



Key: ME - Motion, External, MI - Motion, Internal, DT- Discussion Topic, II - Information Item

Special Orders				
Category (* = consent agenda)				
1.00		MEETING CALLED TO ORDER	Nikolich	1 01:00 PM
2.00	MI	APPROVE OR MODIFY AGENDA	Nikolich	9 01:01 PM
3.00	MI	Motion to confirm Wendong Hu as 802.22 chair	Nikolich	5 01:10 PM
3.01				01:15 PM
3.02				01:15 PM
4.00				01:15 PM
4.01				01:15 PM
				01:15 PM
				01:15 PM
5.00		IEEE Standards Board and Sponsor Ballot Items		01:15 PM
5.01	MI	802.20.3 forward to Sponsor ballot	Canchi	5 01:15 PM
5.02	ME	802.19 Rescind PAR for recommended practice to NesCom	Shellhammer	10 01:20 PM
5.03	MI	802.17 reaffirmation to Sponsor ballot	Lemon	5 01:30 PM
5.04	MI	802.17c to Sponsor ballot (conditional)	Lemon	10 01:35 PM
5.05	ME			01:45 PM
5.06	ME	802.15.3c forward to RevCom (conditional)	Heile	01:45 PM
5.07	ME	802.11w forward to RevCom	Kraemer	5 01:45 PM
5.08	ME*	802.11n PAR extension request to NesCom	Kraemer	01:50 PM
5.09	ME	802.11n forward to RevCom	Kraemer	5 01:50 PM
5.10	MI	802.11p Vehicular communications to Sponsor ballot (conditional)	Kraemer	10 01:55 PM
5.11	MI	802.11u to Sponsor ballot (conditional)	Kraemer	10 02:05 PM
5.12	MI	802.11v to Sponsor ballot (conditional)	Kraemer	10 02:15 PM
5.13	MI	802.11z to Sponsor ballot (conditional)	Kraemer	10 02:25 PM
5.14	ME*	802.3at DTE power enhancements PAR extension request to NesCom	Law	02:35 PM
5.15	ME	802.3at DTE Power via MDI Enhancements to RevCom	Law	5 02:35 PM
5.16	ME	802.3av 10 Gb/s EPON to RevCom	Law	5 02:40 PM
5.17	ME	802.3bc Amendment: Ethernet Organizationally Specific TLVs to RevCom (conditional)	Law	10 02:45 PM
5.18	MI	802.2-2008/Cor 1 (IEEE 802.3bb) Corrigendum 1 Timing considerations for PAUSE operation to Sponsor ballot	Law	5 02:55 PM
5.19	MI	P802.1aj to Sponsor ballot	Jeffree	5 03:00 PM
5.20	MI	P802.1Qav to Sponsor ballot	Jeffree	5 03:05 PM
5.21	MI	P802.1AR to Sponsor ballot	Jeffree	5 03:10 PM
5.22	MI	P802.1X-REV to Sponsor ballot	Jeffree	5 03:15 PM
5.23	MI	P802.1Qau to Sponsor ballot (conditional)	Jeffree	10 03:20 PM
5.24	ME	802.1Qbc, Provider Bridging -- Remote Customer Service Interface PAR forward to NesCom	Jeffree	5 03:30 PM
5.25	ME	802.1Qbe, MIRP PAR forward to NesCom	Jeffree	5 03:35 PM
5.26	ME	802.1Qbf, PBB-TE Infrastructure Protection PAR forward to NesCom	Jeffree	5 03:40 PM
5.27	ME*	802.1 AR PAR modification request to NesCom	Jeffree	0 03:45 PM
5.28	ME*	802.1aq PAR extension to NesCom	Jeffree	0 03:45 PM
6.00		Executive Committee Study Groups, Working Groups, TAGs		03:45 PM
6.01	MI*	802.3 Ethernet support for the IEEE P802.1AS time synchronization protocol (first extension)	Law	0 03:45 PM
6.02	MI*	802.19 TV whitespace coexistence (first extension)	Shellhammer	0 03:45 PM
6.03	MI	802.11 QoS support in management frames	Kraemer	5 03:45 PM
6.04	MI	802.11 TV whitespace	Kraemer	5 03:50 PM

6.05	MI	ECSG Emergency services	Gupta	15	03:55 PM
6.06					04:10 PM
6.07					04:10 PM
6.08					04:10 PM
6.09					04:10 PM
6.10					04:10 PM
7.00		Break		10	04:10 PM
8.00		LMSC Internal Business			04:20 PM
8.01	II	Treasurer's report	Hawkins	5	04:20 PM
8.02	II	Standards for CD ROM	Gilb	5	04:25 PM
8.03	MI	It ain't working	Thompson	30	04:30 PM
8.04	MI	Distribution of Standards and drafts	Marks	10	05:00 PM
8.05	MI	Creation of WG P&P	Sherman	10	05:10 PM
8.06	MI	EC document server	Sherman	10	05:20 PM
8.07					05:30 PM
8.08					05:30 PM
9.00		LMSC Liaisons and External Interface			05:30 PM
9.01	ME*	Press release for 802.1Qav Forwarding and Queuing for Time Sensitive Streams	Jeffree	0	05:30 PM
9.02	ME*	Comments on FCC Medical Body Area Networks NPRM ET Docket 08-59, Doc. 18-09-0077r3	Lynch	0	05:30 PM
9.03	ME*	Liaison to ITU-R WP5D: Update of Section 5.6 in Revision 10 of Recommendation ITU-R M.1457, Doc. 18-09-0083r1	Lynch	0	05:30 PM
9.04	II	Letter to ITU-R SG5 Counselor: Certification of references and transposition for M.1457 Rev. 9, Section 5.6, Doc. 18-09-0084r0	Lynch	0	05:30 PM
9.05	ME*	Liaison to ITU-R WP5A: Response to liaison statement from WP5A on update of Report M.2116, Doc. 18-09-0085r1	Lynch	0	05:30 PM
9.06	II	Letter to ITU-R WP5D IMT-Advanced Workshop Convener: Intention to participate in 3rd Workshop on IMT-Advanced, Doc. 18-09-0086r1	Lynch	0	05:30 PM
9.07	ME*	Liaison response to IEC TC65/SC65C/JWG10 regarding Power over Ethernet and industrial environments	Law	0	05:30 PM
9.08	ME*	Liaison response to ISO/IEC JTC1 SC25 WG3 regarding optical fibre terminology	Law	0	05:30 PM
9.09					05:30 PM
9.10					05:30 PM
9.11					05:30 PM
9.12					05:30 PM
9.13					05:30 PM
9.14					05:30 PM
10.00		IEEE SA items			05:30 PM
10.01					05:30 PM
10.02					05:30 PM
11.00					05:30 PM
11.01	II				05:30 PM
11.02	II	Information Items			05:30 PM
11.03	II	Workshop update	Thompson	9	05:30 PM
11.04	II	Network Services report	Alvin	3	05:39 PM
11.05	II	Liaison letter to Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers (SMPTE)	Jeffree	3	05:42 PM
11.06	II	Liaison response letter to Broadband Forum	Jeffree	5	05:45 PM
11.07	II	Liaison letters to TTA and ARIB	Marks	5	05:50 PM
11.08	II				05:55 PM
11.09					05:55 PM
12.00		ADJOURN SEC MEETING	Nikolich		06:00 PM

3.00 MI Motion to confirm Wendong Hu as 802.22 chair

Nikolich

5 01:04 PM

802.22 held an election for a new chair, Wendong Hu won the runoff election, 12 for Wendong Hu, 9 for Aprova Modi. Moved by David Law, "Confirm Wendong Hu as chair of IEEE 802.22", seconded by Thaler

Vote: 14/0/0, motion passes

5.00

IEEE Standards Board and Sponsor Ballot Items

5.01 MI 802.20.3 forward to Sponsor ballot

Canchi

5 01:09 PM

Canchi presented EC-ClosingPlenary-802.20.3-to-Sponsorballot.ppt.

Thaler asked if there was any changes to the draft after the ballot

Canchi said that there were no changes.

Thompson asked if this was unconditional approval, Canchi confirmed that it is unconditional approval.

Moved by Shellhammer, seconded Lynch

Vote: 14/0/0 motion passes

# 802.20.3 Motion

**P802.20.3 Standard for Minimum Performance Characteristics of IEEE P802.20  
Terminals and Base Stations/Access Nodes**

Agenda Item X.YZ

Friday, July 17, 2009

IEEE 802 LMSC

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

# 802.20.3 Letter Ballot 4 – Recirculation 2 Results

- The return rate, based on 27 voters, is 66%
- YES – 17 (100%) [ $Y/(Y+N)$ ]
- NO – 0 (0%)
- Abstain -1
- Number of Comments: 0 – ***All comments have been resolved to satisfaction of commenter's***
  - Vote and Comment History
    - Initial Ballot: Yes -15, No - 2, Abstain -1. # of comments 62
    - Recirculation 1: Yes -15, No - 2, Abstain -1. # of comments 9

# Move to Forward 802.20.3 to Sponsor Ballot

- Motion: The 802 EC approves moving Draft 2.1 of P802.20.3 to Sponsor Ballot.
  - Mover: Shellhammer
  - Second: Lynch

Shellhammer presented Withdraw.pptx

Moved by Shellhammer, seconded by Sherman

Thompson asked if this was supposed to stop the squabbling between the wireless groups.

Shellhammer said that nothing would stop the squabbling between the wireless groups.

Thompson wanted to know if this would cause the 802.19 group to cease operation.

Shellhammer clarified that 802.19 would not go away, but this specific project would stop.

Thompson wanted to clarify that 802.19 would not have any external documents

Shellhammer said that 802.19 does have an SG that is working on a PAR. This PAR did not have any interest from the members willing to write the document.

Kraemer the group took time to differentiate between withdrawing the PAR and having 802.19 stop its work. The PAR is due to expire in 2010 (18 months). Feels that it would be best to let the PAR expire naturally.

Shellhammer, Nikolich suggested withdrawing the PAR as a housekeeping item.

Rigsbee two questions: 1) Was there a vote taken in 802.19 and what was the result?

Shellhammer, the motion passed 2/0/0. There are 40 people attending during TVWSG, but there is little interest in this PAR.

Rigsbee, agrees with Kraemer to leave it open in case someone wants to write a document.

Marks, agrees with Kraemer, was a supporter of the PAR when it came up. The need for the document has increased. Thinks we should keep it open in case someone comes along and wants to do it.

Sherman spoke in favor of the motion, unless someone makes the commitment, no reason to keep it around. Would rather close it down and open a new activity if interest increases.

Thaler: did the WG know that this was on the agenda?

Shellhammer, yes, it was sent out a week in advance, which caused email discussion with 802.11. Asked if anyone objected, but did not have any response.

