

Meeting Minutes
802.17 RPR WG
Conference Call: February 15, 2005
Ottawa, Canada

February 15, 2005

Attendees on site:

John Lemon, Marc Holness, Mike Takefman, Gary Turner, David James

12:00 Meeting called to order (not that anyone aside from Mike was on the call)

- Discussion on what is an interpretation request versus a maintenance request
- John is discussing with IEEE staff, and in some cases its likely 6 of one and ½ a dozen of the other
- Agenda for the meeting:
 - Can the MAC provide both SAS and non-SAS on a frame by frame basis?
 - Proposed Document Structure (Feb)
 - Section / sub-section changes
 - New clause altogether
 - Adjust old clauses
 - combo
 - Layering Model (Feb)
 - Interactions with security
 - Answers from Norm

12:25 Answers from Norm

- No response yet from Norm and Tony, Mike to push them on getting the answer in time for March. Also to get slides from Norm on his grand unification of bridges that can be distributed to dot17.

12:27 Interactions with Security

- Mike is preparing a paper/slide deck on various threats to RPR and how one might be able to extend .17 along with security to combat the threats.
- Marc requested that such a paper/slide deck at least looks at securing control frames.
- Securing the ring is not as likely to make things more secure as DDOS and other attacks might do more damage.

12:45 Layering Model

- SAS could be:
 - Above ringlet selection (but extending ringlet selection rules)
 - Below ringlet selection (but extending ringlet selection rules)
 - Part of ringlet selection and extending ringlet selection rules

12:50 Document Structure

- John thinks we should adjust existing clauses as compared to a new clause making modifications to the old clauses that someone has to hunt all over the document to figure out how to build the new MAC
- Marc thinks the SASDB might have to be its own clause, he would like the PICS to be in a single place.

1:07 Can SAS be used on a frame by frame basis?

- Why do SAS on a frame by frame basis?
- Discussion on 4 addresses and whether it should stay in the standard or not
 - Majority feeling that 4 addresses should be removed
 - 4 addresses are an internal interface anyway, so removing them isn't really visible anyway, and if they are being used to do a proprietary interface anyway, you can still do the interface

1:20 Agenda for the March Meeting

- Encoding decision (Mar),
- Requirements list review
- Compatibility with .17 (4 address usage)
- Other technical decisions
 - SAS on a frame by frame basis (why, and how)
 - Hosts on ring, running SAS do frames have to be extended?
 - Clarifying interaction with ringlet selection and SAS (trying to get some of the details written)
- Document Structure