

802.1 Plenary - 07/2007

Closing Agenda

802.1 officers etc

■ Officers

- Chair: Tony Jeffree
- Vice Chair: Paul Congdon
- Recording Secretary: Michael Wright
- Link Sec TG Chair: Mick Seaman
- Interworking TG Chair: Steve Haddock
- AV Bridging TG Chair: Michael Johas Teener
- CM TG Chair: Pat Thaler
- Link Sec TG Secretary: Allyn Romanow
- Maintenance of website: John Messenger
- Maintenance of Email exploder: Hal Keen

■ Website

- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/>
- Username: p8021 Password: go_wildcats

Administrative stuff – Upload area

■ Website – Upload area

- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/contrib>

- Username/Password: Ask Tony

- Needs sftp client: suggest you use Winscp:

- <http://winscp.net/eng/index.php>

or Filezilla:

- <http://sourceforge.net/projects/filezilla/>

Hostname is grouper.ieee.org

Membership

■ Voting membership

- Current 802.1 membership rules:
- A *session* is (the whole of) an Interim or Plenary during which 802.1 meets. A *meeting* is a subset of a session; i.e., a contiguous time period during the session when the WG meets. 802.1 considers meetings to be ½ day in duration.
- To gain membership: Attend 2 plenaries in the span of the four most recent plenaries (one interim can be substituted) **and** inform the Chair of your intention to become a voter. Membership is then gained at the start of the next plenary attended
- To maintain membership: Attend 2 out of the last 4 plenaries (one interim can be substituted) , and respond to 2 out of 3 most recent WG/TG ballots
- **Attendance is as per signup book/sheet – must be 75% of meetings during a session in order to count.**
- **Affiliation must be declared on the signup sheet in order for attendance to be counted (see later slides).**
- Signing the signup sheet for a meeting declares that you have (or will have) attended during the majority of the allotted time for that ½ day meeting. Hence, at sessions where more than one WG meets, signing up at two parallel meetings is **not** valid.

■ Voting rights are properly regarded as an obligation, not a privilege!

Membership contd...

- If you don't sign the signup sheet, then you won't get credit for being in the meeting.
- This may result in you not getting membership as quickly as you could.
- **So, if you care about getting/keeping your vote, make sure that you sign in every morning and afternoon that you are present in the meeting.**

Affiliation (1)

- **From the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual:**

5.3.3.1 Disclosure of affiliation

Each participant's affiliation shall be disclosed at any working group or project meeting. The chair or the chairs delegate shall inform the meeting of the requirement for disclosure of affiliation (see 5.2.1.5 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws). This shall be via a sign-in (e.g., sign-in sheet, electronic sign-in, verbal disclosure, or electronic communication) that provides for disclosure of employer and any other affiliation, a reminder of the definition of affiliation, and possible penalties for non-compliance.

Whenever an individual is aware that the ownership of his or her employer or other affiliation may be material to the process, or when the Sponsor or the IEEE-SA Standards Board requests, that individual shall also declare the "ultimate parent entity" of their affiliation. The ultimate parent entity is an entity that directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, controls the entity identified as the individual's affiliation. For the purposes of this definition, the term "control" and its derivatives, with respect to for-profit entities, means the legal, beneficial or equitable ownership, directly or indirectly, of more than fifty percent (50%) of the capital stock (or other ownership interest, if not a corporation) of an entity ordinarily having voting rights.

"Control" and its derivatives, with respect to nonprofit entities, means the power to elect or appoint more than fifty percent (50%) of the Board of Directors of an entity. The minutes of each working group or project meeting shall record a list of attendees and the disclosed affiliation of each attendee.

5.3.3.2 False or misleading disclosure

A meeting attendee who fails to disclose affiliation shall not accrue any membership rights, including rights of or towards voting membership, until such disclosures have been made. The chair shall review the adequacy of disclosures. Failure to disclose affiliation, or materially false or misleading disclosure of affiliation, shall result in loss of membership privileges and may also result in loss of other participation privileges within the IEEE-SA for such participants and any affiliated entities.

The Sponsor of the project shall, when appropriate, review the adequacy of disclosures and, if deemed inadequate, may direct corrective action(s). In the absence of effective corrective action(s) by the Sponsor, the IEEE-SA Standards Board may impose further corrective action(s).

