IEEE 802.1 Minutes, March 2005

Attendees

Vincent	Alesi
Paul	Amsden
Floyd	Backes
Paul	Bottorff
Richard	Brand
Kevin	Brown
Jim	Burns
Frank	Chao
Muralidharan	Chilukoor
David	Chin
Paul	Congdon
Sharam	Davari
Arjan	de Heer
Egied	Dekoster
Russel	Dietz
Linda	Dunbar
Anush	Elangovan
Hesham	Elbakoury
David	Elie-Dit-Cosaque
Uri	Elzur
Don	Fedyk
Norm	Finn
Henry	Fowler
David	Frattura
Ilango	Ganga
Anoop	Ghanwani
Ken	Grewal
Steve	Haddock
Takafumi	Hamano
Asif	Hazarika
Gopal	Hegde
Romain	Insler
Vipin	Jain
Tony	Jeffree
Michael	Johas Teener
Mohan	Kalkunte
Pi-Feng	Kang
Tetsuya	Kawakami
Yongbum	Kim
Marc	Kimpe
Yoav	Kluger
Nenad	Kreculj
Loren	Larsen
Yannick	Le Goff
Jeff	Lynch
David	Martin
Tom	Mathey

Shashank	Merchant
John	Messenger
Dinesh	Mohan
Bob	Moskowitz
Ravi	Nalamati
Don	O'Connor
Karen	O'Donoghue
Hiroshi	Ohta
John	Osswald
Glenn	Parsons
Ken	Patton
Karen	Randall
Allyn	Romanow
Dan	Romascanu
Jessy V	Rouyer
Ali	Sajassi
Panagiotis	Saltsidis
John	Sauer
Mick	Seaman
Koichiro	Seto
Curtis	Simonson
Matt	Squire
Larry	Stefani
Krishnamurthy	Subramanian
Muneyoshi	Suzuki
Yoshihiro	Suzuki
Francois	Tallet
Geoff	Thompson
Genadi	Velev
John	Viega
Dennis	Volpano
Manoj	Wadekar
Timothy	Walker
Dan	Wartski
Ludwig	Winkel
Amy	Wong
Michael D.	Wright

Pre-Meeting Monday, March 14, 2005

Device identification met in parallel with the ad meeting

P8021.ad ballot disposition – Steve Haddock

Discuss about how to get the MIB into a document.

No one is "volunteering" to lead the project.

What is the scope of the MIB that is needed in AD and does this modify existing MIB or does it modify something that does not yet exist.

How does this relate to the work in IETF that is finishing up the bridge MIB?

It will be a timing issue whether the IETF effort can be included in AD.

General consensus is the timing for dropping the IETF MIB into AD is not the place.

The problem is then the MIBs do not have a home. Need agreement that we will find a home for the MIBs.

Do need a note in AD that the work will be done somewhere soon after AD.

Number of comments on definitions – no way to generalize
Comments on capitalization – lower case is used when it is a generalization and upper case is used when it is a proper noun.
Discussion about where the VLAN translation table should reside – move to the EISS
Define in general so in the future other technology can use it without going back and changing the definition
Discussion of port based VLAN support – currently no way for provider Edge Bridge to do port based VLAN.
Issues of customer spanning trees and provider edge bridge – Mick Seaman
Presentation on web site http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2005/ad-seaman-provider-edge-bridge-spanning-tree-0205-11.pdf
Discussion
The understanding is that MEF is working on incorporating ad into their standard to help solve the customer spanning tree issues
Discussion of Comment 62 – Steve Haddock
Review of ballot comments – Steve Haddock
The official disposition is on the web site
The goal of this meeting is going to confirmation ballot out of this meeting
This would get AD to sponsor ballot in July
Discussion about the definitions of Provider Bridges, Provider Edge Bridges, Service and Customer
Steve will remove WARE from SVLAN-Aware

Opening Plenary, Monday, March 14, 2005

Administrative stuff – Tony Jeffree
Voting Membership – Tony Jeffree
TG and WG operations – Tony Jeffree
Patent Policy – Tony Jeffree
The required slides where shown and discussed so the committee members are aware of the IEEE patent policy
Photography/Recording devices – Tony Jeffree
They can not be used in the meeting without the permission of all attendees
May Interim – Tony Jeffree
Cisco sponsoring in Berlin (198 Euros/night) no meeting fee if you stay. The room block is for sixty people
There will be a web site setup
The session will be from Monday noon till Friday noon
Report on Exec Committee Meeting – Tony Jeffree
1550 attendees another record this week
1900.1 Broadband over power lines PAR
Online training – train folks into what 802 does
My Ballot – all web based balloting fully automated for sponsor ballots
Radia Perlman – Tuesday tutorial – this is routing using MAC addresses
BOF at last week's IETF 25% yes WG 25% no WG 50% don't know enough yet
The problem space is still not clear

