Maintenance Task Group Interim Meeting

Via phone conference prior to Munich

Jan 12, 2012

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.

◆IEEE

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

25 March 2008

◈IEEE

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

◆IEEE

25 March 2008

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

25 March 2008

◆IEEE

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.

◆IEEE

Status Update

- 4 new maintenance items received since November
- Qbg in Sponsor Ballot and Q-Cor-2 Task Group Ballot complete

Detailed Totals	Summary Totals
A = 0	Ready for ballot = 3
B = 3	Balloting = 9
CB = 0	Approved = 0
CE = 0	Awaiting clarification = 0
E = 0	Errata = 0
F = 0	To be categorised = 5
I = 0	Review by Technical experts = 0
J = 1	Withdrawn = 0
P = 0	Rejected = 1
R = 5	Published = 0
S = 0	
T = 0	Total = 18
V = 9	
W – 0	
Errors = 0	
	Open = 17
Total = 18	

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
  - Document is still in sponsor ballot?
- Discussion
  - ?

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 lldpV2Xdot1ConfigPortVlanTable. 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. PAR agreed to be modified
  - New maintenance item 0009 submitted to address sending LLDP on physical links
- Discussion
  - ?

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
  - Included in Qbg Sponsor Ballot
- Discussion:
  - Any comments?

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
  - Included in Qbg Sponsor Ballot
- Discussion
  - Any comments?

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
  - Waiting for AX-Rev to address. Status of AX-Rev?
- Discussion
  - ?

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
  - Included in Qbg Sponsor Ballot
- Discussion
  - Any comments?

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:
  - Balloted in Q-Cor-2
- Discussion
  - Any comments?

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:
  - Balloted in Q-Cor-2
- Discussion
  - Any comments?

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:
  - Balloted in Q-Cor-2
- Discussion
  - Any Comments?

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:
  - Balloted in Q-Cor-2
- Discussion
  - Any Comments?

Maintenance Item – 0017
Typos in PICS

- Submission: Craig Gunther – Nov 2011
- Issues:
  - SRP is sometimes transposed to SPR in PICS
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Balloted in Q-Cor-2
- Discussion
  - Any Comments?

Maintenance Item – 0018
Incorrect figure reference

- Submission: Steve Haddock– Nov 2011
- Issues:
  - Figure reference incorrect
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Change Figure 6-4 to Figure 26-2
- Discussion
  - ?

Maintenance Item – 0019
Incorrect Link Aggregation figure for bridges

- Submission: Steve Haddock– Nov 2011
- Issues:
  - Link aggregation diagram is show as a shim between MSAPs, but this doesn't work for bridge architecture
  - Similar issue was addressed in 802.1AC ballot comment.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Change Figure 6-3 usage of MSAP to SAP.
  - Delete MAC service line
  - Change 802.3 MAC to MAC
- Discussion
  - ?

Maintenance Item – 0020
Inconsistent text when NumberOfValues is zero

- Submission: Rich Newpol – Dec 2011
- Issues:
  - In Q-2011, if NumberOfValues is zero then the ThreePackedEvents vector is not included, but BNF appears to imply NumberOfValues must not be zero and vector always included.
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Fix BNF to indicate ThreePackedEvents vector is optional
  - Clearly state what happens when NumberOfValues is zero. In 10.8.2.8
- Discussion
  - ?

Maintenance Item – 0021
TC must be configured for ETS to specify bandwidth

- Submission: Anoop Ghanwani – Jan 2012
- Issues:
  - Qaz does not make it clear that you can only configure bandwidth when the TC is configured for ETS.
  - Invalid TLVs should be discarded and stated in D2.9
- Proposed Resolution:
  - Indicated that the TC table must have values of 0 if the TC is not configured for ETS.
- Discussion
  - ?