

# DVJ&DBG report to the MSC

October 12, 2003

## 1. Overview

The last weeks have been lively, ever since I provided 165 comments (few by my standards) of editorial comments on the P802.3ah draft.

### 1.1 FrameMaker templates adhoc-working-body report

The hard work was behind us, and a comment review process was well defined. Then, after the unrelated DVJ comments supplied to P802.3ah, the project was terminated. Other ways will have to be found to route this useful template to IEEE volunteer editors.

- a) Start of activity, From 2002Oct14 MSC meeting:

*David V James noted that there is interest in common templates, particularly among groups attempting to fast-track the publication process. Similar activities are supported in the IEEE office and in P802.17, so this activity should be coordinated with these groups.*

*Moved to approve a PAR (PI638) for common Word and FrameMaker templates, subject to wordsmithing by David V James and the MSC chair. David V James to be volunteered as the Chair.*

*Moved: David V James*

*Second: Bob Davis*

*Voting: Approved without objection.*

- b) SAB meeting results, as reported by Bob Davis:

*The application for the PI638 project was turned down. The reason for this was the strong pressure from staff that did not want the editorial process fixed in a standard. Their claim was that the changes are needed on regular basis that would be prohibited by the necessity of going through the PAR process to change the form of the forms. The other societies got into the act and said that C/MM did not represent their set of problems; I contended that it was not just a MSC alone issue and it was for the good of all.*

*The final straw was that it would take a new PAR to fix any issue in the profiles, templates or graphic formats which may need to change from time to time and from society to society.*

*I do believe that the message was delivered. We had a majority in favor going of the PAR into the debate. But all the Staff showed up for the debate on the PAR and prevailed.*

- c) Adhoc committee worked with the IEEE Staff, leading to success:

*Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2003 3:55 PM*

*Subject: Templates Minutes and Dates*

*Discuss rollout scenario*

*David Law*

*Review pool, Noelle to coordinate, URL for pdf and FrameMaker source*

*Password would be useful*

*2003Sep03 Two week the pool closes and prompts sent*

*2003Sep17 Two weeks to sign up for the group after prompt*

*2003Oct17 End of 30 day ballot*

*2003Nov03 Comments distributed*

*2003Nov12 Comments reviewed by the group*

- 1 d) 2003Sep15-2003Sep19 IEEE P802.3ah meeting in Italy  
2 1) The group rejects DVJ Liason recommendation for 64-bit EUI.  
3 Insteads chooses to define a 56-bit EUI.  
4 (Shortly thereafter, Mick Seaman argues for freedom of EUI lengths)  
5 2) Significant DVJ comments rejected w/o explanation.  
6 Comments often accepted in Clause X, rejected in Clause Y.  
7 3) High tension is apparent, as noted below:  
8 *From: Daun Langston [mailto:daun@metanoia-technologies.com]*  
9 *Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2003 2:07 AM*  
10 *To: 'David V James'*  
11 *Subject: IEEE P802.3ah Draft 2.0: Comments with proposed responses*  
12 *You have turned yourself into a public joke, you look very foolish, like a small child who needs*  
13 *entertainment and requires attention. You are the laughing stock of this meeting. You should*  
14 *know how many folks joke about you at lunch. In fact, you have become an article of enter-*  
15 *tainment for many of us.*  
16 e) 2003Sep22-2003Sep26  
17 1) IEEE calls, on topic of folio numbering. Indicates that 802 folks have been complaining and  
18 acting “childish” since Italy meeting.  
19 2) DVJ requests these folks be added to the templates distribution, and to be invited to participate  
20 on the comment review team.  
21 3) Later in the week, progress of comment review questioned multiple times, no IEEE Staff  
22 response is returned.  
23 f) 2003Sep29.  
24 1) DVJ's emails remain unanswered. Phone calls unanswered.  
25 2) Call to Yvette confirms:  
26 i) Templates are being heavily modified, after comments from unnamed 802 individuals.  
27 ii) Open comment review is not an obligation of IEEE Staff.  
28 3) DVJ withdraws his copyright permission (IEEE has no original on file).  
29 g) DVJ, DBG telecon meeting with Susan Tatinier:  
30 1) No agreements (see attached).  
31 2) Susan identifies paths of appeal:  
32 i) Judy Gorman from IEEE Staff  
33 ii) SAB, where the project PAR was originally proposed  
34  
35  
36

