802.17 Meeting in Ottawa, ON
Monday, October 4, 2004

Attendees

Mike Takefman
Robert Castellano
Bob Sultan
Yongdong Jin
Nitin Gogate
Peter Jones
Bob Sultan
Glenn Parsons
Gary Turner
Marc Holness

Minutes

- o Meeting objectives: Finalize PAR and 5-Criteria, technical presentations and requirements discussion, and pre-submit to NesCom.
- o At 9:58am, agenda was approved.
- o Fujitsu presentation hilighted the need to consider Ringlet Selection within the spatially aware sublayer (SAS). In addition, the SAS may introduce frame reorder/duplication when switching between undirected to directed transmissions.
- o Impromptu discussion regarding RPR frame size occurred. 802.17 specify that it supports frame sizes of 1616 bytes and 9216 bytes. 802.3 is specifying that additional headers and trailer fields can be added, thus increasing the size of the Ethernet frame. The service data unit of the Ethernet frame remains at 1500 bytes however. 802.17 WG needs to be clear on how it specifies frame size support for various clients. Link security, provider bridging, backbone provider bridging are example 802.1 activities that may result in larger Ethernet frame sizes. We should try to specify things such that we don't have to revisit and update our specifications each time the Ethernet frame size changes.
- o Wording of the PAR required clarification. Previous text seems to imply that the scope was specific to Bridging clients only. This is not the case. 802.17-2004 provides spatial reuse for local unicast transmissions. This extension provides spatial reuse for other frame transmissions (e.g., remote unicast as seen in 802.1 bridging).
- o 802.17b scoping discussion also occurred. Should we also support spatial reuse for multicast applications as well as remote unicast as well. Decision was madeword the PAR such that it does not preclude supporting spatial reuse for multicast group addressing over the ring.
- o The chair decided that we need to close on our strategy to deal with spatial reuse support of multicast by the ending of this weeks meeting (i.e., Wednesday).
- o Members of 802.17 WG that are interested in pursing supporting spatial reuse for multicast group addressing are requested to provide analysis and technical

direction. We need to see if considering this feature extension will conflict with agreed upon Objectives (e.g., conformance with 802.1 FDB operations, time-to-market schedule, etc.). This needs to be closed by the November Plenary meeting.

- o Discussion took place regarding voting within 802.17b. Should we move to one company per vote, or the individual vote?

802.17 Meeting in Ottawa, ON
Tuesday, October 5, 2004

Minutes

- o Agenda agreed upon.
- o These may be issues that need to be resolved relating to how the secondary MAC address feature in 802.17-2004 would interact with the SAS data base operations. Need to consider service primitive operations.
- o How does the SAS DB know if the client destination address is local or remote? May need to look in to the topology database somehow. Need to specify.
- o When the SAS receives an indication service primitive, it may need to move the *sa_extended* and *da_extended* into the *sa* and *da* parameters (respectively).
- o There may a general problem with the 802.17-2004 specification concerning how the *sa_extended* and *da_extended* parameters get mapped to the MAC client. Need to consider possible amendments to 802.17 spec.
- o We may need to consider supporting an option where the SAS DB does and does not learn VIDs.
- o There are 3 ways in which we can support SAS interworking.
    1. Use of the rprGroupAddress
    2. Use of Topology Discovery attributes to indicates SAS capable RPR stations
    3. Use of explicit bit in RPR header to indicate SAS capable RPR station.
- o Marc Holness actioned with tightening up the reception rules when the rprGroupAddress is used. For example, what happens when a (basic) bridge or host/router receive this reserved group address.
- o Peter Jones actioned with providing analysis and pulling together a chart package where topology discovery is used to distribute a SAS attribute.
- o Robert Castellano actioned with providing analysis and pulling together a chart package where a reserved bit in the RPR header is used to indicate SAS capable RPR station.
- o Discussion took place to determine level of spatial reuse we should pursue between SAS capable and SAS non-capable RPR stations.
- o SAS may require ringlet selection entity. This is primarily due to the fact that the SAS now can explicitly transition from undirected to directed transmissions over the ring. The SAS ringlet selection rule may be as simple as stating that no re-order or duplication is a result.
- o It is not clear the level of detail is required when specifying re-order and duplication rules within the SAS.