Affiliation (2)

- **From the IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws:**

5.2.1.5 Disclosure of affiliation

Every member and participant in a working group, Sponsor ballot, or other standards development activity shall disclose his or her affiliation. An individual is deemed "affiliated" with any individual or entity that has been, or will be, financially or materially supporting that individual's participation in a particular IEEE standards activity. This includes, but is not limited to, his or her employer and any individual or entity that has or will have, either directly or indirectly, requested, paid for, or otherwise sponsored his or her participation. Failure to disclose every such affiliation may result in complete or partial loss of rights to participate in IEEE-SA activities. An individual is not excused from compliance with this policy by reason of any claim of a conflicting obligation (whether contractual or otherwise) that prohibits disclosure of affiliation. A person who believes that a participant's disclosure is materially incomplete or incorrect should report that fact to the Secretary of the IEEE-SA Standards Board and the appropriate Sponsor(s).

The following are 802.1 voters:

Alexei Beliaev
Jan Bialkowski
Jean-Michel Bonnamy
Mike Borza
Paul Bottorff
Rudolf Brandner
Dirceu Cavendish
Frank Chao
Paul Congdon
Alex Conta
Uri Cummings
Russell Dietz
Linda Dunbar
Hesham Elbakoury
David Elie-Dit-
Cosaque
Don Fedyk
Felix Feifei Feng
Norm Finn
David Frattura
John Fuller
Geoffrey Garner
Anoop Ghanwani
Franz Goetz
Ken Grewal
Tanmay Gupta
Steve Haddock

Brian Hassink
Romain Insler
Tony Jeffree
Pankaj Jha
Michael Johas Teener
Hal Keen
Keti Kilcrease
Yongbum Kim
Mike Ko
Raghu Kondapalli
Bruce Kwan
Kari Laihonen
Yannick Le Goff
David Martin
Menucher Menuchery
John Messenger
Dinesh Mohan
Hiroshi Ohta
Don Pannell
Glenn Parsons
Ken Patton
Neil Peers
Haim Porat
Charles Qi
Ray Qiu
Karen Randall
Robert Roden

Josef Roese
Allyn Romanow
Dan Romascanu
Jessy V Rouyer
Eric Ryu
Ali Sajassi
Joseph Salowey
Panagiotis Saltsidis
Sam Sambasivan
John Sauer
Mick Seaman
Koichiro Seto
Curtis Simonson
Nurit Sprecher
Kevin B Stanton
Bob Sultan
Muneyoshi Suzuki
Francois Tallet
John Terry
Pat Thaler
Dennis Volpano
Manoj Wadekar
Bert Wijnen
Ludwig Winkel
Michael D. Wright
Chien-Hsien Wu

The following can claim voting membership if they are here this week:

Osama Aboul-Magid

Jaihyung Cho

Mitch Gusat

Tae-eun Kim

Alan McGuire

Max Pritikin

Ananda Rajagopal

Himanshu Shah

Oliver Thorp

Maarten Vissers

Suresh Vobbilisetty

Hideo Yosimi

Access to 802.XX websites/reflectors

- As per established 802 EC decisions, there should be no restriction placed on access to websites and email reflectors owned by other WGs
- Some WGs allow the 802.1 username/password to be used on their websites
- For others, a request to the WG Chair should produce the desired result.
- IF YOU DON'T GET A SENSIBLE RESPONSE FROM THE RELEVANT WG CHAIR, LET ME KNOW.

Instructions for the WG Chair

The IEEE-SA strongly recommends that at each WG meeting the chair or a designee:

- Show slides #1 through #5 of this presentation
- Advise the WG attendees that:
 - The IEEE’s patent policy is consistent with the ANSI patent policy and is described in Clause 6 of the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws*;
 - Early identification of patent claims which may be essential for the use of standards under development is encouraged;
 - There may be Essential Patent Claims of which the IEEE is not aware. Additionally, neither the IEEE, the WG, nor the WG chair can ensure the accuracy or completeness of any assurance or whether any such assurance is, in fact, of a Patent Claim that is essential for the use of the standard under development.
- Instruct the WG Secretary to record in the minutes of the relevant WG meeting:
 - That the foregoing information was provided and the five slides were shown;
 - That the chair or designee provided an opportunity for participants to identify patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) and/or the holder of patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) that the participant believes may be essential for the use of that standard;
 - Any responses that were given, specifically the patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) and/or the holder of the patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) that were identified (if any) and by whom.
 - It is recommended that the WG chair review the guidance in the *Standards Companion* on inclusion of potential Essential Patent Claims by normative reference.

