

IEEE 802.1 Minutes, November 2002, Kauai, HI

Opening Plenary, Monday, November 11, 2002

Agenda – Tony Jeffree

Administrative stuff – Tony Jeffree

Voting Membership rules

Website – Tony Jeffree

Web site <http://www.ieee802.org/1>

Username p8021

Password go_wildcats

Executive Meeting Review – Tony Jeffree

802.6 DQDB is to be withdrawn

802.7 Broadband recommended practices to be withdrawn

Lots of new PARs 12 in all; 3 from .1, many from wireless groups

Some discussion about folks claiming conformance to drafts

Task force to improve communications between SA and 802 (GET802 and trade mark policy issues)

P1541 Binary Prefixes Standard: Kibi Mibi Gibi etc. Being proposed as part of metric units compliance. This may cause some problems with standards. Kilo could be changed to Kibi, which would cause technical changes to the documentation. SA rejected the standard; however, it may be a trial use period or re-form the ballot pool. We need to make sure this stuff does not catch our standards

802.16 and Wireless Mobility group in some conflict, 802.16 is proposing a PAR to use for mobility that uses .16 and the wireless mobility is proposing a PAR that does not use .16.

802.17 considering a "lite" version of 802.17 to avoid incompatibility with ITU X.MSR

Rules changes to make it easier to close ballots in large WGs

DFW – 5 restaurants in operation on site plus buffets. Continuous shuttle between Hyatt & Grapevine Mall 5pm to midnight

Current registration fees too low; up to \$300/\$350 in March

Meeting survey: <http://ieee802.org/16/meetings/mtg22/survey.html>

802.1 Patent Policy – Tony Jeffree

Review of the patent policy.

Patent about 802.1X Alcatel Patent Number 6339830, Tony is working resolve this issue

Interim Meetings – Tony Jeffree

Jan 2003, Vancouver at Hotel Vancouver, week of 6 Jan, and joint with 802.3 Meet Tues AM through Fri mid-day

Week's Schedule – Mick Seaman

Monday 4.00 – P802.1aa – overview of changes, discussion of technical and editorial points arising since the interim meeting

Tuesday – 9.00 – P802.1ab Discovery Protocol

Tuesday – 2.00 – P802.1ad Address separation (Marc Holness, presentation)

Service separation - Marc

Steps toward a draft – Mick

Bridge based Ethernet service provision – Norm

Wednesday 9.00 MAN PAR stuff, (check each of the new three PARs)

Wednesday 10.30 Technical plenary – no proposals at this time

Wednesday 2.00 Bridging over NBMA networks (.3ah/.17), extending .1D/.1Q, necessary interfaces

Thursday 9.00 – TBD

Thursday 2.00 – TBD

P802.1aa Overview of changes and discussions – Tony Jeffree

The current draft is a complete text. This way the changes can be seen in the correct context.

There was a change to the initial message logic. The mechanism decided in New Orleans, moving the initial message logic to the back end authentication state machine would cause problems. After discussing the issues it was decided to create a management identifier that allows the initial message to be defined. The default will be request identity. Les Bell will create the MIBs for this management object.

There was discussion about the how many EAPOL key types are defined. There may be need for more EAPOL key types. Do we want to provide for this in .1aa?

There was a supplementary set of comments to .1aa. The committee reviewed the comments and created a set of responses.

Tuesday AM, November 12, 2002

Review of the status of P802.1ab – Paul Congdon

This was a review of the current draft and what changes should be incorporated into the next draft.

Discussion of how to modify Figure 6-1

It was decided that both an architectural diagram and a detail view of the components is required

Discussion of LLDP relationship with 802.1x

It was decided that LLDP should run over the control port.

Frame format updated

Principles of Operations is a bit light

The principles of operations needs more detail such as topology, repeater information. It was decided that things that involve interoperability should be in the Principles of Operations.

Frame Format

Since slow protocol is defined for 802.3 how does the standard handle ring topologies such as 802.5 or 802.17? It was decided that LLDP will simply use SNAP encoding.

Max Frame Size

What is the correct maximum frame size? The slow protocols defined a maximum of 128. LLDP will use 256 as a recommendation. The maximum value will use the media maximum.

