

Maintenance Task Group

Via Phone Conference prior to Nanjing

September 14, 2011

Paul Congdon

Agenda

- Patents
- Status Update
- Maintenance item discussion

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 consistent with the ANSI patent policy and 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.



25 March 2008

(Optional to be shown)

Participants, Patents, and Duty to Inform

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

- “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

Quoted text excerpted from IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws subclause 6.2

- 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/guides/bylaws/sect6-7.html#6>

IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual

<http://standards.ieee.org/guides/opman/sect6.html#6.3>

Material about the patent policy is available at

<http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-material.html>

If you have questions, contact the IEEE-SA Standards Board Patent Committee Administrator at patcom@ieee.org or visit <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/index.html>

This slide set is available at <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-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.

Status Update

- 4 new maintenance items received since July Plenary
 - 3 are very editorial, 1 requires discussion

<u>Detailed Totals</u>	<u>Summary Totals</u>
<u>Detailed Totals</u>	<u>Summary Totals</u>
A = 0	Ready for ballot = 2
B = 2	Balloting = 1
CB = 0	Approved = 0
CE = 0	Awaiting clarification = 0
E = 0	Errata = 0
F = 0	To be categorised = 4
I = 0	Review by Technical experts = 0
J = 1	Withdrawn = 0
P = 0	Rejected = 1
R = 4	Published = 0
S = 0	
T = 0	Total = 8
V = 1	
W = 0	
Errors = 0	
Total = 8	Open = 7

Maintenance Item – 0003

Inconsistent VID for LBR Frames

- Submission: Steve Haddock – March 2011
- Issues:
 - Multiple choices for selecting `vlan_identifier`
 - Non-normative language used to describe VID selection
 - Normative text for 20.28.2 is for PBB-TE only
 - Priority and drop eligibility determination also not specified.
 - No managed objects to set Primary VID for MIP
- Latest Status: Balloting
 - Steve Haddock to introduce a ballot comment at San Francisco meeting for 802.1aq
- Discussion
 - Comment has been introduced and accepted, but not put into the draft. The draft is in recirc at the moment. Comment will be resubmitted. Leaving balloting state

Maintenance Item – 0005

Missing enable for Link Aggregation TLV

- Submission: Pat Thaler – June 2011
- Issues:
 - When LinkAgg TLV was moved into 802.1 MIB, the enable was not included
 - Error in table D-5 for IldpV2Xdot1ConfigPortVlanTable. Reference and MIB text don't agree
 - Missing security considerations in D.4.4 for Congestion Notification
- Latest Status: Ready for Ballot
 - Waiting for a revision of 802.1AX to fix
 - Points out issue with sending LLDP frames on physical links of aggregation in architecture
- Discussion
 - The extension MIB is open in Qbg and we could fix some of the relevant bits, but this is in working group recirc. The best long-term answer solution is to put this in AX, but we don't have a revision scheduled. Since there is really no new information to change the urgency, we will leave this in its current state.

Maintenance Item – 0006

Corrigendum items for .1AS

- Submission: Geoff Garner – June 2011
- Issues:
 - Various
 - Actively being worked at a TG item
- Latest Status: Ready for Ballot
 - Waiting for AB Corrigendum ballot
- Discussion
 - AB Corr PAR has been approved, but a draft has not yet been circulated for ballot. Once this goes to ballot we need to validate the items are covered and then change the state to balloting.

Maintenance Item – 0007

incorrect operPointToPointMAC references

- Submission: Craig Gunther – August 2011
- Issues:
 - When 802.1ak was rolled into 802.1Q it contained incorrect references to clause 6.4.3 for operPointToPointMAC. They should be 6.6.3.
- Proposed Resolution:
 - Update references at next opportunity
- Discussion:
 - We should just fix this in any amendment to Q, this could be done in aq or Qbg. It would be better to have a TG chair submit a comment against Qbg to get it fixed – do it now rather than wait for another draft. Action: Paul to submit late Qbg comments. Move to balloting phase.

Maintenance Item – 0008

MVRP cut-and-paste errors

- Submission: Craig Gunther – August 2011
- Issues:
 - MVPR1 and MVPR2 PICs items were pasted from MMRP items and remain incorrect
- Proposed Resolution:
 - Update references at next opportunity
- Discussion
 - Since this is similar to 0007, do the same resolution.

Maintenance Item – 0009

Disambiguating LLDP over Link Aggregations

- Submission: Jeffrey Lynch – September 2011
- Issues:
 - It is unclear how LLDP should operate over an aggregation
 - It is currently not possible to determine at the receiver if the LLDP frames were sent from a peer at the physical link or at the aggregate
- Proposed Resolution:
 - Document in IEEE 802.1Q or IEEE 802.1AX the requirements and operational behavior for LLDP in the present of Link Aggregation
 - Either redefine the use of some of the reserve bits or add new fields to the existing LAG TLV (to disambiguate the source & target of LLDP frames)
 - Identify which TLVs should be sent on each individual link or on the aggregate
 - Resolve the architectural addressing issues introduced by running LLDP over a LAG.
- Discussion
 - There is some question as to whether you can actually send/receive LLDP frames at the physical layer because of the way it has been specified originally in 802.3. If that is true, then we have a new feature requirement for 802.1AX and it is needed to send/receive at the physical layer. This aspect could be put into AXbq.
 - How should a Y work in the link aggregation layer? If we want to de-multiplex frames then we would either need new addresses or content specific multiplexing. The way it currently works is that you would see multiple peers at the aggregate layer and one of the physical links would see two peers while others would only see one. Doing the Y based on protocol is a slippery slope (e.g. it would be protocol specific – the LLDP Y as a shim). We would rather not create a new destination address and instead use a TPMR type Y. Discuss this at the Interim via a submission by Jeff, Paul and Norm. Leave in received state for now.

Maintenance Item – 0010

Incorrect Annex reference

- Submission: Christian Boiger– September 2011
- Issues:
 - A reference to Annex G in 6.11.4 should really be a reference to Annex I
- Proposed Resolution:
 - Change "Annex G" to "Annex I"
- Discussion
 - Also make a comment against Qbg to fix this one as done with 0007 and 0008