802.3ar Congestion Management Task Force **Polls, motions, future meetings**

Kevin Daines World Wide Packets

Sacramento, California

802.3ar Congestion Management - January 2005

Do you agree in principle with defining a per-packet rate limiter?

Y: 4 N: 2
In room: 16



Do you agree in principle with defining a maximum payload rate limiter?

Y: 8 N: 2
In room: 16



Do you agree in principle with defining a packet rate limiter?

Y: 6 N: 2
In room: 16

Do you agree in principle with cleaning up the MAC service interfaces (Clause 2, 4, 31, Annex 4A)?

Y: 10 N: 1 In room: 16

Do you agree in principle with having Clause 30 attributes for each rate limiter?

Y: 9 N: 0In room: 16

Do you agree in principle with defining a remote rate control request?

Y: 3 N: 3
In room: 16

- Do you agree in principle with this statement:
 - IEEE 802.1 should specify a standard mechanism for MAC Clients to provide congestion information to L2 edge devices

Y: 9 N: 1
In room: 14

Do you agree in principle with this statement:

 In order to enable accelerated deployment of Ethernet into emerging limited-topology applications (clustering, backplanes, storage, data centers, etc.), IEEE 802.1 should specify a standard mechanism for MAC Clients to provide congestion information to L2 edge devices, using wadekar_1_0501.pdf as a basis

Y: 9 N: 0 A: 2 In room: 14

In support of the following objective:

- Specify a mechanism to limit the rate of transmitted data on an Ethernet link
- do you agree in principle with defining:
 - Fixed per-packet overhead rate limiter
 - Technique:
 - IPG increase
 - Sample use cases:
 - Encapsulation, e.g., MACsec
- Y: 7 N: 0
 Room count: 14

In support of the following objective:

- Specify a mechanism to limit the rate of transmitted data on an Ethernet link
- do you agree in principle with defining:
 - Maximum payload rate limiter
 - Technique:
 - IPG stretch
 - Sample use cases:
 - Throttling 100 Mb/s link to 802.3ah Copper link rate
 - Throttling Gb/s link to NIC bus rates (e.g., 800 Mb/s)

Y: 7 N: 2

Room count: 14

Essentially straw poll #3 restated more clearly

In support of the following objective:

- Specify a mechanism to limit the rate of transmitted data on an Ethernet link
- do you agree in principle with defining:
 - Maximum packet rate limiter
 - Technique:
 - e.g., Start-of-packet to start-of-next-packet timer
 - Sample use cases:
 - Port not capable of max packet rate
 - Interrupt-driven, microcode based NIC

Y: 6 N: 1

Room count: 14

Do you support packet marking as the means for forward congestion notification?

Y: 8 N: 0In room: 14

- Which method of packet marking do you prefer? (choose one)
 - Existing 81-00 EType VLAN tag's CFI bit 3
 - Separate L2 tag 2
 - Insert new L2 tag
 - Change VLAN tag to new EType
- In room: 14

Motion: approve minutesApproved by acclamation

Future meetings March 13-18, 2005 IEEE 802 Plenary, Atlanta May 9-13, 2005 • Tentative: 802.1/802.3ar/802.3as interim Barcelona (8 indicated they would attend) July 17-22, 2005 IEEE 802 Plenary, San Francisco