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Abstract

Minutes of the IEEE 802.11 ARC Standing Committee held Wednesday, 20 March 2013, in the AM1 time slot.

**Wednesday, 20 March 2013**

Agenda deck is 11-13/0275r0.

The Chair made the call for Patents. There was no response.

The Chair reviewed the agenda. No changes were suggested.

The Minutes of the January 2013 session, and teleconferences on February 8 and February 22 were approved as posted.

IETF/802 coordination, lead by Dorothy Stanley (Aruba Networks).

* IETF met here in Orlando last week, and there was a joint meeting between IETF and IEEE 802 on Saturday.
* Dorothy gave a pointer to IETF documents of general interest.
* RFC 4441 update – Biggest challenge is finding the right balance between enough information for this document to be useful as a standalone introduction to IETF processes, versus too much duplication of information already in Best Current Practices. The comment period on the RFC4441 draft is still open, so if anyone has comments get them to Dorothy.
* In the Operations Area working group, they do general maintenance on RFCs that are completed and have no active working group. They have received submissions on the CAPWAP topic, and will be considering these submissions. Dorothy will monitor. No action needed at this time.

802.11 TGak (“Enhancements For Transit Links Within Bridged Networks”) and 802.1Qbz on “802.11 bridging” update.

* Donald Eastlake, 802.11 TGak Chair, reported informally on the status: A number of technical presentations again this week, especially from the 802.1 folks. Most presentaations will be reviewed during the joint meeting on Thursday AM1.
* Topics are a presentation on modelling approach from Philip Klein, and presentations by Norm Finn on the possible changes needed to 802.1Q and 802.1AC to coordinate with 802.11ak work. Note that this will require a new PAR for 802.1AC changes.

802 Overview and Architecture

* First sponsor ballot was supposed to close on Feb 13, but was actually in error, so the deadline is extended to March 22.
* Reviewed the 802.11 comments ([**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0206-00-0arc-combined-comments-802rev-d1-6-sb1.xls**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0206-00-0arc-combined-comments-802rev-d1-6-sb1.xls)) to the Sponsor ballot (made via Mark Hamilton, a member of the Sponsor pool).
* Noted that one comment was to substantially change the Reference Model figure for 802.11’s AP/DS/Portal construct, based on discussion in last time’s ARC session ([**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0198-00-0arc-802rev-802-11-ap-reference-model.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0198-00-0arc-802rev-802-11-ap-reference-model.docx)).
* Noted that the new figure (and an old one that wasn’t modified) shows the PLCP and PMD in the PHY layer, but REVmc is removing these and changing to a single monolithic PHY concept. We need to update the figures. But, we haven’t made this change officially, it is only in REVmc draft so far. Agreed to suggest noting in the figure that the RM continues to evolve and may change from this picture, noting specifically that he PLCP/PMD structure is being considered for removal. Dotorhy will submit these comments personally as a Sponsor ballot pool member.
* The new figure leads to more discussion this time on how 802.11 considers the architecture of AP/DS/Portal infrastructure.

AP/DS/Portal architecture was discussed. Reviewed document [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0115-03-0arc-considerations-on-ap-architectural-models.doc**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0115-03-0arc-considerations-on-ap-architectural-models.doc), posted by Mark Hamilton

* Is the MAC-SAP really different from the ISS/EISS in 802.1 architecture specs? Yes, more than just an implementation point of view, these service interfaces have somewhat different primitives and semantics – although they are quite similar.
* Looked at 802.1Q Bridge picture (“baggy pants”). What is the layer between the High Layer Entities and the MAC Relay? Concluded this isn’t a layer, but a “hole” in the picture that’s hard to see visually. (Shading of the boxes versus the ‘holes’ might be helpful.) Is the small empty box to the left and right of this non-existant layer thing, the LLC? Probably.
* Looked at Mark’s proposed figure, and at 802.11’s Figure 5-1. Agreed that Figure 5-1 has confusing aspects (like unlabelled boxes and ‘holes’ similar to 802.1Q’s picture). Agreed that Mark’s picture clarifies several things and avoids the confusing aspects. This is a helpful improvement. Need to note where (if anywhere) there are multiples of components in the picture – one per peer STA; not sure there are any places like that, although perhaps the controlled port could be modelled that way.
* Considered the picture of the overall infrastructure system (the last picture in the document). The new pictures don’t show mesh, or IBSS, or DLS, or PBSS. Consider these.
* Don’t try to put everything into one picture. It gets too complicated to understand. And, some concepts are from a particular point-of-view, and are different from the point-of-view of another place in the system; so putting them all on one picture is just confusing and arguably wrong. Keep the discussion and the figures as one thing at a time.
* Everyone should note material in 802.11 Annex P. Even though it is only informative, it has a lot of explanastoin about the architecture.
* We need to call out all the interfaces between all the major blocks on the figure. These need names and descitpions to be understandable. In particular, need to label where there are MAC-SAP(s) in the first picture, or other interfaces that are very similar but different from MAC-SAPs. Having interfaces all labelled and understood is key to being able to have multiple figures for the different points-of-view, and letting the reader map these concepts to each other.
* Note that we may have an 802.11 MAC-SAP, which is not identical to the 802 definition of MAC-SAP, but serves our puroses. This should be considered further.

Future: ARC meets ad hoc but seems to always have something. One slot planned at May meeting. No teleconferences planned.

No other business. Adjourned.