

IEEE 802.5

May 12th - 15th, 1998
Herzliya, Israel

Hosted by Novacom

Minutes of meeting 'ff'

Neil Jarvis, Recording Secretary
Madge Network Ltd, York, UK

njarvis@madge.com
http://www.8025.org/

<i>Revision History</i>		
V1.0	15 May 98	End of recording
V1.1	18 May 98	First release
V1.2	1 July 98	Updated with comments

Attendees.

Karl Reinke
Bob Love
Ken Wilson
Richard Knight
Simon Harrison
Andy Fierman

Bay Networks
IBM
IBM
Madge
Madge
Madge

John Messenger
Neil Jarvis
Moshiko Levhar
Peggy DiMauro
Moshe Barlev
Ivar Jeppesen

Madge
Madge
Novacom
Novacom
Novacom
Olicom

Document List.

Number/ Release	Description	Author	Comments
05-00	Document list	-	
05-01	Meeting Agenda	-	
05-02	Meeting Minutes	Neil Jarvis	This document
05-03	Business Cards	-	
05-04	<i>Reserved</i>	-	
05-05	802.5t Draft 2	-	
05-06r3	Draft 2 comment report	-	r3: post comment resolution
05-07	Updated Annex L	Ken Wilson	
05-08	Updated Annex M	Ken Wilson	
05-09	Source Route/VLANs PAR	-	
05-10	Source Route/VLANs 5 Criteria	-	

Tuesday, 12 May 1998

802.5 Source Routing and VLANs.

Started with a recap of John Messenger's presentation from Irvine (Progressing VLAN/Source Routing, <http://www.8025.org/meetings/mar98/03-16.pdf>). When talking about option 1 and 2, it became clear that there was confusion about what the IBM proposal actually was. 2 versions of their proposal were available, enough differences that the option 1 and 2 model would need to be revisited.

The committee then produced a list of items that need to consider in the document:

- ❖ Frame forwarding rules
 - ARE/STE
 - SR
 - Ingress/progress/egress model like 802.1Q
- ❖ Preservation of source routing advantages
 - Meshing
 - Redundancy
 - Largest frame discovery
- ❖ GMRP/GVRP/GARP issues
- ❖ Spanning tree issues
 - 802.1d
 - Multiple spanning trees
 - Spanning grove
- ❖ Multicast traffic issues

Because no SR/VLAN work had been carried out before this meeting by any of the participants, the word-smithing of the proposed PAR and 5 criteria had to be carried out during the meeting. This resulted in the committee produced a preliminary draft of the PAR and 5 criteria (05-09 and 05-10).

The committee passed straw poll 05-01 to distribute these texts to 802.5 for review and comment before forwarding them to the SEC in time for getting them approved at the July plenary. [ACTION: RDL]

Simon Harrison is empowered to co-ordinate comments and produce a final revision of the texts for transmission to SEC in time for the required review prior to the July plenary. [ACTION: SJH]

Wednesday, 13 May 1998

802.5t, Draft 2, Ballot Results.

The ballot on 802.5t, 100Mbit/s DTR, Draft 2 closed successfully at noon (PST), Sunday, 10th May. Before comment resolution, the ballot to approve draft 2 failed. After comment resolution, the ballot to approve draft 2 passed

Full results are as follows:

Voting Member	Vote Received Before Comment Resolution	Vote Received After Comment Resolution
Peggy Jean DiMauro	Approve	Approve
Andy Fierman	Disapprove	Approve ^(*)
Paul Gessert	Approve	Approve
Michael Hanrahan	Disapprove	Disapprove
Simon Harrison	Disapprove	Approve ^(*)
John Hill	Approve	Approve
Bob Hubbard	Abstain	Abstain
Neil Jarvis	Disapprove	Approve ^(*)
Ivar Jeppesen	Disapprove	Approve ^(*)
George Lin	Abstain	Abstain
Bob Love	Approve	Approve
Keith Luke	-	-
John Messenger	Disapprove	Disapprove
Avishay Noam	Abstain	Approve ^(*)
Ivan Oakley	Abstain	Abstain
Syou-Chin Peng	-	-
Karl Reinke	Approve	Approve
Bob Ross	Approve	Approve
Tam Ross	Approve	Approve
Steve Scandalis	-	-
Carson Stuart	-	-
Bo Thomsen	Disapprove	Disapprove
Scott Valcourt	Abstain	Abstain
Trevor Warwick	Abstain	Abstain
Dave Wilson	Disapprove	Disapprove
Ken Wilson	Disapprove	Approve ^(*)
Ed Wong	Approve	Approve

^(*) Indicates a changed vote

Measurement	Count (Before)	Count (After)
Balloting pool size	27	27
Approve vote count	8	14
Disapprove vote count	9	4
Abstain vote count	6	5

Question	Criteria	Result	Answer
Ballot Closed?	75% of voters participated	81%	Yes
Ballot Passes? (Before)	75% of Approve/Disapprove votes are Approve	47%	No
Ballot Passes? (After)	75% of Approve/Disapprove votes are Approve	77.7%	Yes

802.5t, Draft 2, Comment Resolution.

