Motion

- 802.1 approves the response to the interpretation request on Link Aggregation.
- text as presented:

http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2010/ax-interp-request-802-1ax-2008-0110-BMC-proposed-response-0310-v01.pdf

- Proposed: Mack-Crane Second: Messenger
- For: 26 Against: 0 Abstain: 1

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

Motion

- 802.1 requests EC approval to forward the draft PAR for 802.1AXbk Link Aggregation Amendment: Protocol Addressing to NesCom. The PAR text and 5C text are:
  http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2010/new-messenger-axbk-linkagg-addressing-draft-par-0110-v03.pdf

  http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2010/new-messenger-axbk-draft-5cs-0110-v03.doc

- Proposed: Messenger Second: mack-crane
- For: 25 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second: XXX
- For: XX Against: XX Abstain: XX

Motion

- 802.1 requests EC approval to withdraw the P802.1H Revision PAR

- Proposed: Messenger Second: Seaman
- For: 24 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second: XXX
- For: XX Against: XX Abstain: XX

Motion

- 802.1 requests EC approval to initiate a reaffirmation Sponsor ballot for IEEE Std 802.1D

- Proposed: Messenger Second: Seaman
- For: 26 Against: 0 Abstain: 3

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second: XXX
- For: XX Against: XX Abstain: XX

MOTION

- 802.1 request that the EC approve forwarding 802.1Qau to RevCom.
  - Sponsor ballot results Y: 64, N: 0, Abs: 4
- Proposed: Thaler
- Second: Gray
  - For: 27
  - Against: 0
  - Abstain: 0

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

Supporting material: P802.1Qau

- Sponsor recirc closed 7 Jan 2010
- Sponsor ballot results Y: 64, N: 0, Abs: 4
- No outstanding comments
- No changes to the draft
- Already pre-submitted

MOTION

- 802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.1AS to Sponsor ballot.
- Proposed: garner Second: fuller
- For: 24 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

Supporting material: P802.1AS

- WG recirc closed 9 Mar 2010
- WG ballot results Y: 25, N: 1, Abs: 39
- One outstanding No voter (Yueha Wei) who did not respond on the recirc despite considerable efforts to determine which of her comments are unresolved. Comments from Yueha Wei:

http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/Exec_files/802-1AS-d6-6-comments-yueha-wei.pdf

- Some editorial changes needed that will be forwarded to Sponsor ballot in cover letter
- No changes to the draft other than the insertion of registered numbers

MOTION

- 802.1 requests conditional approval of the EC to forward P802.1Qbb to Sponsor ballot.
- Proposed: Thaler Second: Gray
- For: 19 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

Supporting material: P802.1Qbb

- WG recirc closed 5 Mar 2010
- WG ballot results Y: 25, N: 1, Abs: 30
  - Recirculation in March/April timeframe for minor changes to satisfy one outstanding disapprove
  - Comment resolution via telecon April 12 at 9 AM PDT
  - Disapprove comments are in the next 3 slides:

PFC Statistics

- *Cl* **12** *SC* **12.18** *P* **9** *L* **11** # 15
- It would be more informative to know the number of PFCRequestsSent and PFCIndicationsReceived per priority.
- *SuggestedRemedy*
- Define PFCRequestsSent and PFCIndicationsReceived to be per priority. Modify the MIB accordingly.
- REJECT.
- See comment #12
- Having the statistics per priority is not so useful because many implementations always set the e[n] bits to one and just use the time value to pause or unpause a priority.

PFC response time at 10 Gig

- *Comment Type* **TR**
- The PFC response time definition is still not satisfactory. The relaxation of the constraint to 12 pause quanta from 8 for 10Gb/s may result in unusable buffering requirements for implementations.
- *SuggestedRemedy*
- Change the PFC response time for 10Gb/s to 8 pause quanta
- REJECT.
- The group decided to keep the delay as is.
  - See http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2010/bb-lakshmikantha-PFCResponseTime.pdf

PFC response time above 10 Gig

- *Comment Type* **TR**
- The PFC response time should take into account the speed (i.e. 10, 40, 100 Gb/s). However, picking either an absolute time or absolute pause quanta for all speeds shouldn't be necessary. Picking an absolute pause quanta decreases the response time by the multple of the speed increase and may place unreasonable constraints on implementation clocks (per past comment ballots). On the other hand, picking an absolute time assumes implementations will not increase their clock speeds at all and may result in requiring excessive buffering for handling this upper layer response delay.
- *SuggestedRemedy*
- Instead of selecting a single number for all speeds, specify a delay value that is appropriate for each speed - which takes into account implementation approaches as well as reasonable buffering requirements.

  For example, consider a delay factor which increases by a factor of one half of the link speed increase, then, given a response delay of 8 PQ at 10Gb/s,
- For 40G, it gives 16PQ = 8PQ x 4/2, as speed increased by a factor of 4 from 10G.
- For 100G it gives 20PQ = 16PQ x 2.5/2, as speed increased by a factor of 2.5 from 40G.
- ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
- Add an editor's note: "Potential concerns have been expressed about the delay constraint for the 100G speed. The DCB group is seeking input based on real designs.“
- There were no responses on recirculation to the editor’s note except to ask

MOTION

- 802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.3bd to Sponsor ballot.

- Proposed: Thaler Second: Gray
- For: 20 Against: 0 Abstain: 4

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

Supporting material: P802.3bd

- WG recirc closed 5 Mar 2010
- WG ballot results Y: 28, N: 0, Abs: 24
- No outstanding comments or changes to the draft

MOTION

- 802.1 requests conditional approval from the EC to submit 802.1Qbe to Sponsor Ballot.

- Proposed: Finn Second: Messenger
- For: 27 Against 0 Abstain: 3

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

Supporting material: P802.1Qbe

- WG recirc closed Mar 2010
- WG ballot results Y: 17, N: 3, Abs: 28
- Final recirculation in March/April timeframe to clear the outstanding negatives (Saltsidis, Kumar, Fedyk)
- Comments are at:

http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/Exec_files/802-1be-d1-2-negative-comments.pdf

- Comment resolution in May interim meeting if necessary

MOTION

- 802.1 approves the liaison letter to MEF regarding 802.1Qbc (RCSI):
- text as presented:

http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2010/liaison-mackcrane-to-mef-802-1Qbc-0310-v02.pdf

- Proposed: messenger Second: mack-crane
- For: 20 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

MOTION

- 802.1 approves the liaison letter to the MEF regarding CFM MIB extensions:
- text as presented:

http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2010/liaison-parsons-to-mef-mibs-0310-v03.pdf

- Proposed: Parsons Second: Lemon
- For: 22 Against: 0 Abstain: 1

MOTION

- 802.1 approves the liaison letter to the ITU-T Q9/15 regarding Etherwire, G.8021 and code-point reuse:
- text as presented:
- http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2010/liaison-messenger-draft-response-q9-15-codepoint-use-0310-v03.pdf
- Plus attachments
- http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2010/liaison-Rooted-Multipoint-Examples-0310-v01.ppt
- http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2010/liaison-rooted-multipath-vids-0310-v03.pdf
- Proposed: messenger Second: seaman
- For: 25 Against: 0 Abstain: 1