

TO spec or not to spec, II

Howard M. Frazier, Jr.
Cisco Systems, Inc.
Workgroup Business Unit
28-January-1997

IEEE P802.3z	Page 1 of 4
Gigabit Task Force	28-January-1997
Howard M. Frazier, Jr.	

Where are we now?

■ Motion # 2 from Vancouver:

Instruct the chair and editor(s) of 802.3z to generate a first draft for review in January 1997, based on the following presentations, plus any other presentations or amendments as may be approved by 802.3z for use "as the basis of the first draft".

9/96	Frazier	Review and Update of Carrier Extension
9/96	Haddock	CSMA/CD Bit Budget
9/96	Johnson	PCS-Update to Protocol Proposal
9/96	Taborek	Gigabit Ethernet Serial Line Codes
9/96	Hanson et al	Optics
11/96	Grow	GMI

AND: (see Page 2)

Minimal specification of asymmetric flow control as defined in:

11/96	Bunch	Asymmetric Flow Control
-------	-------	-------------------------

to permit operation of buffered distributor as presented in:

11/96	Daines	Full Duplex Repeater Update
-------	--------	-----------------------------

Moved: Dr. Howard Johnson Seconded: Bob Fink

Y: 117 N: 22 A: 13 (Technical) Motion #2 Passes.

IEEE P802.3z	Page 2 of 4
Gigabit Task Force	28-January-1997
Howard M. Frazier, Jr.	

Options

1. Say nothing at all about Buffered Distributors

- Not one word
- Assume they are completely and totally outside the scope of 802.3z

2. Say very little about Buffered Distributors

- Justify the inclusion of asymmetric flow control, and provide guidance for its use

3. Say just enough about Buffered Distributors

- Enable some level of interoperability amongst vendors
- Don't describe the internals
- Do describe the expected behavior at the interfaces.

4. Provide a complete standard for a Buffered Distributor

- Along the same lines as the standard for a repeater, or a bridge
- Requirements (shalls), features, functions, PICs, etc, etc, etc

Options (cont)

■ Option 1

- + Sounds simple enough!
- No guidance to implementors or consumers

■ Option 2

- + Less "mystery" concerning asymmetric flow control
- + Some guidance for implementors
- Not much hope for interoperable management, consistent topologies

■ Option 3

- + Interoperable management, consistent topologies
- + Room for product differentiation
- More work for 802.3z

■ Option 4

- + Universal (?) interoperability
- Std in 1999