We returned again to the question about what editorial work the committee should perform on the draft standard, and how much the IEEE editors would change it. It was decided to formulate a list of rules that would accompany the standard to the editors, indicating what rules the committee editors should adopt and what may or may not be changed by the IEEE editors. See annex A for the first cut at the rules.

In addition, a number of issues being discussed reflected problems in the base standard. A list has been started to capture these issues (re-started? Have you got the original list Mick? [ACTION: MJH]). See annex B for the list as it stood at the end of the meeting. We have a maintenance PAR in the process of being authorised by the SEC. Resources will need to be assigned to this work. [ACTION: RDL].

Comment resolution was performed by reviewing document 05-06r1, the report generated from the combined comments against draft of the HSTR standard.

Thursday, 14 May 1998

802.5t, Draft 2, Management objects.

Although not discussed in open committee, the question of whether the various token ring management objects would need to be updated was discussed in offline sessions.

- Annex K MIB does not require any updates for HSTR.
- RFC1213 (MIB-II) already supports 100Mbit/s (and greater) for all networks including token ring.
- RFC1231 (Token Ring MIB) needs to be revised to support 100Mbit/s (and greater). The current definition of dot5.dot5RingSpeed is shown below. It is an enumerated type, which will require new values for 100Mbit/s and 1000Mbit/s.

dot5.dot5RingSpeed:

R/W, Mandatory

Unknown (1), oneMegabit (2), fourMegabit (3), sixteenMegabit (4)

The committee must determine the correct course of action to make the required changes, and to get the information published to the widest possible audience. An item should be included in the next committee meeting to discuss this topic [ACTION: JLM]

In addition it was pointed out that the Annex K MIB is still an IETF draft document with a limited lifetime, and that Trevor Warwick and Katie Lee, the document's editors, were no longer actively involved in the committee. [ACTION: RDL]

802.5t, Draft 2, Comment Resolution.

Comment resolution continued.

Speed trade-up

The major topic of the day was the speed trade up proposal contained in the draft. E-mail discussion prior to the meeting had raised some concerns about the proposal, whether it worked and whether it solved all known problems. After much discussion it became clear that there were four approaches that could be taking for including trade-up in the standard. A brief description of these approaches, together with their pros and cons is shown below. Subsequent discussion led the committee to a motion (05-02) to adopt approach 2 as the speed trade-up solution.

Approach 1:

- If trade-up is requested during registration, both entities go into a new state, and await link status to become asserted.
- If link status does not come asserted, the state tables return to registration and re-join at the original speed, with an interlock flag to prevent the trade-up request being sent.
- If the link status does become asserted, registration is performed, followed by lobe test.
- If lobe test fails both ends of the link to return to registration and re-join at the original speed, with an interlock flag to prevent the trade-up request being sent.

PRO: less management interaction: failed trade-up handled within tables

CON: less flexible in error cases: 16, 100, 16, that's it; have to change PHY settings within state tables

Approach 2 (Adopted by vote 05-02):

- If trade-up is requested during registration, both entities go into a new state, and await link status to become asserted.
- If link status does not become asserted, the state tables returns to bypass. Management is responsible for retrying the open.

- If the link status does become asserted, registration is performed, followed by lobe test.
- If lobe test fails return to bypass. Management is responsible for retrying the open.

PRO: handles 4/16 to 100 trade-up inside MAC; lets MGT handle difficult cases; incomplete spec of process.

CON: have to change PHY settings within state tables

Approach 3:

- If trade-up is requested during registration, both entities return to bypass. Management is responsible for retrying the open at a new speed.

PRO: simpler because less transitions

CON: timing windows; incomplete specification of process; allows non-interoperable proprietary solutions

Approach 4:

- Remove trade-up

PRO: get standard out

CON: less functionality (market problem); it's still work to take it out; allows non-interoperable proprietary solutions

9.8 Study Group

A concern was raised that the draft should a number of layer interfaces in clause 2 diagrams that were not documented anywhere else in the standard (e.g. PM_UNITDATA) This re-opened the discussion about what the layering picture should be, and whether it needed to be fixed in the draft. Because it was felt that this was potentially a large item of work, it was proposed that a study group be formed to produce the necessary modification to 9.8 (and to 2, 9.1 and 14 if required). These modification would be published well in advance of the official draft 2.1 release date, and allow the committee to decide via e-mail if the changes should be made.

The group is to publish its findings to the group by 27 May. [ACTION: STUDY GROUP]

Friday, 15 May 1998

802.5t, Draft 2, Comment Resolution.