Note: **WG** includes Working Groups, Task Groups, and other standards-developing committees.

(Optional to be shown)

Highlights of the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws on Patents in Standards*

- **Participants have a duty to tell the IEEE if they know (based on personal awareness) of potentially Essential Patent Claims they or their employer own**
- **Participants are encouraged to tell the IEEE if they know of potentially Essential Patent Claims owned by others**
 - This encouragement is particularly strong as the third party may not be a participant in the standards process
- **Working Group required to request assurance**
- **Early assurance is encouraged**
- **Terms of assurance shall be either:**
 - Reasonable and nondiscriminatory, with or without monetary compensation; or,
 - A statement of non-assertion of patent rights
- **Assurances**
 - Shall be provided on the IEEE-SA Standards Board approved LOA form
 - May optionally include not-to-exceed rates, terms, and conditions
 - Shall not be circumvented through sale or transfer of patents
 - Shall be brought to the attention of any future assignees or transferees
 - Shall apply to Affiliates unless explicitly excluded
 - Are irrevocable once submitted and accepted
 - Shall be supplemented if Submitter becomes aware of other potential Essential Patent Claims
- **A “Blanket Letter of Assurance” may be provided at the option of the patent holder**
- **A patent holder has no duty to perform a patent search**
- **Full policy available at <http://standards.ieee.org/guides/bylaws/sect6-7.html#6>**

IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws on Patents in Standards

6.2 Policy

IEEE standards may be drafted in terms that include the use of Essential Patent Claims. If the IEEE receives notice that a [Proposed] IEEE Standard may require the use of a potential Essential Patent Claim, the IEEE shall request licensing assurance, on the IEEE Standards Board approved Letter of Assurance form, from the patent holder or patent applicant. The IEEE shall request this assurance without coercion.

The Submitter of the Letter of Assurance may, after Reasonable and Good Faith Inquiry, indicate it is not aware of any Patent Claims that the Submitter may own, control, or have the ability to license that might be or become Essential Patent Claims. If the patent holder or patent applicant provides an assurance, it should do so as soon as reasonably feasible in the standards development process. This assurance shall be provided prior to the Standards Board's approval of the standard. This assurance shall be provided prior to a reaffirmation if the IEEE receives notice of a potential Essential Patent Claim after the standard's approval or a prior reaffirmation. An asserted potential Essential Patent Claim for which an assurance cannot be obtained (e.g., a Letter of Assurance is not provided or the Letter of Assurance indicates that assurance is not being provided) shall be referred to the Patent Committee.

A Letter of Assurance shall be either:

- a) A general disclaimer to the effect that the Submitter without conditions will not enforce any present or future Essential Patent Claims against any person or entity making, using, selling, offering to sell, importing, distributing, or implementing a compliant implementation of the standard; or
- b) A statement that a license for a compliant implementation of the standard will be made available to an unrestricted number of applicants on a worldwide basis without compensation or under reasonable rates, with reasonable terms and conditions that are demonstrably free of any unfair discrimination. At its sole option, the Submitter may provide with its assurance any of the following:
 - (i) a not-to-exceed license fee or rate commitment, (ii) a sample license agreement, or (iii) one or more material licensing terms.

IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws on Patents in Standards

Copies of an Accepted LOA may be provided to the working group, but shall not be discussed, at any standards working group meeting.

The Submitter and all Affiliates (other than those Affiliates excluded in a Letter of Assurance) shall not assign or otherwise transfer any rights in any Essential Patent Claims that are the subject of such Letter of Assurance that they hold, control, or have the ability to license with the intent of circumventing or negating any of the representations and commitments made in such Letter of Assurance.

