

Minutes of the MSC meeting

Draft 0.60

October 13, 2003

Los Altos, CA

1. Informal conversation

The dinner fee of \$25 was collected from all in attendance. Bob Davis noted there is no longer a charge for the IPF (international participation fund).

1.1 Introductions (agenda II)

The following were in attendance:

Bob Davis (Chair)
Martin Freeman
David B. Gustavson (Vice-Chair)
David V. James (Secretary)
Peter Johansson
Richard Karpinsky
John Lemon
Geoff Thompson
Dan Zuras

1.2 P1596.1 and P754 merger status (over dinner, agenda III)

David James (as past Chair of P1596.1 Shared Data Formats) asked Dan Zuras (as current Chair of working group 754R Floating point) whether 754R remains interested in merging the P1596.1 text into the floating point revision. If not, perhaps this should progress separately. Dan recommended the following:

- a) David James should attend the next 754R meeting at HP, 1501 Page Mill Rd, Thursday PM, 2003Oct16, where this topic will be placed on the agenda. Bob Davis noted he will also attend.
- b) David James should provide written text, so that the 1754 WG can evaluate the length and scope of the proposed material.

1.3 Approval of the agenda (agenda IV)

Bob Davis distributed the agenda, available at:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/msc/MS200310/agenda.pdf>

1.4 Approval of past minutes (agenda VI)

Bob Davis moved to approve the last meeting minutes. Geoff Thompson objected, noting that the blank left in the last meeting's minutes for the MSC checking account balance had not been filled in. Geoff requested that the balance be provided for the approved version. Bob Davis accepted the action item to supply the missing dollar amount.

1 NOTE—The MSC checking account has since been verified (by Bob Davis) to be \$6056.40, for both last
2 month and this month.
3
4

5 **2. Officer reports (agenda VII)**

6 **2.1 MSC Chair report (agenda VII.1)**

7
8 **2.1.1 Standards Board, P1394.3:** Bob Davis noted that P1349.3 generated some controversy at the last
9 Standards Board meeting. The expressed concern of IEEE Staff was that separate figure files (one per file)
10 were requested. Bob Davis noted that these were shown to be extractable from the PDF, which allowed the
11 draft to be accepted.
12
13

14 **2.1.2 Standards Board, P1394c:** Bob Davis noted that P1349c generated some controversy at the last
15 Standards Board meeting, due to its reliance on a (not yet specified) code-point definition within an 802
16 Standard. Thus, an 802.3 revisions would be required to define the appropriate code points. Geoff Thompson
17 stated a desire to approve a code point for the use of P1394c within the appropriate 802 standard. The PAR
18 was approved. The P1394c group was give an action item by the Sponsor (Bob Davis, acting on behalf of the
19 MSC) to open a communication channel with 802, acting through Paul Nicholich, for the purpose of coordi-
20 nating relevant activities.
21

22 **2.1.3 PAR reaffirmation:** Three standards were sponsored by the MSC for reaffirmation ballot, as follows:
23 1156.1-1993 (C/MM) IEEE Standard Microcomputer Environmental Specifications for Computer Modules
24 1156.2-1996 (C/MM) IEEE Standard for Environmental Specifications for Computer Systems
25 1301.3-1992 (R1997) (C/MM) IEEE Standard for a
26 Metric Equipment Practice for Microcomputers - Convection-Cooled with 2.5 mm Connectors.
27
28

29 **2.2 MSC Vice-Chair report (agenda VII.2)**

30
31 The vice-chair noted no activity of interest.
32
33

34 **2.3 MSC Secretary report (agenda VII.4)**

35
36 The Secretary accepted the task of finding and publishing the April meeting minutes.
37
38

39 **2.4 Election of officers (agenda VIII)**

40
41 Bob Davis provided a list of volunteer candidates. Peter Johansson volunteered to run for IEEE/RAC
42 representative. Bob Davis provided paper ballot forms. John Lemon counted the votes. Results were:

43 Chair—Bob Davis (8 votes)

44 Vice Chair—David Gustavson (8 votes)

45 Secretary—David James (8 votes)

46 Treasurer—Bob Ferguson (8 votes)

47 RAC liasons:

48 David Gustavson (8 votes)

49 David James (5 votes)

50 Peter Johansson (3 votes)

51 (so, David Gustavson and David James are the representatives)

52 SC24/WG4—Peter Johansson (8 votes)
53
54

2.5 Liaison reports (agenda IX)

2.5.1 Senior standards report (verbal presentation, agenda IX.1)

Bob Davis and Geoff Thompson reported on the Senior Standards Proposal, which is progressing with an expected mid-2004 completion date. This is proposed to apply to stable standards, with the desire to keep patent assurances in place. The standards would continue be available for sale only as pdf or printed-on-demand and would be marked on their cover as to their special status. Reaffirmation would be by board action rather than having to assemble a ballot group.