TLV type definitions

Should the mandatory and optional TLVs be separated to allow the mandatory to be expanded? The committee decided no gap is necessary.

Mandatory Address TLV

There was discussion about which fields should be mandatory in the TLV. It was decided that the management address should be optional but highly recommended to include it.

Capabilities vector

The capabilities vector is incomplete.

Paul is seeking input about how to define it and what is it we want

The goal is to quickly identify the device so the correct MIB can be probed to manage the device.

The link aggregation information is important since that information will be needed to resolve misconfiguration, which will prevent communications.

There will be a discussion on the reflector to determine what is the best way to implement the capabilities vector.

Structure for Vendor TLV

In New Orleans discussion that there needs to be some structure so the management station can obtain this information
There is no current definition of a subtype. Paul proposed that the reserved octet be changed to a subtype. The proposal was accepted

Change to the format of TLV

Change size of type and length to 1 octet each

Guidelines for vendor specific TLV

How does .1 manage this? Review board or let the market decide

Conclusion is the market should decide

Additional work

Need state machines and variables to manage the objects received via the protocol MIBs updated or replacement with a placeholder before running 1st ballot

Needham-Schroeder Key Descriptor Presentation – Robert Moskowitz

Presentation about request for a N/S key descriptor in 802.1aa

The classic implementation is Kerberos

Lots of discussions

What problem are we trying to solve?

There needs to be more offline discussions so .1 can understand the issues better

Proposed P802.1ad Multiple Instance MAN Services (Provider Bridged Services) – Mick Seaman

Mick proposed a starting point for provider bridge services.

Tuesday PM, November 12, 2002

Bridge-Based Ethernet Service Provision – Norm Finn

Slides Rev 2

This presentation is on the 802.1 website

Virtual Private LAN Services VPLS – Ali Sajassi

This presentation is on the 802.1 website

Wednesday AM, November 13, 2002

Bridging Solution for the MAN: Address Separation – Marc Holness

Presentation is on the website

Bridging Solution for the MAN: Service Separation – Marc Holness

Presentation is on the website

Discussion of the presentation and what is the scope. Is this idea within the scope of the existing par?

Question from 802.17 about header format – Tony Jeffree

The header has an FCS

Discussion about architectural issue with header check

Joint meeting with 802.17 to discuss 802.17 bridging issues – Tony Jeffree

What is 802.1 doing to support 802.17 bridging

How to do bridging with Non-Broadcast Media Access (NBMA)

Annex F captures the current 802.17 support for basic bridging

Going forward 802.17 will do the basic bridging

There will be some work by interested parties to do enhanced bridging in 802.17

Wednesday PM, November 13, 2002

Review of three new 802.1 PARs - Tony Jeffree

Multiple Instance MAN PAR – Tony Jeffree

Review of Geoff Thompson's comments

This will be an amendment to 802.1Q

Discussion of the scope – part b was removed

Discussion of purpose

Review of the 5 criteria

The title will be Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks – Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks – Amendment 4: Provider Bridges

PAR for 802.1b – Tony Jeffree

How OIDs are allocated within 802.

This is an addition to the O&A

Maintenance PAR for 802.1d – Tony Jeffree

Withdraw the PAR for 802.1y and substitute this maintenance PAR for P802.1D

Discussion of 802.0a/d1 – Tony Jeffree

Discussion of Geoff Thompson comments about the RAC's desire to minimize the use of new Ethertypes.

Geoff would like the comment to stand, 802.1 will do a rebuttal. Both will be distributed to the sponsor pool.

Interoperable testing results from UNH IOL – Gerard Goubert

Gerard gave a short presentation on the results of interoperability testing of RSTP that occurred at UNH IOL earlier this month. Below are websites for information about the Interoperability Lab:

www.iol.unh.edu/consortiums/bfc

www.iol.unh.edu/testsuites/bfc

802.3ah EFM (NBMA) issues – Mick Seaman

How do we progress 802.3ah?

Would be nice to have same primitives for both 802.3ah and 802.17.

There will be some offline discussions to sort this out.

