

Meeting Minutes:

09/27/2004 AM session

Recording Secretary: Manoj Wadekar

1. Portland meeting minutes approved by voice vote.
2. Ben read bylaws on Patents in Standards to SG members and introduced the process of standardization in IEEE 802.3.
3. Kevin Daines: 1:1 Oversubscription
 - a. Constriction caused by untagged->tagged 1:1 traffic
 - b. FESG adding many octets
 - c. Other examples show that 1:1 oversubscription is very likely case
 - d. Hence, should egress rate control be specified by CMSG?Discussion:
 - a. Is it too narrow scenario? – Pat
 - b. This is “part” of many constriction scenarios. MACSEC can certainly pose serious issue. – Hugh
 - c. His company has received many RFPs with request for edge rate control in last 9-10 months - Kevin
 - d. Unified fabric applications for Blade Server: looking for rate control solutions - Sadri
 - e. Ethernet over DSL: Transport incorrectly interprets constriction as congestion. Whereas it would be much better to control rate - Hugh
4. Brad Booth: Ethernet Congestion Management
 - a. Geoff: Add objective “Do no harm”
 - b. Pat: Extend to “minimize throughput reduction to un-congested flows”.
 - c. Hugh: Stated objectives does summarize nicely, however, these can be extended.
 - d. David Law: Need to clarify the stated objectives appropriately.
 - e. Bob: “Preserve the 802.3/Ethernet frame format”.. may not be appropriate. Allow extension. And at service interface, there is no frame format, but SDU.
5. Pat Thaler: Congestion Spreading
 - a. Demonstrates issue with 802.3x-like mechanisms can cause
 - b. Need to make sure that CM mechanisms need to conform to “Do no harm”
6. Manoj Wadekar: Rate Control mechanisms
 - a. Lively discussion on two example mechanisms: DRC (Directional Rate Control) and L2-Congestion Indication.
 - b. Consensus building around Congestion Indication mechanism for joint work with 802.1.

09/27/2004 PM session

7. Hugh Barrass: Problem Definition
 - a. (Need to fix 802-5 on foil 30)

- b. IETF volunteers may be needed to consider further enhancements to transport layers to take further advantage of short latencies that can be achieved with L2-CI/ECN
- c. Bob has talked to Tony. He is willing to allocate time in Interim meeting next Monday. Willing to consider expediting PARs. Willing to work together for joint Tutorial in November

09/28/2004 sessions

- 8. Hugh: 802.1 presentation on behalf of CMSG approved.
- 9. Manoj: Presentation for possible split of functionality between 802.1 and 802.3 for joint TF.
 - a. 802.3 needs Project for Rate Control and any support for 802.1 work in Congestion Indication
 - b. 802.1 needs Project for Congestion Indication. Working jointly with 802.3 for essential support.
- 10. Ben Brown: Motions and polls. Discussion and approval with unanimous consensus: [See agenda_2_0904.pdf for actual counts](#)
 - a. Joint "Objectives for TF" approved.
 - b. 5 Criteria discussed and approved.
 - c. PAR Scope discussed and approved
 - d. PAR Title discussed and approved
 - e. PAR Purpose (14) discussed and approved
 - f. PAR Purpose (14a) discussed and approved
 - g. Presentation to 802.1 next Monday
 - h. Preparations for November Tutorial to be started in next two weeks.
 - 1. Intel and Cisco have offered logistics support.
 - 2. Ben will kick-off the effort soon.
 - i. January meeting site yet undecided. However there is interest in co-locating with 802.1