The Submitter of a Letter of Assurance shall agree (a) to provide notice of a Letter of Assurance either through a Statement of Encumbrance or by binding any assignee or transferee to the terms of such Letter of Assurance; and (b) to require its assignee or transferee to (i) agree to similarly provide such notice and (ii) to bind its assignees or transferees to agree to provide such notice as described in (a) and (b).

This assurance shall apply to the Submitter and its Affiliates except those Affiliates the Submitter specifically excludes on the relevant Letter of Assurance.

If, after providing a Letter of Assurance to the IEEE, the Submitter becomes aware of additional Patent Claim(s) not already covered by an existing Letter of Assurance that are owned, controlled, or licensable by the Submitter that may be or become Essential Patent Claim(s) for the same IEEE Standard but are not the subject of an existing Letter of Assurance, then such Submitter shall submit a Letter of Assurance stating its position regarding enforcement or licensing of such Patent Claims. For the purposes of this commitment, the Submitter is deemed to be aware if any of the following individuals who are from, employed by, or otherwise represent the Submitter have personal knowledge of additional potential Essential Patent Claims, owned or controlled by the Submitter, related to a [Proposed] IEEE Standard and not already the subject of a previously submitted Letter of Assurance: (a) past or present participants in the development of the [Proposed] IEEE Standard, or (b) the individual executing the previously submitted Letter of Assurance.

IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws on Patents in Standards

The assurance is irrevocable once submitted and accepted and shall apply, at a minimum, from the date of the standard's approval to the date of the standard's withdrawal.

The IEEE is not responsible for identifying Essential Patent Claims for which a license may be required, for conducting inquiries into the legal validity or scope of those Patent Claims, or for determining whether any licensing terms or conditions are reasonable or non-discriminatory.

Nothing in this policy shall be interpreted as giving rise to a duty to conduct a patent search. No license is implied by the submission of a Letter of Assurance.

In order for IEEE's patent policy to function efficiently, individuals participating in the standards development process: (a) shall inform the IEEE (or cause the IEEE to be informed) of the holder of any potential Essential Patent Claims of which they are personally aware and that are not already the subject of an existing Letter of Assurance, owned or controlled by the participant or the entity the participant is from, employed by, or otherwise represents; and (b) should inform the IEEE (or cause the IEEE to be informed) of any other holders of such potential Essential Patent Claims that are not already the subject of an existing Letter of Assurance.

Other Guidelines for IEEE WG

Meetings

- **All IEEE-SA standards meetings shall be conducted in compliance with all applicable laws, including antitrust and competition laws.**
- **Don't discuss the interpretation, validity, or essentiality of patents/patent claims.**
- **Don't discuss specific license rates, terms, or conditions.**
 - Relative costs, including licensing costs of essential patent claims, of different technical approaches may be discussed in standards development meetings.
 - Technical considerations remain primary focus
- **Don't discuss fixing product prices, allocation of customers, or dividing sales markets.**
- **Don't discuss the status or substance of ongoing or threatened litigation.**
- **Don't be silent if inappropriate topics are discussed... do formally object.**

If you have questions, contact the IEEE-SA Standards Board Patent Committee Administrator at patcom@ieee.org or visit <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/index.html>

See *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual*, clause 5.3.10 and “Promoting Competition and Innovation: What You Need to Know about the IEEE Standards Association's Antitrust and Competition Policy” for more details.

This slide set is available at <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt>

Use of audio/video recording devices & other techno toys

- **Per 2006 SA ops manual:**
 - **No use may be made of audio or video recording devices to record the proceedings in any 802.1 meetings without the express knowledge and agreement of all participants in the meeting. ()**
 - **Any members of the press are required to announce their presence**
- Participants are reminded that mobile phones should be adjusted to the “off” or “silent mode” setting. **Use of either of these settings would be a considerable courtesy to the speaker and other members of the audience.**

Presentation materials

- **Copyright statements or privacy/confidentiality statements of any kind SHALL NOT APPEAR on any contributions to 802, either in emails or in presentation material**
- Power Point bloat
 - At these meetings external bandwidth is not free
 - Please consider this when developing presentations
 - Corporate logos, graphic backgrounds, lots of clip art, etc. occupy lots of megabytes & generally do not convey any content that helps us to make technical progress
 - A comparison: Current 802.1Q-REV plus AD is a mere 2.8 megs; some recent presentations have been of comparable or greater size (but smaller in content by a couple of orders of magnitude!)
 - I will reserve the right in future to refuse circulation of materials that I consider to be excessive in this regard

Future meetings

- September interim:
 - 4-7 September, Stockholm, Sweden
- January 2008 interim:
 - Possible locations:
 - Eilat, Israel
 - Singapore
 - California (Bay area or Sacramento area)
 - Week of 28th?
 - 802.3 are meeting in Portland, week of 10th.
- May 2008 - .3 week of May 12th?
- Sept 2008 – York?

