

FC-BB-2 Ad Hoc Meeting Minutes 02-04-03

1. Introductions

Steve Wilson opened the meeting at 9:07am Mountain Time on Tuesday, February 4th, 2003, in Newport Beach, CA.

2. Approval of BB-2 Meeting agenda. (No agenda was posted since we're in Letter Ballot comment resolution)

Previous Ad-hoc minutes were approved (02-685v0).

3. Review of old BB-2 action items:

Action Item 55: Steve Wilson to make a project proposal for BB-3. On Going

New Action Items:

Action Item 57: Scott Kipp to work with Murali, Claudio and Ralph to develop overview text to explain authentication and extended to cover the general security overview. Done.

Action Item 62: All members to review 02-547v1 Frame Mapped GFP for Fibre Channel and be ready for a vote on this in the February meeting. Done.

4. Patent Call:

Steve updated the group on the necessity of placing patent calls in the T11.x plenaries instead of this meeting since we develop these standards for ANSI, INCITS and T11.

5. Scheduled New Business:

5.1 Letter Ballot Comment Resolution (No Presentation)

Murali and Steve lead the discussion on the remaining comment resolution. Murali will update the bookmarks of the document. Scott raised one technical issues of removing the requirement to have time stamps. Since this is viewed as a special case, the group would prefer to keep the requirement of using time stamps.

Ralph made the motion and Scott seconded the motion to approve the comments and forward to T11. There were no objections to doing so.

The comment database (03-027v0) was accepted by the committee so that the letter ballot could be closed and FC-BB-2 6.0 and 03-026v2 will be forwarded to T11 for further processing.

5.2 GFP and T1X1.5 Update (02-547v1 and 03-068v0)

Neil discussed the history of SONET and GFP. ITU-T is today prepared to ratify a modification to the GFP standard which would extend transparent GFP (GFP-T) to arbitrary transport (rate) facilities (i.e., removing idles), ITU-T will await the future definition by T11.3 of a frame mapping definition (GFP-F) for FC. The GFP-T is seen as faster-track and future-proof; while GFP-F is seen as slightly more efficient in bandwidth utilization. ITU-T has requested feedback from T11 regarding whether utility is seen in the pursuit of both options.

The group discussed the two methods and the difference between them. Several people in the group stated that they were not clear on the differences between GFP-T and GFP-F.

The group agreed to promote both proposals to ITU-T.

5.3 BB-3 Topics (No presentation)

Steve lead the discussion on topics for FC-BB-3. The topics include:

- ?? Improvements to the SONET/ATM model
- ?? Enhanced Autonomous Regions
- ?? Distributed timers
- ?? Management and input from Telcos
- ?? SRM and SNM

6. Review of BB-2 Action items and Status.

6.1 Status:

October 2002 – Document back from T11 Letter Ballot

February 2003 – Forward to INCITs for 1st public review.

6.2 Action Items

Action Item 55: Steve Wilson to make a project proposal for BB-3. On Going

New Action Items:

None.

8. Meeting Schedule:

8.1 Future Meetings

The next meeting will be the December T11 meeting and we'll request 2 hours for letter ballot. An interim conference call will be on January 8th for two hours. There will possibly be another conference in late January.

9. BB-2 WG Meeting adjourned at 10:36 pm.

10. Attendees:

Attendee	Company
Scott Kipp	McDATA
Steve Wilson	Brocade
Alex Goral	SANcastle
Murali Rajagopal	SV Systems
Bret Ketchum	CNT
Bill Collette	CNT
Michael O'Donnell	McDATA
Jeff Warren	Extreme Networks
Claudio Desanti	Andiamo
Matt Gafney	Storagetek
Ken Hirata	Vixel
Ed McGlaughlin	Qlogic
Craig Carlson	Qlogic
Robert Kembel	Connectivity Solutions
Bill Krieg	Lucent
Charles Monia	Nishan
Harry Paul	Inrange
Robert Pederson	General Dynamics
Ralph Weber	ENDL
Haluk Aytac	Velio
Chris Janz	Akara
Bill Martin	Brocade

Elizabeth Rodriguez	
Tim Sheehan	SANDIAL
Steve Sletten	SUN
Horst Truedtedt	True Focus
Neil Wanamaker	Self

These minutes submitted by Scott Kipp. Any discussion items or important points that have been accidentally omitted or incorrectly reported should be appended to the fc reflector (i.e. used by T11.3 TG for business and technical discussion).