

IEEE802.5/96/11-17

Concentrator Management Group Address Assignment

Date: 7 November 1996, 13:00:10 EST

From: Robert D. Love 919 543-2746 RDLOVE at RALVM29

IBM

PO Box 12195 Department CE6A/ Building 664

Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Internet: rdlove@vnet.ibm.com Fax: 919 254-5483

To: William P. Lidinsky (630) 840-8067 lidinsky at hep.net

Alan M. Chambers alan at archway.demon.co.uk

 cc:
 R.V. (Rosemary) Slager
 1-919-543-4017
 RVSLAGER at RALVM29

 John Messenger
 011 44 1904 693 409
 jlm at proteon.com

 Trevor Warwick
 011 44-1753-661000
 twarwick at madge.com

 Kirk Preiss
 919-254-4410 (444)
 PREISS at RALVM6

Subject: Concentrator Management Group Address for 802.5

Reference: Note from Alan Chambers, attached

Bill, Alan, the attached note looks pretty good so far. These questions still remain: What process must we go through before we can be certain that the group address assigned is one we should be putting into our standard (which will be going out to LMSC ballot imminently)? Is there any way that 802.1 can help to lock in this address or to verify that it is locked in at the plenary meeting next week? Is it locked in well enough to use it in the draft out for LMSC ballot? If so, would we need an editor's note stating that the number would be verified after its final approval before publication?

Let's chat next week to discuss the best procedure for taking this forward. Thanks for all the help. This concern is almost wrapped up because of your much appreciated help.

Best regards.

-Robert D. Love Thursday, Nov 7, 1:04 p.m.

-----Referenced Note-----

From: Alan M Chambers <alan@archway.demon.co.uk>
To: rvslager@vnet.ibm.com, rdlove@vnet.ibm.com
Cc: lidinsky@hep.net, cowellpj@btlip25.bt.co.uk

Subject: 802.5 DTR Group MAC Address Date: Sun, 20 Oct 1996 19:12:36 +0100

Hi Bob, Rosemary,

As per my earlier e-mail I have spoken to Paul Cowell, who agreed that we should pick the next free address 01-80-C2-00-00-1B for use as the "All DTR concentrators group MAC address".

With some careful footwork at the November 802 Plenary, we have a chance to get this value into the next balloted draft for revising TR 11802-2. The September SC 6 meeting in Guernsey authorised a JTC 1 ballot of DTR 11802-2 (third edition), adding the 802.3 Flow Control "special" group MAC address and the Functional Address for Dedicated Token Ring. Paul and I think that it should be possible, and that it would certainly be desirable, to fast-track a request to add the new value as well, so that it gets exposure in the ballot process.

(The alternative would be to submit the request with the US -- and possibly other, eg UK -- ballot comments. That would still get the new

value published at the same time, maybe next September, but there seems to be more value to the world in letting the new value be seen in the text that goes for ballot, to take place roughly during 1Q97.)

If we want to do this, I think it should be possible without causing any procedural objections or otherwise ruffling feathers, as follows.

Note first that the basic procedural criterion for assignment of one of the "ordinary" standard group MAC addresses is that the request should come from an ISO/IEC National Body (eg, ANSI), which has a responsibility to ensure that the proposal is suitable Õparaphrased from annex A of ISO/IEC TR 11802-2:1996b. Suitability is essentially guaranteed for a protocol that is being progressed as an ISO/IEC standard, and the Dedicated Token Ring text was progressed to DAM ballot at Guernsey. (The request must also be accompanied by a copy of the protocol standard: however, since the text is available in SC 6, a reference will suffice.) Consequently, there is no real chance of this request being rejected.

I suggest, therefore, that IEEE 802 in its capacity as US TAG for SC 6 should submit a formal request from the November meeting, for circulation by the SC 6 Secretariat. This should also request that the new value be added to the instructions to the editor (SC 6 N 10303) for producing the third edition ballot text DTR 11802-2. Informally, we should ensure adequate communication about what is going on with at least Jean Shildneck and the SC 6/WG 1 convener Dr Kim (who, I believe, is expecting to be at the Vancouver meeting, which is handy), as well as with Paul as editor, of course.

That should do the trick!

(Note to all, including Bill: although there is nothing remotely underhand in the above suggestions, it seems prudent to keep them off exploders with wide circulation at least until we have checked out the fast-tracking idea a little further. I don't believe I have overlooked any procedural problem, or any unduly excitable set of feathers, but better safe than embarrassed.)

Best regards,

Alan