Interpretation requests outstanding...

- 802.1AB interp request
- 2 interp requests on 802.1ak
 - Needs urgent action as there is a bug in the protocol

Liaisons received:

- Feb liaison from MEF: <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2007/liaison-mef-from-jan-2007-meeting-0207.doc>
- Proposed response: <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2007/liaison-proposed-response-to-mef-from-jan-2007-meeting-0707.doc>
- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2007/liaison-itut-sg15-ls-158-0707.doc>
- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2007/liaison-itut-sg15-ls-173-0707.doc>
- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2007/liaison-itut-sg15-ls-185-0707.doc>
- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2007/liaison-itut-sg15-ls-174-0707.doc>
- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2007/liaison-dsl-forum-auth-for-wt146-0707.doc>
- IETF – CCAMP – Re Qay

Scope of P802.1aq

- Some doubt as to whether some of the proposed work in this area is within scope of the PAR.

TG reports

- Interworking
- Security
- AV
- CM

(IN)Sanity check – current workload

1. 802.1AC (MAC Service): Second draft. End date Dec '08
2. 802.1af (Key agreement): TG ballot. End date Dec '08
3. 802.1ah (Backbone PB) WG ballot. End date Dec '08
4. 802.1aj (Two-port relay) TG ballot. End date Dec '08
5. 802.1ap (Q MIB). TG ballot. End date Dec '09
6. 802.1aq (Shortest Path) TG ballot. End date Dec '09
7. 802.1AR (Device identifiers) TG ballot. End date Dec '09
8. 802.1AS (Time synch) – Editor's drafts. End date Dec '10
9. 802.1Qat (SRP) Initial drafts. End date Dec '10
10. 802.1Qau (Congestion Notification) PAR approved. End date Dec '10
11. 802.1Qav (AVB Forwarding & Queuing) - PAR approved
12. 802.1H revision - PAR approved
13. 802.1AB (LLDP) revision - PAR approved
14. 802.1Qaw (DD-CFM) – PAR approved
15. 802 O&A – Revision PAR approved
16. 802.1Qay – PBB-TE – PAR approved
17. (802.1AX - Link Agg – PAR approved (but .3 project)
18. 802.1ak-CORR-1
19. 1 more AVB PAR – by when?

Motions

MOTION

- 802.1 approves the March 2007 and May 2007 minutes.
- Proposed: messenger Seconded: ghanwani
- For 43 Against 0 Abstain 5

MOTION

- 802.1 resolves to hold a pre-meeting on the Monday morning of the November 2007 plenary session.
- 802.1 Proposed: fuller
- Second: haddock
 - For: 49 Against: 0 Abstain: 1

MOTION

- Motion: The AVB TG will continue to have teleconferences weekly at 2PM (US Pacific) Wednesdays for AVB general topics and 10AM (US Pacific) Mondays for 802.1AS specific topics. Access information will be sent to the 802.1 reflector immediately after the plenary.
- Proposed: fuller
- Second: pannell
 - For: 25
 - Against: 1
 - Abstain: 16

MOTION

- Motion: The CM simulation ad hoc will continue to have teleconferences weekly at 9AM (US Pacific) Thursdays. Access information will be sent to the 802.1 reflector immediately after the plenary.
- Proposed: Thaler
- Second: wadekar
 - For: 24
 - Against: 0
 - Abstain: 19

MOTION

- The following interpretation request on Std 802.1ak has been received:
"Situation:

An MRPDU is being parsed. At this point, a VectorAttribute has just been parsed and the next two bytes in the packet are 0x00 0x01. According to the grammar, we would expect another VectorAttribute or an EndMark at this point. Given that the next byte is 0x00, it appears to be an EndMark followed by another message with AttributeType 0x01. However, these same bytes could be interpreted as another VectorAttribute. In this case, the VectorHeader for this VectorAttribute would be 0x0001 which indicates that LeaveAll is clear and NumberOfValues is 1.