Thaler, thus, even though the vote was 2/0/0, anyone who wanted it to survive could have shown up to vote. If there is no work going on, it should be withdrawn.

Law, if no one is working on it, withdraw. If someone wants to work on it, then create a PAR.

Grow (Intel), it is unfortunate that no one wants to work on it. Other groups are working on wireless and could benefit from this.

Shellhammer, an recommended practice for a coexistence method would likely have more interest than a recommended practice for coexistence analysis.

Perahia (Intel), there are coordination problems as well.

Nikolich closed discussion

Vote 12/2/0, motion passes.

Nikolich mentioned that TVWS initially was not going to generate a PAR, but now Shellhammer has indicated that they will be preparing a PAR. Nikolich asked if anyone had problems with the extension of the TVWS SG now that it will be generating as PAR. No member expressed any concern.

Marks asked what agenda item we were discussing.

Nikolich said that it was a consent agenda item to extend the TVWSG

Rigsbee asked which type of project this would be, recommended practice or standard.

Nikolich said we should take this up at the end of the meeting as an II.



# Motion to withdraw 802.19 Recommended Practice PAR

- Move to withdraw the P802.19 PAR entitled, “Recommended Practice for Information Technology – Telecommunications and information exchange between systems – Local and metropolitan networks – Specific requirements – Part 19: Methods for assessing coexistence of wireless networks”
- Move Steve Shellhammer
- Second Mat Sherman
- Vote
  - Yes
  - No
  - Abstain

Lemon presented "802.17-2004 reaffirmation.pdf"

Law started to say that this motion was not required.

Nikolich ruled that Law was out of order, said that Lemon should have a chance to present.

Moved by Lemon, seconded by Hawkins

Law asked why not a revision PAR?

Lemon, they can't get a revision PAR prior to finishing 802.17c.

Law said that it doesn't need to be done until the December meeting. It only takes one person on the standards board objecting to the administrative withdraw to stop it.

Lemon withdraws the motion.



# Reaffirmation of 802.17-2004

# Background

- 802.17-2004 due for maintenance by 19 October 2009
- 802.17 WG expected to request revision PAR in November

# Motion

- Approve initiation of reaffirmation of 802.17-2004

Moved: John Lemon

Seconded:

Y:            N:            A:

Lemon presented "802.17c to sponsor conditional.pdf"

Motion: "Grant conditional approval, under Clause 13 of LMSC OM, to forward 802.17c to sponsor ballot.

Moved by Lemon, seconded by Jeffrey

Thompson asked if the ballot pool has been formed yet.

Lemon said no.

Thompson said that the interest is small, it is a concern that a group will not be able to be formed.

Vote: 14/0/0, motion passes.

# Request For Conditional Approval To Send 802.17c To Sponsor Ballot

# Clause 13 Requirements

- *“motions requesting conditional approval to forward when the prior ballot has closed shall be accompanied by:”*
- *Date the ballot closed: 16 May 2009*
- *Vote tally including Approve, Disapprove and Abstain votes: Y:4, N:1, A:0*
- *Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and WG responses: There are no remaining disapprove votes*
- *Schedule for recirculation ballot and resolution meeting: Recirculation ballot closes 17 July 2009 (AOE)  
Currently no resolution meeting planned because no comments*



# Additional Details (1)

- The one disapprove voter on the previous draft, version 1.2, has switched to approve.
- All comments have been satisfied.
- There are no comments carried forward from previous ballots.
- There are no disapprove votes carried forward from previous ballots.

# Additional Details (2)

- With less than one day remaining on the recirc ballot, the votes so far are  
Y:6, N:0, A:1  
Comments:0

# Motion

- Grant conditional approval, under Clause 13 of LMSC OM, to forward 802.17c to sponsor ballot

Moved: John Lemon

Seconded:

Y:            N:            A:

Heile presented "15-09-0581-00-0000-3c-revcom-conditional-approval-package.ppt"

Law asked if there was a mandatory coordination requirement with RevCom.

Heile indicated that 48/64 bit is out of scope as this is a PHY amendment. We are continuing to discuss this issue.

Motion "The 802.15 WG requests Conditional Approval from the Executive Committee to forward the P802-15-3c latest draft to RevCom"

Moved by Heile, seconded by Gilb

Vote: 14/0/0, motion passes

## 802.15.3c Sponsor Ballot Status

- Date 2<sup>nd</sup> ballot recirculation closed: 7 July 2009
- Vote tally:
  - 161 affirmative
  - 7 negative with comments
  - 1 negative without comments
  - 8 abstain
- Comments supporting remaining disapprove votes and WG responses in document 15-09-0571-00-003c
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Recirculation began 16 July 2009,
- Resolution meeting: 28 July, 2009, 9 am JST, 27 July, 2009, 5 pm PST, 2 hours

## 802.15.3c Sponsor Ballot Summary

	Initial	1 <sup>st</sup> recirculation	2 <sup>nd</sup> recirculation
Approve	157 (94%)	159 (95%)	162 (95%)
Disapprove	9	8	6 (1 changed after ballot)
Abstain	8	8	8
Total	174	175	177 (1 disapprove w/o comments)
# comments	207	63	9 (with approve vote)

- No new valid disapprove votes in last recirculation.
- No new comments from previous disapprove voter
- Based on comments from approve voter, 3 small technical changes were needed
- 3<sup>rd</sup> recirculation began 16 July 2009

# Summary of Unsatisfied Comments from Disapprove Voters

Ballot	Accepted	Principle	Disagree	Out of scope	Unresolvable	Total
Initial	19	12	12	1	0	44
1 <sup>st</sup> recirc	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 <sup>nd</sup> recirc	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	19 (lost contact with voter)	12 (lost contact with voter)	12	1	0	44

## 802.15.3c Draft Status

### **Comment Resolution Summary and Detail:**

- The 12 rejected comments fell into 6 categories, which were more philosophical in character such as “change MAC aggregation scheme”, “delete a particular PHY mode,” “too many PHY options”, and such
- One comment related to the use of “48 vs 64 bit addressing”. Given that this is a PHY amendment and the comment concerned a MAC issue it classified as out-of scope
- The full comment resolution file can be found at <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/09/15-09-0571-01-003c-combined-sb-disapprove-comments.xls>.



## Motion passed in Working Group

Motion: Move that 802.15 WG request  
Conditional Executive Committee Approval to  
forward the P802-15-3c latest draft to RevCom

Moved by Shu Kato

Seconded by Phil Beecher

Yes: 31

No: 0

Abstain: 0

## Motion to the Executive Committee

- Motion: The 802.15 WG requests Conditional Approval from the Executive Committee to forward the P802-15-3c latest draft to RevCom
- Mover: Bob Heile
- Second: James Gilb

Kraemer presented 11-09-0905-02, slides 6-8

Motion: "Request the IEEE 802 Executive Committee to forward P802.11w D11.0 to RevCom."

Moved by Kraemer, seconded by Lynch

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

## **IEEE P802.11w - Protected Management Frames Unconditional request to forward to RevCom**

- **Request the IEEE 802 Executive Committee to forward P802.11w D11.0 to RevCom.**
- **P802.11w had a 94% approval on the last Recirculation Sponsor Ballot. There are 6 disapprove voters representing 44 unsatisfied comments.**
  - Working Group vote on the Motion Passed: 55 y, 0 n, 2 a
- **Moved: Bruce Kraemer      2<sup>nd</sup>: <tbd>**
  - Yes                      No                      Abstain

# IEEE P802.11w - Protected Management Frames

## Unconditional request to forward to RevCom

- **Item 1 - Date the ballot closed:**
  - IEEE P802.11w initial Sponsor ballot of D6.0 closed Sept 24, 2008
  - 4<sup>th</sup> Sponsor Recirculation Ballot of D11.0 closed June 28, 2009
- **Item 2 - Vote tally:**

Draft	Opened	Closed	Days	Ballot Type	Pool	Return	Disapprove			Abstain		Approve	
D11.0	6/18/2009	6/28/2009	10	4th Recirc	148	125 84%	6 with 6%	0 w/o	9 7%	110	<b>94%</b>		
D10.0	5/31/2009	6/14/2009	15	3rd Recirc	148	124 83%	8 with 7%	0 w/o	9 7%	107	<b>93%</b>		
D9.0	5/9/2009	5/23/2009	14	2nd Recirc	148	123 81%	9 with 8%	0 w/o	10 7%	104	<b>92%</b>		
D7.0	1/8/2009	1/18/2009	10	1st Recirc	148	121 81%	13 with 12%	0 w/o	9 7%	99	<b>88%</b>		
D6.0	8/22/2008	9/24/2008	30	New	148	116 78%	15 with 15%	0 w/o	9 7%	92	<b>85%</b>		

# **IEEE P802.11w - Protected Management Frames**

## **Unconditional request to forward to RevCom**

- **Item 3 - Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and WG responses:**
- **<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/09/11-09-0795-0>**

Item approved as part of the consent agenda

Kraemer presented 11-09-0905-02, slides 10-12 and TGn.pdf

Motion: "Grant approval, to forward P802.11n Draft 11.0 to RevCom."

Moved by Kraemer, seconded by Gilb

Thaler: Were links to these ballot packages sent to the EC?

Nikolich: Saw the email last night.

Sherman asked how many comments received.

Kraemer, 380 in first Sponsor ballot, 12,000 in first WG ballot.

Shellhammer, speaks in favor as they made changes to enhance coexistence.

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes.

Marks offered congratulations to Kraemer (applause from the audience).

Thompson asked if he expected controversy in RevCom

Kraemer said yes.

Lynch offered congratulations as this work is also an input to ITU.

