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Agenda

- Welcome and introductions
- Appoint recording secretary
- Goals for this meeting
- Reflector and web
- Ground rules
- IEEE
  - Structure
  - Bylaws and rules
  - Call for patents
  - IEEE standards process
- Liaison letters
- Presentations/discussion
- Motions
- Future meetings
Reflector and web

- To subscribe to the Congestion Management TF reflector send an email to:
  listserv@ieee.org

- with the following in the body of the message:
  subscribe stds-802-3-cm <first name> <last name>

- Congestion Management TF web page URL:
  http://www.ieee802.org/3/cm_study/

  Note: By March 2005, the URL will change to
  http://www.ieee802.org/3/ar/
Ground rules

- IEEE 802.3 WG Operating Rules apply
  - Foundation based upon Robert’s Rules of Order
- Anyone in the room may speak
- Anyone in the room may vote
- RESPECT… give it, get it
- NO product pitches
- NO corporate pitches
- NO prices!!!
  - This includes costs, ASPs, etc. no matter what the currency
- NO restrictive notices
IEEE structure

IEEE

IEEE-SA Standards Association

Standards Board

RevCom Review Committee

NesCom New Stds. Committee

IEEE 802 Sponsor Group

IEEE 802.3 Working Group

Congestion Mgmt Task Force
Bylaws and rules

- Bylaws of the IEEE Standards Association (IEEE-SA):

- Bylaws of the IEEE-SA Standards Board:

- IEEE LAN/MAN Standards Committee (LMSC) Operating Rules:

- IEEE 802.3 Working Group Operating Rules:
  http://www.ieee802.org/3/rules/
IEEE-SA Standards Board bylaws on patents in standards

6. Patents

IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder or applicant with respect to patents essential for compliance with both mandatory and optional portions of the standard. This assurance shall be provided without coercion and prior to approval of the standard (or reaffirmation when a patent becomes known after initial approval of the standard). This assurance shall be a letter that is in the form of either

a) A general disclaimer to the effect that the patentee will not enforce any of its present or future patent(s) whose use would be required to implement the proposed IEEE standard against any person or entity using the patent(s) to comply with the standard or

b) A statement that a license will be made available without compensation or under reasonable rates, with reasonable terms and conditions that are demonstrably free of any unfair discrimination

This assurance shall apply, at a minimum, from the date of the standard's approval to the date of the standard's withdrawal and is irrevocable during that period.

Approved by IEEE-SA Standards Board – December 2002
Inappropriate topics

- Don’t discuss licensing terms or conditions
- Don’t discuss product pricing, territorial restrictions or market share
- Don’t discuss ongoing litigation or threatened litigation
- Don’t be silent if inappropriate topics are discussed… do formally object.
- If you have questions, contact the IEEE Patent Committee Administrator at patcom@ieee.org

Approved by IEEE-SA Standards Board – December 2002
IEEE 802.3 standards process (1/4)

Idea

Call for Interest

Yes

802.3 Forms SG

No

RIP

Yes

802 EC Forms SG

No

RIP

Yes

Study Group Meetings

802.3 Forms SG

No

RIP

Yes

Objectives

5 Criteria

PAR

No

802.3 Approve

Yes

RIP

802 EC Approve

No

RIP

Yes

NesCom Approve

No

RIP

Yes

STB Approve

No

RIP

Yes

Approved PAR

No

RIP

5 Criteria

Objectives

PAR
IEEE 802.3 standards process (2/4)

- Approved PAR
- Task Force Meetings
  - Objectives
  - Proposals Selected
    - Yes
    - No
- Task Force Review
  - D1.0
  - D1.n+1
    - To 802.3 WG Ballot
      - No
      - Yes
  - TF Review Done
    - Yes
    - No
  - D2.0
    - A
IEEE 802.3 standards process (3/4)

A

802.3 WG Ballot

> 75 %

Yes

No

RIP

Comments

Yes

No

D2.n+1

D3.0

802.3 Forward to LMSC

Yes

No

A

EC Forward to LMSC

Yes

No

A

B
IEEE 802.3 standards process (4/4)

1. LMSC Sponsor Ballot
   - If > 75%
     - Yes: Comments
     - No: RIP
   - If Comments
     - Yes: D3.n+1
     - No: RIP

2. D3.n
   - 802.3 Forward to RevCom
     - Yes: EC Forward to RevCom
     - No: B
   - EC Forward to RevCom
     - Yes: B
     - No: B

3. RevCom Review
   - Yes: RevCom Approval
     - Yes: Std
     - No: RIP
     - No: B
   - No: B

4. STB Approval
   - Yes: Std
   - No: RIP
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Study group

- **IEEE 802.3 standards process (1/4)**
  - Function is to draft a PAR and 5 Criteria
  - Gain approval at 802.3 WG, 802 EC, IEEE NesCom and IEEE Standards Board
  - SG only exists for 6 months
    - Extensions can be requested... voted on by 802.3, ratified by EC
- Development of Objectives helps set the goals for the Task Force
- Developing consensus
  - Education helps build consensus
  - Consensus (> 75%) required to move forward
Task Force

- Agree upon a set of baseline proposals
- Create drafts that meet TF objectives
  - Refine objectives, if necessary
- Complete Task Force ballot
  - *IEEE 802.3 standards process (2/4)*
- Complete Working Group ballot
  - *IEEE 802.3 standards process (3/4)*
- Complete Sponsor ballot
  - *IEEE 802.3 standards process (4/4)*
Motion: n

- Adopt <title> <filename> as the basis for 802.3ar/D1.0

- Move: Second:
- Technical: 75%
- Y: _ N: _ A: _
802.1 comments (11/04)

- L2+ bridges already violate the layer stack and set congestion indication bits in the IP header
- It may be easier for vendors to do this with new protocols than for 802.1 to create an L2 tag
- Are TCP & IP the only market-worthy protocols?
- Are there other protocols in backplanes, data centers, clusters, etc. that don’t have congestion indication marking capability?
- What new market-worthy protocols might come into existence by adding an L2 tag?

- The TF needs to have responses to the above list
## Presentations/discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Filename</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Len</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Barrass</td>
<td><em>Rate Control for Ethernet Congestion Management</em></td>
<td>barrass_1_0501.pdf</td>
<td>0930</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Wadekar</td>
<td>Congestion Notification Mechanisms in 802 Networks</td>
<td>wadekar_1_0501.pdf</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Preparation for 802.1 joint meeting</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>