Specifically, any time that the second, third, etc VectorAttribute in an AttributeList has LeaveAll clear and (NumberOfValues < 256), the sequence of bytes appears to not be distinguishable from an EndMark followed by an AttributeType. How should these byte sequences be interpreted in these cases?"

- 802.1 resolves to approve the following response:
This is an error in the PDU specification. The correct specification of EndMark is SHORT (i.e., a 16-bit field, value 0). 802.1 has raised a PAR for a corrigendum to correct the error.
- Proposed: Haddock Seconded: fuller
- For 30 Against Abstain 7

MOTION

- The following interpretation request on Std 802.1ak has been received:

"Situation:

In section 10.8.3.5, the standard says that a message with a higher protocol version and an unknown attribute type should be discarded. The parser should proceed to the next message in the MRPDU. However, the FirstValue length is not encoded in the PDU itself as indicated in section 10.8.1.2. The length of FirstValue is provided by the application itself based on the attribute type (ie MMRP knows that MAC addresses are 6 bytes long). In this case, if the application does not recognize the attribute type because it was introduced in a new version of the application, it has no basis to know the length of the FirstValue. Without the length of FirstValue, the parser has no reliable way to skip past this message and proceed with parsing the next message as required by section 10.8.3.5.

Should the parser just discard the message with the unknown attribute type and all subsequent messages even though it contradicts 10.8.3.5? "

- 802.1 resolves to approve the following response:

This is an error in the PDU specification. There should be a length field in the structure.

The definition of Message should be:

Message ::= AttributeType, AttributeLength, AttributeList

and the definition of AttributeLength should be:

AttributeLength BYTE ::= <<Defined by the specific MRP application>>

802.1 has raised a PAR for a corrigendum to correct the error.

- Proposed: Haddock Seconded: finn
- For 33 Against 0 Abstain 8

MOTION

- 802.1 requests EC approval to forward the draft PAR for 802.1ak-COR-1, to NesCom.
- 802.1: Proposed: Haddock Second:
finn For: 27 Against: 0 Abstain:
7
- EC proposed: Jeffree second:

MOTION

- 802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1ah (Paul Bottorff) to prepare a further draft taking account of the discussion this week. The Chair is authorized to submit the project for further Working Group recirculation balloting.
- Proposed: bottorff Second: finn
- For: 37 Against: 0 Abstain: 5

MOTION

- 802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1ap (Glenn Parsons) to prepare a further draft. The Chair is authorized to submit the project for Task Group balloting, and subsequent Working Group balloting.
- Proposed: Haddock Second: Parsons
- For: 34 Against: 0 Abstain: 7

MOTION

- 802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1aj (Tony Jeffree) to prepare a further draft following completion of the resolution of ballot comments at the September Interim. The Chair is authorized to submit the project for Task Group balloting.
- Proposed: Haddock Second: messenger
- For: 40 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

MOTION

- 802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1AB-REV (Tony Jeffree) to prepare a further draft . The Chair is authorized to submit the project for Task Group balloting.
- Proposed: Haddock Second: finn
- For: 39 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

MOTION

- 802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1Qaw (Linda Dunbar) to prepare a further draft. The Chair is authorized to submit the project for Task Group balloting.
- Proposed: Haddock Second: Dunbar
- For: 41 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

MOTION

- 802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1AS (Geoff Garner) to prepare a further draft. The Chair is authorized to submit the project for Task Group balloting.
- Proposed: Fuller Second: Garner
- For: 49 Against: 0 Abstain: 0

MOTION

- 802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1Qat (Felix Feng) to prepare a further draft. The Chair is authorized to submit the project for Task Group balloting.
- Proposed: fuller Second: Feng
- For: 44 Against: 0 Abstain: 1

MOTION

- 802.1 resolves to forward the attached liaison contribution to IEEE 1588.
- Proposed: fuller Second: Garner
- For: 35 Against: 0 Abstain: 4

To: IEEE 1588

From: IEEE 802.1

Date: Thursday, July 19, 2007

The AVB TG within the IEEE 802.1 Working Group has been working on P802.1AS Draft Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks – Timing and Synchronization for Time-Sensitive Applications in Bridged Local Area Networks. The IEEE 802.1 Working Group approved the following motion to submit the latest editor's draft for initial TG ballot:

[Insert text of motion here.]

