development.

Patent Policy is stated in these sources:

IEEE-SA Standards Boards Bylaws

http://standards.ieee.org/guides/bylaws/sect6-7.html#6

IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual

http://standards.ieee.org/guides/opman/sect6.html#6.3

Material about the patent policy is available at

http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-material.html

If you have questions, contact the IEEE-SA Standards Board Patent Committee Administrator at patcom@ieee.org or visit http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/index.html

This slide set is available at http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt

25 March 2008

◆IEEE

Call for Potentially Essential Patents

- If anyone in this meeting is personally aware of the holder of any patent claims that are potentially essential to implementation of the proposed standard(s) under consideration by this group and that are not already the subject of an Accepted Letter of Assurance:

  - Either speak up now or
  - Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible or
  - Cause an LOA to be submitted

25 March 2008

◆IEEE

Other Guidelines for IEEE WG Meetings

- All IEEE-SA standards meetings shall be conducted in compliance with all applicable laws, including antitrust and competition laws.

  - Don't discuss the interpretation, validity, or essentiality of patents/patent claims.

  - Don't discuss specific license rates, terms, or conditions.

    - Relative costs, including licensing costs of essential patent claims, of different technical approaches may be discussed in standards development meetings.

      - Technical considerations remain primary focus

  - Don't discuss or engage in the fixing of product prices, allocation of customers, or division of sales markets.

  - Don't discuss the status or substance of ongoing or threatened litigation.

  - Don't be silent if inappropriate topics are discussed ... do formally object.

See *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual*, clause 5.3.10 and "Promoting Competition and Innovation: What You Need to Know about the IEEE Standards Association's Antitrust and Competition Policy" for more details.

◆IEEE

Status Update

- Maintenance web site update in progress
- 18 new maintenance items received since July
  - Majority on MRP (5) / MVRP (3) / MSRP (9)
- Q-Cor-2 sent to RevCom
- AB-Cor initial Task Group Ballot concluded

Detailed Totals	Summary Totals
A = 0	Ready for ballot = 10
B = 10	Balloting = 16
CB = 5	Approved = 0
CE = 0	Awaiting clarification = 5
E = 0	Errata = 0
F = 0	To be categorised = 0
I = 0	Review by Technical experts = 11
J = 5	Withdrawn = 0
P = 3	Rejected = 5
R = 0	Published = 3
S = 0	
T = 11	Total = 50
V = 16	
W = 0	
Errors = 0	
	Open = 42
Total = 50	

New Maintenance Projects

- ## 802.1AB Corrigenda
  - Progress in Maintenance TG

- ## 802.1Q Revision
  - Progress in Interworking TG
  - Revision required before Aug 2014
    - 7 amendments approved since 802.1Q-2011
      - 802.1aq, 802.1Qaz, 802.1Qbb, 802.1Qbc, 802.1Qbe, 802.1Qbf, 802.1Qbg
    - 4 new amendments in progress
      - 802.1Q Cor2, 802.1Qbp, 802.1Qbu, 802.1Qbv
  - Complete rolling 802.1D into 802.1Q
    - Conformance statements
  - 802.1AC alignment

EXISTING MAINTENANCE ITEMS

Maintenance Item – 0003
Inconsistent VID for LBR Frames

- Submission: Steve Haddock – March 2011
- Issues:
  - Multiple choices for selecting vlan_identifier
  - Non-normative language used to describe VID selection
  - Normative text for 20.28.2 is for PBB-TE only
  - Priority and drop eligibility determination also not specified.
  - No managed objects to set Primary VID for MIP
- Latest Status: Published
  - Steve Haddock introduced comment 283 on D4 of 802.1aq (July 2011) and it was accepted
  - It was implemented in Draft 4.3
  - Published in 802.1aq-2012

Maintenance Item – 0005
Missing enable for Link Aggregation TLV

- Submission: Pat Thaler – June 2011
- Issues:
  - When LinkAgg TLV was moved into 802.1 MIB, the enable was not included
  - Error in table D-5 for lldpV2Xdot1ConfigPortVlanTable. Reference and MIB text don't agree
  - Missing security considerations in D.4.4 for Congestion Notification
- Latest Status: Ready for Ballot
  - Waiting for a revision of 802.1AX to fix. PAR agreed to be modified
  - New maintenance item 0009 submitted to address sending LLDP on physical links
- Discussion
  - .1AXrev editor will ensure this comment is included for discussion
  - Subsequent resolution will be handled in the .1AXrev task group.

