IEEE 802.1 Minutes, June 2003, Ottawa, Ontario

Interim Meeting, Monday Morning, June 2, 2003

Agenda – Tony Jeffree

    Administrative stuff

Discussion about how IEEE 802.1 works – Tony Jeffree

    Mick, Tony, and Geoff reviewed how 802.1 works and how 802.1 gets standards completed.

Patent Policy – Tony Jeffree

    Reviewed the required IEEE patent policy

    Tony showed the two required patent policy slides

September Interim – Tony Jeffree

    This is an EFM meeting.

    Probably not a good idea to go to Italy.

    Bob offered Washington D.C. area – around Dulles area

    Another suggestion is the St. Louis area

Meeting Arrangements – Glen Parsons

    Many thanks for good arrangements for meeting

Link Security – Dolores Sala

    The Link Security minutes are kept by the Link Security Task Group

Monday Afternoon, June 2, 2003

    Link Security – Dolores Sala

        The official minutes for all link security is kept by the Link Security Task Group.

        LinkSec Architecture – Robert Moskowitz, ICSAlabs

        Overview of 802.10 SDE Protocol – Ken Alonge

        Discussion about scope of the LinkSec par and Architecture – Mick Seamen

Tuesday Morning, June 3, 2003

The official minutes for all link security is kept by the Link Security Task Group.

Discussion of Link Sec Par – Mick Seaman

    Discussion about what should or should not be in the PAR

    Doing the 5 criteria

Tuesday Afternoon, June 3, 2003

The official minutes for all link security is kept by the Link Security Task Group.

There was further discussion of Link Sec PAR and 5 criteria

Review of the current 802.1aa draft – Tony Jeffree

    Reviewed the changes to Clause 9.1 Management functions

        Question - are the changes appropriate?

            Will these changes break existing implementations?

            Is the current protocol compatible with previous version?

                Yes, it is probably compatible. Therefore, we do not need to revise the protocol version number.

Comments – it may be a good idea to bump the protocol number simply to make sure we get things right.

It is a good idea to bump the protocol number to see what breaks. Break things early so it can be fixed without much pain.

Consensus – bump the protocol number.

If we create a rev 3 protocol and it cannot talk to a rev 1 and 2 then the rev 3 should have a new Ethertype.

Section 9.5.1.1.3 – Supplicant PAE state

What to do with Acquired state?

Leave in or take out and mark as unused.

How many variables where removed?

Discussion about how to handle the removed, added, and not modified MIB variables.

Discussion about how to handle the situation we have changed the internal operation of the state machine but the external operation should be the same. However, some MIB variables have changed, been added, or modified. So what should we do with the protocol version?

Consensus – send draft out in current form. When folks are reviewing document be aware of this discussion and go through the management clause to make sure it is correct. The consensus of the room was adding and deprecating is okay. Changing an existing variable to count something different is not a good idea that is don't lie to the management console. An old version of the management console would not be able to interpret the variable correctly, which causes the operator to misunderstand what is happening with this instances of 802.1x.

Wednesday Morning, June 4, 2003

Agenda for the rest of the meeting – Mick Seaman

Current Status of IEEE 802.1ab – Bill Lane

This presentation will be on the website

Background of the standard

The IETF work stopped after discovering IBM had a patent which conflict (source routing), since that time IBM has given assurances that it will open the patent.

Ballot Review of IEEE 802.1ab – Bill Lane

The ballot resolution is on the website and is the official repository of ballot comment resolutions.

Mick discussed ballots and how 802.1 handles task group and working group ballots. The purpose of task group is to look at the current document and get input on its content or lack of content. Lack of content does not mean vote the document is not complete unless you supply text.

Architectural definition – explaining how/where LLDP fits into the structure of the conceptual model has been an on-going problem.

Another issue – allow or not to allow multiple (different) frames

Recommendation of TLV/MIB definitions

Discussion of organization of the document to allow other organizations such as 802.3, 802.11, etc; this allows each organization to define their TLVs and which MIB or define a MIB to populate.

Further discussion about the mechanism of how different organizations would request TLVs and MIBs.

Discussion about how to uniquely identify a particular device and what part of the MIB. Consensus there is a unique identifier of the LLDP entity, which currently is labeled chassis.

Wednesday Afternoon, June 4, 2003

Review of ballot resolution for IEEE 802.1ab – Bill Lane

There was a ballot comment requesting the term "alphanumeric strings" be replaced by ANSI or UTF-8. Michael Wright volunteered to research what IETF and the like are doing then make a recommendation.

We will create a list of things that requires 802.3 working group input for variables and TLVs and request 802.3 fill in the blanks.

P802.1ad/D1 task group ballot review and status of the current draft – Mick Seaman

Reviewed of the task group ballots

Reviewed clause 16 to get everyone understanding the current content and intent

Thursday Morning, June 5, 2003

P802.1ad/D1 task group ballot review and status of the current draft – Mick Seaman

What should the name of the VID be since PVID is already taken by protocol control. Consensus is Service VID or SVID

Mick reviewed figure 16-1 and discussed what the figure is showing.

