Segment Protection Phone Discussion Minutes
May 6, 2009
Bob Sultan

Attendees:

Bob Sultan (Huawei)
Ben Mack-Crane (Huawei)
Steve Haddock
Ken Young (Gridpoint)
Zehavit Alon (NSN)
Nurit Sprecher (NSN)

Zehavit presented a proposed PAR that extends Segment Protection to PtP VLANs:
http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/segprot/files/segment-protection-draft-PAR-v4-with-support-to-P2P-VLANs.ppt

Some *paraphrasing* of the discussion follows (with no guarantee of accuracy):

Bob: Generally okay with the modification to the PAR but what's missing from the wording is something that says that this applies only to P2P VLANs *that do not use STP/MVRP*.

Steve: The modifications change the PAR from a PAR dealing with Segment Protection to a PAR dealing with Traffic Engineering for PBNs. Suggest separate PAR proposal on Traffic Engineering for PBNs. If adopted and similar in scope, then the PARs could be combined.

Ken: Concern that the inclusion of PtP VLAN in the current PAR greatly increases its scope. He agrees that the proposal is technically feasible. More detail is needed on how it would work.

Ben: Opposes use of a special MSTID to identify VIDs not associated with STP but pointed out that there are significant environments where STP is not used. Would be okay if Segment Protection for PtP VLAN is applied specifically to environments where STP is not used.

Steve: While people may 'turn off' spanning tree this is not something that we would want to codify in standards.

Nurit: Questions in what way the OAM mechanism is broken. Steve replies that it is a change to CFM since the VID is the path selector to the destination (vs. the DA, VID pair). This leads to possible issues with the currently defined OAM mechanisms.

Nurit: PtP VLAN is widely deployed so the requirement for addressing Segment Protection in this environment is as strong as that for PBB-TE. Nurit argues that it would

be a waste to develop two divergent methods of solving essentially the same problem. Steve replies that it's not clear that the solutions are the same since, for example, in the PtP VLAN case the member set is updated while in the PBB-TE case it is the outbound port of the FDB entry that is updated.

Conclusion: The PAR proposal for PBB-TE Segment Protection will not be updated to include Segment Protection for P2P VLAN. People in the group are interested in the development of a PAR for P2P VLAN Segment Protection and the segprot yahoo group can provide a forum for development of this PAR. If a P2P VLAN Segment Protection PAR is adopted, the two PARs could be merged in order to ensure that commonalities are appropriately exploited. Zehavit and Nurit will present material at the meeting next week (if they are ready with the material) in support of a PtP VLAN Segment Protection PAR.

In response to a question from Bob, Steve suggested that for the Pittsburgh meeting it should be sufficient to present the PAR, as well as a brief presentation describing how infrastructure Segment Protection differs from data path Segment Protection, and that the current PAR would cover infrastructure protection (while not precluding a PAR covering data path protection in the future).

Bob asks that participants let him know by email whether they would like to have their names on the PAR presentation in Pittsburgh as an indication of their support. The PAR proposal is: http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/segprot/files/segment-protection-draft-PAR-v4.ppt or http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/new-sultan-segprot-draft-par-mtg4-0509-v01.pdf

Next Week:

>
> We will have another phone meeting at the same time next Wednesday May 13 at 9AM New York time (6:30PM India, 9PM China, etc.). On the agenda will be:
>
> - Presentation from Zehavit and Nurit on solving technical concerns regarding Segment Protection for PtP VLAN and/or PAR for Segment Protection for PtP VLAN.
> - Other issues, please suggest.

Minutes:

>
> Please send any comments on these minutes to bsultan@huawei.com or to segprot@yahoogroups.com