Discussion about one plenary per year being outside the US
This is fallout of the 802.11i and Chinese WAPI proposal issues
Entity balloting – motion passed that we do individual balloting. Tony will propose a rule change that explicit states individual voting
SC6 WAPI/802.11i
11i is back on the fast track
WAPI submission fell foul of procedural stuff
Proposal is in limbo at this time
Large number of rules change ballots will come up on Friday
Attempt to update rules to reflect current IEEE operations
Architecture group
Lot of education that needs to be accomplished within the other working groups
We probably need to think about how to educate 802 on some of this
EC ad-hoc meetings this week

Liaison reports

TIA – TR41.4 – Dave Futtura
Final doc using LLDP
How we can provide back to 802.1 the documents – they use entities so getting documents to individuals is a problem

802.11 – Bob Moskowitz
11s is looking at proposals on mesh
Bob is proposing a security model

IETF – Bob Moskowitz
Low PAN – 802.15.4 devices looking at security and meshing

IETF – Paul Congdon
Radius – Draft 3 of 802 extensions not official work yet but it will be
EAP – final call for EAP extensions

ITU – Dinesh Mohan
SG13 – Ethernet OAM
SG15 - .1ah and .1ad are being factored in so we need to check

Agenda – Mick Seaman

Tutorial on device identification will be in July
Monday
4.00 – 5.00 Q Rev Ballots
3.30 – 4.00 Device id discussions
Tuesday
9.00 – 12.30 P802.1ad ballot resolutions
9.00 – 12.30 P802.1af Document structure, initial draft
1.5 hours in afternoon – 802.16 discussions needed
1.30 – 5.00 P802.1AE ballot resolutions
1.30 – 5.00 ITU-T SG13/15 updates
1.30 – 5.00 ag CFM discussion for next draft
1.30 – 5.00 Provider Backbone Bridges, progress to initial draft
Wednesday
9.00 – 12.30 P802.1ah

	P802.1ak, Multiple Registration Protocol
9.00 – 12.30	< reserved for link security>
1.30 – 5.00	802.3 Congestion Management
2.45	802.3 Residential Ethernet
3.45	802.3as Frame Expansion
1.30 – 5.00	Wireless Management

Thursday

9.00-12.00	P802.1ak Multiple Registration Protocol continued
	P802.1aj TMR, Two Port MAC Relay (Jeffree)
	Two port MAC Relay Scope (Martin)
	Position in sublayer stack (Seaman)
9.00 – 12.00	<reserved for continuation of other discussion>
1.30 – 3.00	Closing Plenary

Secure Identification PAR – John Viega

Review the PAR

Questions – does this apply to two port MAC relays?

Discussion about what is the definition of a device

A device that can be addressed can participate in Device ID protocol

Review of the 5 criteria

This project will not require any new registration authority there are mechanisms that allow this protocol to work

Next steps – in the closing plenary will vote to send to the exec committee

This will allow the PAR to be approved in the July

P802.1Q Rev Re-circulation Ballot comments – Tony Jeffree

The official ballot disposition is kept on the web site

Comment 36

There was discussion about dealing with this comment

The feeling in the room was this comment should be rejected because it is not possible to maintain the standard and keep it in sync with current work

Question "Who would change there vote if there was a diagram put in?"

There was indication that some folks would change yes to no vote if this comment was accepted.