Is figure 16-1 complete?

We need to model the UNI-Wart as an 802.1Q bridge, if we get to that point then we know we have the design correct.

Discussion of Tag selection

Required selections/translations

Port -> SVID

CVID -> SVID {SVID, data} or {SVID, CVID, data}

CVID -> SVID

CVID a + CVID b -> SVID 1; CVID c + CVID d -> SVID 2

Port + CVID -> SVID

Service definition EISS

Discussion of whether QOS such as drop precedence is within the scope of the current par. There was a difference of opinion as to this work should be in scope. The consensus was the work is necessary but disagreement about whether the work should be in EMF, IETF, this par, or 802.1 needs to do this with a new par.

Spanning Tree issues

Table 7-1 Page 53 in draft 1 Customer control protocols. How to handle current work?

Discussion of how provider networks currently handle customer control protocols and how the standard should address the issues It may be that we say MAC control protocols terminate at the MAC so these protocols will not be tunneled.

Discussion about this

Need to settle address space stuff soon since this goes into Asics

ITU-T Study Group 15/and bit of 13 Update for IEEE 802.1 – Glen Parsons

This presentation is on the website

Another liaison coming from SG15 for 802.1

List of the liaison

Link to OTNT Standardization Workplan is found at

http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/studygroups/com15/otn/index.html

Question 12 SG15

Point is to make 802.1 aware of the ITU work.

Request comparison of SG15 work to IEEE 802.1 work

Invite comments of SG15 Standardization work plan

Request specific review of SG15 G.ethsrv Ethernet service 'L2 control frame processing

Thursday Afternoon, June 5, 2003

Fault Management for Provider Bridges – Ali Sajassi & Norm Finn

This presentation is on the website Link:

http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2003/IEEE-Provider-Bridges-OAM-June03.ppt

Ali would like to continue work on this effort by getting a PAR.

Discussion about drafting a PAR

Requirements for 802.1AD Provider Bridges presentation – Muneyoshi Suzuki :
http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2003/Requirements%20for%20802.1AD%20Provider%20Bridges1.ppt

Considerable discussion over VID space & the relative merits of Q in Q vs MAC in MAC

Disscussions

- EPON OAM: We were asked by .3 to take a look at this. Not many seem to have done so as yet.
- "Wildcard" VID: Decided that we are happy with the use of 4095 as a wildcard for MIB use. We will need to either:
  - o Simply relax the restriction currently stated in Q; or
  - o Also modify the managed object definitions to reflect the use of this value. The choice of which of these will be determined in consultation with the Bridge MIB group in IETF.
- Home networking: Nothing more to be done re their request for review (comments sent to the list have been forwarded to them already).
- Q reaffirmation/revision: Tony described the current situation re the reaffirmation of Q. This is being done on Q plus its three amendments (s, u, v). We need to change the maintenance PAR for Q (P802.1z) to be a revision PAR: Tony to issue the PAR change.
- Interim meeting: Some discussion of the possibility of Barcelona in September vs Bay area. No final conclusion reached except the need to avoid EFM week.

Friday Morning, June 5, 2003

Spanning the World - Norm Finn
http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2003/spanning-the-world-7.pdf

Provider Bridges Discussion – Mick Seaman
> Further discussion on draft of Provider Bridges
> Guidance given to Mick on generation of an interim draft (which he will circulate to the group before July).
> The plan is to complete the review of ballot comments on the TG ballot in July.
> - Discussion of drop priority: if we decide to support this, would have to use an additional bit other than the existing priority bits. Possible use of the CFI bit. No interest in more than 1 bit for drop precedence at L2.

P802.1aa – Tony Jeffree
Need to change P802.1aa to a revision PAR: Tony to sort.

Interim meeting plans – Tony Jeffree
Shows of hands indicate a preference for Barcelona over the US, with west coast US being the preferred alternative if Barcelona proves to be impractical. Timing would be week before or after EFM.

Many Thanks to Nortel and to Glenn Parsons
The attendees expressed their appreciation for the excellent meeting facilities provided by Nortel, and to Glenn Parsons for organizing them.

Attendees

Kenneth Alonge	Cheng-Yin Lee
Stephen Bailey	Marcus Leech
Paul Bottorff	David Martin
Jim Burns	Dinesh Mohan
Richard Cam	Bob Moskowitz
Dirceu Cavendish	Don O'Connor
Paul Congdon	Jae Park
Arjan de Heer	Glenn Parsons
Hesham Elbakoury	Roy Pereira
David Elie-Dit-Cosaque	Allyn Romanow
Norm Finn	Jessy V Rouyer
Yukihiro Fujimoto	Ali Sajassi
Steve Haddock	Dolors Sala
Kyeong-Soo Han	Mick Seaman
Marc Holness	Egbert-Jan Sol
Tony Jeffree	Muneyoshi Suzuki
Tetsuya Kawakami	Kazuo Takagi
Kwangjo Kim	Geoff Thompson
Sharntanu Kothavale	Genadi Velev
Bill Lane	Ludwig Winkel
Le Goff	Michael D. Wright