Maintenance Item – 0006
Corrigendum items for .1AS

- Submission: Geoff Garner – June 2011
- Issues:
  - Various
  - Actively being worked at a TG item
- Latest Status: Ready for Ballot
  - Waiting for AS Corrigendum ballot
- Discussion
  - Initial official draft of AS-Cor-1 has been balloted. AVB TG is keeping track of the bugs that need fixing in AS-Cor-1.

Maintenance Item – 0007
incorrect operPointToPointMAC references

- Submission: Craig Gunther – August 2011
- Issues:
  - When 802.1ak was rolled into 802.1Q it contained incorrect references to clause 6.4.3 for operPointToPointMAC. They should be 6.6.3.
- Latest Status: Published
  - Published in 802.1Qbg

Maintenance Item – 0008
MVRP cut-and-paste errors

- Submission: Craig Gunther – August 2011
- Issues:
  - MVPR1 and MVPR2 PICs items were pasted from MMRP items and remain incorrect
- Latest Status
  - "MVRP" change was made in Qbg, but references (10.8 & 11.2) were not changed
- Discussion
  - MVRP change published in 802.1Qbg
  - Change references in Q-REV

Maintenance Item – 0009
Disambiguating LLDP over Link Aggregations

- Submission: Jeffrey Lynch – September 2011

- Issues:
  - It is unclear how LLDP should operate over an aggregation
  - It is currently not possible to determine at the receiver if the LLDP frames were sent from a peer at the physical link or at the aggregate

- Latest Status: Received
  - Discussed at Nanjing Interim and at Atlanta Plenary - http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2011/maint-lynch-LLDP-over-LAG-0920-v1.pdf
  - We desire to have the ability to send/receive at the physical layer – can be done in AXbq.
  - Agreed to workout the technical details in AXbq – prefer a TPMR type Y to send/receive
  - Preferred to define new TLVs or new bits, thus modifying existing TLVs – prefer to wait for AX revision to fix MIBs and TLVs
  - Incldued as comment for AX-Rev to address.

- Discussion
  - To be discussed as part of AX-Rev.   Subsequent resolution will be handled there.
  - In current draft

Maintenance Item – 0010
Incorrect Annex reference

- Submission: Christian Boiger– September 2011
- Issues:
  - A reference to Annex G in 6.11.4 should really be a reference to Annex I
- Latest Status: Published
  - Published in 802.1Qbg

Maintenance Item – 0011

No recommended priority to traffic class mappings for credit-based shaper in table 8-4

- Submission: Christian Boiger– September 2011
- Issues:
  - Text recommends classes 5 and 6 for SR classes A & B, but should be 3 and 2.
  - Table references are wrong
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Balloted in Q-Cor-2
- Discussion
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0012

Missing MEP/MHF icons in fig 26-2

- Submission: Steve Haddock – September 2011
- Issues:
  - Visio source used for figures has a problem including MEP/MHF icons.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Balloted in Q-Cor-2
- Discussion
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0013

MRP address for MSRP does not exist

- Submission: Christian Boiger– October 2011
- Issues:
  - MSRP uses Nearest Bridge address, but text indicates there is a specific MRP application in Table 10-1 for this – there is not.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Balloted in Q-Cor-2
- Discussion
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0014

LLDP TLV error processing

- Submission: Paul Congdon, Pat Thaler – Nov 2011
- Issues:
  - 802.1AB text is not clear whether you discard entire LLDPDUs if an optional TLV is in error or simply discard the TLV.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Make it clear that you only discard the TLV if the error is in an optional TLV, but the PDU if the error is in the mandatory TLVs
- Discussion
  - New maintenance item 0027 includes this fix and additional clarification.
  - Included in 802.1AB Cor ballot

Maintenance Item – 0015
Clause number issue impacts PICS

- Submission: Craig Gunther – Nov 2011
- Issues:
  - A new clause 35.2.5 was inserted pushing other clauses up in numbering, but several old references in PICS were not adjusted.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Balloted in Q-Cor-2
- Discussion
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0017
Typos in PICS

- Submission: Craig Gunther – Nov 2011
- Issues:
  – SRP is sometimes transposed to SPR in PICS
- Proposed Resolution:
  – Balloted in Q-Cor-2
- Discussion
  – Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0018
Incorrect figure reference

- Submission: Steve Haddock– Nov 2011

- Issues:

  – Figure reference incorrect

- Proposed Resolution:

  – Change Figure 6-4 to Figure 26-2

- Discussion

  – Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0019
Incorrect Link Aggregation figure for bridges

- Submission: Steve Haddock– Nov 2011
- Issues:
  - Link aggregation diagram is show as a shim between MSAPs, but this doesn't work for bridge architecture
  - Similar issue was addressed in 802.1AC ballot comment.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Change Figure 6-3 usage of MSAP to SAP.
  - Delete MAC service line
  - Change 802.3 MAC to MAC
- Discussion
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0020
Inconsistent text when NumberOfValues is zero

- Submission: Rich Newpol – Dec 2011
- Issues:
  - In Q-2011, if NumberOfValues is zero then the ThreePackedEvents vector is not included, but BNF appears to imply NumberOfValues must not be zero and vector always included.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Fix BNF to indicate ThreePackedEvents vector is optional
  - Clearly state what happens when NumberOfValues is zero. In 10.8.2.8
- Discussion
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0021
TC must be configured for ETS to specify bandwidth

- Submission: Anoop Ghanwani – Jan 2012

- Issues:
  - Qaz does not make it clear that you can only configure bandwidth when the TC is configured for ETS.
  - Invalid TLVs should be discarded and stated in D2.9

- Proposed Resolution:
  - Indicated that the TC table must have values of 0 if the TC is not configured for ETS.

- Discussion
  - Since the Q-Cor-2 is by necessity having to address items that are amendments to Q-Rev, it is conceivable that we can incorporate a small change to address this item. Anoop has proposed the following text to the end of Clause D.2.9.7

    NOTE--While it is intended that only TCs configured for ETS will have a bandwidth value associated with them, it is possible, during configuration changes, to have situations where a TC is not configured for ETS but has a non-zero TCBandwidth percentage. In this case, the sum of all the TCBandwidth percentages must still be 100, but the TC bandwidth percentages of the non-ETS TCs would effectively be unused bandwidth and reallocated to the ETS TCs.

  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0022
MSTP MIB issues

- Submission: Ben Mack-Crane – Jan 2012
- Issues:
  - MSTP MIB is out of sync with revision of clause 13 of 802.1Q-2011
  - enableBPDUtx default is not consistent with ieee8021MstpCistPortEnableBPDURx in 23.5.10 and 23.5.11
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Change DEFVAL to true for the objects. See attached MIB.
- Discussion
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0024

Typos in 6.1.4 and 6.1.6

- Submission: John Messenger – Jan 2012

- Issues:

  - Space inserted in OperPointToPointMAC in 6.1.4

  - Identification miss spelled in 6.1.6

- Proposed Resolution:

  - Fix

- Discussion
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0025
Table for learned B-MAC addresses in PIP

- Submission: Maarten Vissers – Feb 2012
- Issues:
  - Use of the enableConnetionIdentifier parameter implies that the PIP must hold a table of addresses referenced by the connection_identifier, but no such table is described anywhere in the text.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Specify in 6.10 that the PIP contains a table and provide specifics detailed in maintenance request
  - Specify in 6.10.1 that a learning process stores the values
  - Specify in 6.10.2 that the table is used to find the B-DA value
- Discussion
  - How the connection_identifier value is used to obtain the B-MAC address is really implementation specific. There was a specific comment during the development of this to make sure the connection_identifier was an indirect reference to the actual MAC address and not explicit. This also allows the connection_identifier to contain other values for other port types (e.g. Port Extension). There was and is a strong desire to NOT have a learning/ageing function for this capability, so no additional table is required. Given this, we really don't have a problem here, but a clarification could be helpful and two proposals are on the table; Make the connection_identifier explicitly a MAC address for CBPs or insert a note that indicates this is implementation specific and in the case of a 1:1 mapping does not require any learning/ageing and can be stored in the existing FDB.
  - Steve Haddock proposes a note option -- seems safest. Consider the following for Q-Cor-2
    - Option2: insert a note to the effect that, "the connection_identifier is a 1:1 mapping to the DA MAC and does not require learning or ageing"
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0027