## **IEEE P802.11n – High Throughput Unconditional request to forward to RevCom**

- **Grant approval, to forward P802.11n Draft 11.0 to RevCom.**
- **P802.11n had a 91% approval on the last Recirculation Sponsor Ballot. There are 18 disapprove voters representing 80 unsatisfied comments.**
  - Working Group vote on the Motion Passed: 53 y, 1 n, 6 a
- **Moved: Bruce Kraemer      2<sup>nd</sup>: James Gilb**
  - Yes                      No                      Abstain



# IEEE P802.11n – High Throughput

## Unconditional request to forward to RevCom

- **Item 1 - Date the ballot closed:**
  - IEEE P802.11n initial Sponsor ballot of D7.0 closed Jan. 10, 2009
  - 5<sup>th</sup> Sponsor Recirculation Ballot of D11.0 closed July 3, 2009
- **Item 2 - Vote tally:**

Draft	Opened	Closed	Days	Ballot Type	Pool	Approve	Disapprove			Abstain		Return	
D7.0	2008-12-11	2009-01-10	30	New	277	158 78%	45 with 22%	4 w/o	17 7%	224	80%		
D8.0	2009-02-19	2009-03-06	15	1st Recirc	277	169 80%	42 with 20%	4 w/o	17 7%	232	83%		
D9.0	2009-03-20	2009-04-04	15	2nd Recirc	277	171 81%	41 with 19%	4 w/o	17 7%	233	84%		
D10.0	2009-05-15	2009-05-30	15	3rd Recirc	277	190 88%	26 with 12%	4 w/o	17 7%	237	86%		
D11.0	2009-06-05	2009-06-20	15	4th Recirc	277	195 90%	22 with 10%	4 w/o	17 7%	238	86%		
D11.0	2009-06-23	2009-07-03	10	5th Recirc	277	199 91%	19 with 9%	3 w/o	17 7%	238	86%		

**IEEE P802.11n – High Throughput  
Unconditional request to forward to RevCom**

- **Item 3 - Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and WG responses:**
  - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/09/11-09-0674-03-000n->

Kraemer presented 11-09-0905-02, slides 18-20 and TGp.pdf

Motion: "Grant conditional approval, under Clause 13 to forward P802.11p to Sponsor Ballot."

Thompson asked if these comments were no longer in play.

Nikolich asked Thompson to clarify what "still in play" means

Thompson clarified that he means that the comments have been recirculated once without "pile-on"

Rosdahl (CSR) said that they are substantially complete in balloting and that they number of no voters is decreasing.

Thompson said that while there are outstanding topics, they have been procedurally dealt with.

Moved by Kraemer, seconded by Jeffree

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

# P802.11p Wireless Access in Vehicle Environments (WAVE)

## Conditional to Sponsor ballot

- **Item 1 - Date the ballot closed:**
  - IEEE P802.11p Working Group initial ballot on D4.0 closed 3 May 2008
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> Recirculation ballot on D7.0 closed 13 Jun 2009
- **Item 2 - Vote tally:**

Ballot ID	Ballot Close Date	Title	BallotType	Pool	Return	%Return	Abstain	%Abstain	Approve	Disapprove	%Approve
125	May 03 2008	Recirculation Letter Ballot for IEEE 802.11p_D4.0	Initial	234	205	87.6	32	15.6	136	37	78.61
141	Dec 05, 2008	Recirculation Letter Ballot for IEEE 802.11p_D5.0	Recirculation	232	210	90.5	35	16.7	149	26	85.1
144	Mar 31, 200	Recirculation Letter Ballot for IEEE 802.11p_D6.0	Recirculation	232	211	91.0	29	13.7	161	20	88.95
151	Jun 13, 2009	Recirculation Letter Ballot for IEEE 802.11p_D7.0	Recirculation	232	211	91	26	12.3	158	27	85.41

# **P802.11p Wireless Access in Vehicle Environments (WAVE) Conditional to Sponsor ballot**

- **Item 3 - Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and WG responses.**
- **<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/09/11-09-0871-0>**
- **Item 4 - Schedule for recirculation ballot and resolution meeting.**
  - Fourth Recirculation 28 Jul 2009
  - Teleconferences scheduled for every Thursday starting 13 Aug, 2009
  - Interim Meeting 20 Sep 2009
  - Clean Recirculation 02 Oct 2009
  - First Sponsor Ballot 30 Oct 2009

# **P802.11p Wireless Access in Vehicle Environments (WAVE)**

## **Conditional to Sponsor ballot**

- **Grant conditional approval, under Clause 13 to forward P802.11p to Sponsor Ballot.**
- **P802.11p had a 85.41% approval on the last WG Recirculation Ballot. There are 27 disapprove voters representing 167 unsatisfied comments. (4 of the disapprove voters have no unsatisfied comments)**
  - Working Group 11 vote on the Motion Passed: 44 y, 0 n, 6 a
- **Moved: Bruce Kraemer      2<sup>nd</sup>: <name>**
  - Yes                      No                      Abstain

Kraemer presented 11-09-0905-02, slides 26-28 and referred to TGu.pdf

Motion: "Grant conditional approval, under Clause 13, to forward P802.11u to Sponsor Ballot."

Moved by Kraemer, seconded by Gilb

Thompson, are you trying for September RevCom?

Kraemer, that would be December, this is for Sponsor ballot before November.

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

# IEEE P802.11u Internetworking with External Networks Conditional to Sponsor Ballot

- **Item 1 - Date the ballot closed:**
  - IEEE 802.11u Working Group initial ballot on D3.0 closed 12 July 2008
  - 4th Working Group Recirculation Ballot on D7.0 closed 19 Jun 2009
- **Item 2 - Vote tally:**

ID	Ballot Close Date	Title	BallotType	Pool	Return	%Rtn	Abstain	%Abs	Approve	Disapprove	%Approve
132	12 July 2008	802.11u_D3.0	Initial	213	182	85.5	35	19.2	113	34	76.9
137	08 October 2008	802.11u_D4.0	1 <sup>st</sup> Recirculation	213	189	88.7	37	19.6	118	34	77.6
142	20 February 2009	802.11u_D5.0	2 <sup>nd</sup> Recirculation	213	191	89.7	39	20.4	125	27	82.2
148	24 April 2009	802.11u_D6.0	3 <sup>rd</sup> Recirculation	213	192	90.1	35	18.2	142	15	90.4
152	19 June 2009	802.11u_D7.0	4 <sup>th</sup> Recirculation	213	194	91.0	33	17.0	142	19	88.2
152.1		LB152 Post Ballot vote changes		213	194	91.0	33	17.0	146	15	90.7



# IEEE P802.11u Internetworking with External Networks

## Conditional to Sponsor Ballot

- **Item 3 - Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and WG responses.**
  - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/09/11-09-0715-06-000u-tgu-report-to-ec.ppt>
- **Item 4 - Schedule for recirculation ballot and resolution meeting.**
  - Third recirculation                      26-Jul-09
  - Teleconferences scheduled for Wed and Fri starting 19-Aug-09
  - Interim Meeting                              20-Sep-09
  - Clean recirculation                        28-Sep-09
  - First sponsor ballot                        21-Oct-09

# IEEE P802.11u Internetworking with External Networks

## Conditional to Sponsor Ballot

- **Grant conditional approval, under Clause 13, to forward P802.11u to Sponsor Ballot.**
- **P802.11u currently has a 91% approval. There are 15 disapprove voters representing 121 unsatisfied comments. (3 of the disapprove voters have no unsatisfied comments)**
  - Working Group 11 vote on the Motion Passed: 49 y - 0 n – 1 a
- **Moved: B. Kraemer      2<sup>nd</sup>: <name>**
  - Yes                  No                  Abstain

Kraemer presented 11-09-0905-02, slides 22-24 and TGv.pdf

Motion: "Grant conditional approval, under Clause 13 to forward P802.11v to Sponsor Ballot."

Moved by Kraemer, seconded by Law

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

# IEEE P802.11v – Wireless Network Management Conditional to Sponsor ballot

- **Item 1 - Date the ballot closed:**
  - IEEE 802.11v Working Group initial ballot on D4.0 closed 19 Dec 2008
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Working Group Recirculation Ballot on D6.0 closed 12 Jun 2009
- **Item 2 - Vote tally:**

Ballot ID	Ballot Close Date	Title	Ballot Type	Pool	Return	%Return	Abstain	% Abstain	Approve	Disapprove	%Approve
140	19 Dec 2008	Technical Letter Ballot for Task Group-v Draft 4.0	Initial	254	225	88.58	40	17.78	149	36	80.54
146	4 Apr 2009	Recirculation Letter Ballot for Task Group-v Draft 5.0	Recirculation	254	228	89.76	41	17.98	155	32	82.88
150	12 Jun 2009	Second Recirculation Ballot for Task Group-v Draft 6.0	Recirculation	254	230	90.55	38	16.10	172	20	89.58
150.1	15Jul 09	Second Recirculation Ballot for Draft 6.0 Post ballot results	Recirculation	254	230	90.55	38	16.10	174	18	90.6

# IEEE P802.11v – Wireless Network Management Conditional to Sponsor ballot

- **Item 3 - Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and WG responses.**
- <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/09/11-09-0720-02-000v-tgv-sponsor->
- **Item 4 - Schedule for recirculation ballot and resolution meeting.**
  - Third recirculation 24-Jul-09
  - 3 Teleconferences scheduled: 14 Aug, 1 Sept and 15 Sept. 2009
  - Interim Meeting 20-Sep-09
  - Clean recirculation 25-Sep-09
  - First sponsor ballot 19-Oct-09

## IEEE P802.11v Wireless Management Conditional to Sponsor ballot

- **Grant conditional approval, under Clause 13 to forward P802.11v to Sponsor Ballot.**
- **P802.11v had a 89.58% approval on the last WG Recirculation Ballot. There are 18 disapprove voters representing 40 unsatisfied comments. (4 of the disapprove voters have no unsatisfied comments)**
  - Working Group 11 vote on the Motion Passed: 58 y, 0 n, 2 a
- **Moved: Bruce Kraemer      2<sup>nd</sup>: <name>**
  - Yes                      No                      Abstain

Kraemer presented 11-09-0905-02, slides 14-16 and TGz.pdf

Motion: "Grant conditional approval, under Clause 13, to forward P802.11z to Sponsor Ballot."

Moved by Kraemer, seconded by Law

Vote: 14/0/0, motion passes

# 802.11z Tunneled Direct Link Setup (TDLS) Conditional to Sponsor ballot

- **Item 1 - Date the ballot closed:**
  - IEEE 802.11z Working Group initial ballot on D3.0 closed 18 Dec 2008.
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> WG Recirculation Ballot on D5.0 closed 23 June 2009
- **Item 2 - Vote tally:**

Ballot ID	Ballot Close Date	Title	Ballot Type	Pool	Return	%Return	Abstain	%Abstain	Approve	Disapprove	%Approve
139	18 Dec 2008	Technical Letter Ballot for TGz draft 3.0	Initial	254	225	89	41	18	155	29	84
143	5 March 2009	First Recirculation Ballot for TGz draft 4.0	Recirculation	254	230	91	37	16	170	23	88
153	23 June 2009	Second Recirculation Ballot for TGz draft 5.0	Recirculation	254	232	91	34	15	183	15	92
153.1	17 July 2009	After ballot comment resolution		254	232	91	35	15	189	8	96



# 802.11z Tunneled Direct Link Setup (TDLS) Conditional to Sponsor ballot

- **Item 3 - Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and WG responses.**
  - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/09/11-09-0879-02-000z->
- **Item 4 - Schedule for recirculation ballot and resolution meeting.**

Third recirculation	24-Jul-09
Interim Meeting	20-Sep-09
Clean recirculation	25-Sep-09
Start of Sponsor Ballot	19-Oct-09

## **802.11z Tunneled Direct Link Setup (TDLS) Conditional to Sponsor ballot**

- **Grant conditional approval, under Clause 13, to forward P802.11z to Sponsor Ballot.**
- **P802.11z currently has a 96% approval. There are 8 disapprove voters representing 8 unsatisfied comments. (3 of the disapprove voters have no unsatisfied comments)**
  - Working Group 11 vote on the Motion Passed: 52 y, 0 n, 3 a
  
- **Moved: B. Kraemer 2<sup>nd</sup>: <name>**
  - Yes            No            Abstain

5.14 ME\* 802.3at DTE power enhancements PAR extension request to NesCom

Law

Item approved as part of the consent agenda

5.15 ME 802.3at DTE Power via MDI Enhancements to RevCom

Law

5 02:15 PM

Law presented 802d3\_0709\_closing\_EC.pdf, slides 6-11

Motion: "The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit IEEE P802.3at/D4.2 to RevCom"

Moved by Law, seconded by Kraemer

Gilb asked if the group had considered the comment from the Approve voter.

