

**IEEE P802.3 (IEEE 802.3bx)  
Revision to IEEE Std 802.3-2012  
Maintenance #11 Task Force**

Ad hoc teleconference  
23 December 2014

# Agenda

- Attendance recording
- Patent policy
- Future meetings
- Discussion of comments

# Instructions for the WG Chair

The IEEE-SA strongly recommends that at each WG meeting the chair or a designee:

- Show slides #1 through #4 of this presentation
- Advise the WG attendees that:
  - The IEEE's patent policy is described in Clause 6 of the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws*;
  - Early identification of patent claims which may be essential for the use of standards under development is strongly encouraged;
  - There may be Essential Patent Claims of which the IEEE is not aware. Additionally, neither the IEEE, the WG, nor the WG chair can ensure the accuracy or completeness of any assurance or whether any such assurance is, in fact, of a Patent Claim that is essential for the use of the standard under development.
- Instruct the WG Secretary to record in the minutes of the relevant WG meeting:
  - That the foregoing information was provided and that slides 1 through 4 (and this slide 0, if applicable) were shown;
  - That the chair or designee provided an opportunity for participants to identify patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) and/or the holder of patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) of which the participant is personally aware and that may be essential for the use of that standard
  - Any responses that were given, specifically the patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) and/or the holder of the patent claim(s)/patent application claim(s) that were identified (if any) and by whom.
- The WG Chair shall ensure that a request is made to any identified holders of potential essential patent claim(s) to complete and submit a Letter of Assurance.
- It is recommended that the WG chair review the guidance in *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual* 6.3.5 and in FAQs 12 and 12a on inclusion of potential Essential Patent Claims by incorporation or by reference.

Note: **WG** includes Working Groups, Task Groups, and other standards-developing committees with a PAR approved by the IEEE-SA Standards Board.



# Participants, Patents, and Duty to Inform

All participants in this meeting have certain obligations under the IEEE-SA Patent Policy.

- **Participants [Note: Quoted text excerpted from IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws subclause 6.2]:**
  - **“Shall inform the IEEE (or cause the IEEE to be informed)” of the identity of each “holder of any potential Essential Patent Claims of which they are personally aware” if the claims are owned or controlled by the participant or the entity the participant is from, employed by, or otherwise represents**
    - **“Personal awareness” means that the participant “is personally aware that the holder may have a potential Essential Patent Claim,” even if the participant is not personally aware of the specific patents or patent claims**
  - **“Should inform the IEEE (or cause the IEEE to be informed)” of the identity of “any other holders of such potential Essential Patent Claims” (that is, third parties that are not affiliated with the participant, with the participant’s employer, or with anyone else that the participant is from or otherwise represents)**
- **The above does not apply if the patent claim is already the subject of an Accepted Letter of Assurance that applies to the proposed standard(s) under consideration by this group**
- **Early identification of holders of potential Essential Patent Claims is strongly encouraged**
- **No duty to perform a patent search**

# Patent Related Links

All participants should be familiar with their obligations under the IEEE-SA Policies & Procedures for standards development.

Patent Policy is stated in these sources:

IEEE-SA Standards Boards Bylaws

*<http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/bylaws/sect6-7.html#6>*

IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual

*<http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/opman/sect6.html#6.3>*

Material about the patent policy is available at

*<http://standards.ieee.org/about/sasb/patcom/materials.html>*

If you have questions, contact the IEEE-SA Standards Board Patent Committee Administrator at [patcom@ieee.org](mailto:patcom@ieee.org) or visit <http://standards.ieee.org/about/sasb/patcom/index.html>

This slide set is available at  
<https://development.standards.ieee.org/myproject/Public/mytools/mob/slideset.ppt>



# Call for Potentially Essential Patents

- If anyone in this meeting is personally aware of the holder of any patent claims that are potentially essential to implementation of the proposed standard(s) under consideration by this group and that are not already the subject of an Accepted Letter of Assurance:
  - Either speak up now or
  - Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible or
  - Cause an LOA to be submitted

# Other Guidelines for IEEE WG Meetings

- **All IEEE-SA standards meetings shall be conducted in compliance with all applicable laws, including antitrust and competition laws.**
  - **Don't discuss the interpretation, validity, or essentiality of patents/patent claims.**
  - **Don't discuss specific license rates, terms, or conditions.**
    - Relative costs, including licensing costs of essential patent claims, of different technical approaches may be discussed in standards development meetings.
      - Technical considerations remain primary focus
  - **Don't discuss or engage in the fixing of product prices, allocation of customers, or division of sales markets.**
  - **Don't discuss the status or substance of ongoing or threatened litigation.**
  - **Don't be silent if inappropriate topics are discussed ... do formally object.**

-----  
See *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual*, clause 5.3.10 and “Promoting Competition and Innovation: What You Need to Know about the IEEE Standards Association's Antitrust and Competition Policy” for more details.