This draft uses a subset of IEEE P1588 Version 2, and includes an IEEE P1588 profile. However, the draft is written in the style of IEEE 802.1 standards rather than IEEE 1588 standards.

The IEEE 802.1 Working Group would appreciate any comments on this draft from the IEEE 1588 Committee or its members. A Task Group ballot form is attached.

A copy of the draft is attached.

Best regards,

Tony Jeffree
IEEE 802.1 WG Chair.

MOTION

- 802.1 resolves to forward the attached liaison contribution to 802.11.
- Proposed: Haddock Second: gray
- For: 27 Against: 0 Abstain: 5

802.11 – Liaison response

To: Stuart Kerry, IEEE P802.11 WG Chair

From: Tony Jeffree, IEEE P802.1 WG Chair

Your liaison letter of May 18, 2007 was discussed in the 802.1 WG meeting of 28 May, 2007.

We are given to believe that you seek guidance on the issue of potential incompatibilities between implementations compliant with IEEE Std 802.11e-2005 and implementations compliant with IEEE Std 802.1Q-2005, and its successors, arising out of changes in mappings between user priority (UP) values and traffic types. We further understand that the IEEE P802.11 WG is concerned that this issue may be further complicated should the IEEE P802.1 WG subsequently decide to make their current recommended mappings normative.

It would be inappropriate for the IEEE P802.1 WG to attempt to guarantee that any particular change to subsequent versions of IEEE Std 802.1Q-2005 will not occur and this includes possibly changing the normative status of current recommendations of the standard.

However, we can offer guidance on the issue of incompatibility that came up in discussion of this issue in the working group. The original reason for making the mappings non-normative was to allow for potential changes as a result of experience gained from deployment. Changes to the mapping that occurred between IEEE Standards 802.1D-2004 and 802.1Q-2005 were driven by that deployment experience and the fact that many (if not most) of the deployed equipment used a mapping that was consistent with the recommendations in IEEE Std 802.1Q-2005 (and therefore not consistent with the recommendations of IEEE Std 802.1D-2004).

Since deployed equipment already uses this mapping, changes in recommendations of IEEE Std 802.1Q-2005 should be considered to more accurately reflect the existing deployed base, exposing incompatibilities that may occur in the future if not otherwise addressed.

Applications of 802.1 Bridging typically will have different specific requirements than applications of wireless access networks. If future WLAN applications include being part of network infrastructure, we encourage the IEEE 802.11 WG to consider use of the mappings defined in IEEE 802.1Q-2005. Experience indicates that the class of network control that is introduced in IEEE 802.1Q is necessary for ensuring the proper operation of networking infrastructure.

Recognizing that there would be applications that required a different set of mappings, the IEEE Std 802.1Q-2005 defines mechanisms for regeneration of these values for compatibility with those applications. Hence it is likely that: a) there are already existing scenarios in which this issue is being adequately addressed by existing implementations and b) one standard mechanism that might be used to address this issue is the use of configured priority regeneration, (see IEEE 802.1Q-2005, section 6.7.3).

Hopefully, this note addresses your concerns.

Sincerely,

Tony Jeffree

IEEE 802.1 WG Chair

MOTION

- 802.1 instructs the editor of P802.1AR (Max Pritikin) to prepare a further draft taking account of the discussion this week. The Chair is authorized to submit the project for Task Group balloting.
- Proposed: seaman Second: kilcrease
- For: 21 Against: 0 Abstain: 11

MOTION

- 802.1 authorizes its Chair to forward the liaison response to liaison-mef-from-jan-2007-meeting-0207.doc contained in
- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2007/liaison-proposed-response-to-mef-from-jan-2007-meeting-0707.doc>
- to the MEF
- Proposed: Haddock Second: finn
- For: 26 Against: 0 Abstain: 4