Tuesday AM, March 15, 2005

P802.1ad ballot resolution met in parallel with the LinkSec

P802.1af document structure – Mick Seaman

This presentation is on the web site at http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2005/af-seaman-amending1X-0105-02.pdf

Discussions about how wireless folks have implemented 11i and 1x and how we can modify 1x to allow for the implementations and make life easier for the implementers

Another presentation http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2005/af-seaman-uncontrolled-ports-0305-10.pdf

This is discussing how to sort out the position and functionality of the y function in 1x

Multiple CAs per Port – Paul Congdon

This presentation is at http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2005/ae-congdon-multi-ca-0305.pdf

Using virtual ports is never worse than VLANs
Using VLANs would constraint how VLANs could be used which affect legacy deployments
Observation – most implementation join the control and uncontrolled ports at the top end, which is part of the problem
Discussion about where the demux element should be for determining if the frame is PAE or some other protocol
There was debate about whether there should be one demux or first demux routes to controlled or uncontrolled and then the PAE would demux to a PAE instance or a legacy protocol stack
We need to think about running EAPOL over non-SCI systems
What needs to be changed in the draft to support this model?
Several options
Leave as is
Show multiple ports being built out of what we have today
Need to set down and pull the demux down and write the text and see what affect it causes
No one wants to hold up AE for this but we need to look AE draft to see affect
The ports are seen as ports by the bridge architecture so all of the bridge facilities are available
Making sure AF requirements are understood sufficiently so AE will not have to be modified
Probably will not have many CAs per port, but no knowledge at this time
The current architecture does not care it is an implementation issue

Tuesday PM, March 15, 2005

Joint meeting with .16 to discuss architecture issues – D J Johnston (802.16)

Somewhat informal session
Context - .16 has some questions and it was thought it would be good to get the questions asked in this venue.
Sought to duplicate many of the services available in DOCSIS, including the security components
PKM protocol
In the CS layer there are several types of services offered – ATM, 802.3, and 802.1. The 802.1 is a VLAN tagging services. Most folks are implementing 802.3.
The CS layer creates a carrier for EAP frames outside of 802.1x
This is close to 802.1x except you are saying use this port not that port
Discussed the roaming problem of 802.16 clients to 802.16 base stations and how the keys are derived
It was observed that pre-auth does not work after discussions with cell operators
Discussion
There was discussion this morning about what has to happen to 1x to make it work for AE

In the future we want to sort out how protocols work on the uncontrolled port
We realize when we look at .1x it is like a control switch which is not the architecture we use in MACSec - there is not the occurring above
Where we are going is PAE is tied to the data stream a bit lower down in the stack
The multiplexing function gives you a pair of ports
This architecture allows you to have the service running over "the wet string" service
.16 might be able to use the architecture of AE and AF then you may have solution to the .16 problems
How .1 is looking at doing the Y function in .1x could be useful for .16
The initial focus is .3 asked for this work but wanted it done in such a way that it could be used across many different MAC types
This work has been focused on infrastructures
If we do a good job then protecting logical wires should be straight forward
If .1x is coming up with a framework that .16 can be used that is a good thing and .16 should do it that way

Key naming issue – Mick Seaman

MBS – Phillip Barber

Tens of thousands of clients with shared key
One client drops out you have to re-key
Created a re-key interval so all of the clients do not try to re-key at once

After the break the committee split up into LinkSec and Provider Bridges

P802.1ae Ballot Comment Review – Allyn Romanow

This will not be an official resolution of comments – it will be more a discussion
Comment Clause 5.2 Jim Burns & John Viega – Issue - text is contradictory in cipher suites allowed
This is "What cipher suites we want to allow?" and "what should be in the criteria for user specified?"
This is the cipher not the mode
This is what ciphers one must have to be conformant anyone can drop in their cipher and use it
If someone did all the ciphers and a proprietary cipher could they claim conformance? No was the consensus
You have to close down otherwise folks will do a weak cipher and claim conformance
Does NIST endorse or approve? Approve so wording should change to approved cipher standard.
John Viega's second bullet – discussion of what is academically peer-reviewed means
John's number 6 bullet move to 2
No known attack of complexity of less than 2^^100
Use Mick's formatting comments when incorporating John's comments
Comment clause 6.7 Jim Burns

This text is too detailed
Accept comment

Comment clause 6.7 Paul Congdon
It is only auto that is important
There may be reasons to set false if only one person in CA

Comment clause 6.9 Tony Jeffree
Need to get a mechanism to record maintenance items for 802.1d

Comment clause 6.10 Paul Congdon
You could turn off replay protection – not a good idea
Paul will supply text
Did we end up with a window of vulnerability?
We decided not to "score board"
This prevents time delay attacks
If use IPSec mechanism then it does not scale
Have a configurable re-play window no score board within the window
If you are concerned with re-play then the window size is 1
If you are concerned with re-ordering then need window

