

Minutes – 802.1 Interim meeting, Jan 17-18 2002

Attendees (both days):

Tony Jeffree
Norm Finn
Mick Seaman
Paul Congdon
Loren Larsen
Neil Jarvis

Agenda items:

- 802.1s
 1. Ballot comments
 2. Other stuff
- Discovery protocol (Paul Congdon)
- EPON issues
- Maintenance activity
- May Interim meeting?

802.1s Ballot comments

Mick Seaman gave a brief introduction to the technical changes that had been introduced into the draft, before the task group started to deal with the comments received on the ballot of D11. Mick has checked for D10 resolutions that have yet to be rolled into the draft; these will be handled in D12.

Once we're sure that the technical content of 802.1s is reasonably stable, there will be a need to review what (if anything) from S needs to be reflected in maintenance of 802.1w.

Most of the first day and some of the second morning of the meeting was spent resolving ballot comments; the agreed resolutions of these comments will be documented and posted on the website by Tony.

Discovery protocol – Paul Congdon

Paul made a presentation on the possibility of 802.1 starting a project in this area – the slides have been posted on the website. The aim of the presentation was to determine whether there was interest in reviving the work started by the IETF.

More background stuff will be posted to website.

It was clear that there was interest in studying this further – not necessarily resulting in a new protocol; could be recommended practice, etc. whose main focus is how to make use of existing protocols, parameters and so on to achieve discovery. We would need more input to 802.1 for this to happen.

Interim meeting in May

802.3 is planning to hold an interim meeting in Edinburgh, Scotland 20-22nd May 2002. We have been asked if we would be interested in participating. Initial reaction

of the task group is that this would be good – we would prefer to meet 23-24th so as to not overlap with EFM. We will need to discuss/formally agree this in March.

802.3 EPON and related issues

From the discussions in the EPON meeting earlier in the week, it looks as if it will be useful, both to them and to us, if we produce a description of a MAC service that covers the “native PON” style of operation, in which downstream traffic from the OLT is visible to all downstream ONUs, but traffic upstream from an ONU is visible only to the OLT. The intent would be to document what the characteristics of the service are for such a network, along with details of what works or doesn’t work when connected to such a network. It would be worth drafting a mock-up of this document at this stage, although we need to wait & see where the EPON work ends up before actively starting a PAR for this.

We also need to retrieve the current MAC service definition and update it to include (possibly just by reference) the ISS and EISS from the current 802.1D and 802.1Q. This would be documented separately from the EPON service definition, to ensure that the MAC service as we know it doesn’t become a dumping ground for all possible service definitions that may be proposed from elsewhere. Tony to draft a PAR for the MAC service revision, with a view to formally agreeing it in March.

There is probably the need for a technical plenary session in March, with EPON and possibly also 802.17, to discuss some of these issues – in particular to look at configurations that will/will not work with the topologies that they are generating. Norm may be able to bring in some tutorial material to help with this.

Maintenance activity

We will schedule time in March to discuss the revised drafts of P802.1y and P802.1aa that have been posted on the website.

Paul Congdon raised some issues with regard to 802.1X:

1. Currently, X specifies that it operates on physical ports only in systems that support link aggregation, and the ports cannot aggregate until they have been authorized. However, aggregatable links could belong to different people. The document should mention this possibility and advise that links that have different owners cannot be aggregated together. Therefore, the same user ID should be used for all links that may aggregate, and force different key values for links with different Ids.
2. Do we need to reauthenticate after an aggregation has been formed? The rationale might be that the user’s privileges may depend on the available bandwidth. Could possibly achieve this through use of a new RADIUS attribute value.
3. The parameters associated with the authorization (e.g., permitted VLANs) could specify stuff that the supplicant cannot support. In this case, the port should be forced to unauthorized.

These points were felt to be potential additions to the annex material in X, and will be included in the next draft of P802.1aa for further consideration.

802.1s PAR

The current PAR for 802.1s needs to be extended, as the completion date has now been passed. Tony to do the necessary here, aiming for a completion date of end 2003. Our expectation is that this will be more than sufficient for the remaining work.

802.1s – next steps

We will have a new draft to consider in March, with a view to dealing with any final polishing that may be required before a ballot shortly after the March meeting.