## 37 1.2 IEEE/RAC report

38  
39 The IEEE/RAC was particularly busy this quarter, primarily addressing implied and/or actual requests from  
40 802 groups arising after the P802.3ah meeting in Italy. Interesting items include the following:  
41

- 42 a) Deprecation of company\_id.  
43 1) The company\_id name alias was a brainchild of Gary Robinson to allow MSC standards to  
44 print their MSB-to-LSB in left-to-right order, despite Don Loughry and Mick Seaman objec-  
45 tions to any representations of the OUI in this fashion.  
46 2) Mick Seaman now (apparently) agrees that this can now be done, since 802 standards now  
47 have acknowledged that many data streams have no defined bit-transmission order.  
48 3) Note that the MSC has been extremely flexible in waiting for 802 representatives to gain this  
49 insight over the past 10 years.  
50 4) DVJ has updated preliminary tutorials, with no further complaints received.  
51 The quiet is disconcerting; it's probably the calm before the storm.  
52 b) Directions for P802.3ah.  
53 1) This group “invented” an EUI-56, rather than using the defined EUI-48 or EUI-64 options.  
54

- 2) This was acting against the IEEE/RAC liason's suggestions. 1
- 3) The P802.3ah submitted no request-for-clarification to the IEEE/RAC. 2
- 4) In apparent sympathy, several IEEE/RAC members now argue for "any length is OK", despite: 3
  - i) No official request from P802.3ah to provide this capability. 4
  - ii) No apparent need beyond that provided by the EUI-48 and EUI-64. 5
  - iii) Consistent unyielding past RAC history requiring clarity of documentation and reduction of options (for non 802 standards). 6
- c) Directions for P802.17. 7
  - 1) The P802.17 utilized the existing IEEE/RAC defined EUI-64, in conformance with its "no restrictions on use" policy. 8
  - 2) The P802.17 group was advised by David James, acting after confirming with the IEEE/RAC at its San Francisco meeting. 9
  - 3) Other IEEE/RAC members have written "interesting" initial responses: 10
    - i) They have discouraged the use of EUI-64, based (apparently) on personal preference. 11
    - ii) They have encouraged the use of other non-standard identifier lengths. 12
    - iii) They have not agreed to provide suggested text to clarify the usage of these values. 13
    - iv) Responses to specific questions and/or proposals from DVJ remain unanswered. 14
  - 4) The contrast between responses to the formal P802.17 request and the (implied) P802.3ah, as well as the recent inconsistencies arguing for allowing 802 anarchy, are highly confusing. 15
- d) Directions for P802.11i. 16
  - 1) The P802.11i group has been discussing (through email) the use of 40-bit context-sensitive identifiers. 17
    - i) No formal request has been filed. 18
    - ii) No extreme bandwidth hardship has been shown. 19
    - iii) No extreme product-in-the-pipe hardship has been shown (although rumored). 20
  - 2) Other IEEE/RAC members (and Chair) have been quickly responding to the implied need. Much quicker (x10) than any review of DVJ tutorial clarifications. 21
  - 3) Two IEEE/RAC members effectively cancelled a teleconference, called by David Johnson (Intel), which was intended to help other IEEE/RAC members better understand the needs. 22
  - 4) Many premature actions have been proposed: 23
    - i) Propose to approve the usage first, see the tutorial later. 24
    - ii) Propose to approve the usage first, see the request letter later. 25
    - iii) Propose to approve the usage first, establish context-sensitive policies later. 26
- e) Directions for the future (as perceived by DVJ) 27
  - 1) History of the past. 28
    - i) Only (worldwide unique) EUI-48 and EUI-64 identifiers supported (for over 10 years). 29
    - ii) IEEE/RAC has interacted directly with requesters. 30
    - iii) IEEE/RAC meetings were open meetings, typically teleconferences when disagreements. 31
    - iv) New proposals were critiqued in detail. For example, DVJ suggested that individuals simply crush an Ethernet card to get a only-one-needed EUI-48 or 64K of EUI-64, folks noted there could be significant legal conflicts with respect to the ownership rights of that number, or its potential use in other products. As such, we developed a program for companies to sell inexpensive EUI-64 values, on a per-item basis. 32
  - 2) Organizational directions. 33
    - i) Open the gates: the details of uniqueness and clarity are beyond our scope. 34
    - ii) Respond quickly to any (perceived or anticipated) requests from friendly 802 projects. 35
    - iii) Respond slowly, constraining actual requests from unfriendly projects. 36
    - iv) IEEE/RAC meetings are one-on-one telephone jawboning sessions by the Chair. 37
    - v) The consensus conclusion is then prepared by the Chair. Teleconferences are discouraged. 38
    - v) New proposals seem adhoc and inconsistent. Mick's email suggested using a crushed Ethernet card when a single EUI-48 was needed, thereby eliminating the need for 39