Thursday AM, November 14, 2002

Agenda for the day – Mick Seaman

Path Aggregation – Roger Lapuh

Rebuttal to Geoff Thompson 's no vote on 802a

Liaison to IETF and ITU

Path Aggregation – Roger Lapuh

Presentation is on the website

The presentation is similar to several pieces of IP that are patented. Tony reminded everyone that a patent holder cannot be “forced” to give away its IP to create a standard. The next step is to resolve the IP issues and get a perspective of the scope of this project. Is someone going to promote multi-vendor interoperability?

Liaison to IETF about Provider Services – Mick Seaman

Mick is looking for some proposal about what we should be saying to IETF. Current thinking in IETF, provided by Norm Finn, is switching based on MAC address at the edge is classic bridging. Norm thinks the L2 VPN framework document will be cast in these terms. If we send them the Provider Bridge PAR and say that we want to help get this working and to work with IETF to get this ready, will that satisfy everyone? Decided that it is best to send IETF the PAR. When the PAR is approved it will be posted on the IETF reflector so IETF participants know what .1 is planning.

Rebuttal to Geoff Thompson's no vote on 802a – Mick Seaman

Mick presented a rebuttal letter. It was discussed and reviewed by the committee. It will be placed on the reflector this evening for review.

Liaison to the ITU SG15 – Mick Seaman

SG15 is working on Ethernet over Transport Network Architecture. There is agreement that a letter should be sent to ITU SG 15 discussing 802.1's contribution to this architecture. The committee will empower Tony or Mick to create the letter, distribute it on the reflector so it can be discussed and sent to SG 15.

Agenda Discussion – All

Since all the work is done the committee decided to hold the closing plenary this afternoon at 3pm

Closing Plenary, Thursday, November 14, 2002

Voting membership – Tony Jeffree

Patent Policy – Tony Jeffree

Interim meetings – Tony Jeffree

Jan 6, Tues 9am – Friday 12pm Vancouver, BC
802.3 is considering Seoul meeting location for May

Executive Committee stuff – Tony Jeffree

Wireless PARs – 802.16 versus Wireless Mobility Study Group
The PARs have been modified to separate the technologies in the market place.
Tony is looking for guidance from the committee about what position to take
Call for interest in link layer security
Discussion about where this effort belongs
Future meetings
There has been some concern voiced about having meetings in Hawaii
This issue about being split across hotels is bothersome
Discussion about the meeting needs
Reaffirmations – B, E, F, G, and Q
B, E, F, and G should be withdrawn
Q – best way is to run a reaffirmation ballot, which is like a sponsor ballot

Motions

Motion: 802.1 resolves to hold an interim meeting in Vancouver, on the Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of the week of 6th Jan 2003 (7th – 10th Jan), co-located with 802.3

Proposed: Wright

Second: Finn

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 approves the July meeting minutes.

Proposed: Wright

Second: Finn

For: 6

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Motion: 802.1 requests approval from the SEC to forward the P802.1ad PAR (Provider Bridges) to NesCom.

802.1 Proposed: Larsen

Second: Wright

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 requests approval from the SEC to forward the P802b PAR (Object Identifier Registration Procedures) to NesCom.

Proposed: Seaman

Second: Wright

For: 8

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Motion: 802.1 requests approval from the SEC to forward the P802.1D PAR (MAC Bridges - Revision) to NesCom.

Proposed: Wright

Second: Finn

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 requests approval from the SEC to forward P802.1s/D15 (Multiple Spanning Trees) to RevCom.

Proposed: Finn

Second: Bell

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 requests approval from the SEC to initiate a reaffirmation Sponsor ballot for 802.1Q.

Proposed: Bell

Second: Wright

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 approves the text of the rebuttal of Geoff Thompson's disapproval comment on P802a, as discussed during this meeting (see next slide).

Proposed: Seaman

Second: Bell

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Rebuttal to Geoff Thompson

802.1 shares the concern that the rate of allocation of Ethertypes should be reduced to a sustainable level by encouraging the use of subtypes. The committee differs from the commenter in the way this objective would be best achieved, and includes two members of the RAC.

