IEEE 802.3ar Congestion Management Task Force July 19th, 2005 Plenary Meeting Minutes San Francisco, California

Attendees (alphabetical): Hugh Barrass/Cisco Scott Barrick/Mentor Ralf-Peter Braun/t-systems **Robert Brunner/Ericsson** Uri Cummings/Fulcrum Kevin Daines/World Wide Packets Tom Dineen/Dineen Consulting Kristian Ehlers/Vitesse Uri Elzur/Broadcom Ilango Ganga/Intel Bob Grow/Intel Tanmay Gupta/Intel Takafumi Hamano/NTT Asif Hazarika/Fuiitsu Gopal Hedge/Intel Pankaj Jha/Intel Mike Ko/IBM David Koenen/HP Raghu Kondapalli/Marvell Subi Krishnamurthy/Force 10 Aniruddha Kundu/Intel Bruce Kwan/Broadcom Defeng Li/Huawei Shashank Merchant/Nokia Wayne Mueller/Neteffect Shekhar Patkar/Aarohi Peter Schulter/Egenera Matt Squire/Hatteras Manoj Wadekar/Intel Jeff Wise/Motorola Hans Yum/Flextronics

8:45am Session started

Welcome and introductions

Manoj Wadekar/Ericsson was appointed recording secretary for this session.

Kevin Daines (P802.3ar Chair) presented ar_daines_1_0507.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.

Motion: "Approve published minutes for Austin Interim Meeting" Move: Manoj Wadekar Second: Robert Breunner Motion Passed by voice vote (People in the room, unofficial count: 29)

Kevin Daines read patent policy. No letters of assurance were brought forward.

Kevin Daines discussed the Austin meeting for the benefit of those no in attendance in May. In short,

- May 2005 failed to adopt rate limit proposal
- May 2005 motion failed to reaffirm rate limit objective
- May 2005 voted not to move work to the IEEE 802 Architecture group

Kevin Daines articulated some options on the table

- 1. 802.3ar TF can shut down, turning in PAR
- 2. 802.3ar TF does not meet in September and allows group member to attend 802.1 meeting in Sacramento. The desire would be for progress to be made going into November 2005 meeting.
 - Editor's Note: September 2005 IEEE 802.1 Interim Meeting is now scheduled for Southern California

Kevin Daines reviewed presentations to IEEE 802.1 during May Interim related to work of P802.3ar TF

- a) Paul Congdon (802.1p enhancements)
- b) Davide Bergamasco: Backward Congestion Notification
- c) Manoj Wadekar: Framework for Congestion Management: Expedited Forwarding, End to end congestion management (BCN) and Class based flow control as insurance against packet drop

The TF had some discussion about the delineation of .3 and .1 relative to meeting the objectives.

Robert Brunner gave presentation brunner_1_0507.pdf. Robert Brunner explained that priority-based PAUSE is being proposed only in supportive mode for end to end CM and not as primary congestion management mechanism Shashank Merchant gave presentation merchant_1_0507.pdf. Lots of discussion following this presentation, including concerns raised about end-to-end congestion management coupled with class-based PAUSE will not adhere to TF objective #3, "Do no harm."

Proponents of class-based PAUSE believe it is an improvement over linkbased PAUSE (802.3x). Some in the TF want supporting details.

P802.3ar Straw Poll #1

Do you support P802.3ar TF objective #1? Y: 21 N: 2 (room count=31) 802.3: Y: 14 N: 1

P802.3ar Motion #1

"Adopt changes to Clause 4, Annex 4A & Clause 30 described in barrass_1_0505.pdf as a baseline proposal for 802.3ar/D1.0. The changes to Clause 4 will be made after the changes to Annex 4A have been solidified in 802.3ar TF review."

M: P. Thaler S: M. Squire Y: 16 N: 1 A: 9 (31 room count) >= 75% Passes 802.3: Y: 14 N: 1 A: 2 Passes

The TF then discussed preparing for the joint technical plenary with 802.1 (scheduled for the following day). It was decided that the TF should present a series of straw polls showing support and interest for various efforts within 802.1.

P802.3ar Straw Poll #2

Do you support Paul Congdon's 802.1 proposal (improving expedited forwarding) as a component of congestion management? 802.3ar: Y: 21 N: 1

P802.3ar Straw Poll #3

Do you encourage 802.1 pursuing L2 congestion notification? 802.3ar: Y: 20 N: 1

P802.3ar Straw Poll #4 (Foil 27)

Do you encourage the work and continued evaluation of Davide Bergamasco's 802.1 BCN presentation as a component of congestion management?

802.3ar: Y: 19 N: 1

P802.3ar Straw Poll #5

Do you support the addition of class-based flow control as a complementary mechanism to L2 congestion notification? 802.3ar Y: 21 N: 1

P802.3ar Straw Poll #6

Do you recommend 802.1 consider the addition of class-based flow control as a complementary mechanism to L2 congestion notification? 802.3ar Y: 20 N: 1

Kevin Daines proposed that the group attend the 802.1 September interim in the interest of progressing the work. As a result, Kevin proposed not meeting as a TF in September.

Bob Grow/802.3 WG Chair Asked if anyone objected to not meeting in September for Interim: No one objected in the room

Kevin Daines asked for an indication of those interested in attending the 802.1 interim in Sacramento. 18 indicated interested.

Editor's note: The September interim is now scheduled for Southern California

Motion to adjourn session: Approved by voice.