Law said yes.

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

# IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements

## Sponsor balloting results

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Sponsor recirculation ballot – draft D4.2
  - Ballot opened 5<sup>th</sup> June 2009, closed 20<sup>th</sup> July 2009
  - 98% approval, three comments received

Comments received: 3

	Initial Draft D4.0			1 <sup>st</sup> Recirculation Draft D4.1			2 <sup>nd</sup> Recirculation Draft D4.2			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	4	4	PASS	4	4	PASS	4	4	PASS	< 30
Disapprove with comment	12	-	-	10	-	-	1 <sup>Note 1</sup>	-	-	-
Disapprove without comment	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	72	85	PASS	77	88	PASS	88	98	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	88	75	PASS	91	78	PASS	93	80	PASS	≥ 75
Voters	116	-	-	116	-	-	116	-	-	-

Note 1 – One ballot change from Disapprove with Comment to Approve with Comment by email after ballot close.

# IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Recirculation ballot (D4.2) comments

---

- 3 comments received on last recirculation
  - [http://www.ieee802.org/3/at/comments/D4.2/P802d3at\\_D4p2\\_postmtg\\_by\\_ID.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/at/comments/D4.2/P802d3at_D4p2_postmtg_by_ID.pdf)
  - Editorial coordination comment
    - Draft met all requirements
  - Comment from approve voter
    - Out of scope as on unchanged text
  - Comment from remaining disapprove voter
    - Recirculation not required as it is a restatement of this voters previous unsatisfied negative comments submitted against initial sponsor ballot (a pile-on to own comment)
    - Original comments and 2nd Recirculation ballot comment on following slides

# IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements 2<sup>nd</sup> Recirculation ballot (D4.2) Comment #1

Cl 33      SC 33.4.1      P87      L 26      # 1  
Maytum, Michael      Bourns, Inc.

*Comment Type*    TR      *Comment Status*    R

\*\*\* Comment submitted with the file 33723600024-T09-SG05-090525-TD-GEN-0137MSW-E.doc attached \*\*\*

Illogical

The a) 1500 V rms AC voltage is 2121 V peak. Thus the impulse should not be 1500 V, but at least 2121 V.

*Suggested Remedy*

Change 1500 V to least 2121 V, 2400 V preferred.  
See Annex C of the attached

*Response*      *Response Status*    W

REJECT.

This comment is out of scope as it does not relate to text that was changed in the last recirculation and is a restatement of a previously rejected comment from the same commentor.

This is the response to the previously rejected comment: "These are well established parameters set forth by the IEEE as minimum functional requirements and are not replacements for safety (or other) requirements that may need to be met by a specific product in a specific jurisdiction. IEC 60950-1 is only referenced for the methodologies."

Furthermore, accepting this comment for this amendment may make existing devices which are compliant to IEEE Std 802.3-2008 non-compliant.

# IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements

## Initial ballot (D4.0) Comment #177

CI 33 SC 33.4.1 P82 L34 # 177  
Maytum, Michael Bourns, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Subclause 5.2.2 of IEC 60950-1 specifies an insulation test voltage of a)1500 V rms or a DC voltage at least equal to the peak AC voltage e.g. b)2250 V dc. Impulse test of c)1500 V, 10/700 completely fails to reach the 2250 V peak stress voltage of tests a) and b). The TNV-1 CIRCUIT or a TNV-3 CIRCUIT voltage level of 1.5 kV is based on ITU-T K.21 Resistibility of telecommunication equipment installed in customer premises to overvoltages and overcurrents. In K.21 the assumed primary protector let-through voltage of 1.5 kV sets the 1.5 kV test level of K.21 test 2.1.1.b (basic). In the case of Ethernet circuits primary protectors are not installed, which will increase the inherent impulse voltage level. Conversely most Ethernet wiring is internal, which will decrease the impulse voltage level. For unprotected TNV-1 interfaces ITU-T K.21 specifies a higher level 6 kV (enhanced). A US telecommunication supplier has found it necessary to increase internal port withstand test level from 1.5 kV to 6 kV for their fibre to the home installations to reduce failures.

### Suggested Remedy

Change the option c) 1500 V 10/700 test level to 2250 V 10/700

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

These are well established parameters set forth by the IEEE as minimum functional requirements and are not replacements for safety (or other) requirements that may need to be met by a specific product in a specific jurisdiction. IEC 60950-1 is only referenced for the methodologies.

See 178, which is the identical comment without a remedy.





# IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements to RevCom

---

- The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit IEEE P802.3at/D4.2 to RevCom

M: D Law, S:

Y: ??, N: ??, A: ??

Working Group vote:

Y: 84, N: 0, A: 0

Law presented 802d3\_0709\_closing\_EC.pdf, slides 13-14

Motion: "The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit IEEE P802.3av/D3.4 to RevCom"

Moved by Law, seconded by Jeffree

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

# IEEE 802.3av 10 Gb/s Passive Optical Networks

## Sponsor balloting results

- 3<sup>rd</sup> Sponsor recirculation ballot – draft D3.4
  - Ballot opened 20<sup>th</sup> June 2009, closed 5<sup>th</sup> July 2009
  - 100% approval, zero comments received

Comments received: 0

	Initial Draft D3.0			1 <sup>st</sup> Recirculation Draft D3.2			2 <sup>nd</sup> Recirculation Draft D3.3			3 <sup>rd</sup> Recirculation Draft D3.4			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	8	8	PASS	9	9	PASS	9	9	PASS	9	9	PASS	< 30
Disapprove with comment	3	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Disapprove without comment	1	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	82	96	PASS	86	97	PASS	89	100	PASS	89	100	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	94	82	PASS	97	85	PASS	98	85	PASS	98	85	PASS	≥ 75
Voters	114	-	-	114	-	-	114	-	-	114	-	-	-

# IEEE 802.3av 10 Gb/s Passive Optical Networks to RevCom

---

- The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit IEEE P802.3av/D3.4 to RevCom

M: D Law, S:

Y: ??, N: ??, A: ??

Working Group vote:

Y: 89, N: 0, A: 2

Law presented 802d3\_0709\_closing\_EC.pdf, slides 20-25

Slides with the comments had the wrong title, it should be 802.3bc instead of 802.3at.

Motion: "The LMSC Executive Committee grant Conditional Approval for IEEE P802.3bc RevCom submittal per Procedure 13."

Moved by Law, seconded by Hawkins

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

# IEEE P802.3bc Ethernet Organizationally Specific TLVs Conditional to RevCom

- Item 1 - Date the Sponsor ballot closed:
  - IEEE 802.3 initial Sponsor ballot on D3.0 of IEEE P802.3bc closed Tuesday, 13<sup>th</sup> July 2009.

- Item 2 - Vote tally:

Comments: 22

	Initial Draft D3.0			Req %
	#	%	Status	
Abstain	5	5	PASS	< 30
Disapprove with comment	3	-	-	-
Disapprove without comment	0	-	-	-
Approve	83	96	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	91	90	PASS	≥ 75
Voters	101	-	-	-

# IEEE P802.3bc Ethernet Organizationally Specific TLVs Conditional to RevCom

---

- Item 3 - Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and WG responses.
  - 3 unsatisfied negative comments  
[http://www.ieee802.org/3/bc/comments/D3.0/P802d3bc\\_D3p0\\_unsatisfied.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/bc/comments/D3.0/P802d3bc_D3p0_unsatisfied.pdf)
- Item 4 - Schedule for recirculation ballot and resolution meeting.
  - Draft 3.1 of IEEE P802.3bc will begin a recirculation ballot on or before 27<sup>th</sup> July 2009
  - RevCom submittal on 31<sup>st</sup> July
  - Recirculation will close no later than 10<sup>th</sup> August 2009
  - Comment resolution to be conducted on 12<sup>th</sup> August 2009
  - If pulled from RevCom agenda conduct another recirculation ballot to complete by 18<sup>th</sup> September
  - Comment resolution to be conducted week of 21<sup>st</sup> September 2009
  - RevCom submittal 19<sup>th</sup> October

# IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements Initial ballot (D3.0) Comments #1 and 12

CI 00 SC 0 P L # 1  
Messina, Don

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

This draft meets all editorial requirements.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

CI 79 SC 79.3.1 P 25 L 30 # 12  
Thaler, Patricia Broadcom

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

This TLV seems rather out of date. There are 3 types of auto-negotiation in 802.3 and auto-negotiation support status fails to indicate which one is supported. This is rather out of date as the RFC 4836 ifMauAutoNegCapAdvertisedBits don't include 10GBASE-T nor any of the backplane PHYs all of which are covered by auto negotiation. These PHYs are also not covered for operational MAU type since they aren't in RFC 4836.

*SuggestedRemedy*

This TLV should probably be deprecated at some point and replaced with one that indicates which type of auto-neg is supported and either has a larger advertised capability field with enough bits for all capabilities or where the capability bits are specific to the autonegotiation type so they fit in the 16 bit field.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

While deprecating and replacing this TLV as suggested is beyond the scope of this project, it would be a reasonable thing to do in the future.

See also comment #13.



# IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements

## Initial ballot (D3.0) Comment #18

CI 00

SC 0

P

L

# 18

Thompson, Geoffrey

Nortel Networks

*Comment Type*

**GR**

*Comment Status*

**R**

This is a general disapprove for the methodology of the project and the many detailed manifestations of that methodology that show up throughout the text. This project seeks to incorporate specifications that were developed in other groups (802.1 and the IETF) that were supposed to track our underlying hardware specifications and produce the management software specifications for that management.

All of this would be perfectly reasonable if (1) they had appropriate input from us at the front end and kept in line with that guidance and (2) they had been willing to maintain responsibility for management standards on an ongoing basis.