- 1 individual EUI-64 assignments. This is inconsistent with previous policy (noted  
2 previously) and particularly concerning if EUI-48 values are allowed to become  
3 context-dependent (which Mick also favors).
- 4 3) Context-sensitive identifiers (see following item)
- 5 i) There is heavy 802.x pressure to support context-sensitive EUIs, rather than unique EUIs.  
6 ii) There is heavy support from 802.x members in the IEEE/RAC.  
7 iii) There is no written documentation evaluating pro/con properties.  
8 iv) There may be significant organization/documentation problems:  
9 v) These are similar to what Peter Johansson suggested last year, which were soundly  
10 rejected and resulted in a tutorial statement of uniqueness.
- 11 f) Context-sensitive identifier concerns.
- 12 1) Within each organization, the subassignment authority is more complex.
- 13 i) Separate uniqueness in many different types of assignments.  
14 (significant confusion already, with only company\_id/OUI, MAC-48, EUI-48, EUI-64)  
15 ii) Uniqueness in many different sizes of assignments.  
16 iii) Knowledge of context is required for assignments to be correct.  
17 iv) Multiple organizations may be applying for shared use of number space.  
18 v) Contexts thought to be non-overlapping and independent sometimes have become  
19 overlapping due to unforeseen developments; this now would destroy the needed  
20 uniqueness.
- 21 2) Many organizations still can't correctly handle OUI/EUI-48 assignments:  
22 \*\*\*\* was assigning 24 bits based on divisions subassignments.  
23 \*\*\*\* has been consuming 10x the allowed rate, for several years.
- 24 3) Previous history has many mistakes, even within the knowledgeable 802.3 community:
- 25 i) The use of a 22-bit OUI, subset of the 24-bit assignment.  
26 ii) Waste through assigned subpartitions (model, revision, etc.).
- 27 4) The size reduction (e.g. 4 bytes vs 6 bytes) may result in insignificant cost savings.
- 28 i) A more compact alias is often used after the negotiation phase.  
29 ii) Ethernet manages to cope with two 48-bit MAC (maybe IP addresses also) in every frame.
- 30 5) Chair (Tony) believes the WG has no requirement to identify the impact (bandwidth, relative  
31 cost, or otherwise) of using a larger globally unique EUI-48 identifier.
- 32
- 33 g) Possible context-sensitive identifier resolutions.
- 34 1) DVJ concepts for an LUI-40:
- 35 i) A local-unique identifier is represented as the concatenation of an EUI-48 and LUI-40.  
36 EUI-48 *contextId* is globally unique and identifies the context.  
37 LUI-40 *valueId* is unique within each instance of *contextId*, but not across instances  
38 ii) A one-to-one mapping associates one *uniqueId* with each {*contextId*, *valueId*} pair.  
39 This mapping is defined in a mandatory association table (location is TBD):  
40 

<i>uniqueId</i>	<i>contextId</i>	<i>valueId</i>
vv-vv-vv-uu-uu-uu	== cc-cc-cc-cc-cc-cc	: vv-vv-vv-vv if <i>uniqueId</i> is EUI-48.
vv-vv-vv-uu-uu-uu-uu-uu	== cc-cc-cc-cc-cc-cc	: vv-vv-vv-vv if <i>uniqueId</i> for EUI-64.
- 41  
42
- 43 2) Mick Seaman concepts for context-sensitive identifiers.
- 44 i) Based on variable-length ASN.1 arcs.  
45 ii) (See Mick for further details).
- 46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

