RPR November 15-18, 2004 Plenary Meeting Minutes San Antonio, Texas

Attendees: **Costas Bassias** Leon Bruckman Robert Castellano Nitin Gogate John Hawkins Marc Holness David James Peter Jones Michael Kelsen John Lemon Glen Parsons Mike Takefman Gary Turner Nader Vijeh Amril ???

Monday November 15, 2004

13:30 Meeting started

- 13:57 Opening Presentation by the Mike Takefman
 - Patent statement presented by the Chair
 - Schedule call called
 - 2004Dec Conference call
 - 2004Jan Interim Session in Ottawa
 - (teleconferencing facilities provided)
- 14:02 Motion #1:
 - Approval of agenda
 - M-Lemon, S-Jones
 - passed w/o dissent
- 14:03 Motion #2:
 - Move to confirm the approval of the SABSG PAR and 5 Criteria from the Ottawa Interim session.
 - M-Jones, S-Hawkins
 - passed w/o objection
- 14:11 Maintenance Procedure by John Lemon Filename: jl_maint_01.pdf
 - Voting is deferred till Thursday, for review time
 - No objections raised
- 15:21 Operation of 802.17B by Mike Takefman Filename: mt_op_01.pdf
 - Voting considerations discussed, with two possibilities
 - Operate in task force, with WG binding decisions
 - Operate with working group voting
 - Will consider formally at the plenary
- 16:01 Presentation of 802.1 PARs Norm Finn Filename: no slides presented
 - Group expressed a few concerns on 802.1aj PAR
 - This appeared to be very 802.3 centric
 - Why is this an admendment? It looks like distinct work.
- 17:01 PARs from other then 802.1 Mike Takefman url to slides:
 - Review of 802.3 Congestion Management Protocol
 - Group felt that the 802.1 dependency should be listed
- 18:00 Recess

Tuesday November 16, 2004

8:38 Motion #3:

8:40

- Accept the Tuesday agenda
- M-Takefman, S-Lemon
- Approved w/o dissent

SAS Overview by Marc Holness

Filename: mh_sas_overview_01.pdf

- Leon notes that some things change, and may need thought:
- Concern: does this introduce reordering possibilities?
- Concern: does this introduce uncertainty in BW allocations (no longer is this just flooding or local traffic)
- 9:30 SAS Requirements Round 1 by Mike Takefman Filename: mlt_req_01.pdf
 - Discussed requirements, deferred decisions
- 9:50 SAS Interworking options by Marc Holness Filename: mh_interwork_01.pdf
 - Presented the summary of three option
 - Mike Takefman expressed concern that local(da) is involved in all three proposals, and it might be hard to migrate into the bridge.
 - There could be an issue on whether 4-address extended formats could be excluded by some/all of the proposals.
 - Thoughts for comparison:
 - Efficiency of local ==> remote
 - Mike pointed out that we did this on a host for simplicity
 - Could do the same thing, regardless of destination
 - Question: Is there a need to have dynamic SAS-capable properties? Probably not, but food for thought.
- 13:05 Meeting restarts

Adjusted Agenda shown given the duration of presentations

13:06 Response to 802.1aj PAR - Mike Takefman Filename: 802_1_PAR_1.pdf

- Minor changes, some discussion on whether the example of a
- SONET/SDH regenerator was the best choice. The end result
- is that it is a box that people there might know and hence
- understand

13:21 Motion 4:

- Move to Forward the response to 802.1aj PAR as written in 802_1_PAR.doc.
- Mover:Lemon Second:Jones
- Unanimous
- 13:25 Topology Signalling / Efficient Multicast by Peter Jones filename: pj_SAStopo_01.pdf
 - Discussion on safety / race conditions during topology changes.
 - Discussion on Multicast service and transmission scope, questionas to whether this needs to be standardized or not.
- 14:00 Reserved Group address method of SAS interworking By Marc Holness
 - Filename: mh_rga_sas_interworking_01.pdf
 - Question on whether the group address will leak out of the ring
 - Discussion on whether the extended frame format is always used.
 - It is not used for local to local although it requires
 - SAS to have the topology database inside the SAS layer
 - in order to make the determination.
 - Action: Need to study what a SAS capable host sends out for a broadcast multicast ARP/OSPF announcement.
 - Further issues to be discussed, what to do about 4 address invocations of MA_DATA.request