For the Senior standards, the reaffirmation must happen every 5 years, per ANSI, is made automatic through REVCOM and the Standards Board. However there will be no maintenance and no interpretation of the standard.

2.5.2 IEEE/RAC report (verbal presentation, agenda IX.2)

David James and Bob Davis provided verbal status reports from the last meeting of the IEEE/RAC in San Francisco.

2.5.2.1 Zeros and ones EUI-64: David James provides a status report, with clarifications by Bob Davis. The key item was the approval of all zero and all ones for reserved EUI-64 values. A letter from Xerox (the owner of the 00-00-00 OUI value) allows this to be done. We noted this only applies to EUI-64, not to EUI-48 or MAC-48. Other possible concerns were noted:

- a) Peter Johansson noted the scope of the Xerox letter may have been broader than intended. The MSC IEEE/RAC representative were directed to bring this to the attention of the IEEE/RAC.
- b) There was also a concern that if the 00-00-00 OUI value were given over completely for EUI-64 then the Xerox right to 00-00-00 in EUI-48 would be put into a conflict situation with the common scheme to encapsulate EUI-48 within EUI-64.

2.5.2.2 Software IDs: Peter Johansson noted that Bob Davis has been requested to discuss software identifiers with the IEEE/RAC. Bob noted this had slipped his mind. David James noted this was an agenda topic for November IEEE/RAC meeting (to be held in conjunction with the 802 Plenary).

2.5.2.3 Tutorials: David James noted that the tutorials were tasked for revision. Recent revisions are out for review within the IEEE/RAC, awaiting comments from Mick Seaman.

2.5.2.4 WWN names: Bob Davis noted that the SCSI folks have the concept of a world wide name (WWN), which is a 4-bit code (where the code value of 5 identifies the IEEE) concatenated with a 60-bit EUI-like value. We queued this as a topic that should be addressed by the IEEE/RAC in the future, perhaps with a defined one-to-one mapping into EUI-64 values. David James noted that a tutorial is needed. Bob Davis offered to assist in creating one.

2.5.3 IEEE/RAC report (written presentation, agenda IX.2)

David James and David Gustavson presented a written report (1.2 and Clause 2 of of <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/msc/MS200310/DbgDvjReport.pdf> MSC report). Most of the time was spent on topics (b) and (c). This lead to the general topic of software-instance and hardware-instance numbers, as well as uniqueness requirements.

The present MSC members appeared to identify a few concepts:

- a) If a specification mandates a fixed-size context dependent identifier, this identifier would be unique only within that context. The identifier length would not be constrained. The standard would define

1 this as an OUI followed by OUI-field dependent unique-within-this-context information. David
2 James raised a question on consumption, what do you do when all values have been consumed? A
3 couple of possibilities were raised:

- 4 1) Geoff Thompson. The vendor can simply place an escape code in the initial code-specifier
5 field. The assumption was that if you got to the escape value you were defining a new protocol.
6 The new protocol could make provision for changing the length of the identifier.
- 7 2) David James. A new OUI would never be granted due to complete consumption; the standard
8 should keep this in mind when sizing such parameters.
- 9 3) Geoff Thompson: What a company does in a private protocol is outside the scope of standards.
10 The best that we can hope for is advisory admonition (much like we do for EtherType) that
11 they should have more than adequate fields allocated to designate a lifetime of variants and
12 versions.

- 13 b) If a specification mandates an EUI-48 or EUI-64, the standard should conform to the tutorials and
14 these values should be unique across all possible applications, so that uniqueness is not
15 context-dependent. Thus, there would be only one assignment of that identifier (a hardware
16 instance identifier, software interface instance identifier, protocol identifier, or whatever),
17 regardless of application.