Comment clause 7.1 Allyn Romanow
Can not confuse the ports and the state the ports are in
In the case where validate frames is strict then D can not send frames in the CA but it could use frames on the un-controlled port
This section is talking about secure connectivity so don't discuss un-controlled port

Comment clause 7.1 John Viega
2^^64 lifetime of one key
After some discussion John decided the comment is incorrect
An SA can be re-keyed off the SAK or a separate EAP fetch new master key, you have used an EAP method based on your credentials, and lifetime is independent of any sub-key generation method
If there are constraints then it should be greater than 10 years
After 2^^64 encryption operations the key is "toast" – used up
SC life is across encryption keys
After more discussion there was a need to clarify the text by distinguishing key dependencies
A single SC key will generate SA key so need clarify lifetime of SC and the relationship with SA

Comment Clause 7.1.2 John Viega
Don't make text impossible for SC to have different keys
This structure implies that you must have different keys – this is what the comment is about
The problem is the text implies all the keys must differ
Or it is an issue with how you define the SC

Comment Clause 7.1.3 Paul Congdon
Because of document history there was a phase where the SecY knew a lot more about what is going on – the SecY was looking after itself. Turns out this was not a good model – SecY has to do what it was told

This is a description of the whole system not of the SecY it is the KaY that will drive this
This is a case of history
We need to something about the KaY – this is a context setting clause
Should say something the KaY will drive MAC operational FALSE when out of PN and KaY is not working
SecY has to know when the space is exhausted but the KaY recovers
What happens in this scenario?
On the transmit if PN is out the MAC op is false
On the receive side if PN is out then can not receive from any other peer – you know because there is no CA or the PN space is empty.
A CA can not have a single station

Comment Clause 7.1.3 How many SA per SC Allyn Romanow
By limiting by 2 you can not be guaranteed to swap master key
If you have message loss and folks leaving group then you have problems – 50 stations in 50 stations out per second then you have problems

Comment Clause 7.2 Paul Congdon
Multiple CA per LAN
This needs to be reconsidered in light of the discussions this morning in the discussion about multiple CAs per LAN
Paul and Mick should get together to sort out how to re-do the text of 7.2
Discussion
Shouldn't AE be consistent with the multiple access stuff?
Yes, but we have to consider how to add the multiple access stuff.
One way is infrastructure and security and the other way is both at once. This is the current discussion point
LAN Service has not been defined – may need to search a remove/replace

Comment Clause 8.2.6 Jim Burns
Modify the suggested change to remove the KaY since it is not under consideration here
This is telling how the KaY does it
We do not want to have to come back to this when we do AF
Truncate at "to a peer"

Comment 8.2.7 Mick Seaman
This may constrain AF so it needs to be removed for now and will be picked up in AF
We need enough here for folks that do not use AF
If folks are rolling their own then they need to replace the KaY

Wednesday AM, March 16, 2005

P802.1ae comment discussions – Allyn Romanow

Comment Clause 8.1.7 – Dan Romascanu & Mick Seaman
Discussion about counters and how to call out the counters that are telling you bad things are happening on your network without calling it intrusion detection

Suggested to combine 8.1.7 and 8.1.8 using Mick's comments and delete the 8.1.7 heading

Comment Clause 8.2.4 Dan & Mick

Should the paragraph be re-written as Mick suggested or should it be deleted?

The P802.1af in q) in 1.2 must be removed so it says Key Agreement

Comment State of Document – Karen Randall

Comment Clause 3.22 – Karen Randall

Should we use standard definitions rather than our own? Yes, we should use the other standards definitions

Comment Clause 3.23 – Karen Randall

Accept comment

Also, Karen will go through definitions to see if there are changes to make consistent with security industry definitions

Comment Clause 6 – Dennis Volpano

Accept

Comment Clause 6.5 – Frank Chao

Default value for adminPoint2PointMac needed

There is no default value and variable is specified in .1D

Comment Clause 6.10 – Ken Patton

There should be a note about MTU around Line 47 Page 43

Comment Clause 7.3.1 – Les Bell

No intention of the document to tell you how to do it - the bridge standard and the radius RFC will provide the information

Need to add RFC 3580 to reference list

7.3.1 needs a bit of a tweak to make sure folks know client policies are not in scope but also give pointer to where to find the information

