802.1 Motions and supporting material – Dallas 11/2013

MOTION

- 802.1 requests EC approval for forwarding P802.1AB-Cor2 PAR to NesCom.
- Proposed: Parsons
- Second: Gray
- For: 30 Against: 0   Abstain: 1

- EC proposed: Jeffree   Second: Thaler
- For____Against___Abstain____

P802.1AB-Cor-2 PAR modification - supporting material

- Maintenance PAR – circulated this week in accordance with P&P
- No comments received, no changes to the text
- PAR text is at:
  - http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2013/new-p802-1AB-2009-cor-2draft-par-1113.pdf

MOTION

- 802.1 requests EC approval for forwarding P802.1Q-rev PAR modification to NesCom.
- Proposed: Parsons
- Second: Gray
- For: 33 Against: 0   Abstain: 0

- EC proposed: Jeffree   Second: Thaler
- For____Against___Abstain____

P802.1Q-REV PAR modification - supporting material

- Maintenance PAR – circulated prior to this meeting and pre-submitted

- No comments received, no changes to the text

- PAR text is at:

  - http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2013/q-revision-draft-par-modification0913.pdf

MOTION

- 802.1 Chair requests EC approval for forwarding P802.1AX-rev PAR modification to NesCom, conditional upon successful completion of an email ballot of the WG to support this action.

- EC proposed: Jeffree   Second:
- For_____Against____Abstain_____

P802.1AX-REV PAR modification - supporting material

- Maintenance PAR – circulated prior to this meeting and pre-submitted

- One editorial comment received from 802.11, no changes to the text (proposal is for a NesCom member to submit the comment as the PAR is already presubmitted)

- The WG did not vote on this PAR modification due to an oversight; plan is to conduct this vote immediately via email.

- PAR text is at:

- http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2013/ax-rev-draft-par-modification-request-0913.pdf

MOTION

- 802.1 requests EC approval for forwarding P802 PAR extension request to NesCom.
- Proposed: Gilb
- Second: Gray
- For: 23 Against: 0 Abstain: 2

- EC proposed: Jeffree   Second: Thaler
- For____Against___Abstain____

P802-REV PAR modification - supporting material

- Maintenance PAR – circulated prior to this meeting and pre-submitted
- Comments received from 802.11 and 802.16, responses sent before Wednesday 5PM, no changes to the text
- PAR text is at:
- http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2013/802-rev-par-extension-request-0913-v1.pdf

MOTION

- 802.1 requests EC conditional approval for initiating sponsor ballot on P802.1Q-rev.
- Proposed: Parsons
- Second: Gray
- For: 34 Against: 0   Abstain: 0

- EC proposed: Jeffree   Second: Thaler
- For_____Against____Abstain_____

P802.1Q-REV: Supporting material

- WG recirc ballot closed in November; results are
- Yes: 32 (100%) No: 0 Abs: 8 (20%)
- Responding: 40 (66.66%)
- Draft will undergo a final recirulation in December timeframe
- Balloting pool will be formed once the PAR modification is approved
- SB initiation Jan/Feb 2014

MOTION

- 802.1 requests EC approval to submit P802.1Xbx D1.2 to Sponsor Ballot.
- Proposed: Seaman Second: Randall
- For__23__Against_0__Abstain__11__

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second: Thaler
- For____Against___Abstain____

[P802.1Xbx D1.2 Port-Based Network Access Control: Amendment— MAC Security Key Agreement protocol (MKA) extensions, passed WG & WG recirc ballots: 60 voters, 37 responding (62% response), 10 approve (100%), 0 disapprove (no outstanding comments), 27 abstentions.]

P802.1Xbx: Supporting material

- WG recirc ballot closed in November; results are:

- 60 voters, 37 responding (62% response), 10 approve (100%), 0 disapprove (no outstanding comments), 27 abstentions.

Motion

- 802.1 requests EC approval to forward 802.1Qbp to REVCOM.

