IEEE 802.1Qbf Editor's Report
May 2010 Interim Meeting
Geneva, Switzerland

Bob Sultan (bsultan@huawei.com)

802.1Qbf Draft 0.2 Task Group Ballot

Ballot Results

Approve	1
Disapprove	4
Abstain	14
Total	19
Commenters	5

Comments Submitted

	Required	Not Required	Total
Technical	32	4	36
Editorial	13	1	14
Total	45	5	50

Going Forward

- Expect to issue D0.3 in time for completion of task group ballot before July meeting;

- D0.3 will

  - include M:1 state machines, clause 17 content, MIBs, and remaining PICS items;

  - reflect comments made against D0.2;

  - be complete wrt entering WG ballot after July meeting;

- Version of MIB has been posted under D0.2 for informal review (comments welcomed); this was not included in the D0.2 TG ballot;

3

Comment Review Plan

- Commenters (and others) have had opportunity to review proposed remedies;

- I will summarize key comments in the next few slides;

- The only open issue of which I'm aware is comment #12 (speak now if you think there are other comments whose resolutions require discussion);

- Otherwise, this is the only comment I plan to discuss in the meeting.

Comment Summary (1)

- Add M:1 state machine (6, 42, 50);

- Add MIBs (43);

- Change 'TESI List' to '2-tuple' list (38);

- 'Merge' TESI Protection and IPS State machines (33);

- Fig 26-9 should show *down* MEPs for Segment MA (4, 14);

- LBM and LTM *are* supported for Segment MA (11);

- No changes identified for clauses 20-22 (45);

- Correct specification of IPS control entity as described in http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2010/bf-sultan-three-issuest-0310-v01.pdf (49)

- Nested IPG description (19, 46-48);

- Make 'scope' description consistent with PAR (21);

Comment Summary (2)

- NOTE to indicate that "in the case of a point-to-multipoint TESI, it is only a linear portion of the TESI that is protected by the IPG, as an Infrastructure Segment is a linear entity." (16)

- Functions mapDatatoWorking() and mapDatatoProtection() were reversed; (18)

- 'SEID' not needed in IPG Managed Object as it is in the MEP Managed Object (and SEID will probably be eliminated in favor of Port Number) (27-28, 31);

- Terms/definitions/wording (1-3, 7-9, 15, 17, 20, 23-26, 29-30, 34-36); possibly eliminate 'redirection' and 'SEID';

- Various editorial (5, 12-13, 32, 37, 39-41, 44, 51);

Segment MA in Qbf D0.2

- 3 types of MA are currently defined in 802.1Q (prior to Qbf):
  1. VLAN-based (identified by VID);
  2. Backbone service instance based (identified by I-SID);
  3. PBB-TE MA – associated with TESI (identified by TE-SID);
- We add fourth type of MA, associated with a *Segment* rather than a *Service Instance*;
- Organize four types of MA like this:
  1. VLAN-based (identified by VID);
  2. Backbone service instance based (identified by I-SID);
  3. PBB-TE MA
     a) TESI MA – associated with TESI (identified by TE-SID); uses UP MEP; deployed on CBP;
     b) Segment MA – associated with Segment (identified by TE-SID; i.e., pair of 3-tuples); uses DOWN MEP; deployed on PNP;

7

Why organize the MA types like this?

- There are *many* references to PBB-TE MA in clauses 19 – 22;
- Most of these references need not be changed;
  - Because the TESI MA and Segment MA don't differ in the context of the reference;
- In cases where behavior of TESI MA and Segment MA are different, text is changed to explicitly specify TESI MA or Segment MA and the associated behavior;
- D0.2 currently uses this approach because it is thought that this involves the least change to 802.1Q;

Comment 12

- The commenter suggests that there would be fewer changes to .1Q if the four MA types were independent;
  - That is, if a new Segment MA was introduced *independent* of the three existing MA types;
- The editor believes that such an approach would result in a *large* number of changes to, for example, clause 20;
- The commenter and editor agree that the best approach is the one involving the least change (while still being correct);
- The issue may be resolved by producing Clause 20 text using this approach and comparing to the current draft;
- Discussion on which approach to use is invited (now);
- If there is no agreement in the meeting, the editor suggests that we reject the comment and carry this as an issue in Annex Z until the next meeting when appropriate text can be presented.

Brief Question on Managed Objects (1)

12.20.1.2 Create IPG managed object
12.20.1.2.2 Inputs
a) A reference to the MA managed object (12.14.6) identifying the Segment MA associated with the
Working Segment; and
b) A reference to the MA managed object (12.14.6) identifying the Segment MA associated with the
Protection Segment.
c) A list of TESIs associated with the IPG where each TESI is identified by a pair of <ESP-DA, ESPSA, ESP-VID> 3-tuples, or NULL indicating that no TESIs are associated with the IPG and the IPG is disabled.
~~d) Working SEID (outbound Port value in ESP entry when Working Segment is the Active Segment);~~
~~e) Protection SEID (outbound Port value in ESP entry when Protection Segment is the Active Segment);.~~

- Comment 28 correctly points-out that the 'SEID' or 'Port Number' is specified when the MA is created;
  - It does not need to be specified on creation of the IPG List or the IPG Managed Objects;

Brief Question on Managed Objects (2)

12.20.1 IPG list managed object
12.20.1.1 Read IPG list
12.20.1.1.2 Inputs
12.20.1.1.3 Outputs
A list, perhaps empty, of the IPG managed objects configured on the IB-BEB or BCB supporting PBB-TE IPS. For each item in the list, the Read IPG list command returns:
a) A reference to a particular MA managed object (12.14.6) identifying the Segment MA associated with the Working Segment; and
b) A reference to a particular MA managed object (12.14.6) identifying the Segment MA associated with the Protection Segment;
c) Working SEID (outbound Port value placed in ESP entry when Working Segment is the Active Segment);
d) Protection SEID (outbound Port value placed in ESP entry when Protection Segment is the Active Segment);.

- But, should this value be supplied in the Read IPG List MO?
  - It can be found if you reference the MA MO;

11

Brief Question on Managed Objects (3)

12.20.2.1 Read IPG managed object
12.20.2.1.1 Purpose
12.20.2.1.2 Inputs
12.20.2.1.3 Outputs

a) Operation status.

b) A reference to the MA managed object (12.14.6) identifying the Segment MA associated with the Working Segment; and

c) A reference to the MA managed object (12.14.6) identifying the Segment MA associated with the Protection Segment.

d) Working SEID (outbound Port value in ESP entry when Working Segment is the Active Segment);

e) Protection SEID (outbound Port value in ESP entry when Protection Segment is the Active Segment);.

f) (writable) A list of TESIs associated with the IPG where each TESI is identified by a pair of <ESPDA, ESP-SA, ESP-VID> 3-tuples, or NULL indicating that no TESIs are associated with the IPG and the IPG is disabled……. Etc.

- What about in the Read IPG MO?

- Should you provide the SEID or Port Number in the IPG MO or should you just assume that this can be referenced by the Read MA MO?