Neither has proved to be the case. It now turns out that the IETF did not utilize the device lists and identifications that we provided but, rather went off on their own. 802.1 initiated a project to do 802.3 management (the roots of this project) without participation from 802.3. Now we are being asked (for the sake of expediency and compatibility with legacy implementations) to accept this work as the normative reference foundation for our standard AND to take over the maintenance of what they did outside of our process.

In full recognition of the difficulty of getting management standards skillfully written and adequately reviewed in 802.3, this all seems like a terribly bad idea. It is effectively bypassing the 802.3 balloting/review process for a major chunk of this important process and then telling us that we can't fix it.

Further, recent input from Bert Wijnen has indicated that this course of trying to maintain backward compatibility is a bad idea. As I understand the rules for management standards in this area, once you establish a MIB it can never be "changed", only amended or fully replaced. This seems like an inappropriate constraint to place on these 802.3 projects considering.

# IEEE 802.3at DTE Power Enhancements

## Initial ballot (D3.0) Comment #18 (cont)

---

### *Suggested Remedy*

That the draft be modified so that the external reference material that is specific to the 802.3 implementations (as opposed to the protocol itself) from either 802.1 or any RFC be pulled into the body of this draft and that the resulting draft be returned to review at the Working Group level.

(This might well be accompanied by not deprecating the 802.3 portion of 802.1AX for some length of time in order to support the extended redevelopment and review of this document. I would suggest that 802.3 take over the editorial pen of that document in the meantime in order of not hold 802.3 projects hostage to this important project in the meantime.)

### *Response*

*Response Status*   **W**

REJECT.

The IEEE P802.3.1 project is already working on incorporating, updating and maintaining the RFC that are referenced in IEEE P802.3bc. Replicating this activity in IEEE P802.3bc would be outside the scope of the PAR. Once the IEEE P802.3.1 project is complete the references in IEEE 802.3 can be updated as a maintenance activity.

These external references define not only the values found in the MIBs, but in this case also the values sent in the TLVs. It is for this reason that backward compatibility is important as the only way to change the values sent in the TLVs would be to deprecate the

# IEEE P802.3bc Ethernet Organizationally Specific TLVs Conditional to RevCom

---

- The LMSC Executive Committee grant Conditional Approval for IEEE P802.3bc RevCom submittal per Procedure 13.

M: D Law, S:

Y: ??, N: ??, A: ??

Working Group vote:

Y: 75, N: 1, A: 5

Law presented 802d3\_0709\_closing\_EC.pdf, slides 16-18

Motion: "The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit IEEE 802.3bb to Sponsor ballot"

Moved by Law, seconded by Thaler

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

# IEEE 802.3bb Pause Reaction Delay Corrigendum Working Group balloting results

- 1<sup>st</sup> Working Group recirculation ballot – draft D1.2
  - Ballot opened 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2009, closed 5<sup>th</sup> June 2009 11:59PM AOE
  - 98% approval, 10 comments received

Comments received: 10	Initial Draft D1.1			1 <sup>st</sup> Recirculation Draft D1.2			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	18	15	PASS	18	15	PASS	< 30
Disapprove with comment	3	-	-	2	-	-	-
Disapprove without comment	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	95	97	PASS	98	98	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	116	50	PASS	118	51	PASS	≥ 50
Voters	229	-	-	229	-	-	-

# IEEE 802.3bb Pause Reaction Delay Corrigendum 1<sup>st</sup> Recirculation ballot (D1.2) comments

---

- 10 comments received on last recirculation  
[http://www.ieee802.org/3/bb/comments/d1.2/P802d3bb\\_d1p2.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/bb/comments/d1.2/P802d3bb_d1p2.pdf)
  - 6 Comments on the front matter
  - 2 Editorial comments on a missing space
  - 2 TRs which were restatements of TRs
    - Commenter has indicated he is satisfied with responses
    - No unresolved negative comments
  - No substantive changes need to be made to the draft as a result of the recirculation

# IEEE 802.3bb Pause Reaction Delay Corrigendum to Sponsor ballot

---

- The LMSC Executive Committee grant approval to submit IEEE 802.3bb to Sponsor ballot

M: D Law, S:

Y: ??, N: ??, A: ??

Working Group vote:

Y: 77, N: 1, A: 2

Jeffree presented 2009-07-802-1-exec-motions.pdf, slides 2-3

Motion: "802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.1aj to Sponsor Ballot."

Moved by Jeffree, seconded by Thaler

Vote 11/0/0, motion passes



# MOTION

- 802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.1aj to Sponsor Ballot.
- Proposed: Haddock Second: Messenger
- For: 36 Against: 0 Abstain: 6
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:
-

# P802.1aj supporting information:

- Recirculation ballot closed 9<sup>th</sup> July 2009
- 91 Voters, of which 78 have responded (86%)
  - 35 Approve = 97%
  - 1 Disapprove = 3%
  - 42 Abstain = 54%
- A small number of editorials will be carried forward to Sponsor ballot
- The one outstanding Disapprove voter is David James (now deceased). His comments addressed (1) Editor's notes in the front matter that have since been removed, and (2) excessive capitalization:
  - *Comment Type* **ER**
    - Excessive capitalization, within subclause titles (such as Subtree), bad table formatting (without using the straddle capabilities to merge cells together), and single items described with two words (such as Root Port) make this hard to read.
  - *SuggestedRemedy*
    - Read the IEEE Style Manual and look at 802.17 as an example. After this comment is accepted, the first pass changes are made in good faith, and the leading prefix discussing the irrelevance of editorial comments is removed, I would be happy to review what editorial problems might have been missed. After the editorial problems have been fixed, allowing me to read the text easily, I would also become capable of providing technical comments.
  - *Committee Response*
    - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The editor will review the text in the light of this comment and will make such changes as are consistent with both the style guide and the existing choices made in the base document (802.1Q).

Jeffree presented 2009-07-802-1-exec-motions.pdf, slides 4-5

Motion: "802.1 requests unconditional approval of the EC to forward P802.1Qav/D6.0 to Sponsor ballot."

Moved by Jeffree, seconded by Thaler

Vote 10/0/0, motion passes

# MOTION

- 802.1 requests unconditional approval of the EC to forward P802.1Qav/D6.0 to Sponsor ballot.
- Proposed: Johas Teener Second: fuller
- For: 37 Against: 0 Abstain: 4
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

## P802.1Qav supporting information:

- Recirculation ballot closed 9<sup>th</sup> July 2009
- 108 Voters, of which 72 have responded (67%)
  - 28 Approve = 100%
  - 0 Disapprove = 0%
  - 44 Abstain = 61%
- A small number of editorials will be carried forward to Sponsor ballot

Jeffree presented 2009-07-802-1-exec-motions.pdf, slides 6-7

Motion: "802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.1AR to Sponsor ballot."

Moved by Jeffree, seconded by Thaler

Kraemer asked about the large number of abstains.

Jeffree indicated that there are 4 distinct groups that experts in their specific area with very little cross-over.

Kraemer, this is anticipation of the P&P discussion.

Thaler, 802 P&P doesn't have an abstention rule, but it would probably be allowed in the OM

Vote 12/0/1, motion passes

# MOTION

- 802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.1AR to Sponsor ballot.
- Proposed: Seaman Second: wright
- For: 33 Against: 0 Abstain: 4
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

## P802.1AR supporting information:

- Recirculation ballot closed 11<sup>th</sup> July 2009
- 106 Voters, of which 89 have responded (84%)
  - 17 Approve = 100%
  - 0 Disapprove = 0%
  - 72 Abstain = 80%



Jeffree presented 2009-07-802-1-exec-motions.pdf, slides 8-10

Motion: "802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.1X-REV to Sponsor ballot."

Moved by Jeffree, seconded by Thaler

Sherman asked how many people are in the WG.

Jeffree said that there is 104 members of the WG.

Sherman wanted to know if the 50% return rate was met.

Jeffree said that it had been met.

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

# MOTION

- 802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.1X-REV to Sponsor ballot.
- Proposed: Seaman Second: wright
- For: 35 Against: 0 Abstain: 2
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

## P802.1X-REV supporting information:

- Recirculation ballot closed 12<sup>th</sup> July 2009
- 104 Voters, of which 69 have responded (66%)
  - 20 Approve = 95%
  - 1 Disapprove = 5%
  - 48 Abstain = 69%
- 1 outstanding “No” vote – details on next slide
- This “No” was ruled out of scope as it refers to unchanged/uncommented text from the previous draft; the MIB editor has proposed changes that will be documented in the Sponsor ballot cover letter, and which the commenter agrees will fix his problems with the document. However, the commenter declined to change his vote pending sight of the updated draft.

- **Comment:**

- smicng compilation errors: \bw\smicng\802.1pae-D4.0>smicng IEEE8021-PAE-REV-MIB-D4-0.inc
- E: f(IEEE8021-PAE-REV-MIB-D4-0.mi2), (2372,14) Size of default value for "ieee8021XKayMkaPartDistCKN" is outside allowed range  
This is because the default is a null string while the TC Ieee8021XPaeCKN is SIZE (1..16)  
MUST be fixed
- W: f(IEEE8021-PAE-REV-MIB-D4-0.mi2), (2501,1) Sequence "Ieee8021XNIDConfigEntry" and Row "Ieee8021XNIDConfigEntry" should have related names  
MUST be fixed
- E: f(IEEE8021-PAE-REV-MIB-D4-0.mi2), (2512,31) IMPLIED is not compatible for index item "Ieee8021XNidNID", since it may have a size of zero  
Having a table indexed by a string that may be zero length is not a good idea - MUST be fixed
- E: f(IEEE8021-PAE-REV-MIB-D4-0.mi2), (2683,31) IMPLIED is not compatible for index item "Ieee8021XAnnounceNID", since it may have a size of zero  
Having a table indexed by a string that may be zero length is not a good idea - MUST be fixed
- E: f(IEEE8021-PAE-REV-MIB-D4-0.mi2), (2743,31) IMPLIED is not compatible for index item "Ieee8021XAnnouncementNID", since it may have a size of zero  
Having a table indexed by a string that may be zero length is not a good idea - MUST be fixed
- W: f(IEEE8021-PAE-REV-MIB-D4-0.mi2), (889,23) Row "Ieee8021XPacPortEntry" does not have a consistent indexing scheme - index item Ieee8021XPaeControlledPortNumber from base row Ieee8021XPaePortEntry is not defined as an index item  
Must be fixed - Ieee8021XPaeControlledPortNumber is defined as a column (not an index) in another table. It cannot be an index here.
- W: f(IEEE8021-PAE-REV-MIB-D4-0.mi2), (1050,23) Row "Ieee8021XPaePortSessionEntry" does not have a consistent indexing scheme - index item Ieee8021XPaeControlledPortNumber from base row Ieee8021XPaePortEntry is not defined as an index item  
Must be fixed - Ieee8021XPaeControlledPortNumber is defined as a column (not an index) in another table. It cannot be an index here.
- \*\*\* 4 errors and 4 warnings in parsing

- **Proposed change:**

- fix the compilation problems as discussed in the mail exchange

- **Resolution/rebuttal:**

- The comment and proposed change identify text in the draft that was not changed from the previously (working group) balloted draft and was not the subject of any comment on that draft or any outstanding comment. The comment is therefore outside the scope of the working group recirculation ballot, and the document should be forwarded to the next stage (Sponsor ballot) since further modifying the draft as a result of completely new comments while in recirculation ballot processing is a potentially non-terminating process. The commenter has indicated that he could not have made the comment in the prior ballot because the MIB checking tool "smicng" was not available to him at that time due to license availability issues. Similarly the tool was not available to the draft editors, so the issues identified (which vary by checking tool) were not readily anticipated.
- The issues identified are confined to the MIB, and do not have technical repercussions through the rest of the document. A revised MIB has been generated by the MIB editor, and the commenter has indicate that when that MIB revision is included he would be able to change his ballot to Approve. The tentative revised MIB also addresses two other comments by the same commenter that relate to MIB DESCRIPTION clauses and to INDEXes. Clearly further MIB revision including refinements to the tentative revision could be expected as a result of sponsor ballot. The errors identified by this unresolved comment do not inhibit further comment and analysis of the proposed MIB.

