

802.3at Layer 2 (DLL) Ad-hoc Chair's Report

January 2008 Portland Interim
Wael William Diab – Broadcom

Work Summary

- Ad-hoc reviewed contribution law_1_0108.pdf
- Ad-hoc created a list of open items to work on between January interim and March plenary
- Ad-hoc took polls regarding
 - Questions for .1
 - TLVs
 - Logistics for conducting work between January interim and March plenary

Work Items

- Initialization and MIB interaction
- Shutdown and MIB interaction
- Timeout
- Other Topics for Discussion
 - We have defined what happens when a PSE loses communications – what happens when PD loses communication?
 - Timing - complete TBDs - is it complete
 - L2 coming up after L1 complete
 - Responsiveness of dynamic power allocation

Work Items Contd.

- Other Topics for Discussion Contd.
 - Definitions of state diagram variables
 - Conflict resolution (PSE/PD collision)
 - References to TIA 1057 (if required)
 - Clean up the TLVs
 - Error conditions on L2 coming up
 - Indication to user during L2 coming up
 - Complete or delete Additional Status TLV
 - Indication that ‘I’m providing power’
 - Test mode
 - Initialization and MIB interaction
 - Validity of the L2 interaction w.r.t PSE/PD pair

Straw Poll

- Recommend that the 802.3at Task Force send an informal communication asking the following
 - If we add a new 802.3 subtype, can the subclause reference be in 802.3?
 - If we add a new 802.3 subtype, do we have to implement all the previous sub-types?
 - Can we add new TLV definitions to the entry labeled 802.3 subtype 2, and if so, can we also request modifications to the descriptions?
 - What is the window of opportunity for us pursue any of the 3 options above within the current 802.1AB Revision project?
- Poll: Y:10 N:0
- People in Room:11

Straw Poll

- Recommend that the 802.3at Task Force rely only on 802.1AB for the DLL (L2) TLVs
- Poll: Y: 11 N:0
- People in Room: 11

Straw Poll

- How many people would be willing to do work on L2 in between the January Interim Meeting and the March Plenary?
- Poll: Y:11 N:0
- People in Room:11

Straw Poll

- How many people would try to attend a face to face meeting for the L2 Adhoc prior to the March Meeting. Dial in access will be provided for members that chose not to travel.
- Poll: Y:8 N:1
- People in Room:11

Straw Poll

- How many people would prefer to have the face to face meeting for the L2 Adhoc on the
 - East Coast 6
 - West Coast 6
 - Middle of the country 3
 - Don't Care 4
- Chicago Rules
- People in Room:

Straw Poll

- Investigate a location in DC (Dulles) area for Friday February 29th
- Poll: Y:9 N:0
- People in Room:11

Motion

- Move that the 802.3at Task Force send an informal communication asking the following
 - If we add a new 802.3 subtype, can the subclause reference be in 802.3?
 - If we add a new 802.3 subtype, do we have to implement all the previous sub-types?
 - Can we add new TLV definitions to the entry labeled 802.3 subtype 2, and if so, can we also request modifications to the descriptions?
 - What is the window of opportunity for us pursue any of the 3 options above within the current 802.1AB Revision project?

Allow the Task Force Chair or his delegate editorial license

M:Diab S:Law

- ALL: Y:26 N:0 A:3
- .3: Y:22 N:0 A:1
- Passes 10.25AM

Motion

- Move that the 802.3at Task Force rely only on 802.1AB for the DLL (L2) TLVs
- M: Diab S: Sastry
- ALL: Y:23 N:1 A:5
- .3: Y:18 N:1 A:3
- Tech. Passes 10.27AM