# Future meetings

- 8 January 2015, 12:00 pm to 1:00 pm EST
  - Ad hoc teleconference
- 12 and 13 January 2015
  - Atlanta, GA, USA



# Comment summary (24)

- Company ID #53, #69
- Implementer vs. implementor #20
- PICS: Date of statement #50
- Align draft with P802.3bm #8
- Ordered set and ordered\_set #26, #27
- Remove deprecated clauses #68
- Out of date text #56, #57
- 100BASE-TX EEE (state diagrams) #47, #48
- EEE TLVs missing from bit string #40, #70
- Attribute assignment to package #41
- Clause 33 #59, #80, #60, #82, #81, #83
- Text for reserved bits #58
- Bit range for SNR margin #10
- Reserved registers #4

## Comment summary, continued (17)

- PCS type selection field #11
- MR12xx (Clause 53 jitter) #49, #24
- 10GBASE-T “LPI cycle” **#79**
- 10GBASE-KR start-up (state diagram) #71
- Clause 75 TDP #9
- Missing PICS #23
- 40GBASE-SR4 OM4 reach #44, #45
- Skew variation #15
- rx\_down\_count definition #33
- PRBS9 description #7
- RS-FEC error marking #65
- PMA SI lane vs. FEC lane #66, #67, #75
- Which return loss? #28

# “Bucket-worthy” editorial (42)

- Common mode vs. common-mode #19
- Typos #21, #76, #78, #36, #73, #74, #52, #29, #30
- Paragraph tag #22
- Management objects template #35
- Cross-references #2, #3, #17, #12, #43, #34, #13, #14, #32, #42
- Empty subclause #25
- Style #77, #18, #72, #1, #61, #62, #64, #63, #16
- Missing PICS fields #37, #38, #39
- Grammar #31
- Numbering #46
- Bit ordering #5, #6
- Frontmatter #54, #51, #55

# Unapproved meeting minutes: 23 December 2014

- Meeting begins at 11:06 am EST.
- Patent policy reviewed.
- Call for patents made; none responded.
- Comments #53, #69 discussed
  - Refine definition of OUI and CID for proposed response.
  - Propose to replace CID acronym expansion (“consecutive identical digits”, only used in Clause 50) with “Company ID”.
  - Suggested remedy covers through Section 4. Propose to replace instances of “OUI” with “OUI/CID” for field names and “OUI or CID” in text. References to “OUI-22” should not be updated. Check Clauses 57, 73, and 79.
- Comment #20 discussed
  - Propose to use “implementer” consistently throughout the draft.
- Comment #26, #27 discussed
  - Propose to use “ordered set” throughout the draft.
  - Propose to delete the “global” definition of “ordered\_set” in 1.4.304 so that it will be defined locally where it is used (different in different clauses).
  - Another option is to leave the definition as is (Clause 36 specific)

# Unapproved meeting minutes, continued

- Comment #68 discussed
  - Knock-on effects for removing “obsolete” clauses must be considered.
  - Some risk to project schedule.
  - Not essential to do this now.
  - May be better suited to a target maintenance project where all of the consequential changes can be more carefully considered.
- Comments #40, #70 discussed
  - Suggested remedy provided in comment #40 appears to resolve the issue.
- Meeting adjourned at 12:02 pm EST.

## Attendees: 23 December 2014

- Pete Anslow, Ciena
- Piers Dawe, Mellanox
- Bob Grow, RMG Consulting
- Mark Gustlin, Xilinx
- Marek Hajduczenia, Bright House Networks
- Adam Healey, Avago Technologies
- David Law, HP Ltd.
- Val Maguire, Seimon
- Pat Thaler, Broadcom
- Geoff Thompson, GraCaSI
- George Zimmerman, Linear Technology & Commscope