CTF status update from Nendica perspective

Rev 0: 2022-05-31

Roger Marks (EthAirNet Associates; Huawei) <u>roger@ethair.net</u>

+1 802 capable

2022-06-01

Background

- Nendica: <u>IEEE 802 "Network Enhancements for the Next</u> <u>Decade" Industry Connections Activity</u>
- Nendica Study Item: <u>Cut-Through Forwarding in Bridges</u>
 <u>and Bridged Networks [CTF]</u> active since 2021-03-11
- Organized IEEE 802 Plenary Tutorial (2021-07-07): "<u>Cut-</u> <u>Through Forwarding (CTF) among Ethernet networks</u>"
- Nendica Consensus (2021-09-16) that "further discussion should be brought to the 802.1 WG or a Task Group"
- 802.1 WG submitted draft PAR 802.1DU ("Cut-Through Forwarding Bridges and Bridged Networks") <u>PAR</u> and <u>CSD</u>, 2022-01-31 for IEEE 802 March Plenary
- Comments developed in 802.3 WG, with 802.3 and 802.1 members
- Comment responses developed in 802.1 WG, with 802.1 and 802.3 members
- 802.1 WG decided not to pursue PAR in March

802.1 WG Motions

- 802.1 WG Motions, 2022-03-15:
 - Authorize the 802.1 WG to hold joint meetings with the 802.3 WG to discuss cut-through forwarding.
 - 802.1 authorizes the 802.1 WG chair to present status of P802.1DU to the 802.3 WG and request joint meetings to continue discussion.
 - 802.1 authorizes the TSN TG to generate PAR and CSD for pre-circulation to the EC for the July 2022 plenary session for an IEEE 802.1 standard on Cut-Through Forwarding.

Additional 802.1 WG Motion

- 802.1 WG Motion, 2022-05-22:
 - 802.1 authorizes the TSN Task Group to hold an electronic meeting 12:00-14:00 ET on June 9, 2022, to generate PAR and CSD for pre-circulation to the EC for an IEEE 802.1 standard on Cut-Through Forwarding.
 - Agenda to be announced subject to notice of at least
 5 calendar days on the 802.1 Minutes email reflector.
 - Access information is posted on the http://www.ieee802.org/1/tsn page and will be updated as necessary.

802.1/802.3 WG Actions

- 802.3 Closing Plenary (2022-03-17)
 - 802.1 WG Chair <u>presentation</u> recounted history of CTF activity in 802 back to 2016 and reported:
 - *P802.1DU PAR is deferred*...
 - Consensus in 802.1 WG to discuss further with 802.3 WG jointly
 - Proposed venue
 - Joint NEA and Nendica Industry Connections ad hoc
 - Note: "NEA" is IEEE 802.3 Industry Connections New Ethernet Applications Ad Hoc
 - <u>https://www.ieee802.org/3/ad_hoc/ngrates</u>
 - 802.3 Chair verbally accepted the proposal, with details to be determined

Ad Hoc Initiation

- Discussions in Nendica meetings
 - ^o 2022-03-24, 2022-03-31, 2022-04-07
- Coordination with NEA and 802.3 leadership
- Polled potential participants regarding time slot
- Agreed to meet Wed 12:00-13:00 ET
 - 2022-04-20, 2022-04-27, 2022-05-04
 - Ad hoc can schedule further meetings
 - <u>https://1.ieee802.org/802-nendica/ctf-adhoc/</u>
 - Contributions to Nendica mentor, or via 802.3
 - Nendica Chair and NEA Chair to alternate as meeting chair and meeting secretary

Summary of First Meeting

- 2022-04-20, 12:00-13:00 ET (see <u>minutes</u>)
- 66 people
 - 17 registered in just 802.1 IMAT
 - 22 registered in just 802.3 IMAT
 - I registered in 802.1 and 802.3 IMAT
 - 26 additional on Webex seemed to not be in IMAT
- Contribution by NEA Chair on 802.3/NEA process
- Contribution by Nendica Chair on ad hoc background
- Contribution by Johannes Specht: "Cut-Through Forwarding (CTF) in Bridges and Bridged Network – Status Update"
- very little technical discussion
- request made for a contribution to detail the 802.3 perspectives; none offered yet

Summary of Second Meeting

- 2022-04-27, 12:00-13:00 ET (see <u>minutes</u>)
- 52 people
 - 18 registered in just 802.1 IMAT
 - 23 registered in just 802.3 IMAT
 - 11 additional on Webex seemed to not be in IMAT
- Contribution by Peter Jones: "802.3 NEA CTF: CTF concerns"
- extensive technical discussion
- continued objections to CTF from several 802.3 participants