Comment Clause 8.2.4 – Les Bell

Covered in previous

Comment Clause 8.2.5 – Michael Wright

Accept in principle – shorten the clause

The KaY supports mutual authentication

Comment Clause 8.3 figure 8-2 – Mick Seaman

The generic AAD interface does not work and we are pushing to limit the choices here. We need to make this specific

Go through the whole document to see where the other references to AAD are and make sure they are not broken

Comment Clause 8.3 – Les Bell

Typo – accept

Comment Clause 9.2 Allyn Romanow

The ICV should be 16 bytes

Nope, should be a range of size

To make the text consistent do not talk about size in other places in the text

8 to 16 is the correct answer

Comment Clause 9.9 – Jim Burns

OUI 000000 is owned by Xerox
We should pick a curious value to indicate an invalid value
We can use all F's

Comment 9.8 Paul Bottorff
We are okay with the current key size

Comment clause 9.5 – Allyn Romanow
If it is clear and the encryption bit is clear then remove MACSec header and trailer then you have the original text
Even if not encrypted you still must be able to parse to do deep packet inspection
Discussion about if the text is clear enough and the use case of a sniffer application trying to parse the frame
May need a table based on the multiple CA discussions yesterday
Probably need to combine the definition of the two bits C & E such that their definitions are not independent
When both C & E are set currently it is nonsense with multiple CAs it will be an indicator
There was a bit of discussion about the use of C & E bits for multiple CA support

Comment Clause 9.9 Les Bell
Accept

Comment Figure 10.5 – Frank Chao
Accept

Comment Clause 10.6.2 – Dennis Volpano
Looking at figure 10-5 Page 79, what would an implementer encounter when handling the parallel processing
The implementation model is there are several frames proceeding through the processing you must wait until out of the parallel processing and back into serial processing to detect the re-play attack
You could do the re-play protection after the validation but that would create problems for the validation engine when an attack is occurring
Depending on the location of the replay check the affect on management counters could operate differently – Conformance test can cause failures because of different mechanisms for bumping the counters
Need to add definition of preliminary and/or refer to figure 10-6 where first re-play check is occurring

Comment Page 38 Line 22 – Tom Mathey
Multipoint connectivity may or may be different than a shared media
EPON is an example of point to multipoint
There are lots of emulated LANs implemented in 802
Need definition of multipoint in the definition section

Comment page 49 Line 27 – Tom Mathey
Separate the parameter from its encoding
The issue is what to do when the SCI is set
Need a tweak in clause 9 to state if SCI is explicitly encoded Page 65 Line 45

In clause 9 need to change the name so it references the encoded field
Amend figure 9.2 saying that the SCI is optional
There does need to be text to explain the multiple virtual machine case – someone needs to provide the text
Need to describe point to point as a relationship between two peers not physical media

Comment page 50 line 15 – Tom Mathey
Accept in principle

Comment page 50 line 21 – Tom Mathey
Use replayProtect to turn off replay protection
Delete lines 21 and 22

Wednesday PM, March 16, 2005

This afternoon there will be three joint meetings with 802.3 CM, Residential Ethernet, and Frame Expansion

Joint meeting with 802.3 Congestion Management – Manoj Wadekar

This is discussion items not a specific proposal at this time
I/O in the datacenter can be consolidated around 10 Gig Ethernet
SAN, LAN, and IPC traffic has different requirements but when combined onto a single Ethernet network need that underlying Ethernet to account for the different requirements
Agreed that VLANs are not to be used for partition
1p is a way to think of a class of control
8 classes cover a lot of territory
Don't go down the path of paramerterizing your QOS but parameterize your behavior – here is my service model so then you can ask "How close to the service model do you need to be?"
Flow handling and how do you know you have a frame for a particular flow – you have to be able to do both
Datacenter will require in the beginning with three traffic buckets
There may be a need for a fourth – the "I don't care bucket"
Start by looking RVSP IntServe that is start looking at the top and decide what it is you do not need
This is not a proposal but is saying here is the problem how will you get to a solution
If only need three classes then DiffServe can get you to an answer
What does not exist that you need to solve this problem?
Everybody does this but there is not standard way to do this
If everybody in one class is using different from another class the trouble – this is the problem – no standard way to setup the behavior of the mixed classes consistently across vendors

Joint meeting with 802.3 Residential Ethernet – Michael D Johas Teener

This is to explain to 802.1 what Residential Ethernet is about
Time-sensitive delivery in residential deployments
Auto configuration must be required