- Proposed: Haddock
- Second: Mack-Crane
- For __25___Against__0___ Abstain _8____

- EC proposed: Jeffree   Second: Thaler
- For____Against___Abstain____

802.1Qbp D1.7 Sponsor Ballot Results

Ballot closed 03 Oct 2013

RESPONSE RATE

- This ballot has met the 75% returned ballot requirement.
- 63 eligible people in this ballot group.
    - 54 affirmative votes
    - 1 negative vote with comments
    - 0 negative votes without comments
    - 2 abstention votes: (Lack of expertise: 1, Lack of time: 1)
- 57 votes received = 90% returned, 3% abstention

APPROVAL RATE

- The 75% affirmation requirement is being met.
- 54 affirmative votes
- 1 negative vote with comments (carried forward from previous ballot)
- 55 votes = 98% affirmative

***CI 20 SC 20.1 P81 L 0 # 2* Wei, Yuehua (Comment and response from previous ballot)**

Comment Type TR

In current draft timing mechanism is used to detect failure of particular ECMP path, in detail, when ECMP path failure is detected at the local MEP, the RDI flag is set for the next transmitted CCM, and after the remote MEP receive the CCM with RDI flag set, the remote MEP deduce the failed ECMP path by the time when CCM(with RDI) is received, the latency of CCM(with RDI), and the transmission period at the local MEP. IMO using the timing mechanism to detect failure of particular ECMP path is vulnerable, in some cases(e.g. the transmission period at the local MEP is much longer than that at the remote MEP, or the unidirectional path by the CCM with RDI flag set happens to be in failure too) the remote MEP can't deduce the failed ECMP path correctly, because firstly the CCM transmission in one direction is independent from the CCM transmission in reverse direction, and secondly the transmission periods for the two directions may be different

SuggestedRemedy

To specify a new mechanism to detect ECMP path failure. The proposed one includes below three points:

    1) Append the CCM with Flow Hash TLV (or flow-id TLV with the pre-defined mapping between flow-id and Flow Hash);

    2) When ECMP path failure is detected at the local MEP, the RDI flag is set for the next transmitted CCM, and at the same time the local MEP will generate a CCM error SNMP notification with MEP-ID of the remote MEP, the last received Flow Hash (or flow-id) and sequence number before the failure is detected;

    3) When CCM is received again at the local MEP, the RDI flag is cleared for the next transmitted CCM, and at the same time the local MEP will generate a CCM resume SNMP notification with MEP-ID of the remote MEP, the first received Flow Hash (or flow-id) and sequence number after the failure is detected.

Of course other mechanism than the above one may be adopted by the editor, as long as the requirement can be met.

Response

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The CCM transmission period is set for the MA and is therefore the same for all MEPs in the MA (or else the errorCCMreceived defect is asserted). CCM is used to detect defects; however, it is not required that CCM (or the MEP) isolate the fault. The currently specified mechanism will detect path defects. (See also comment 15.) To clarifty that CCM is not responsible for isolating faults, delete the last two sentences in the paragraph at line 34.

CI 20 SC 20.2 P81 L 0 # 3 **Wei, Yuehua (Comment and response from previous ballot)**

Comment Type TR

As I have proposed for several times, in order to meet the requirement of the operator to freely select the return path for LBR, a Reverse Flow Hash TLV should be defined for LBM. This comment has ever been accepted in principle in 802-1bp-d1-0-dis after the discussion around the presentation (there was a immediate vote and majority supported), and needed changes were recorded in D1-1 draft as below:

> <<Editor's Introduction to draft 1.1: This is the draft for the fifth Task Group ballot. This draft: 3) includes editor's notes where material is needed for LBM/LBR Reverse Flow Hash.>>

Support at that time was also recorded in Annex Z.1.2 as below:

> Discussion at the San Diego meeting indicated support for adding a reverse flow hash to the LBM for use in the LBR F-TAG. There was also support for including text indicating the limits to the information that can be reliably obtained by using a reverse flow hash in this way.