MOTION

- 802.1 authorizes the CM task group to draft a PAR for enhanced transmission selection at the Sept Interim, and authorizes the Chair to forward the resultant text to the EC under the 30 day rule.
- Proposed: Thaler Second: Wadekar
- For: 32 Against: 1 Abstain: 9

MOTION

- 802.1 authorizes the CM task group to draft a PAR for priority-based flow control.
- Proposed: Thaler Second: Wadekar
- For: 16 Against: 8 Abstain: 21

MOTION

- 802.1 authorizes its Chair to forward the attached liaison response to:
 - liaison-itut-sg15-ls-173-0707.doc
- to ITUT SG15
- Proposed: Haddock Second: Sprecher
- For: 24 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

- To ITU-T SG15 Q12From: 802.1Thank you for your liaison of June, 2007, and the question of clarification that you have asked for which is reproduced below for reference:
- "Body: SG15 requests clarification on the term “service interface”, specifically can the option of translation of 802.1Q 12-bit S-VIDs be applied at any interface where a S-VLAN tag is present?"
- With respect to the term service interface this refers to an interface at the edge of the Provider Network.
- In terms of translation of a 12 bit S-VID at any interface then yes, it is an option that may be supported at each provider bridging interface. Please note that the information (translation table) is provided by management means only (there is no support of control protocols to set it).

MOTION

- 802.1 authorizes its Chair to forward the attached liaison response to:
 - liaison-itut-sg15-ls-185-0707.doc
- to ITUT SG15
- Proposed: Haddock Second: Sprecher
- For: 29 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

- To ITU-T SG15 Q11:From: 802.1Thank you for your liaison of June, 2007, reproduced below for reference:
- "Body: As you may know, ITU-T SG15 has previously approved G.8031 – Ethernet Linear Protection Switching. At our June 2007 SG15 plenary, an amendment to G.8031 was consented.
- The scope of the G.8031 Amendment is to add enhancements about response to EXER and DNR, and the location of protection switching process. It also presents additional descriptions about management information (MI) signals.
- Q9 suggests that the protection mechanisms of G.8031 may be useful to consider in your development of P802.1Qay.”
- We would like to thank you for keeping us informed of recent developments at the ITU-T. Work has now been initiated on P802.1Qay and at this meeting some tutorial information on G.8031 was provided and discussed. We look forward to continued collaboration on topics of joint interest.

MOTION

- 802.1 authorizes its Chair to forward the attached liaison response to CCAMP WG co-chairs and IEEE-IETF liaisons
- Proposed: Haddock Second: saltsidis
- For: 29 Against: 0 Abstain: 5

- To CCAMP WG co-chairs and IEEE-IETF liaisons:
From: 802.1

Thank you for your query of June 4, 2007, reproduced below so that it is clear what question is being answered:

"Body: The CCAMP Working Group of the IETF notes the recent approval of a PAR for the 802.1Qay project, and we understand that part of the intent of this project is to support provisioning systems that explicitly select traffic engineered paths within Provider Backbone Bridge (802.1ah) Networks."

This is correct. The first meeting of P802.1Qay (PBB-TE) was in May 2007. For your information, the official home page of the project can be accessed at <http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1ay.html>.

"It has been suggested that GMPLS protocols developed within the IETF under the care of the CCAMP Working Group are suitable aids to such provisioning systems. We propose to investigate the applicability of GMPLS protocols to the control of 802.1Qay networks, and we would like to work with the IEEE by proposing suitable GMPLS protocol extensions for use in single and multi-domain networks subject to 802.1 reaching consensus on the definition of the data plane."

IEEE 802.1 currently has no GMPLS related protocol work under development and therefore has no opinion on whether GMPLS is suitable to control 802.1Qay networks. Note that the scope of P802.1Qay is single domain networks.

"Please confirm that in your opinion the use of GMPLS control plane protocols in this way is appropriate, and that IEEE 802.1 has no objection to the IETF CCAMP Working Group starting work in this area."

Although IEEE 802.1 holds no opinion on GMPLS control plane work, the IEEE 802.1 working group does not object to work that is compatible with IEEE 802.1 data planes.

Note that IEEE 802.1 reserves the right to develop its own control planes for PBB-TE. For your information, the only projects currently underway that are related to control planes is P802.1aq for Shortest Path Bridging and P802.1Qat for bandwidth reservation.

Regards,
Tony