

802.3at L2 (DLL) Adhoc Chair's Report

Wael William Diab

802.3at L2 Adhoc Chair

Friday October 19th, 2007

Summary of Ad-Hoc Meetings

- Met 2 times with following high level goals
- Wednesday, October 10th – 90 mins. Agenda below
 - Cover Patent policy
 - Review and approve agenda
 - Review discussions / resolutions related to L2 (DLL) from Seoul meeting
 - Review contributions (if any)
 - Simplifying any agreed-to material
 - Cover L2 Behavior for PD and PSE
 - Cover TLVs for PD and PSE
 - Cover MDIO Registers for PDE and PSE
 - Discuss next meeting / call of adhoc
- Thursday, October 18th – 105 mins. Agenda below
 - Cover Patent policy
 - Review and approve agenda
 - Review any text from Mr. Law regarding consensus from last meeting
 - Review contributions (if any)
 - Cover comment and suggested work areas (see below)
 - Discuss next steps / next mtg. of adhoc prior to Nov if necessary

Wednesday, October 10th

- The adhoc reviewed and discussed the contribution by Mr. Law
- Discussion on how to best reference/incorporate material from 1057 and whether or not a copyright release will be necessary
- Mr. Stanford asked if it would make sense to split out the Layer 2 activities into a separate Task Force. There was consensus that keeping the work within 802.3at would be best and least disruptive to all the current efforts of 802.3at.
- Decision to conduct another meeting next Thurs

Thursday, October 18th

- The adhoc reviewed and discussed the previous contribution by Mr. Law
- Reviewed proposed document restructure for L2
 - Agreed to a set of detailed changes
- Reviewed proposed work and comment areas
 - Added one additional work area
- Worked through some comments
- Decision to conduct at least one other meeting prior to November

Work Areas and Categorized Comments (Covered)

- Restructuring of the text
 - Per consensus on last call, Mr. Law will propose some text that we can review
 - We may need text for informative annex: We have some material here. We may need additional text
 - Comments: 246*, 245*, 257*, 264*
 - Incomplete definitions and/or state diagrams
 - Same as above
 - May be partially resolved by first item
 - Comments: 198, 266, 84, 197*, 260*, 261*
 - Loss of communication
 - Comments: 268
- * = Comments resolved during Seoul TF meeting

Work Areas and Categorized Comments

- "Conflict Resolution" - Comments: 267
- Comments related to referencing 1057 / maintaining the doc (Covered)
 - Comments: 240, 217, 43
- Editorial / LLDP Ref - Comment: 263*, 259*
- Other areas to address
 - Timing parameters on L2 coming up (this is after the physical layer engine has completed)
 - Error conditions in L2 coming up
 - Indication to user during L2 coming up / failure of mutual ID by L2 engine
 - Responsiveness of Dynamic power allocation

Structure of 802.3at Amendment (As of Seoul Meeting)

- Classification intro under classification section
- State machine (s)
 - Per Seoul, under PSE and PD class sections
 - do we want to change this?
 - Introductory text has been saying to move to 33.6
 - Suggest that any timing be left here; behavior in 33.6
- Register changes in 33.6
- Management attributes in 30
- TLV frame definitions to a normative annex
- Example LLDP exchanges to informative annex
- Refer to comment #246

Adhoc Decisions (10/19/07)

- Move TLV frame definitions to 33.7
 - 33.6.2, and 33.6.3 move 33.7.1 and 33.7.2
- Tables from slides 8 and 9 and redrawn state machine from slide 10 with the correction to the transition from Local_Request to Local_NACK go into
 - Tables 33.7.3
 - State Machine 33.7.4
- Merge 33.6.4 to 33.7.3
- Second paragraph of 33.6 moves to introductory text for 33.7
- Move figure 33-12b to section 33.7.4.1 as an informative figure

Adhoc Decisions Contd. (10/19/07)

- Close restructuring comments with actions from previous page
 - AIP 266. Update 246 (N AN). Update 257 (IN AN)
- AIP 266 and reproduce and own our TLV
 - OBE 43, 217
 - Accept 240
- Comment 84 closed by DL slides
- Accept 198
- Accept 268
 - Consensus that on loss of L2 communication system will fallback to last classified state
 - Consensus that a timeout is needed. Value TBD

Comment #267

- Adhoc had limited time on this
 - Will require more detailed work prior to Nov
- Issue is that a PSE or PD running DLL can get into a state where it is requesting a change and receiving a request for a change
- These can be different, hence the “collision”
 - Requires prioritizing actions and/or PSE vs. PD
- Comment suggests
 - Using a different term than collision
 - Defining behavior in such cases
 - Updating the state diagram and perhaps splitting into 2
- Suggestion
 - AIP and assign work item to adhoc