Admission control
Need to bridge to other MACs so 802.1 is needed in this world
Hook up consumer electronics using Ethernet – replace 1394
We need help from 1D – this needs to be discussed
Need help with admission control and perhaps same type of things the Congestion Management folks are asking for
Need to look at it as a system
Do not want to constrain beyond what the network already does such as one hop only
There is a legacy base already installed in the home and we need to take care of that base
This is a touchy issue – other organizations are making in the home are already using Ethernet - legacy may not work or work in degraded mode
It is a hope that the 1p stuff will work
What will be requested of 802.1?
For sure there will be request to tighten up the timing requirements
This was a bit controversial
Need to get started – there is an issue between how 802.1 and 802.3 operates
It is possible that the existing MAC and 802.1p bridges will work
Too many gotcha getting the legacy stuff to work

Joint meeting with 802.3 Frame Expansion – Kevin Danes

Update
One frame format with three possible length, 1518, 1522, and 1982 data (2000 with header) envelope frame
Will ask 802.3 to ratify this tomorrow afternoon
This proposal does not specify the contents of the extra bytes because there is not an enforcement mechanism
Next update will be at the July Plenary

Thursday AM, March 17, 2005

MRP frame format – Tony Jeffree

Review of the current draft of this project
The current draft is at http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/private/ak-drafts/d1/802-1ak-d1-0.pdf
Discussion about assigning addresses and where to assign for LLDP and 802.1x
Assigning the addresses is one issue but any further protocol issues should not be addressed at this time
Do not want one address per protocol
Is the editor of 802.1ad prepared to put something together?
There should be an address for talking from A to B
Discussion about getting this nailed down soon
It was observed that no amount of words can stop silly folks from doing silly things
Consensus – need a set of address that will allow the reach-ability and then the protocol is assigned with the type field. It might be necessary to

segregate slow and high volume traffic. Steve will get with Mick and Norm to sort out how to put this in the draft

Back to review of the AK draft

If trees start to reconfigure before the information has fully propagated then interesting and bizarre things can happen

This is a known problem

P802.1aj – Two Port MAC Relay Scope - Dave Martin

This presentation is at http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2005/aj-martin-1-0305.pdf

Discussion about whether this device should be "service aware" and what is the definition of service aware

The device should support Pause

The device may need to be aware of SLA versus wire capabilities such that it can throttle traffic if the traffic exceeds the SLA such that the SLA provides an 80 Mbs but the link is 100 Mbs then the device will insure that only 80 Mbs is provided

Data transfer should be defined in terms of 802.1D ISS

Development of a MIB should be in the scope of the this project

Next steps

Why in P802.1Q because it is tied with terminology that is being put in Q

D does not have provider bridging terminology

It needs to be in Q because it is part of provider bridging

Tony will have an initial draft by the May meeting

Shortest Path Bridges – Mick Seaman

This presentation is at http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2005/new-seaman-shortest-path-0305-01.pdf

MSTP Reflection Vector – Norm Finn

This presentation is at http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2005/new-nfinn-mstp-vector-0305.ppt

Discussion

This fixes the "nearest neighbor in a ring" problem

This allows multicast and plug and play

Don't want a world where multicast is not important

Need to support the legacy world

Have to convince the world that bridging can solve these problems

No definite proposals need more discussion

Need something that would generate a press release

The IETF has been discussing but not getting good traction

Thursday PM, March 17, 2005

P802.1ae comment discussions – Allyn Romanow

Comment review of P802.1ae – Allyn Romanow

Comment Page 53 Line 3 – Tom Mathey

Would a forward reference to Clause 11.X solve the problem?

Comment Page 62 Line 8 – Tom Mathey

Reject due to previous comment on this subject

Comment Page 62 Line 7 – Tom Mathey
Multi-access LAN solves this one, always convey the SCI in the SecTag
Comment Page 62 Line 8 – Tom Mathey
Resolved by previous comment on this subject
(Two comments) Comment Page 65 Line 41 – Tom Mathey
Following from Mick's drawing:
Bridge to Bridge and Point to Point ES = 0 & SC = 0
Bridge to Multi-Bridges ES = 0 & SC = 1
ES, ES, to Bridge ES = 1 & SC = 0
ES = 1 & SC = 1 is not allowed
End of Mick's drawing
The SCI is always there but it may not be encoded
Comment Page 65 Line 45
These are SCI encoding issues
Comment Page 65 Line 47
Leave as it is and Tom will review with Clause 12