15:00 SAS and VLANs by Robert Castellano Filename: rc_sasvlan_01.pdf

- Noted that the RPR ring is no different from a yellow coax ethernet in terms of the vlan learning etc.
- Action: What is the official point of view with hosts attaching to vlan trunk ports and dealing with vlans directly.
- Discussion on whether MAC A can be on two different boxes and whether the errors described are "real life" or not.
- Action: how does one handle default vlan configuration by SAS
- 15:50 Local Addresses and SAS by Robert Castellano Filesname: rc_saslocal_01.pdf
 - Action: does SAS *have to* be VLAN aware, or is a SAS layer without VLAN support legal.
 - Action: coupling between SAS database and Bridge Database ie FID versus VID in lookup.

16:30 Response to 802.3ar PAR - Mike Takefman Filename: 802 3 PAR.pdf

• Discussion around item 13 of the PAR and whether dot 1 is actually doing work and whether the yes box should have been ticked.

- 16:45802.3 representatives arrive to discuss 802.3arBen Brown and Bob Grow represented 802.3ar
- 17:45 Resumption of Response to 802.3ar Mike Takefman Motion 5:
 - Move to Forward the response to 802.3ar PAR as written in 802_3_PAR.doc.
 - Move :Lemon Second:Jones
 - Unanimous

18:00 Recess

Wednesday November 17, 2004

- 8:45 Call to Order
 - Adjusted Agenda given lack of PAR questions and previous days agenda.
 - Motion 6
 - Approval of the agenda
 - Move: Takefman, Second: Lemon
 - Unanimous

8:52 Ringlet Selection Method by Nitin Gogate Filename: ng_sas_rs_01.pdf

- Discussion on reorder and strict traffic, and it cannot ever occur, which is consistent with 802.17
- Discussion on whether relaxed traffic can be reordered only in the case of topology change. This is consistent with what dot17 does today. Some views expressed on both sides.
- Discussion on whether any ringlet selection history is required it seems that the main rule is that the same decision has to be made and maintain the state needed to make the decision
- Discussion on whether we need to age on TCNs from the bridge layer
- Action: consider the effects of end-station moves on the ring
- Action: do we need to provide a method for a client aging the database (control primitive of some kind)
- Discussion on whether fast aging is needed or just a large hammer (prune_all) is needed. Intelligent pruning is optional.

10:15 RPR MAC and Bridging Interaction Issues by Marc Holness filename: MH_RPRMAC_bridge_issues_01.pdf

- Discussion on whether SAS should deal with 4 addresses or not. There seemed to be concensus that SAS and 4 addresses do not play nicely. Options are: reject 4 address requests; or to detour around SAS is client asks for 4 addresses, if your detour, then to know whether a given frame has SAS is if there is a header bit.
- Robert asked to insert the following comment into the minutes "The issue is having backwards compatibility with 802.17-2004 standard which permits clients from sending all 4 addresses and making sure that a SAS capable station does not mistake a 2004-station for having SAS."
- 11:30 Review of Presentation to 802.1 by Marc Holness

- 13:40 SAS and VRRP by Marc Holness filename: mh_sas_vrrp_01.pdf
 - One key point is that 802.17-2004 supports a subset of possible VRRP deployments, other deployments would require different techniques.
- 14:05 RPR Requirements Round #2 by Mike Takefman filename – mlt_req_01.pdf
 - Much discussion over the first 2 requirements but did reach unanimous concensus on those items
- 15:15 Travel to Wyndam Hotel to meet with dot1
- 15:40 Joint Meeting with 802.1 Marc Holness and Mike Takefman representing 802.17 Filename: xyzzy
 - A group address is for MAC specific things is in the process of being defined in one of the current 802.1 standards and will be available for use by 802.17b
 - The issues highlighted with vlan position and transparency are exactly the issues
 - It might be the case the the vlan position moves deeper in the frame as more 802.1 standards are done
 - It is possible to place 802.1 security below 802.17b but the implications of this have to be thought out carefully
 - If all nodes on a ring are from the same service provider then a single association is needed to authenticate stations. Placing security above the MAC does mean that MAC control frames are in the clear.
 - Action to determine if this is a security hole or not
 - On the issue of frame expansion, Norm Finn gave the opinion that 802.1 was not in control of the size of the frame due to the upper layer stacks doing all sort of encapsulations etc of a base Ethernet frame. That in addition to the overhead from 802.1 shims leads to the requirement that "a lot" of space be available.
 - Action to check 802.1 security to see what the size of the shim is (likely 64 bytes).
 - Action to check the size of the 802.1ah shim (likely 18 bytes) plus a second CRC is possible
- 17:45 Continued discussion of Requirements
- 18:00 Recess