Jeffree presented 2009-07-802-1-exec-motions.pdf, slides 11-12

Motion: "802.1 requests conditional approval of the EC, as per current P&P, to forward P802.1Qau to Sponsor ballot following completion of recirculation balloting."

Moved by Jeffree, seconded by Thaler

Marks asked if members cast an abstain vote, do they give a reason for abstention?

Jeffree said that most will be "lack of expertise"

Thompson, while you are meeting the strict requirement for return rate, the rules allowing abstention are masking the true return rate.

Jeffree the number of approve votes gives you an idea of the skill pool.

Law said that this shows the diverse set of experts in this group.

Jeffree would like to see discussion regarding this over the weekend.

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

# MOTION

- 802.1 requests conditional approval of the EC, as per current P&P, to forward P802.1Qau to Sponsor ballot following completion of recirculation balloting.
- Proposed: Thaler    Second: Finn
- For: 33    Against: 0    Abstain: 3

## P802.1Qau supporting information:

- WG ballot closed 11<sup>th</sup> July 2009
- 101 Voters, of which 57 have responded (56%)
  - 13 Approve = 93%
  - 1 Disapprove = 7%
  - 43 Abstain = 75%
- 1 outstanding “No” vote from Mick Seaman. Comments and resolutions visible here:
- [http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/Exec\\_files/802-1au-d2-1-seaman-comments.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/Exec_files/802-1au-d2-1-seaman-comments.pdf)

Jeffree presented 2009-07-802-1-exec-motions.pdf, slide 13

Motion: "Forward draft PAR for 802.1Qbc Provider Bridging – Remote Customer Service Interface to the EC for approval to forward to NesCom."

Moved by Jeffree, seconded by Thaler

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes



# MOTION

- Forward draft PAR for 802.1Qbc Provider Bridging – Remote Customer Service Interface to the EC for approval to forward to NesCom.
- Proposed: Haddock Second: Mack-Crane
- For: 35 Against: 0 Abstain: 2
  
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:
  
- No comments received from WGs. PAR/5C text, unmodified from pre-circulation, is here:
- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/new-qbc-jeffree-draft-par-0609-v01.pdf>
- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/new-qbc-jeffree-draft-5c-0609-v01.pdf>

Jeffree presented 2009-07-802-1-exec-motions.pdf, slide 14

Motion: "Forward draft PAR for 802.1Qbc Provider Bridging – Remote Customer Service Interface to the EC for approval to forward to NesCom"

Moved by Jeffree, seconded by Thaler

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

# MOTION

- Forward draft PAR for 802.1Qbe Multiple Backbone Service Instance Identifier Registration Protocol (MIRP) to the EC for approval to forward to NesCom.
- Proposed: Haddock Second: Finn
- For: 37 Against: 0 Abstain: 6
  
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

No comments received from WGs. PAR/5C text, unmodified from pre-circulation, is here:

<http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/new-qbe-jeffree-draft-par-0609-v01.pdf>

<http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/new-qbe-jeffree-draft-5c-0609-v01.pdf>

Jeffree presented 2009-07-802-1-exec-motions.pdf, slide 15

Motion: "Forward draft PAR for 802.1Qbe Multiple Backbone Service Instance Identifier Registration Protocol (MIRP) to the EC for approval to forward to NesCom."

Moved by Jeffree, seconded by Thaler

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

Nikolich called a break for 10 minutes, to return at 3:05 pm.

# MOTION

- Forward draft PAR for 802.1Qbf PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection to the EC for approval to forward to NesCom.
- Proposed: Haddock Second: Sultan
- For: 37 Against: 0 Abstain: 5
  
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:

No comments received from WGs. PAR/5C text, unmodified from pre-circulation, is here:

- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/new-qbf-jeffree-draft-par-0609-v01.pdf>
- <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/new-qbf-jeffree-draft-5c-0609-v01.pdf>

5.27	ME*	802.1 AR PAR modification request to NesCom	Jeffree	0
5.28	ME*	802.1aq PAR extension to NesCom	Jeffree	0

Items approved as part of the consent agenda

6.00 Executive Committee Study Groups, Working Groups, TAGs

6.01	MI*	802.3 Ethernet support for the IEEE P802.1AS time synchronization protocol (first extension)	Law	0
6.02	MI*	802.19 TV whitespace coexistence (first extension)	Shellhammer	0

Items approved as part of the consent agenda.

6.03	MI	802.11 QoS support in management frames	Kraemer	5 03:07 PM
------	----	---	---------	------------

Meeting called to order at 3:06 pm local time.

Kraemer presented 11-09-0905-02, slides 31-32

Motion: "Request approval by IEEE 802 LMSC to form an 802.11 Study Group to Address QoS for Management Frames [as described in doc 11-09/0817r1] with the intent of creating a PAR and five criteria."

Moved by Kraemer, seconded by Jeffree

Vote 13/0/0, motion passes

## Summary QoS Man SG – QoS Management Study Group

- **With the Action Management frames defined in TGk and subsequent amendments, there is an increasing amount of Action Management traffic, which could lead to contention issues with Voice and Video QoS streams.**
- **The proposed SG will create a PAR and 5 criteria to address QoS issues with Management frames.**
- **The WNG presentation was given in document 11-09/817r1.**

## Motion to Create QoS Man SG – QoS Management Study Group

- **Request approval by IEEE 802 LMSC to form an 802.11 Study Group to Address QoS for Management Frames [as described in doc [11-09/0817r1](#)] with the intent of creating a PAR and five criteria.**
  - WNG Results: By: Michael Montemurro; 2<sup>nd</sup>: Cam-Winget – 34y -3n -14a
  - WG11 results: by TK Tan; 2<sup>nd</sup> Richard Kennedy - 39y -2n -20a
  
- **Moved: B. Kraemer      2<sup>nd</sup>: <name>**
  - Yes                      No                      Abstain



Kraemer presented 11-09-0905-02, slide 30

Motion: "Because of its suitability as a primary candidate for a TVWS technology, and in the expectation that the FCC and Ofcom will clarify their requirements for the database in the interim, the 802.11 WG should begin a Study Group to develop PAR and 5 Criteria documents for approval by the EC at the Atlanta Plenary in November 2009. "

Moved by Kraemer, seconded by Lynch

Hawkins asked why the low numbers of voters

Eccelsine (Cisco) thought that the vote was different in WG.

Rosdahl said that the vote in the WG was 77/0/8

Marks asked about the motion, wasn't sure what we were approving. Is the scope of the group tied to the database?

Kraemer said that the database is a required part of the TVWS by regulators.

Marks had two questions. Is the EC being asked to approve anything other than the title of the SG?

Kraemer, no, only the SG to form PAR and 5 C.

Marks asked who was the chair.

Kraemer, Richard Kennedy (pro-tem)

Thaler is concerned that there is a specific date for the PAR and 5C that is only 4 months in advance.

Chouinard asked if the first part of the paragraph is part of the scope. The conditions for WS is more than just the data base.

Kraemer, 11 is trying to figure out when in calendar time that they would want to be active. 11 thinks that the rule set will be set before the September interim, so that group could begin work.

Sherman, thinks that there should be a uniform approach, if some SGs require a scope, then all should require a scope.

Thompson has 2 areas of concern, one is trying to get the PAR and 5C in a single meeting. The second is the mention of the FCC database implies that it is a US centric standard.

Kraemer, he can only ask for a SG that extends to November, they may not be successful, but they wanted this goal. Ofcom is the UK regulatory body, they are the front runner of many EU bodies in this area. It is intended to be an international opportunity, but the FCC is currently in the lead in allocating the spectrum.

Rosdahl, the words to the motion give the goals of the SG and its targets. EC should focus on determining if an SG to create a PAR and 5C and if so, then change the motion words if necessary.

Lynch, wants to congratulate .11 for getting started. This is part of the answer, based on the presentations in .18.

Nikolich asked if we should give Kraemer time to clean up the language, straw poll, no one suggested taking more time.

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

## Motion to create TVWS SG – TV White Space Study Group

- **Moved: Because of its suitability as a primary candidate for a TVWS technology, and in the expectation that the FCC and Ofcom will clarify their requirements for the database in the interim, the 802.11WG should begin a Study Group to develop PAR and 5 Criteria documents for approval by the EC at the Atlanta Plenary in November 2009.**
  - WNG Results: Rich Kennedy 2<sup>nd</sup>: Harry Worstell – 39y -0n -15a
  - WG11 results: TK Tan on behalf of WNG, 2<sup>nd</sup> : P. Ecclesine - 39y, 0n, 15a
  - Ref: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/09/11-09-0749-03-0wng-802-11-in-the-tvws.ppt>
- **Moved: B. Kraemer**      **2<sup>nd</sup>: <name>**
  - Yes                      No                      Abstain

Gupta presented Emergency\_Services\_Motion.ppt

Motion:

Request the IEEE 802 Executive Committee to create an IEEE 802 ECSG to address Emergency Services issues in IEEE 802 networks with the following objectives:

- Develop an architecture for supporting Emergency Services
- Define in conjunction with other SDOs (e.g. IETF ECRIT, 3GPP) L2 requirements to support ES for IEEE 802 technologies
- Develop a PAR/5C to satisfy the above requirements

Moved by Gupta, seconded by Thaler

Thompson would like first bullet to say "Develop a proposal (scope(s) and purpose(s)) as to how to fit Emergency Services into the IEEE 802 architecture."

