Maintenance Task Group Meeting

Via phone conference

September 14, 2011

Attendees

1. Tony Jeffree
2. Paul Congdon
3. Norm Finn
4. Jeff Lynch
5. Anoop Ghawani
6. Dan Romascanu

Minutes

1. The TG chair made the call for patents. No responses were recorded.
2. A brief review of the current status was discussed prior to walking through the open items
3. Item 0003
   a. Comment has been introduced and accepted, but not put into the draft. The draft is in recirc at the moment. Comment will be resubmitted. Leaving balloting state
4. Item 0005
   a. The extension MIB is open in Qbg and we could fix some of the relevant bits, but this is in working group recirc. The best long-term answer solution is to put this in AX, but we don't have a revision scheduled. Since there is really no new information to change the urgency, we will leave this in its current state.
5. Item 0006
   a. AB Corr PAR has been approved, but a draft has not yet been circulated for ballot. Once this goes to ballot we need to validate the items are covered and then change the state to balloting.
6. Item 0007
   a. We should just fix this in any amendment to Q, this could be done in aq or Qbg. It would be better to have a TG chair submit a comment against Qbg to get it fixed – do it now rather than wait for another draft. Action: Paul to submit late Qbg comments. Move to balloting phase
7. Item 0008
   a. Since this is similar to 0007, do the same resolution.
8. Item 0009
   a. There is some question as to whether you can actually send/receive LLDP frames at the physical layer because of the way it has been specified originally in 802.3. If that is true, then we have a new feature requirement for 802.1AX and it is needed to send/receive at the physical layer. This aspect could be put into AXbq.

b. How should a Y work in the link aggregation layer? If we want to de-multiplex frames then we would either need new addresses or content specific multiplexing.   The way it currently works is that you would see multiple peers at the aggregate layer and one of the physical links would see two peers while others would only see one. Doing the Y based on protocol is a slippery slope (e.g. it would be protocol specific – the LLDP Y as a shim).   We would rather not create a new destination address and instead use a TPMR type Y. Discuss this at the Interim via a submission by Jeff, Paul and Norm.   Leave in received state for now.

9. Item 0010
   a. Also make a comment against Qbg to fix this one as done with 0007 and 0008