Thursday November 18, 2004

- 8:30 Call to Order
- 8:31 Motion #7
 - Approval of the agenda
 - M-Takefman, S-Lemon
 - unanimous

8:35 Schedule by Mike Takefman Filename: mlt sched 01.pdf

- Purpose is to give the WG milestones
- Straw poll agreement that 'schedule 2' is most realistic.
- This allows March 2006 RevCom approval.

9:05 Maintenance by John Lemon Filename: jl_maint_proc_02.pdf

- modified process based on discussions with David Law of 802.3
- 9:20 January Interim Discussion
 - Choices: Sacrameto, San Jose, Ottawa, Vancouver, Boston
 - Vancouver 802 hosted chosen, to be ratified during motion madness

9:45 Motion 8 - Maintenance

- Motion: Move to adopt the maintenance process as defined in jl_maint_proc_02.pdf and to authorize John Lemon to create the necessary web pages
- Moved: Peter Jones Second: Michael Kelsen
- unanimous consent

9:52 Motion 9 - Interpretations

- Motion: Move to adopt the interpretation process as defined in jl_maint_proc_02.pdf and to authorize John Lemon to create the necessary web pages
- Moved: Peter Jones Second: Michael Kelsen
- unanimous consent

9:53 Motion 10 – Minutes of Past Sessions

- Motion: Move to approve the minutes of the following sessions: July 2004, October 2004 and its teleconferences.
- Moved: John Lemon Second: Peter Jones
- unanimous consent

9:56 Motion 11 - .17b PAR to EC

- Motion: Move to request the 802 EC to forward the PAR for 802.17b to NESCOM.
- Moved: Marc Holness Second: Gary Turner
- unanimous consent

10:20 Motion 12 - interim in Vancouver

- Move to hold an 802.17 Interim Session as part of the 802.3 Interim Session in Vancouver on January 25/26/27 and to authorize the group to progress the 802.17b project.
- Moved: Glenn Parsons Second: Michael Kelson
- Y: 4 N: 3 A: 2 motion passes

10:25 Motion 13 - Interim move to Ottawa

- Move to change the location of the January Interim Meeting to Ottawa
- Moved: Marc Holness Second: Robert Castellano
- Y: 5 N: 3 A: 1 motion passes

11:01 Motion 14 - conf call

- Move to hold an 802.17b conference call on Tuesday Dec 14, 2004 from 12 noon ET to 3pm ET and 4pm to 7pm ET. All presentations to be provided by Dec 12, 2004 11:59pm ET
- Moved: Marc Holness Second: Peter Jones
- unanimous consent

11:03 Motion 15 - conf call

- Move to hold an 802.17b conference call on Tuesday Feb 15, 2005 from 12 noon ET to 3pm ET and 4pm to 7pm ET. All presentations to be provided by Feb 13, 2005 11:59pm ET and to authorize the group to progress the project.
- Moved: Peter Jones Second: Marc Holness
- unanimous consent

11:05 Requirements by Mike Takefman Filenames: mlt_req_02.pdf, Requirements_11-18-04_01.xls

- creation of a detailed list of requirements
- we need to determine how we will support bridging (802.1D, Q, ad, ah)

Motion 16 – adjourn 12:02

- Move to adjurn
 Moved: Peter Jones Second: John Lemon
- unanimous consent