**2. Minutes from IEEE Staff appeal**

From: David V James [mailto:dvj@alum.mit.edu]  
 Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2003 10:53 PM  
 To: s.tatiner@ieee.org  
 Cc: David B. Gustavson  
 Subject: (unapproved) Minutes of todays FrameMaker adhoc meetingSusan,

Thank you for making time to discuss policies and events that led to cancellation of the FrameMaker templates project. Unapproved minutes of this discussion are appended.

Please review and provide factual corrections before distribution.

David (James) generated these minutes; Dave (Gustavson) has proof-read a previous near-final copy.

David's plan is to release this on Thursday 12:00 PDT, so an early review would be greatly appreciated. The reasons for minutes:

- a) Accurate documentation allows others to understand; understanding facilitates high-level policy reviews.
- b) The open review process helps build trust, particularly with (otherwise uninvolved) members.

Thanks,  
DVJ

David V. James  
 3180 South Ct  
 Palo Alto, CA 94306  
 Home: +1.650.494.0926  
 +1.650.856.9801  
 Cell: +1.650.954.6906  
 Fax: +1.360.242.5508  
 Base: dvj@alum.mit.edu

\*\*\*\* Unapproved draft minutes \*\*\*\*

Minutes of FrameMaker template meeting:

Susan Tatiner: IEEE Staff, Manager of editors

Dr. David B. Gustavson: Member, IEEE FrameMaker adhoc (Dave, within the minutes)

Dr. David V. James: Member, IEEE FrameMaker adhoc (David, within the minutes)

Date: Wednesday, October 01, 2003

Start Time: 1:00 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time

End Time: 3:55 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time

Participants: 3

Minutes authored by Dr. David V. James

No request for confidentiality was expressed.

These minutes reflect the content of the meeting, not the actual sequence of events.

- a) Dave and David clarified the recent sequence of events.
  - 1) David provided source material for the FrameMaker templates. IEEE provided stylistic comments, but no specific text.
  - 2) IEEE staff spent minimal technical effort on this project.

- 1 i) No markup copy was ever provided.
- 2 ii) Requests for style-name reviews were never answered.
- 3 3) IEEE Staff was cooperative on this project, with useful inputs on user and post-processing
- 4 requirements.
- 5 4) In a seemingly unrelated activity, David provided extensive comments on 802.3ah D2.0 draft
- 6 deficiencies.
- 7 i) After only casual reading, he provided 165 review comments.
- 8 ii) Suggestions to provide a notation subclause were provided.
- 9 iii) Offers to assist in drafting/reviewing notation subclause were provided.
- 10 These (intended to be helpful) comments resulted in extreme
- 11 defensiveness, with apparent concern towards schedule slips.
- 12 5) Subsequently, certain anonymous members of 802.3 apparently had private conversations with
- 13 IEEE Staff.
- 14 6) In apparent response to demands in (a5), Yvette authorized extensive unilateral edits of the
- 15 proposed FrameMaker templates prior to releasing them for the agreed-upon review.
- 16 7) In response to arbitrary changes of source material, David refused to complete the granting of
- 17 his copyright permissions to the IEEE. The adhoc group's intent had been to provide material
- 18 that reflected the needs of multiple IEEE editors. Censure based on (apparently)
- 19 emotion-based private conversations has since made this impossible.
- 20 8) Susan noted that the IEEE will not contest copyright ownership of FrameMaker templates by
- 21 Dr. David V. James.
- 22 9) David James now intends to make the templates freely available to all, using a type of
- 23 free-software license (such as GNU's well known license) which requires only that improve-
- 24 ments shall be reported to the author.
- 25 b) Expanding on (a5), one or more offended 802.3 individuals (apparently) have mandated
- 26 FrameMaker template changes by IEEE Staff, through confidential phone calls.
- 27 1) Susan was unaware of the identities of these callers.
- 28 An offer to supply such information (if deemed to be nonconfidential, in the mind of the caller)
- 29 was provided. Susan noted IEEE Staff would maintain the confidentiality of their caller(s), if
- 30 confidentiality has been assumed. Confidentiality thus limits identification of callers, discus-
- 31 sions, rationale, and/or conclusions. Susan clarified that the IEEE Staff has the freedom to base
- 32 FrameMaker template revisions on confidential/undocumented comments, despite the IEEE
- 33 Staff's previous agreement to utilize a comment review process.
- 34 2) Susan was unaware if written or email inputs were provided.
- 35 She noted that IEEE Staff has no obligation to share inputs with directly affected parties, such
- 36 as the adhoc.
- 37 No offer to collect such information was provided.
- 38 3) David noted that collusion and anti-trust might apply, due to the effect of these decisions on
- 39 multiple companies and the normally open nature of IEEE projects/meetings. Susan noted that
- 40 rules on collusion and anti-trust do not apply to IEEE Staff in this context, since IEEE Staff
- 41 activities are not an officially sanctioned IEEE project.
- 42 4) David expressed the clear desire for the following information.
- 43 i) caller names
- 44 ii) caller comments
- 45 iii) caller emails
- 46 iv) caller written inputs
- 47 Susan did not fulfill requests for this information.
- 48 No offer to collect such information was provided.
- 49 5) David asked if Susan could classify the callers identities. Susan was apparently unaware
- 50 whether the callers were:
- 51 i) A few hot-headed individuals
- 52 ii) Formally approved by the working group
- 53
- 54