Friendly amendment, accepted by Gupta and Thaler.

Shellhammer asked if we have someone to chair the ECSG?

Nikolich said that there was someone in mind.

Marks has found that emergency services is an albatross around our neck. We have not had specific proposals. Change the nature of the SG to either define a problem or just go away. Asks to have a bullet added "Define a problem 802 can solve.?"

Marks, instead requests the deletion of the specific SDOs, i.e., delete "(e.g. IETF ECRIT, 3GPP)"

Friendly amendment, accepted by Gupta and Thaler (and editorial changes).

Motion now reads

Request the IEEE 802 Executive Committee to create an IEEE 802 ECSG to address Emergency Services issues in IEEE 802 networks with the following objectives:

- Develop an architecture (scope(s) and purpose(s)) as to how to fit Emergency Services requirements into the IEEE 802 architecture
- Define, in conjunction with other SDOs, L2 requirements to support ES for IEEE 802 technologies
- Develop a PAR/5C to satisfy the above requirements

Kraemer believes that this is within our scope and is beneficial.

Jeffrey asks for "set of" to be added to the third bullet. Asks who the proposed chair would be.

Nikolich proposed chair is Geoff Thompson

Thompson asked to add to the end of the first bullet "(i.e., state the problem in terms that we can deal with)" Also should have passing mention of the satisfaction of regulatory requirements. Suggests adding ", including regulatory," in the second bullet after "requirements."

Messenger (Adva optical networking) wanted to know the number of individuals and the number of companies expressing interest.

Gupta, about 15 members, 6 companies.

Messenger, only 4 votes for the PAR.

Nikolich asked Henderson how many might be interested.

Henderson (RIM), there were at least 3 members in the SG that want to continue and 2 more outside who were interested.

Motion now reads

Request the IEEE 802 Executive Committee to create an IEEE 802 ECSG to address Emergency Services issues in IEEE 802 networks with the following objectives:

- Develop an architecture (scope(s) and purpose(s)) as to how to fit Emergency Services requirements into the IEEE 802 architecture (i.e., state the problem in terms that we can deal with)
- Define, in conjunction with upper layer SDOs, L2 requirements (including regulatory requirements) to support ES for IEEE 802 technologies
- Develop a set of PAR/5C to satisfy the above requirements

Thompson indicated that there is a conflict with the wireless and wired interim meetings.

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

Marks made a point of order asking when Nikolich would bring the chair to the Sponsor for approval.

Nikolich said that his intention was to appoint Geoff Thompson as the chair of the ECSG

Motion: "Move to approve Geoff Thompson as the chair of the emergency services ECSG."

Moved by Law, seconded by Lemon

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

# Emergency Services PAR/5C

- Based on the comments received from different EC members the IEEE 802.21 WG passed a motion to withdraw the 802.21.1 PAR on Emergency Services
  - WG Motion Passed: 8/1/1
- Several EC members have suggested need to create an ECSG to further study issues related to Emergency Services

# Motion to form Emergency Services ECSG

- **Request the IEEE 802 Executive Committee to create an IEEE 802 ECSG to address Emergency Services issues in IEEE 802 networks with the following objectives:**
  - Develop an architecture for supporting Emergency Services
  - Define in conjunction with other SDOs (e.g. IETF ECRIT, 3GPP) L2 requirements to support ES for IEEE 802 technologies
  - Develop a PAR/5C to satisfy the above requirements
  
- Moved: Vivek Gupta
- Seconded:
  
- Result:

8.00

LMSC Internal Business

8.01 II Treasurer's report

Hawkins

5 03:50 PM

Hawkins presented TreasurerClosingReportv1.pdf

Messenger (Adva optical networking) What are the reserves?

Hawkins: 1,285,081 (estimated)

**IEEE Project 802**  
**Statement of Operations**  
**Mar 2009 Plenary Session**  
**Vancouver, BC**  
**As of Jul 17, 2009**

**Draft**

Session Income	dB	Est/Act	Budget	Deviation
<b>Net Registrations</b>		1,016	1,200	(184)
80.4% 817 Early Registrations @ \$400	\$ 326,800			
25 Cancellations @ \$350	(8,750)			
10 Early cancellations @ \$400	(4,000)			
0 Visa cancellations @ \$400	0			
19.6% 199 Registrations @ \$500	99,500			
0 Cancellation @ \$500	0			
2 Cancellation @ \$450	(900)			
0.0% 0 Student @ \$150	0			
0 Other credits @ \$100	0			
<b>Registraion Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 412,650</b>	<b>\$ 412,650</b>	<b>\$ 505,680</b>	<b>\$ (93,030)</b>
0 Deadbeat Payment @ \$500		0	0	0
<b>Interest</b>		2,318	1,400	918
<b>Other</b> (Hotel comps and commission)		52,886	75,000	(22,114)
<b>TOTAL Session Income</b>		<b>\$ 467,854</b>	<b>\$ 582,080</b>	<b>\$ (114,226)</b>
<b>Session Expenses</b>		<b>Est/Act</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Deviation</b>
Audio Visual		16,995	25,500	8,505
Audit		6,000	6,000	0
Bank Charges		480	350	(130)
Copying		3,157	3,500	343
Credit Card Discounts & Fees		17,271	14,964	(2,307)
Equipment Expenses		1,900	2,500	600
Get IEEE 802 Contrribution		73,425	88,200	14,775
Insurance		0	0	0
Meeting Administration		82,634	92,400	9,766
Misc Expenses		1,461 *	3,500	2,039
Networking		110,115	70,000	(40,115)
Other Expenses		0	0	0
Phone & Electrical		1,231	2,000	769
Refreshments		103,078	150,000	46,922
Shipping		12,424	15,000	2,576
Social		53,681	50,000	(3,681)
Supplies		483	800	317
<b>TOTAL Session Expense</b>		<b>484,335</b>	<b>524,714</b>	<b>40,379</b>
<b>NET Session Surplus/(Deficit)</b>		<b>(16,481)</b>	<b>57,366</b>	<b>(73,847)</b>
<b>Analysis</b>				
Refreshments per registration		101	125	24
Social per registration		53	42	(11)
Meeting Admin per registration		81	77	(4)
Surplus/(Loss) per registration		(16)	48	(64)

\* Misc items: Hotel gratuities

<b>Cash recognized on hand as of Jul 12, 2009</b>	<b>\$ 1,199,115</b>	
<b>Reserve for unpaid expenses for prior sessions</b>	<b>\$ (1,000)</b>	bank fees, CC fees, etc
<b>Reserve for other outstanding commitments</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	
<b>Income received for current session</b>	<b>\$ (22,387)</b>	
<b>Expenses prepaid for current session</b>	<b>\$ 66,689</b>	
<b>Expenses prepaid for future sessions</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	
<b>Equipment Receivable Acct</b>	<b>\$ 42,664</b>	
<b>Operating Reserve following this session</b>	<b>\$ 1,285,081</b>	



**IEEE Project 802**  
**Estimated Statement of Operations**  
**Jul 2009 Plenary Session**  
**San Francisco, CA**  
**As of Jul 17, 2009**

Draft

<b>Meeting Income</b>	<i><b>Estimate</b></i>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Variance</b>
Registrations	1,125	1,100	25
Registration income	483,750	473,000	10,750
Cancellation refunds	(9,675)	(9,460)	
Deadbeat collections	0	0	0
Bank interest	2,000	2,000	0
Other income	70,000	75,000	(5,000)
<b>TOTAL Meeting Income</b>	<b>\$ 546,075</b>	<b>\$ 540,540</b>	<b>5,535</b>
<b>Meeting Expenses</b>	<i><b>Estimate</b></i>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Variance</b>
Audio Visual Rentals	15,000	\$ 25,500	10,500
Audit	0	0	0
Bank Charges	350	350	0
Copying	2,750	3,500	750
Credit Card Discount	16,931	16,555	(376)
Equipment Expenses	2,000	2,500	500
Get IEEE 802 Contribution	82,725	80,850	(1,875)
Insurance	0	0	0
Meeting Administration	88,313	86,950	(1,363)
Misc Expenses	1,500	3,500	2,000
Network	100,000	100,000	0
Other Expenses	0	0	
Phone & Electrical	400	2,000	1,600
Refreshments	115,000	120,000	5,000
Shipping	8,500	15,000	6,500
Social	105,000	100,000	(5,000)
Supplies	800	800	0
Other Discounts	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL Meeting Expense</b>	<b>\$ 539,269</b>	<b>\$ 557,505</b>	<b>18,236</b>
<b>NET Meeting Income/Expense</b>	<b>\$ 6,806</b>	<b>\$ (16,965)</b>	<b>23,771</b>
<b>Analysis</b>			
Refreshments per registration	102	109	7
Social per registration	93	91	(2)
Meeting Administration per reg	79	79	1
Networking per registration	89	91	2
Get IEEE 802 Contribution per r	75	75	(0)
Surplus/Deficit per registration	6	(15)	21
Pre-registration rate	70%	70%	

Gilb stated that because the IEEE is unable to state which 802 standards have been published in the last year or even a list of published 802 standards, any newly published standards that are to appear on the new CD-ROM will need to be identified by the WG chairs and the list given to Gilb in order to be included on the CD.

Also, 802.5 will be moved to the withdrawn section of the CD.

Thompson presented Services reform request.doc

Lemon asked why the portion regarding how the IEEE SA staff was unable to purchase the standard online.

Thompson because the staff member requested that it be removed.

Marks suggested saying instead that it include that experienced volunteers were unable to purchase standards.

Tatiner indicated that only the quote "dreadful" was requested to be removed.

Stevens (Intel) asked for the goal of the letter.

Thompson clarified that the goal was to allow the SA go outside for services.

Stevens suggested that the specific action to be taken be listed.

Kraemer what remedies had we asked for in the past?

Thompson we had asked for problem by problem remedies.

Kraemer suggested that a specific date for a response be put in the letter.

Barber (Huawei) this is an ongoing problem, how long is the problem (Thompson, since inception), suggests that we should include when the problem was started.

Thompson this includes sales of drafts, despite the best efforts of SA staff, they were unable to sell drafts when it was useful.

Barber said we should suggest a remedy.

Thompson the common thread is that within the framework of monopoly supplier, this is the best that they can do.

Barber, suggests adding the time for which the problem has been present.

Tatiner, has learned much about the IEEE sales system. IEEE Xplore and IEEE shop are run by different organizations and they use different data bases. IEEE shop appears to be the really broken system. Xplore is only 1 week from publication to subscription system. IEEE shop is part of BMS which was a large project (2008) that failed badly. Now there is an effort to clean up their mess.

