

# Maintenance Task Group

IEEE 802 Plenary, Atlanta, Nov 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](mailto: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

- 6 new maintenance items received since September
  - Mostly editorial, but should discuss item 0011
- Item 0009 on LLDP and Link-Ag still in Received

<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 = 4
CB = 0	Approved = 0
CE = 0	Awaiting clarification = 0
E = 0	Errata = 0
F = 0	To be categorised = 7
I = 0	Review by Technical experts = 0
J = 1	Withdrawn = 0
P = 0	Rejected = 1
R = 7	Published = 0
S = 0	
T = 0	Total = 14
V = 4	
W = 0	
Errors = 0	
Total = 14	Open = 13



# 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
  - Document is still in sponsor ballot. Comment is being address, but no status change for this meeting.

# 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
  - New maintenance item 0009 submitted to address sending LLDP on physical links
- Discussion
  - Still waiting for a project, but as discussed in 0009, we will be revising the AXbq PAR to be a full revision, so this will get incorporated there.

# 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
  - No status change, will likely enter balloting next meeting

# 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.
- Latest Status: Balloting
  - Comment included in last ballot of Qbg
- Discussion:
  - Qbg is still in working group recirculation ballot, but the comment has been address in the last 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
- Latest Status: Balloting
  - Comment submitted in last Qbg ballot
- Discussion
  - Same as 0007

# 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
- Latest Status: Received
  - Discussed at Nanjing Interim and at Atlanta Plenary - <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2011/maint-lynch-LLDP-over-LAG-0920-v1.pdf>
  - We desire to have the ability to send/receive at the physical layer – can be done in AXbq.
  - Agreed to workout the technical details in AXbq – prefer a TPMR type Y to send/receive
  - Preferred to define new TLVs or new bits, thus modifying existing TLVs – prefer to wait for AX revision to fix MIBs and TLVs
- Discussion
  - The editor of AXbq agreed to address these issue, but a scope change is needed in the project. The maintenance TG agreed that we should convert AXbq to a full revision project. Alternatives such as a separate amendment project were discussed but rejected. Motions will be required on Thursday to pre-circulate the new PAR. This may require a change in the project name to AX-Rev (we think). We will need to revise the PAR at the interim. AXbk will still finish and go to sponsor ballot. The based text of AXbk will be rolled into AX-Rev.

# 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
- Latest Status: Balloting
  - Comment submitted to last Qbg ballot.
- Discussion
  - Same as 0007. Included in Qbg which is still in working group recirculation ballot.

# Maintenance Item – 0011

No recommended priority to traffic class mappings for credit-based shaper in table 8-4

- Submission: Christian Boiger– September 2011
- Issues:
  - Text recommends classes 5 and 6 for SR classes A & B, but should be 3 and 2.
  - Table references are wrong
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Various editorial changes to Annex I
- Discussion
  - Normative text is correct in 34, but if someone was looking at the non-normative text this could cause a problem. The group felt this problem was significant enough to justify a corrigendum project. The editor believes the corrigendum can be done quickly.
  - The corrigendum PAR would be written to identify the technical change and then bundle in known typos which are potentially maintenance items (0012, 0013, 0015, 0017). It is possible to raise this PAR during this meeting.



# Maintenance Item – 0012

Missing MEP/MHF icons in fig 26-2

- Submission: Steve Haddock – September 2011
- Issues:
  - Visio source used for figures has a problem including MEP/MHF icons.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Restore the figure to the ah approved version
- Discussion
  - This is also a candidate for corrigendum PAR as well, but the figure is not normative.
  - There is also a plan to create an addition of Q and it should be determined if this can be addressed in the roll-up. We believe not, but we need to check if editorial changes can be made to the base document in the roll-up.

# Maintenance Item – 0013

MRP address for MSRP does not exist

- Submission: Christian Boiger– October 2011
- Issues:
  - MSRP uses Nearest Bridge address, but text indicates there is a specific MRP application in Table 10-1 for this – there is not.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Text changes to indicate use Nearest Bridge instead of updating table 10-1
- Discussion
  - Candidate for the corrigendum as a known typo. Move to ready for balloting.

# Maintenance Item – 0014

## LLDP TLV error processing

- Submission: Paul Congdon, Pat Thaler – Nov 2011
- Issues:
  - 802.1AB text is not clear whether you discard entire LLDPDUs if an optional TLV is in error or simply discard the TLV.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Make it clear that you only discard the TLV if the error is in an optional TLV, but the PDU if the error is in the mandatory TLVs
- Discussion
  - Since there is no open AB amendment we put this in the ready for ballot phase. Note that AB at some point it would be good to remove the Annex of AB for .1 and .3 TLVs.

# Maintenance Item – 0015

Clause number issue impacts PICS

- Submission: Craig Gunther – Nov 2011
- Issues:
  - A new clause 35.2.5 was inserted pushing other clauses up in numbering, but several old references in PICS were not adjusted.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Fix PICS references accordingly
- Discussion
  - Candidate for the corrigendum as a known typo. Move to ready for balloting.

# Maintenance Item – 0017

## Typos in PICS

- Submission: Craig Gunther – Nov 2011
- Issues:
  - SRP is sometimes transposed to SPR in PICS
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Fix PICS references accordingly
- Discussion
  - Candidate for the corrigendum as a known typo.  
Move to ready for balloting.