

IEEE 802.1 Interim Meeting
Edinburgh, Scotland
May 23rd/24th 2002
(Minuted by Neil Jarvis)

Introduction

- Voting membership
- Patent policy
- Invited to join 802.1 interim meeting
 - * New Orleans? (or Florida) week of 30th Sept
 - 4 days joint 802.3/802.17

Agenda

- 802.1S ballot
- 802a ballot
- MAC services PAR
- Discovery Protocol
 - * Presentation
 - * Tech Work
 - * Further work on PAR
- 802.3ah
- 802.1X
- AOB

802.1S ballot

- 9 yes/3 no votes (75% response)
- 111 comments

- Tony expressed concern that although there were 111 comments, most were editorial. He isn't confident that given the number of technical changes made between this and the previous draft, no more technical errors exist.
- It should be possible to publish 802.1s as a new version of 802.1Q
- Bridge management needs to be changed to control the CIST and MSTIs under separate operations.
- Editor to check that it is possible to use RSTP with vanilla Q. Need to fixup clause 12 so that:
 - Any STP and RSTP operations refer back to D/W
 - Any VLAN operations remain in place
 - Any places where there is a choice between STP/RSTP and MSTP, offer an either/or choice.
 - Re-check that the document doesn't make Q and MSTP synonymous
- The plan is to update 802.1s with the comment resolutions from this meeting and sending the document for a confirmation ballot.
- Tony to decide what the key value will be for the digest algorithm.

802.1X

- Quick presentation from David Halasz, reviewing the .1X interlocking key changes .11 is asking for. Two new variables are needed, virtualPort and virtualSecure.

One suggestion is remove virtualPort, and rename virtualSecure as secure, e.g. require all ports to drive secure at the appropriate time. This will allow .11 to implement their new key exchange, and give other media implementations the ability to add more port security, or simply force secure to TRUE to continue with the current state machines.

This can be further abstracted to create a new entity which controls the secure flag for a port. This will be written into the standard.

- They also are asking for .1X to provide a new key descriptor value, whose format will be defined by .11i. This should be no problem.
- New version of 802.1aa will be prepared with these changes and posted to the 802.1 reflector. Try and schedule a meeting with .11 during the July plenary meeting.
- Discussed the new 802.11 pre-authentication scheme, and whether 802.1X needs to change. The pre-authentication requires a wireless client associated with AP1 to run 802.1X to a second access point which it has discovered, and may be associated with in the future. Pre-authenticating with this second access point will speed up any subsequent association. 802.11 will prepare a submission for .1 on this topic.
- {Friday} Took a quick glance at IETF draft-payne-eap-sm-00.txt, which defines EAP state machines for the supplicant/authenticator.

802.3ah, P2MP Sub-Task Force

802.1 received a liaison letter from 802.3ah, titled "Higher Layer compatibility of PONs and existings 802.3 devices"; the meeting decided to discuss and respond to it formally at the July plenary meeting in Vancouver.

Norm Finn gave a recap of the current EPON/bridging issues and described the "fourth way", advanced shared LAN emulation as the current solution. [Refer to Norm's presentation for details].

This approach includes some new bridge functionality, called upper-layer shared lan emulation. It is not exactly a bridge. No spanning BPDUs are generated. Extra information must pass across the emulated LMAC, if a bridge lived above the emulated LMAC {configuration (VLAN,FIB), dynamic parameters (timeouts), spanning tree port state changes}. The shared LAN emulation must know about spanning tree topology changes.

MAC Services PAR (802.1AC)

[Moving the MAC services back from the ISO document to become an IEEE documents, while including some needed updates.]

Word smithing of the PAR and 5 criteria.

802a comment resolution

SNAP encapsulation has been renamed OU extended encapsulation.

Question was raised as to whether this OU extended format should be in the standard at all. For example, it generates a new parse point for network devices to support (e.g. in a firewall), and this may not be worth the expense. Contributors are invited to review this carefully in the next draft.

Aim to go for sponsor ballot after the July plenary meeting.

Link Layer Discovery, Protocol and MIB

Worked through Paul Congdon's LLDP document.

Question of whether this protocol should have its own ethertype, rather than the slow protocol type.

Suggestion to change the capabilities TLV to record the set of supported system MIBS, together with a set of capabilities that could be used to detect possible connectivity issues.

Vendor-specific TLVs were discussed. The words Paul use to limit the scope of these TLVs was felt to be a good start, but that there should be further

restrictions. One idea was to state that any data passed in these TLVs would make the data/protocol information freely available to all users of the protocol. This needs to be checked with lawyers. It was also suggest that the data in the TLV be available in the MIB.

AOB?

No

Adjourned until Vancouver, BC, July 2002