End of LLDPDU TLV error handling

- Submission: Paul Congdon – Feb 2012
- Issues:
  - Text is unclear how to handle error cases around the End of LLDPDU TLV. It is a mandatory TLV, but we appear to accept the PDU if it isn't present.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Two choices: always discard the PDU if the TLV is not present, or update all the places (6.6.1, 9.2.7.7.2) where we describe criteria for discarding the frame.
  - Proposed resolution in maintenance request assumes we try to salvage the PDU whenever possible.
- Discussion
  - Group discussed choices to resolve this. One easy way is to make the TLV optional instead of mandatory. It already is effectively optional since it isn't validated on receipt, though we stress it must be present on transmit.   The other option is to clearly document the current situation which is the intent of the proposed resolution in the maintenance item. Agreed to use the existing approach.
  - Included in draft 802.1AB Cor, in TG ballot

Maintenance Item – 0029

Missing T-Component creation text and ennumeration

- Submission: Ben Mack-Crane – Feb 2012
- Issues:
  - T-Component creation and its enumeration in the MIB were never added.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Add clause 17.5.2.x to describe T-Component creation
  - Add enumeration in MIB.
- Discussion
  - Propose inclusion to next draft of Q-Cor-2. There is, however, a ripple effect as there is no text on how to create a T-Component port as well.   Ben will propose some text for Tony to review at the plenary and to incorporate into the next draft.
  - The T-Component create is actually more complex and needs more study. We could create the MIB enumeration which is most important. Leave the part in 17.5.2.x about port creation undone, but add the simple sub-clause that mentions component creation and there is nothing specific needed (e.g. use B-component as an example).
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0031

Typo on MA_UNITDATA.x in 6.1.1

- Submission: Panagiotis Saltsidis – March 2012
- Issues:
  - M_UNITDATA.x should be MA_UNITDATA.x in 6.1.1. Two occurrences of this in the diagram.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Fix it
- Discussion
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0032

System Capabilities TLV

- Submission: Eric Multanen– March 2012

- Issues:
  - In figure 8-10, the TLV information string length field indicates that it should contain the value '4', but the actual length of the TLV information string, as shown in the figure, is '5'.

- Proposed Resolution:
  - The length should be 4. Revise figure 8-10 by removing the chassis ID subtype field.

- Latest status: Draft in TG ballot
  - Added to 802.1AB Cor1

Maintenance Item – 0033
Inconsistency of text for updtDigest()

- Submission: Mick Seaman – April 2012
- Issues:
  - In .1aq 13.29.32 updtDigest() the agreeND variable is stated to be the value of the Discarded Agreement Number (DAN), *transmitted *in SPT BPDU and SPB Hello PDUs. Elsewhere in .1aq   agreeND is a *received* DAN value.
  - Additionally in 13.29.32 updtDigest(), the agreedND variable is used as the *received* DAN, but is stated to be the *transmitted* DAN value in 13.27.12 and in 13.29.28 txRstp()
- Proposed Resolution:
  - In clause 13.29.32 updtDigest():
    - replace "Updates agreeDigest, agreeN, and agreedND" with "Updates agreeDigest and agreeN".
    - Replace all five occurences of "agreeND" with "agreedND",
    - Replace all four occurrences of "agreedND" with "agreeND"
  - Agree to include in Q-Cor-2
- Latest status:
  - Q-Cor-2-d2-0 submitted to RevCom

Maintenance Item – 0034

System Capabilities TLV (same as 0032)

- Submission: U Arunkumar– June 2012
- Issues:
  - In Figure 8-10, the TLV Information String length is shown as 4 but the TLV Information String shows 3 fields and a total of 5 octets.
  - the chassis ID subtype field has crept into this diagram during the revision - this field does not appear in the 2005
- Proposed Resolution:
  - The length should be 4. Revise figure 8-10 by removing the chassis ID subtype field.
- Latest status: Draft in TG ballot
  - Added to 802.1AB Cor1

Maintenance Item – 0036
MEPactive

- Submission: Weiying Cheng – June 2012
- Issues:
  - Clause 20.9.1 (MEPactive): "Administrative state of the MEP A Boolean indicating the administrative state of the MEP. True indicates that the MEP is to function normally, and false that it is to cease functioning"
  - Administrative or operational state
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Reword to make administrative clear
- Discussion:
  - When can the operational state differ from the administrative state? If these are significant then a separate objects may be needed.
  - MEPactive regulates all of the MEP state machines in parallel with BEGIN. There is not much opportunity for foul ups that would make an operational and an administrative pair for MEP active that would not be visible from the ieee8021CfmConfigErrorListTable.
  - The MEPactive variable controls all of the MEP state machines by holding them in the reset condition. The current description is adequate to convey the meaning of the variable. It does not appear that the suggested text has a significantly different meaning than the current text of 20.9.1 or the dot1agCfmMepActive MIB object.
  - Agree to add a note explaining why an Operational state is not needed.
  - Norm Finn will draft text -- Include in Q-REV