- iii) Formally authorized by their companies Susan emphasized that IEEE Staff has no requirements to disclose such information. Dave and David noted that such individuals were probably not authorized by the working group, although that may have been implied by the callers. No offer to collect such information was provided.
      - 1
      - 2
      - 3
      - 4
- c) Apparent misunderstandings
  - 5
  - 6
  - 1) Project termination
    - 7
    - 8
    - 9
    - 10
    - 11
    - 12
    - 2) Streamlined standards
      - 13
      - 14
      - 15
      - 16
      - 17
      - 18
      - 19
      - 20
      - 21
      - 22
      - 23
      - 24
      - 25
      - 26
      - 27
      - 28
      - 29
      - 30
      - 31
      - 32
      - 33
      - 34
      - 35
      - 36
      - 37
      - 38
      - 39
      - 40
      - 41
      - 42
      - 43
      - 44
      - 45
      - 46
      - 47
      - 48
      - 49
      - 50
      - 51
      - 52
      - 53
      - 54

- 1 - Through several emails, David James encouraged 802.3ah to be involved in comment
- 2 submissions and reviews.
- 3 - Through IEEE Staff communications, David James requested that the IEEE encourage a
- 4 broader comment review team, specifically including members of 802.3ah.

5 d) Format requirements

- 6 1) Susan confirmed that any WG can use any FrameMaker formatting, whether using IEEE
- 7 supplied templates or not, when producing draft standards.
- 8 2) Susan noted that the IEEE Staff would not relinquish control of the IEEE supplied templates,
- 9 as would be required by a approved-PAR based standard's process.
- 10 3) Susan noted that (c) restricts WGs from standardizing (as official standards) the generation of
- 11 standard templates.
- 12 4) David noted that working groups should not be prevented from generating a formatting
- 13 standard, considering (4a) allowances.
- 14

15 e) Comment period

- 16 1) Susan agreed that the IEEE Staff had approved the use of a comment review period, proposed by
- 17 the adhoc to ensure broad applicability of the FrameMaker templates to all standards.
- 18 2) Susan felt that (1) was a mistake, since:
- 19 - The IEEE Staff is not obliged to review/respond to comments; any implication to that effect
- 20 would be misleading.
- 21 - This is not a standards project, so there is no need to achieve consensus.
- 22 - The IEEE Staff can best achieve its goals by excluding others from a formal comment review
- 23 process.
- 24 3) Susan felt that retraction of agreement (a) was acceptable, given the mistakes later identified
- 25 by (2).

26 f) No agreements or conclusions were reached.

27  
28 DVJ  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54