

IEEE 802.3ar Congestion Management Task Force
May 18th, 2005 Interim Meeting Minutes

Attendees (alphabetical):

Hugh Barrass/Cisco
Robert Bruner/Ericsson
Uri Cummings/Fulcrum
Kevin Daines/World Wide Packets
Tom Dineen/Dineen Consulting
Feifei Feng/Samsung
Ilango Ganga/Intel
Geoffrey Garner/Samsung
David Koenen/HP
Bruce Kwan/Broadcom
Defeng Li/Huawei
Arthur Marris/Cadence
Wayne Mueller/Neteffect
Geoff Thompson/Nortel
Jeffrey Wise/Motorola
Yi Zhao/Huawei

8:45am Session started

Welcome and introductions

Robert Bruner/Ericsson was appointed editor for this session.

Kevin Daines (P802.3ar Chair) presented ar_daines_1_0505.pdf, which contains agenda and general information. Kevin Daines outlined the purpose of the meeting, which is to select one or more proposals to serve as the basis for D1.0.

8:54am Kevin Daines read IEEE-SA patent policy. No claims made.

9:08am Hugh Barrass presented “Rate Control for Congestion Management II” as contained in barrass_1_0505.pdf.

10:37am Motion #1:

“Adopt changes to Annex 4A and Clause 30 using barrass_1_0505.pdf as a baseline proposal for P802.3ar/D1.0.”

Move: Hugh Barrass

Second: Ilango Ganga

Technical motion requires $\geq 75\%$

Y: 5 N: 6 A: 5 (all in room)

Motion fails

(room count = 16)

Note: during the debate on the motion, Geoff Thompson, who opposed the motion, was supportive of sending the issue of rate control to the “Architecture Advisory Group to the 802 Executive Committee”.

11:00am Hugh Barrass presented “MAC Service Interface: 2 Items To Consider” as contained in barrass_2_0505.pdf.

11:34am Kevin Daines offered a straw poll in light of the debate on Motion #1

Straw Poll #1:

“Support moving rate control topic to the Architecture advisory group to the 802 EC (meets Sunday’s of Plenary meetings)”

Y: 2 N: 10 (all in room)

The 802.3ar TF Chair commented that not passing Motion #1 and the results of Straw Poll #1 left him confused. The 802.3ar TF Chair highlighted the fact that there are no other proposals for meeting 802.3ar TF objective #1.

11:57am Motion #2:

“Reaffirm 802.3ar TF objective #1, which reads: “Specify a mechanism to limit the rate of transmitted data on an Ethernet link”

Move: H. Barrass

Second: Uri Cummings

Technical motion requires $\geq 75\%$

Y: 6 N: 3 A: 9

Motion Fails

(Room count = 17)

802.3ar TF Chair commented that this motion and any subsequent motions will be reported to the 802.3 WG in July. It was the Chair’s position that a TF not reaffirming an objective was tantamount to changing the TF objectives.

There were some concerns raised on the part of rate control supporters that they didn’t believe Motion #2 failing was equivalent to changing the objectives. They argued that a motion “to remove 802.3ar TF objective #1” would likely fail. The 802.3ar TF Chair acknowledged this but pointed out the fact the Hugh Barrass, a supporter, made the motion this way. Hugh Barrass, in fact, acknowledged that Motion #2 failing indicated to him the TF wants to remove 802.3ar TF objective #1.

12:14pm Motion #3:

“Motion to conduct 802.3 roll call vote on motion #2”

Move: Hugh Barrass

802.3ar TF Chair asked for a clarification from the mover as to the meaning of an 802.3 roll call vote within a TF. Hugh Barrass responded that he wanted the names of the 802.3 voters recorded.

Motion was ruled a procedural motion, requiring > 50%, and for 802.3 voters only.

Y: 3 N: 3

Motion fails

12:20pm Motion #2 802.3 voters only

“Reaffirm 802.3ar TF objective #1, which reads: “Specify a mechanism to limit the rate of transmitted data on an Ethernet link”

M: H. Barrass S: Uri Cummings

Y: 4 N: 2 A: 2

Technical motion requires $\geq 75\%$

Motion Fails

After motion failed, Arthur Marris raised a concern that one of the voters on motion #3 did NOT vote on Motion #2 (802.3 only). This raised a concern about whether that individual was in fact an 802.3 voter. The 802.3ar TF Chair asked Arthur Marris if he wanted to pursue this issue. Arthur Marris responded that he did not.

12:25pm Motion #4:

“Move that the 802.3ar TF recognizes the primary work to meet 802.3ar TF objective #2 is the responsibility of 802.1”

M: H. Barrass S: T. Dineen

Technical motion require $\geq 75\%$

Y: 9 N: 1 A: 7

Motion passes

(Room count = 17)

The 802.3ar TF Chair commented that not reaffirming objective #1, and then passing Motion #4 left little if anything for the 802.3ar TF to do in July. The 802.3ar TF Chair highlighted the fact that objectives #3 and #4 require no work on the part of 802.3ar TF.

The 802.3ar TF Chair further commented that momentum seems to be growing within the 802.1 WG to pick up the issue of “communication of congestion information”. With this now happening in 802.1, and the distinct possibility of 802.3 WG removing objective #1, the TF would be in peril.

The 802.3ar TF Chair concluded by saying a detailed report of the proceedings would be made at the July Plenary meeting in San Francisco.

Hugh Barrass, the sole attendee of both the 802.1 interim in Berlin (week of May 9th) and the 802.3ar interim in Austin (week of 16th), offered to be available for offline discussions about the 802.1 presentations related to congestion management. These presentations were made available on the 802.3ar May meeting materials webpage.

12:31pm Motion #5

“Motion to adjourn session.”

Passed by acclamation