18 The EUI-48/64 would be expected to inherit the properties of unique hardware identifiers, in that
19 uniqueness and no-excess-consumption objectives prohibit sparse and/or structured number assign-
20 ments. Thus, the low-order 24 or 40 bits are not available to contain fields for any purpose such the
21 identification as version or variation.

- 22 c) The properties of exclusivity are determined by the standard, which may elect to use a
23 context-dependent identifier or an EUI values, as noted above. However, to use the EUI name, the
24 property of uniqueness should not be context dependent.
- 25 d) David James and David Gustavson: There are some advantages of fixed-size global-unique identi-
26 fiers, which may compensate for their larger-than-minimal sizes, such as:
 - 27 1) You can recycle numbers from one domain (e.g., a retired Ethernet card) to another (e.g., a
28 software ID), without worry of possible collision.
 - 29 2) Within organizations, the number assignment group is relieved from the maintenance of
30 context classifications and per-context accounting.
 - 31 3) Only a few number of assignment sizes need be administered.
- 32 e) The IEEE/RAC should not mandate usage of identifiers, with judgements of their allowable uses,
33 provided that consumption concerns have been properly addressed.

34 The IEEE/RAC representatives felt the direction was sufficient to generate a more detailed proposal, which
35 could then be reviewed by the MSC for detailed comments.

36 37 38 39 40 **2.5.4 IEEE/RAC directives (MSC conclusion, agenda IX.2)**

41 The IEEE/RAC representatives were directed to include the MSC in distributions of proposed work,
42 tutorials, etc. The intent is to leverage the insights of other MSC members, allowing their needs to be more
43 accurately defined. The MSC reflector was proposed for this purpose.

44 45 46 **2.5.5 FrameMaker® templates ad hoc (agenda VI.3)**

47 John Lemon led the discussion of the ad hoc FrameMaker templates group (similar views are documented in
48 subclause 1.1 of <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/msc/MSC200310/DbgDvjReport.pdf> MSC report). The
49 report noted the project had been indefinitely postponed, based on feedback from unknown IEEE
50 individuals.
51
52
53
54

Geoff Thompson noted he had discussed FrameMaker templates with IEEE Staff. His expressed concern was that other WGs could be forced to use the templates, or critiqued for not using these templates. Some of David James P802.3ah comments had apparently led P802.3ah WG members to this conclusion.

John Lemon noted that the FrameMaker templates ad hoc believed these would never be mandated, but would be provided as a (hopefully attractive) option to new WG projects. Bob Davis noted that groups have provided Microsoft Word formatted documents and can even provide handwritten documents to the IEEE.

Geoff clarified a concern, that format should remain the province of staff and Working Groups should focus on technical content. Geoff noted that comments made on 802.3ah had indicated that inappropriate measures would be taken to impose formatting on a ballot. John Lemon noted these were independent topics and, as such, should not have affected the progress of (optional) FrameMaker templates.

Bob Davis suggested two actions that might help resolve apparent misunderstandings, as follows:

- a) A clarification letter to P802.3ah might help resolve concerns and misunderstandings arising from 802.3ah comments. David James offered to author such clarifications, along with an apology for suggesting rejected-P802.3ah-comment appeals, rather than utilizing the Sponsor Ballot process.
- b) A background/clarification letter would be helpful to clarify the history and optionality of the FrameMaker templates ad hoc. John Lemon offered to generate this text.

NOTE—David James sent letter (a) on the following day, addressed to Howard Frazier, with cc's including those recommended by Geoff Thompson. John Lemon sent letter (b) on the following Friday.

2.6 Revision requests (agenda XI.2)

(To ensure completion, this topic was interleaved within the aforementioned Liaison reports)

Chair was directed to proceed with reaffirmation ballots on the following three standards:

- 1101.1-1998 IEEE Standard for Mechanical Core Specifications for
Microcomputers Using IEC 603-2 Connectors
- 1101.11-1998 IEEE Standard for Mechanical Rear Plug-in Units Specifications for
Microcomputers Using the IEEE 1101.10 Equipment Practice
- 1155-1992 IEEE Standard for VMEbus Extensions for Instrumentation: VXIbus

2.7 Future meeting schedule (agenda XV)

As noted in the agenda,

- January 12, 2004
- April 12, 2004
- July 12, 2004
- October 11, 2004

2.8 Adjournment (agenda XVI)

The meeting adjourned, due to late time and departure of attendees. Study group reports were deferred to the next meeting.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
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