



ADVANCE

802.1aj Two-Port MAC Relay Editor's report

John Messenger, May 2009

v02

Changes in 802.1aj/D3.2

- ▶ Many small changes in response to ballot resolution.
- ▶ Mandatory SNMP-over-Ethernet removed.
- ▶ CFM level-0 MIP issue partially resolved.
 - ▶ A further change is needed here to make this mandatory.
- ▶ 6.21 “Support of the ISS using signalled priority” added.
- ▶ Editorial changes only to address tables 8-1, 8-2 and 8-3.
- ▶ 23.1.1 added to give guidance on placement of MAC Status Shim relative to CFM functions.
- ▶ 23.x added in an editor’s note to explicitly define the MAC Status Shim.

Changes in 802.1aj/D3.2 /contd...

- ▶ Main editorial changes
 - ▶ The capitalization of “Port” where not used as part of a more-specific term has been made more consistent with the majority of 802.1Q and 802.1D. Further changes for better consistency between the 802.1Q amendments may be required in a future 802.1Q/802.1D merge.
 - ▶ The term “relay” when used alone (as a noun), and not as part of MAC Relay, has been changed to “Bridge” or “TPMR” where appropriate.
- ▶ PICS changes
 - ▶ Redrafted to show added and changed lines in PICS tables only, instead of reproducing whole tables, in accordance with ballot resolution.

Management using SNMP-over-Ethernet

- ▶ Mandatory support for one specific management method, over one externally accessible port, was one of the original ideas.
- ▶ Draft 3.2 removes mandatory support of SNMP-over-Ethernet as decided in comment resolution on Draft 3.1.
- ▶ Management over at least one of the externally-accessible ports remains mandatory.
- ▶ Need to resolve how to meet this requirement in order to provide interoperable management.
 - ▶ See ballot comments.

CFM: level 0 MIP

- ▶ Each port must by default be configured with a level 0 MIP.
 - ▶ This allows out-of-the-box detection of the TPMR.
 - ▶ This requirement is insufficiently specified in the draft.
- ▶ There was concern that this would prevent protection of the physical links from the TPMR using level 0 MEPs.
 - ▶ We received an MEF liaison on this topic.
- ▶ However the level 0 MIP can be removed by management just as any bridge can have its CFM configuration changed.
- ▶ Draft 3.2 has been clarified to point this out in a note.

EISS, ISS and multiple traffic classes

- ▶ A TPMR wants to use the priority value in the C-tag of a frame to determine which traffic class the frame belongs to, but to be unaware of the VLAN ID.
 - ▶ Comment resolution on Draft 3.1 considered how this could be best achieved.
- ▶ Draft 3.2 addresses this using new subclause 6.21 “Support of the ISS with signalled priority”
 - ▶ Priority and drop-eligibility are determined from the outermost C- or S-tag using the existing methods from 802.1Q and 802.1ad
 - ▶ Frames are not modified on transmission
 - ▶ TPMR remains VID-unaware.
 - ▶ Text may be unclear as to required conformance to this.

Ballotting

- ▶ PAR granted December 2004
 - ▶ Initial draft 0.0 May 2005
 - ▶ Draft 1.0 July 2005
 - ▶ Draft 1.1 August 2005
 - ▶ Draft 1.2 November 2005
 - ▶ Draft 1.3 May 2006
 - ▶ Draft 1.4 June 2006
 - ▶ Draft 2.0 January 2007
 - ▶ Draft 2.1 May 2007
 - ▶ Draft 2.2 October 2007 (Working group ballot)
 - ▶ Draft 3.1 September 2008 (WG recirculation ballot)
 - ▶ Draft 3.2 May 2009 (WG recirculation ballot)

- ▶ 802.1aj Draft 3.2 issued May 2009
 - ▶ All D3.1 comments addressed except a few very late comments.

D3.2 WG recirculation ballot results

- ▶ Ballot pool comprised those eligible to vote on D2.2
 - ▶ Results include D2.2, D3.1 votes and D3.2 vote changes
- ▶ 27 responses received on the D3.2 recirculation ballot
- ▶ 91 Voters – of which 78 have responded (86%)
 - ▶ 30 Approve 86%
 - ▶ 5 Disapprove 14%
 - ▶ 43 Abstain 55%
- ▶ Ballot passed!

D3.2 WG recirculation ballot results

- ▶ Disapprove voter breakdown:
 - ▶ 3 have responded to D3.2 with new comments
 - ▶ 1 has changed to Yes
 - ▶ 2 have changed to Yes with comments
 - ▶ 1 new No voter
 - ▶ 1 is deceased
 - ▶ This vote must remain and be explained to the 802 executive committee

- ▶ 48 Comments
 - ▶ 21 TR
 - ▶ 5 T
 - ▶ 11 ER
 - ▶ 11 E
 - ▶ 0 G

Main ballot comment items

- ▶ VLAN-awareness
- ▶ Modifying frames; priority regeneration
- ▶ Management using SNMP over UDP over IPv4
- ▶ TPMR MIB module – should it be optional?
- ▶ FSM modifications in clause 23
- ▶ MAC Status Shim
- ▶ Clause 6.10: PIP
- ▶ Missing conformance statements in PICS and Clause 5

VLAN-awareness

- ▶ Should we widen the scope to allow VLAN-awareness as this is what the MEF wants for the NID?
- ▶ Comments
 - ▶ Stephen Haddock: #39

Priority regeneration; frame modification

- ▶ Does the TPMR support priority regeneration? Frames should not be modified when passing through the TPMR.
- ▶ Comments
 - ▶ Panagiotis Saltsidis: #22, #17, #34
 - ▶ Stephen Haddock: #38
 - ▶ Jessy Rouyer: #44

Management using SNMP/UDP/IPv4

- ▶ The TPMR should support mandatory management using SNMP over UDP over IPv4 as recommended by IETF.
- ▶ Comments
 - ▶ John Messenger: #1
 - ▶ Jessy Rouyer: #41

TPMR MIB module – mandatory?

- ▶ Panos wants the TPMR MIB module to be made optional. The editor doesn't agree!
- ▶ Comments
 - ▶ Panagiotis Saltsidis: #13, #36, #37

FSM modifications in Clause 23

- ▶ Initial value of timer linkNotifyWhen should be associated with the linkNotifyRetry value of the **same** port, not the other port.
- ▶ Comments
 - ▶ Panagiotis Saltsidis: #29

MAC Status Shim

- ▶ Should the MAC Status Shim be defined more closely as proposed?
- ▶ Comments
 - ▶ John Messenger: #3
 - ▶ Mick Seaman: #8
 - ▶ Panagiotis Saltsidis: #26
 - ▶ Jessy Rouyer: #47

Clause 6.10: Support of ISS by PIP

- ▶ Was it really intended to replace the content of 6.10?
- ▶ Comments
 - ▶ Jessy Rouyer: #43

Missing conformance statements

- ▶ Various conformance statements are missing in clause 5 and the PICS.
- ▶ Comments
 - ▶ Panagiotis Saltsidis: #11, #33, #35

Plan

- ▶ Do comment resolution for D3.2 at this meeting
- ▶ Generate 802.1aj/D3.3 following this meeting, incorporating
 - ▶ Changes agreed this week
- ▶ Submit this for WG recirculation ballot.
- ▶ Comment resolution at the July plenary.
- ▶ Hope to go to sponsor ballot following that meeting.



Thank You

JMessenger@advaoptical.com