- Abstract rules need to be specified for ringlet selection algorithm in SAS. Do we need to do more than that to support strict mode?

- **Actions (next steps)**

  - **Nitin Gogate** - Provide a the list of (abstract) rules required by the ringlet selection entity in the SAS that will adhere to re-order prevention and duplication prevention of strict ordered frames. Define what needs to be done for relaxed frames. Define what would be the interactions between the ringlet selection entity in SAS and that in the RPR MAC.
  - **Nitin Gogate** - Provide analysis on "intelligent" pruning of SAS DB when a protection/topology event occurs on the ring. NOTE: The mandatory behavior could be to flush the entire SAS DB upon detection of ring topology/protection event. Optional specifications may outline more optimal pruning techniques. Another option to consider is to have the SAS stop doing anything until station management comes back as says start again.
  - **Peter Jones** - Provide analysis on how topology discovery attributes can be used to support SAS interworking procedures.
  - **Robert Castellano** - Provide analysis on how utilization of the reserved bits in the RPR header can be used to support SAS interworking procedures.
  - **Marc Holness** - Provide analysis to show if there are any undesirable side effects if an 802.1 bridge client or host/router of the RPR MAC inadvertently receives a frame where the destination address is the *rprGroupAddress*. Need to consider 802.17-2004 MAC and amended 802.17b MAC.
  - **Peter Jones** - Provide an analysis to determine the interactions between the secondary address feature found in 802.17-2004 and the SAS operations.
  - **Peter Jones** - Clean up the specification regarding how service **indication** primitives are handled by the MAC (and sublayers) prior to dispatch to the MAC client. There may be an impact on existing 802.17-2004 specifications and even 802.17a specifications. Specifically, the handling/translations of the *sa_extended* and *da_extended*, *sa*, and *da* parameters. Talk with John Lemon when closing this one.
  - **Mike Takefman** – Finalize PAR and 5-Criteria with 802.17b SG.
  - **Bob Sultan** - Need to come up with a document outline for the 802.17b draft.
  - Need to solicit an editor. (editors are easy to identify, harder to volunteer(:>).
  - Schedule 1 conference call prior to the November meeting.

802.17 Meeting in Ottawa, ON

Wednesday, October 6, 2004

Minutes

- o Discussion took place regarding voting rights. Options considered were one vote per company, whoever in the room votes, only members vote, running 802.17b as a task force, etc.
- o It was agreed that the task force notion was not a good idea. It slows things down in the end, and not necessary.
- o At the next meeting, we are a SG, and the rules are that everyone in the room votes.
- o Group decided to change the name of the project to spatially aware sublayer. Members within the group objected to using the term bridging since the scope of the project is now being expanded to support increased spatial reuse for not only bridged applications, but also for any application that is running multicast over the ring.
- o PAR to be submitted and agreed upon by SG.
- o Much discussion within the group to word the 5-Criteria.
- o Group review 5-Criteria. Agreed upon content.
- o Much discussion over SAS and secondary MAC address support in base standard.

- o **Motions**

  - o Motion #1 10/04/04 9:35am (administrative): Approval of agenda - *Passed*
  - o Motion #2 10/06/04 2:11pm (technical): Motion moved to approve the SABSG PAR and 5 Criteria and forward them to the 802 EC – *unanimous*. [Moved by Marc Holness. Seconded by Mike Takefman.]
  - o Motion #3 10/06/04 2:15pm (technical): Move to hold an SABSG conference call on Tuesday Oct 26, 2004 from 1pm to 4pm EDT. All presentations to be provided by Oct 25, 2004 noon EDT - *unanimous*. [Moved by Marc Holness. seconded by Peter Jones.]
  - o Motion #4 10/06/04 2:35 pm (administrative): Move to schedule the discussion and voting on requirements/scope of P802.17b at the November Plenary session in anticipation of PAR approval by NesCom. The chair to advertise this fact to the WG 30 days in advance of the meeting. The WG will determine if the voting is to occur in November or delayed - *Unanimous*. [moved by Gary Turner. seconded by Robert Castellano.]
  - o Motion #5 10/06/04 5:01pm (Administrative): Move to adjourn. [Moved by Marc Holness. Seconded by Mike Takefman]
  - o