Maintenance Item – 0037

MEP operational state

- Submission: Weiying Cheng – June 2012
- Issues:
  - There is administrative state defined for MEP (MEPActive), but there is no operational state for MEP in 802.1Q-2011
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Clause 20.9:
    - Add x) MEPOperationalState (20.9.xx)
  - Clause 17
    - Add corresponding MIB objects
- Discussion: Reject (see 36)
  - MEPactive regulates all of the MEP state machines in parallel with BEGIN. There is not much opportunity for foul ups that would make an operational and an administrative pair for MEP active that would not be visible from the ieee8021CfmConfigErrorListTable.
  - The MEPactive variable is a "come from" variable that controls all of the MEP state machines by forcing them to the reset state. It is driven by the state of the dot1agCfmMepActive administrative object. When the object and variable transition between TRUE or FALSE, the state machines should start or stop operation with no discernible lag. The most likely reason that a MEP that is administratively enabled is that the physical port on which it is supposed to reside is physically absent. This could be discovered by examining the dot1agCfmMepIfIndex object; a 0 value indicates that the MEP has no port on which to run. Any configuration problems can be detected using the ieee8021CfmConfigErrorListTable. While it is true that an "operational state" variable could therefore differ from the state of dot1agCfmMepActive, the Working Group feels that the additional information supplied by an operational object would be of too little utility to justify its implementation.

Maintenance Item – 0038

user priority

- Submission: Ben Mack-Crane – July 2012
- Issues:
    - In reviewing 802.1AC some editorial issues were noted in text that is also included in 802.1Q-2011. The same editorial corrections should be made in 802.1Q unless the affected text is removed in favor of maintaining a single copy in 802.1AC.
- Proposed Resolution:
    - 6.1.2 Replace ", but include all of" with "(but include all of)".
    - 6.7.1 Replace "Default User Priority" with "Default Priority".
    - 6.7.2 Replace "user_priority" with "priority" (two occurrences).
    - 6.7.2 Replace "Default_User_Priority" with "Default Priority".
    - 6.7.4.1.1 Replace "user_priority" with "priority".
    - 6.7.4.2.1 Replace "user_priority" with "priority".
    - There are additional instances of "user priority" that could be replaced with "priority" in clauses 12.13.3.3.3 b), 12.13.3.4.2 d), and C.3.3.1 and Figure G-1.
- Discussion
    - The intent is that 6.1 and 6.7 will be removed from 802.1Q as part of the alignment with 802.1AC, so only the additional instances will need to be changed to "user priority"
    - Target for 802.1Q revision

NEW MAINTENANCE ITEMS

Maintenance Item – 0039
LAG TLV

- Submission: Norm Finn – July 2012

- Issues:
  - Clause E.8 of 802.1AB has been moved to P802.1AX-REV Annex E.1. It needs to be removed from 802.1AB, and references to .1AB E.8 changed to refer to 802.1AX E.1.

- Proposed Resolution:
  - Delete Clause E.8 from 802.1AB, and change references to .1AB E.8 to refer to 802.1AX E.1.

- Discussion: Reject
  - Clause E of 802.1AB is now in 802.1Q-2011 Annex D
  - This is too soon to consider and should be proposed after the approval of 802.1AX-REV

Maintenance Item – 0041

SRP title

- Submission: Tony Jeffree – August 2012
- Issues:
  - Clause 35 is titled "Stream Registration Protocol"
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Change title to "Stream Reservation Protocol"

- Discussion
  - Agreed.
  - Target for 802.1Q-REV

Maintenance Item – 0042

MRP Attribute Propagation

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - Propagation of an attribute through the network follows the active topology of the Spanning Tree Instance associated with that attribute.
  - The wording of 10.3, if strictly followed, does not necessarily achieve this goal. One result is that it could allow for declarations to be propagated from blocked ports.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - " For a given MRP application and MAP Context (10.3.1), and for the set of Ports that are in a Forwarding state as defined by that MAP Context: " becomes
  - " For a given MRP application and MAP Context (10.3.1), and for the set of Ports that are in a Forwarding state as defined by that MAP Context, and for the set of attributes associated with that MAP Context: "
- Discussion
  - Mick Seaman will review the MRP set and report back on recommendation

Maintenance Item – 0043
MRPDU transmission actions

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:

    - 10.6.7.1 conflicts with 10.3.e

- Proposed Resolution:

    - Change to
    - " 10.7.6.1 MRPDU transmission actions Unless stated otherwise in these action definitions, MRPDU transmission as a result of the operation of a state machine in a Bridge occurs only through the Port associated with that state machine.