But in D1-2 draft all text related to Reverse Flow Hash was removed, and reason was recorded in Annex Z.1.2 as below:

> Further discussion in the Santa Cruz meeting led to the conclusion that there is no known application for a reverse flow hash since down MPs responding to LBMs on the receiving port will transmit the LBR on that port regardless of the flow hash value and up MPs will send the LBR via the relay and cannot guarantee that the LBM will be transmitted on a particular port (since this depends on the state of the Relay Entity).

I thought the above concern is unreasonable and raised new comment on D1-2 to explain my thoughts, and the comment was rejected with below feedback:

> i. 802-1bp-d1-2-dis REJECT. The discussion at the Santa Cruz meeting failed to identify an application for this feature. The loopback message only tests reachability with ECMP VIDs, it does not guarantee any particular path is followed.

I'm unsatisfied with the feedback because I've presented the application of Reverse Flow Hash TLV in the San Diego meeting, and I disagree with the statement that the loopback message does not guarantee any particular path is followed, I believe it does guarantee. I raised a new comment on D1-5 to explain the application again, and the comment was rejected with below feedback:

> ii. 802-1bp-d1-5-dis-v3 REJECT. If there is no reverse path and the LBR is not received this indicates there is a problem. This is an expected result (fault detection or verification) and not a failure of LBR. Also note that D1.1 does not contain the changes required to specify a reverse flow hash. This has been proposed in the past and has not received sufficient support. It is a restatement of a comment submitted on the first WG ballot.

I'm unsatisfied with the feedback because it misinterpret my comment. My proposal is based on the assumption that there are multiple selectable return paths and some of them may be in failure, and this proposal provides the operator flexibility to select return path of LBR and avoid the failed return path (the operator can know the failed return path by running CFM CC function), and this proposal doesn't resolve the problem that there is no reverse path.

SuggestedRemedy

In page 96 sub-clause 20.28.2, item d) may be changed to:

> d) In the case of ECMP with flow filtering, the flow_hash parameter is set to the value carried in the Reverse Flow Hash field contained in the Reverse Flow Hash TLV of the received LBM, otherwise set to zero if there is no Reverse Flow Hash TLV in the received LBM, and the time_to_live parameter is set to 63.

Some other changes are needed and have been recorded in D1-1 of this draft standard. Also note that all needed changes are minor and feasible.

Response

REJECT.

The belief that a reverse flow hash will guarantee that an LBR will follow a particular path is flawed in that the path followed at each hop is determined by the flow hash (along with the destination address and system ID) and the current state of the Relay Entity; however, the current state of the Relay Entity may differ from the state assumed when choosing the flow hash and therefore the LBR may take another path. Furthermore there is no information in the received LBR that indicates which path it took.

There is no requirement that CFM frames are delivered in spite of faults in the network. That is, failure to receive an LBR due to a fault in the network does not imply that Loopback behavior must to be enhanced to enable LBR to take alternate paths.

The proposed remedy has been discussed several times by the WG (as noted in the comment) and has not received sufficient support to be included in the amendment.

MOTION

- 802.1 requests EC approval to forward P802.1Q-REV D2.0 to ISO/IEC JTC1 SC6, for information under the PSDO agreement, when it is forwarded to Sponsor ballot.
- Proposed: Seaman Second: randall
- For__29__Against_0__Abstain_2___

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:
- For____Against___Abstain____

MOTION

- 802.1 requests EC approval to forward IEEE 802.1AEbn and IEEE 802.1AEbw to ISO/IEC JTC1 SC6, for adoption under the PSDO agreement.
- Proposed: Seaman Second: randall
- For__27__Against_0__Abstain__7__

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:
- For____Against___Abstain____

MOTION

- 802.1 requests EC approval to forward P802.1Xbx D1.2 to ISO/IEC JTC1 SC6, for information under the PSDO agreement.
- Proposed: Seaman Second: randall
- For__29__Against_0__Abstain_5___

- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:
- For____Against___Abstain____