Closing Plenary, Thursday, March 17, 2005

Agenda – Tony Jeffree
Recording/Photography – Tony Jeffree
No recording devices
Future Meetings – Tony Jeffree
May 9, mid day to May 13 mid day in Berlin
There will be a meeting fee for those that want to stay at different hotel
Liaison reports
802.11 – Bob Moskowitz
Number of different proposal for 802.11s
Need to watch this effort
Sanity check of PARs – Tony Jeffree
P802.1ae – hold the ballot open for two more weeks
An email will be sent out
What are we going to do about ...
MIBs
Need a PAR to do a MIB for Q Rev – MSTP
AD will also have input
Should this be one PAR that catches all the MIB updates?
Need motion to generate PAR at Interim
802.11 And Bridging
Congestion management
Residential Ethernet - ResE
In its current form Tony will vote no because we do not won't to be forced into a solution without any thought
Shortest Path Bridging - B-Bridges
Discussions:
We need some text on the table to prove that folks are going to get the work finished

Motions:

802.1 approves the November ‘2004 and January ‘2005 meeting minutes.
Proposed: Wright
Second: Haddock
For: 17 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

802.1 resolves to hold an interim session in Berlin, week of 9-13 May Mon 9th May 2005 1:30 PM through Fri 13th May 12:00 (mid-day), hosted by Cisco
Proposed: Seaman
Second: Wright
For: 18 Against: 0 Abstain: 4

802.1 resolves to hold a pre-meeting on the Monday morning of the July 2005 plenary session.
Proposed: Seaman
Second: Wright
For: 18 Against: 1 Abstain: 1

802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1Q-REV, Tony Jeffree, to prepare a further draft taking into account the discussions during the March 2005 meeting. The Chair is authorised to issue the draft for Working Group recirculation ballotting.
Proposed: Seaman Second: Wright
For: 14 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

802.1 requests conditional approval from the EC, as per current P&P, to forward P802.1Q-REV to Sponsor ballot following completion of recirculation balloting
Proposed: Wright Second: Patton
For: 14 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

802.1 instructs the editors of P802.1ad, Steve Haddock, to prepare a further draft taking into account the discussions during the March 2005 meeting. The Chair is authorised to issue the draft for Working Group recirculation ballotting.
Proposed: Haddock Second: Wright
For: 15 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

802.1 requests conditional approval from the SEC, as per current P&P, to forward P802.1ad to Sponsor ballot following completion of recirculation balloting
Proposed: Wright Second: Haddock
For: 17 Against: 0 Abstain: 1

802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1ae, Allyn Romanow, to prepare a further draft taking into account the discussions during the March 2005 meeting and upcoming May interim meeting. The Chair is authorised to issue the draft for Working Group recirculation ballotting.
Proposed: Romanow Second: Wright

For: 17 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1ag, Norm Finn, to prepare a further draft taking into account the discussions during the March 2005 meeting. The Chair is authorised to issue the draft for Task Group ballotting.
Proposed: Seaman Second: Wright
For: 17 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1ah, Paul Bottorff, to prepare a further draft taking into account the discussions during the March 2005 meeting. The Chair is authorised to issue the draft for Task Group ballotting.
Proposed: Bottorff Second: Wright
For: 16 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

802.1 instructs the Chair to forward the Secure Device Identifier draft PAR to the EC under the 30-day rule.
Proposed: Seaman Second: Wright
For: 14 Against: 0 Abstain: 6

802.1 instructs the Chair to forward the Wireless Management draft PAR to the SEC under the 30-day rule.
Proposed: Seaman Second: Wright
For: 15 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

802.1 authorises the May interim meeting to develop a draft PAR/five criteria for an 802.1Q MIB, including, but not restricted to, 802.1ad extensions, and instructs the Chair to forward the draft PAR to the SEC under the 30-day rule.
Proposed: Seaman Second: haddock
For: 16 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

802.1 authorises the May interim meeting to develop a draft PAR/five criteria for Shortest Path Bridges, and instructs the Chair to forward the draft PAR to the SEC under the 30-day rule.
Proposed: Seaman Second: haddock
For: 16 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

Motion to adjourn
Proposed: Wright
Second: Messenger
For Unanimous
Against
Abstain