- Discussion: reject

    - There appears to be no conflict given the introduction "unless stated otherwise" and the suggested conflict falls into this case. The action definitions are part of the state machine.
    - Mick Seaman will review the MRP set and report back on recommendation

Maintenance Item – 0044
Applicant State Machine

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
    - it is unclear when to consider the Applicant and Registrar state machines as 'discarded'.
- Proposed Resolution:
    - Insert a new note 9 before MRP design notes to Table 10-3 (applied to the intersections of STATE columns VO, AO, QO & EVENTS "rLv! || rLA! || Re-declare!"): "This state transition is ignored if responding to rLA! and the Registrar state machine associated with this attribute value is MT."
    - Insert a new note 10 before MRP design notes to Table 10-3 (applied to the intersections of STATE columns VO, AO, QO and EVENTS txLA! and txLAF!): "This state transition is ignored if the Registrar state machine associated with this attribute value is MT."
- Discussion
    - Mick Seaman will review the MRP set and report back on recommendation

Maintenance Item – 0045
Flush!

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - The current behavior of the Registrar state table (Table 10-4) results in the permanent registration of the associated attribute, as the MRP application is never made aware of the Registrar's state change.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Regarding Table 10-4, state "IN", event "Flush!":

  - Replace "MT" with " Lv MT "
- Discussion
  - This was discussed in 802.1ak D7.0 PDIS comment 45 (Nov 2006)
    - REJECT: As this is an efficiency issue this kind of change needs more detailed study.
  - Panos suggest that he believes the "Lv" may have been deleted by accident
  - Mick Seaman will review the MRP set and report back on recommendation

Maintenance Item – 0046
Initiating VLAN membership declaration

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012

- Issues:
  - The last paragraph of 11.2.3.2.1 describes behavior on receipt of ES_DEREGISTER_VLAN_MEMBER but the last line refers improperly to ES_REGISTER_VLAN_MEMBER

- Proposed Resolution: "
  - Change ES_REGISTER_VLAN_MEMBER occuring in last line of 11.2.3.2.1 to ES_DEREGISTER_VLAN_MEMBER.

- Discussion
  - Mick Seaman will review the MVRP set and report back on recommendation

Maintenance Item – 0047

Registrar Administrative Controls

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - The propagation of statically set VLANs is implied, but no mechanism is defined to actually propagate such information.
  - Specifically, simply being in the "IN" state of the Registrar state machine does not trigger an indication to the MVRP Application.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Change last paragraph of 10.7.2 to:
  - If the value of this parameter is 'Registration Fixed', In and JoinIn messages are sent. If the value of this parameter is 'Registration Forbidden', Empty or JoinEmpty messages are sent.
- Discussion
  - Mick Seaman will review the MVRP set and report back on recommendation

Maintenance Item – 0048

Use of "new" declaration capability

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - 11.2.5 should more clearly state what information will be removed when a new indication is received.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Clarify that only the "Dynamic Filtering Entry" is affected.
  - Change the last paragraph of 11.2.5 to
    - When any MVRP declaration marked as "new" is received on a given Port, either as a result of receiving an MVRPDU from the attached LAN (MAD_Join.indication), or as a result of receiving a request from MAP or the MVRP Application (MAD_Join.request), any Dynamic Filtering Entries in the filtering database for that Port and for the VID corresponding to the attribute value in the MAD_Join primitive are removed.
- Discussion
  - Mick Seaman will review the MVRP set and report back on recommendation

Maintenance Item – 0049

MAP context for MSRP

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - This is unclear as no part of 35.2.4 references spanning trees.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Change: "The Declarations are filtered according to the state of the spanning tree, as described in 35.2.4."
  - to
  - "The Declarations are filtered according to the requirements of 35.2.4 and its subclauses and according to the state of the spanning tree per 35.1.3.1."
- Discussion
  - Agreed.
  - Target for 802.1Q-REV