Recirculation ballot

Prior to the official release of draft 2.1, 3 documents will be made available to the committee for e-mail review:

1. PS_/PM_ interface rewrite.
2. Annex A
3. Chapter 1

If approved, these documents will be included in draft 2.1.

Draft 2.1 will be released for a 15 day recirculation ballot on June 9th. This will include the updated comment database report, any responses to negative comments, and a new database to allow voters to comment on draft 2.1. The recirculation ballot vote (05-03), as pre-authorized during the March plenary meeting, passed.

The recirculation ballot will close on June 25th.

802.5t editors' notes

Here is a random selection of notes that 802.5t editors should be aware of, prior to releasing draft 2.1.

1. Make sure dashes on title page print correctly. [ACTION: NAJ]
2. Don't show cross-outs. (Clause 9).
3. Proof read PDF, especially around hidden cross-outs. [ACTION: NAJ]
4. For all but clause 9, generate draft 2 to draft 2.1 changes.
5. For clause 9 generate changes from Amd. 1 to draft 2.1, and publish in conjunction with the comment database.
6. Editors to supply Word files with the correct revision settings enabled. In addition they should indicate what those settings are.
7. Editors to supply updated comment database.

Close

John Messenger and Neil Jarvis have put their names forward for consideration as vice-chair and recording secretary for the 802.5 committee respectively. This will be ratified at the next 802.5 plenary meeting.

The meeting closed shortly after 12:00pm. The committee expressed their thanks for the excellent job done by Novacom, and Sarah Hagbi in particular, for organising the meeting in Israel. The committee will next meet in La Jolla, CA during the July IEEE 802 meeting.

Motions

Straw Poll:	05-01	Date:	12 May 98
Moved by:	Neil Jarvis	Status:	PASS
Seconded by:	Ivar Jeppesen		

Move that:

The draft PAR and 5 Criteria for

Supplement to - Information technology

Telecommunications and information exchange between systems -
Local and metropolitan area networks -
Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks:
Source Routing

be distributed to 8025 for review and comment. Simon Harrison is empowered to coordinate comments and produce a final revision of the texts for transmission to SEC in time for the required review prior to the July plenary.

Yes:	6	No:	0	Abstain:	1
-------------	---	------------	---	-----------------	---

Straw Poll:	05-02	Date:	14 May 98
Moved by:	Ken Wilson	Status:	PASS
Seconded by:	Neil Jarvis		

Move that:

Approach 2 for speed trade-up be adopted for draft 2.1. Approach 2 is shown below. Approaches 1, 3 and 4 are shown in the minutes. Approach 2 is the state of speed trade-up in draft 2, with appropriate bug fixes.

Approach 2:

- If trade-up is requested during registration, both entities go into a new state, and await link status to become asserted.
- If link status does not become asserted, the state tables returns to bypass. Management is responsible for retrying the open.
- If the link status does become asserted, registration is performed, followed by lobe test.
- If lobe test fails return to bypass. Management is responsible for retrying the open.

Note: The No vote was concerned that we should be fixing the management observe-ability and controllability of the MAC in an explicit fashion (via MGMT_EVENT etc), rather than implicitly as currently shown in the tables. This has been captured as a possible maintenance item.

Yes:	6	No:	1	Abstain:	4
-------------	---	------------	---	-----------------	---

Vote:	05-03	Date:	15 May 98
Moved by:	Karl Reinke	Status:	PASS
Seconded by:	Simon Harrison		
Move that:			
<p>802.5t/D2.1 go out for working group recirculation ballot on June 9th, 1998 based on D2 and the resolution of comments against that draft. The recirculation ballot will close 12 noon, GMT on June 25th, 1998. Comment resolution will occur during the July Plenary meeting, to be held in La Jolla, CA.</p>			
<p>Note: This vote was pre-approved during the March meeting in Irvine. (Vote 03-06).</p>			
Yes:	8	No:	0
		Abstain:	0

Annex A: Standard Writing Rules

Committee Editor's Rules

1. Use "clause" when referring to a whole clause, e.g. "in clause 9".
2. Use nothing when referring to a subclause, e.g. "in 9.1".

IEEE Editor's Rules

??

<< This is now captured in the standalone document 802.5/00-04 >>

Annex B: Maintenance PAR work

1. Need to add 4/16 DTR picture to clause 2.
2. Fix figure 9.1-5, to show a better representation of transmit frame queuing.
3. R3146 will fire before R3152. R3152 can be deleted. This has been done for HSTR.
4. Use MGMT_EVENT.indication in MAC tables? (This is a base and amd 1. Issue)
5. Fix base and Amd 1 PM_CONTROL.request() to use transmit_mode rather than repeat_mode as used in 100Mbit/s.

<< This is now captured in the standalone document 802.5/00-05 >>