A number of protocols that have been recently designed can be characterized as client-server protocols in which some number of clients use some number of servers attached to a bridged local area network. It is expected that many of the protocols that will be designed in the near future will also follow this paradigm. The filtering controls in bridges are often used to select which servers and which clients locate each other in regions of the network, and this selection typically involves filtering frames transmitted by the servers differently from those sent by clients. The design of these protocols is therefore partitioned into a server to client protocol and a client to server protocol, that are developed together but use distinct Ethertypes, so that they may be filtered selectively by existing bridges. Considering the extensive installed base of bridges it is not reasonable to expect that the designers of these protocols would rely on a future subtype filtering capability in bridges.

Therefore not allowing two experimental Ethertypes would simply encourage the waste of one non-experimental Ethertype for early versions of each client server protocol development.

Allowing two experimental types would also facilitate other needs for simultaneous protocol development to realize a single system design.

Motion: 802.1 requests approval from the SEC to forward P802a/D2 ("Playpen Ethertypes") for Sponsor Ballot.

Proposed: Seaman

Second: Wright
For: 9
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 instructs the Editor for P802.1ad (Provider Bridges), Mick Seaman, to prepare an initial draft in line with the discussions held this week.

Proposed: Seaman
Second: Larsen
For: 9
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 gives prior authorization for P802.1ad to be issued for Task Group ballot following the January interim meeting.

Proposed: Seaman
Second: Finn
For: 9
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 recommends administrative withdrawal of 802.1B, 802.1E, 802.1F, and 802.1G.

Proposed: Finn
Second: Bell
For: 9
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 instructs the Editors for 802.1y (Mick Seaman/Tony Jeffree) to issue the next draft (D5) for a Working Group ballot in the Nov/Dec timeframe.

Proposed: Bell
Second: Larsen
For: 9
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 instructs the Editor for 802.1aa (Tony Jeffree) to issue the next draft (D5) for a second Working Group ballot in the Nov/Dec timeframe.

Proposed: Wright
Second: Bell
For: 9
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 instructs the Editor for P802.1ab (Discovery protocol), Bill Lane, to revise the draft in line with the discussions held this week.

Proposed: Finn
Second: Seaman
For: 9
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion: 802.1 gives prior authorization for P802.1ab to be issued for Task Group ballot following the January interim meeting.

Proposed: Larsen
Second: Wright

For: 9
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion to adjourn
Proposed Wright
Second Larsen
Unanimous

Attendance

This is a list of the attendees that had qualified attendance, four meetings.

Ali Sajassi
Arnold Sodder
Bill Lane
Craig Easley
Dan Romascanu
David Frattura
Dennis Volpano
Dirceu Cavendish
Dinesh Mohan
Don O'Connor
Gerard Goubert
Hesham ElBakoury
Ian Hood
Jim Burns
John Roese
Karl Weber
Kaxuo Takagi
Ken Patton
Kim Zhon
Les Bell
Loren Larsen
Ludwig Winkel
Michael Wright
Mick Seaman
Neil Jarvis
Norm Finn
Paul Bottorff
Paul Congdon
Ran Ish-Shadom
Robert Barrett
Roger Lapuh
Tony Jeffree

This is a list of attendees who attended at least one meeting

Akemi Sawada	Kshitij Kumar
Albyn Romanov	Laura Bridge
Ali Sajassi	Les Bell
Anoop Ghanwani	Loren Larsen
Arnold Sodder	Ludwig Winkel
Bill Lane	Marc Holness
Charles Barny	Michael Wright
Craig Easley	Mick Seaman
Dan Romascanu	Neil Jarvis
David Frattura	Norm Finn

Dennis Volpano
Dinesh Mohan
Dirceu Cavendish
Don O'Connor
Frank Reichstein
Gerard Goubert
Glenn Parsons
Hesham ElBakoury
Ian Hood
Jim Burns
John Roese
Karen O'Donoghue
Karl Weber
Kaxuo Takagi
Ken Patton
Kim Zhon

Paul Bottorff
Paul Congdon
Peter Jones
Ran Ish-Shadom
Robert Barrett
Robert Mogkowitz
Roger Lapuh
Sam Sambasivan
Sato Obara
Tim Plunkett
Tony Jeffree
Wai-Chau Huij