Maintenance Item – 0050

MSRP Requirements

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - Clause 5.4.4 requires MSRP to make use of the MAP operation specified in 10.3.1; however, clause 10.3 points to 35.2.4, which simply indicates its different from 10.3
  - 5.4.4, 10.3, and 35.2.4 must be made consistent.
  - Currently, there is no MAP behavior defined for how new or non-new

    attributes are propagated or what to do when tcDetected occurs.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Remove the conflict between 5.4.4 and 10.3/35.2.4.
- Discussion
  - Craig Gunther proposes alternative to change text in 10.3 (i.e., the pointer is an extension to MAP instead of a full definition for MSRP) and will propose text
  - Target for 802.1Q-REV

Maintenance Item – 0051

Failure Information

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - No information is conveyed identifying the Bridge Port.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - strike "and Bridge Port" from 35.2.2.8.7
- Discussion
  - Agreed.
  - Target for 802.1Q-REV

Maintenance Item – 0052

streamAge

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - The goal -- Stream age starts when the stream starts forwarding, not when the entry is first made to the DRE (Dynamic Reservations Entries)
- Proposed Resolution:
  - 35.2.1.4(c) proposed language (below)
  - streamAge: A per-stream 32-bit unsigned value used to represent the time, in seconds, since the control element for the associated port most recently became forwarding in the Dynamic Reservation Entry (8.8.7) corresponding to the stream's destination_address. This value is used when determining which streams have been configured the longest. Streams with a numerically larger streamAge are considered to be configured earlier than other streams, and therefore carry a higher implicit importance."
- Discussion
  - Agree in principle, Craig Gunther will review to confirm the wording is accurate and report back.

Maintenance Item – 0053

streamAge MIB

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - The first sentence of the DESCRIPTION of ieee8021SrpReservationStreamAge Is sufficient to allow for Endstations (Talkers or Listeners) or Bridges to set the value however the implementation determines endstation stream age, and via 35.2.1.4c for Bridges.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Replace DESCRIPTION of with (i.e, delete last two sentences):
  - "The number of seconds since the reservation was established on this port."
- Discussion
  - Agree in principle, Craig Gunther will review to confirm the wording is accurate and report back.

Maintenance Item – 0054
MAP context for MSRP

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - No statement is made regarding whether MSRPDUs are tagged in MST environments.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - In 35.2.4, replace:
  - "All MSRPDUs sent and received by MSRP Participants in SST Bridges are transmitted as untagged frames."
  - with:
  - "All MSRPDUs sent and received by MSRP Participants in SST or MST Bridges are transmitted as untagged frames."
- Discussion
  - Proposal is: "All MSRPDUs sent by MSRP Participants Bridges are transmitted as untagged frames."
  - Andre Fredette will study this, compare to 11.2.3.1.1 & 2, and report back

Maintenance Item – 0055

MSRP Attribute propagation

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - MSRP does not define any further action to take upon receipt of 'new'.
  - It is desireable to explicitly state any action desired, or none if no action is desired (which is presumed in this case).
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Add a subclause after the current 35.2.6 and before 35.2.7 similar to 10.12.3 defined as:
  - 35.2.6 Use of "new" declaration capability
  - MSRP does not make use of the 'new' declaration capability.
- Discussion
  - Craig Gunther will study if this is necessary and report back
  - This is related to item 0050

Maintenance Item – 0056

MSRP MAP

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
    - MSRP MAP functionality is currently not clearly defined.
- Proposed Resolution:
    - Replace :
        - "a) A MAD_Join.indication adds a new attribute to MAD (with the new parameter, 10.2, set to TRUE);"
    - with:
        - a) A MAD_Join.indication adds a new attribute to MAD;"
        - b) A MAD_Join.indication is received with the 'new' parameter, 10.2, set to TRUE;"
- Discussion
    - Craig Gunther will study if this is necessary and report back
    - This is related to item 0050

Maintenance Item – 0057

MRP Attribute propagation

- Submission: Bob Noseworthy – August 2012
- Issues:
  - The existing text is unclear as to which "Port" is referenced in 10.3.a "If the value of tcDetected for the Port..." as it could refer to either:
    - "received by MAP from a given Port" (the ingress Port)
    - "each other Port" (egress Ports)
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Change to
  - "If the value of tcDetected for the given Port..."
- Discussion
  - This is editorial, but provisionally agree to make the change.
  - Mick Seaman will review the MRP set and report back on recommendation