Summary of Third Meeting

- 2022-05-04, 12:00-13:00 ET (see <u>minutes</u>)
- 34 people
 - 19 registered in just 802.1 IMAT
 - 15 registered in just 802.3 IMAT
- extensive discussion of future meetings per <u>802.1-22-0020</u>
 - Agreed to plan meeting 2022-06-01 12:00 ET
 - Pending NEA agreement, 2022-05-19
- Contribution by Johannes Specht ("CTF Considerations on Modelling, Compatibility and Locations")
 - insufficient time for presentation (through Slide 10 only)
 - no time for discussion

Nendica CTF-focus meetings

- Nendica (2022-05-05) scheduled two additional Friday meetings with a CTF focus, prior to Joint Ad Hoc meeting:
 - ^D 2022-05-20 11:00-13:00 ET
 - [•] 2022-05-27 11:00-13:00 ET

Further Nendica/NEA joint meetings

- NEA (2022-05-19) confirmed joint meeting:
 - ^o 2022-06-01 12:00-13:00 ET
 - and proposed additional meetings Wednesdays in June:
 - 2022-06-08 12:00-13:00 ET
 - 2022-06-15 12:00-13:00 ET
 - 2022-06-22 12:00-13:00 ET
 - 2022-06-29 12:00-13:00 ET?
- Nendica agreed to meeting each Wednesday in June

Personal observations

on the following slides

My own understanding of 802.3 views

- Views from 802.3 perspective presented on 2022-04-27
 - Individual contribution
- Key points from 802.3
 - a CTF bridge is inconsistent with a store-and-forward MAC
 - CTF would require a revision of the MAC service in 802.1AC and then a revision of 802.3 to address the documented behavior
 - A CTF bridge cannot conform to the externally-observable behavior specified for the 802.3 MAC
 - CTF would pass errored frames, contrary to IEEE Std 802.3
 - CTF would break management
 - CTF is a layer violation
 - 802.3 rarely changes the MAC and will be reluctant to do so
- In summary, the view is skeptical of an 802.1 CTF PAR.
 - little attention to possible changes to 802.1DU PAR

Possible compromises on some points?

- Possible constraints could be added to PAR (see <u>802.1-22-0020</u>)
 - no forwarding before 64 octets (runt frame check)
 - no CTF on slow-to-fast link speed transition
 - no CTF to LLC
 - other conditions (e.g. slide 53 of <u>CTF tutorial</u>)
- Possible points to add
 - Standardize a CRC "stomp" to identify a frame sent with error
 - as described in <u>Jones' contribution</u>
 - stomp applied by the bridge
 - Standardize counter behavior on errored frames
 - as noted in <u>Jones' contribution</u>
- Clarification of service primitives?
 - Would an amendment to 802.1AC resolve any issues?
 - specify meaning of "atomic"?
 - 802.1AC does not seem to prohibit action in absence of M_UNITDATA.indication

ISS, not "MAC Service," is relevant MAC Service MAC Service LLC User LLC User MS MS Media Access MAC Service MAC Service MA DATA. MA DATA. MAC Relay The second secon Method Provider request Provider indication Entity Independent Functions (8.5) ISS -ISS Media Access Method M UNITDATA M UNITDATA. indication request Dependent Convergence Functions (6.7) MA DATA. MA DATA. indication request Media Access Method **Specific Functions** (IEEE Std 802.n)

NOTE-The notation IEEE Std 802.n in this figure indicates that the specifications for these functions can be found in the relevant standard for the media access method concerned; for example, n would be 3 (IEEE Std 802.3) in the case of Ethernet.

Figure 6-1—Internal organization of the MAC sublayer

- IEEE Std 802.3: "The contents of invalid MAC frames shall not be passed to the LLC or MAC Control sublayer." [doesn't mention to Convergence Function]
 - but 802.3 MAC does not seem to know whether the recipient is a Convergence Function
- IEEE Std 802.3: "Invalid MAC frames may be ignored, discarded, or used in a private manner by MAC clients other than LLC or MAC control. The use of such frames is beyond the scope of this standard."
 - Is relay such a "private manner" of use? [LLC will eventually filter them.]

Early availability of frame data?

- MAC is not required to share frame content serially, but is it prohibited from doing so?
- M_UNITDATA.indication still occurs after end of frame
- Alternatively, consider "lookahead" model <u>802.1-22-0021</u>



NOTE-The notation IEEE Std 802.n in this figure indicates that the specifications for these functions can be found in the relevant standard for the media access method concerned; for example, n would be 3 (IEEE Std 802.3) in the case of Ethernet.

Figure 6-1—Internal organization of the MAC sublayer