Thompson, within that context, SA is not large enough to force them to do this.

Law, there were problems even getting people to join IEEE. This however is just a different manifestation of similar problems.

Thompson related a story of a project in which the Sponsor ballot needed to close in time for a specific meeting. Thompson arrived in Piscataway when it was supposed to be mailed out, but they were not ready to go. Staff said that is the way it is and it would not go out on time. To fix it, Thompson and Frazier went the warehouse and did the mailing themselves.

Lemon asked if this should be sent to the IEEE and cc'ed to the SA staff?

Thompson felt that the SA staff has done the best that they can within the constraints. His intention was to copy Judy Gorman's boss.

Nikolich suggested copying Anthon Durniak, in charge of publications.

Lemon thinks that we should specify exactly the action that we hope is taken.

Astrin (Astrin Radio) put a time limit within which we are intending to switch over to an independent service.

Thompson we don't own the copyright.

Motion: "That the executive committee approves sending the letter with the changes discussed in the meeting and editorial cleanup to Judy Gorman, cc'ing Anthony Durniak, Chuck Adams, Bob Grow, and Jim Pendergast, no earlier than July 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009"

Moved by Gilb, seconded by Marks

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

July 17, 2009

Staff Colleagues-

Over the years various IEEE 802 members and the 802 EC have registered complaints about the situation in which the IEEE-SA is positioned as our monopoly supplier of certain services and that their fulfillment of those services:

- Have not met the business needs of IEEE 802
- Have not met normal commercial business standards for such services
- Have interfered with the operation of 802 business
- Have significantly impeded the availability of 802 information to the industry
- Has significantly interfered with the SA's ability to sell and deliver goods for MONEY

These issues have been of a wide variety over the years. The responses from the SA have largely been one of the following:

- Change is hard
- You have to be patient
- We can't fix it because we (the SA) are a captive customer of the Institute for those services (usually provided in-house by the IEEE) and the SA isn't a big enough part of their business to get them to change any time soon.
- The system just doesn't work that way because....

Our concern is that (a) these deficiencies burden the SA with reduced revenue and artificially high costs for inferior service and (b) do not allow 802 to provide its customers with services that meet their normal expectations as set by access to equivalent sorts of services in the outside world.

Admittedly, the ease with which customers in the outside world can purchase information based products is a rapidly moving target. The IEEE is not keeping up in terms of standards information. The mechanisms available to the IEEE-SA are, we feel, insufficiently motivated to keep up with market requirements. This is because the SA as a captive customer is not allowed to switch to an outside market supplier that operates to more demanding customer requirements.

We strongly believe that the time has come when the Standards Association should be freed from its captive relationship with the Institute for IT services and product fulfillment services so that it is free to select outside suppliers for these services that are:

- Lower cost
- More user friendly
- More willing and able to rapidly tune their services to SA needs

We hope that you will take action on this most sincere and we hope constructive request.

Respectfully,

IEEE 802 Executive Committee

Marks presented Motion-Distribution.pptx

Motion is "Considering the need to ensure access to standards and drafts by the general public, Working Groups shall distribute standards for which they are responsible (and may distribute drafts) when such documents are not available to the public by other means."

Shellhammer expressed concern that we don't have copyright permission to distribute the drafts.

Lemon suggests: "Considering the need to ensure access to standards and drafts by the general public, Working Groups shall distribute standards (and optionally drafts) for which they are responsible when such documents are not available to the public by other means."

Kraemer is worried that the word "distribute" may cause problems. Wants to rework the language so that it is close to what we do at the meetings. That we supply documents to people that are unable to get them another way.

Chouinard, concerned with "shall distribute" being too restrictive.

Lynch spoke in favor of the motion.

Thompson is philosophically in favor and thinks it should be split into two motions, one for standards and one for drafts. The current 6 month waiting period for GetIEEE 802 is supposed to protect revenue without restricting the industry. Would like one motion that GetIEEE 802 waiting period is reduced to 0 months. For drafts, "until is clearly established that the SA is able to provide drafts that are publicly available in a timely manner, drafts will be provided upon request."

Marks, changing GetIEEE 802 is difficult to do.

Law, we don't have a license to do this. Is in favor of changing GetIEEE 802, but we have to wait for that to happen. Speaks against the motion.

Hawkins agrees with Law.

Gilb stated that we can distribute drafts to experts helping in the standard that are not participants.

Chaplin (Samsung) wants to know what is the definition of "public"

Thompson, traditionally only sells drafts that have been designated as available.

Astrin, suggests that there is a simple agreement to allow another publication house to publish the standard.

Law, but the IEEE won't agree to this.

Tatiner suggested adding that we should work with the IEEE SA staff to solve the problem.

Jeffree, now the motion is obvious, it is what we are doing and what we are doing doesn't work.

Thompson, the system is broken now and has been broken and that we should be allowed to give them away.

Tatiner, thinks it will be a distraction if we are fighting over copyright.

Rigsbee, suggests that we change it to say that we request permission from the SA whenever they are not for sale. This would give us the right to distribute the copyrighted material.

Motion now reads

"Considering the need to ensure access to standards and drafts by the general public, Working Groups shall work with IEEE-SA staff to arrange for individuals, upon request, to obtain access to standards (and optionally drafts) when such documents are not available to the public by other means."

Nikolich asks to defer this to discussion during the EC workshop.

Law, the fundamental problem is that they have never listened to us.

# LMSC Motion:

Considering the need to ensure access to standards and drafts by the general public, Working Groups shall distribute standards for which they are responsible (and may distribute drafts) when such documents are not available to the public by other means.

Click to edit Master subtitle style

Motion:            Marks  
Seconded: XXX

# LMSC Motion:

Considering the need to ensure access to standards and drafts by the general public, Working Groups shall work with IEEE-SA staff to arrange for individuals, upon request, to obtain access to standards (and optionally drafts) when such documents are not available to the public by other means.

Click to edit Master subtitle style

Motion:            Marks  
Seconded: XXX

Sherman presents VC1\_17072009\_r0\_EC\_Closing\_Motions.ppt

Motion: "To approve the balloting of the LMSC OM revision titled "Creation of LMSC Working Group (WG) P&P" as described in the document titled:

090716 Cover\_letter\_for\_LMSC\_OM\_Revision\_Ballot.pdf

Found at:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/PNP/>"

Moved Sherman, seconded by Shellhammer.

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes



# 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair Closing Motions

## **Author:**

Matthew Sherman  
1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair, IEEE 802  
BAE Systems - ES  
Matthew.Sherman@BAESystems.com

**Date:** July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2009

# EC Motion

To approve the balloting of the LMSC OM revision titled “Creation of LMSC Working Group (WG) P&P” as described in the document titled:

- 090716 Cover\_letter\_for\_LMSC\_OM\_Revision\_Ballot.pdf

Found at:

- <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/PNP/>

Moved: Matthew Sherman  
2nd: Steve Shellhammer

For:  
Against:  
Abstain:

Sherman made a motion

"To approve creation of an EC document server on the IEEE Mentor."

Moved Sherman, seconded by Shellhammer.

Thaler was concerned that approving documents would be too long.

Law suggested just using mentor, doesn't know who owns mentor.

Shellhammer spoke in favor of using mentor.

Rosdahl indicated that 802.11 has never paid for use of mentor. Spoken in favor of it.

Alfvn (VeriLAN) indicated that his perception is that IEEE has contracted with Bvivio to run the site and any costs should be modest.

Vote 14/0/0, motion passes

9.00

LMSC Liaisons and External Interface

9.01	ME*	Press release for 802.1Qav Forwarding and Queuing for Time Sensitive Streams	Jeffree	0
9.02	ME*	Comments on FCC Medical Body Area Networks NPRM ET Docket 08-59, Doc. 18-09-0077r3	Lynch	0
9.03	ME*	Liaison to ITU-R WP5D: Update of Section 5.6 in Revision 10 of Recommendation ITU-R M.1457, Doc. 18-09-0083r1	Lynch	0
9.04	II	Letter to ITU-R SG5 Counselor: Certification of references and transposition for M.1457 Rev. 9, Section 5.6, Doc. 18-09-0084r0	Lynch	0
9.05	ME*	Liaison to ITU-R WP5A: Response to liaison statement from WP5A on update of Report M.2116, Doc. 18-09-0085r1	Lynch	0
9.06	II	Letter to ITU-R WP5D IMT-Advanced Workshop Convener: Intention to participate in 3rd Workshop on IMT-Advanced, Doc. 18-09-0086r1	Lynch	0
9.07	ME*	Liaison response to IEC TC65/SC65C/JWG10 regarding Power over Ethernet and industrial environments	Law	0
9.08	ME*	Liaison response to ISO/IEC JTC1 SC25 WG3 regarding optical fibre terminology	Law	0

Above items approved as part of the consent agenda.

10.00

IEEE SA items

No IEEE SA items.

11.02 II

Information Items

11.03 II Workshop update

Thompson

9 05:11 PM

Thompson presented Workshop Schedule.doc

Meetings will take place in the Marina room.

802 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WORKSHOP

WHEN: Evening of Saturday, July 18 through mid-PM, Mon, July 20, '09.

WHERE: Hyatt Regency Embarcadero, SF (this hotel)  
Marina Room on the Bay (mezzanine) level.

COSTS: Minimal incremental costs beyond your costs for getting here .  
The following costs are being comp'ed to us by the hotel as a  
(not exceptional) early booking bonus for future meetings.

Sleeping rooms: Rooms: 20 participants for Sat & Sun nights.

Meeting room: Boardroom for 20 with LCD and screen.

Some add'l seating around edge of the room.

Catering: Sat. dinner, Sun. breakfast, lunch & breaks,  
Mon. breakfast, lunch & breaks.

Networking: Provided by hotel in sleeping rooms,  
802 office, & our mtg room included.

SCHEDULE: Saturday, 6:00 PM, Informal Buffet Dinner, Social,  
No formal agenda (Discuss logistical items etc)

Sunday, 7:00 AM, Breakfast available in mtg room

8:00 AM, Formal meeting start

12-1:00, Break for lunch (served in mtg room)

5-5:30, (Flexible) Break for dinner

(Decision for eve sess. is ad hoc)

Dinner off premises.

Monday, 7:00 AM, Breakfast available in mtg room

8:00 AM, Formal meeting start

12-1:00, Break for lunch (served in mtg room)

3-4:00, Break-up/Adjourn

INVITEES: All members of the EC.  
Others at Paul's discretion up to limit

RSVP: We would like to confirm now who will be participating.

AGENDA:

DAY 1

Confirm/formalize agenda

Choose up to 7 topics, each for a period of focused discussion from the following list:

- \* Domination and other distortions to the consensus process
- \* Disparities in WG practice for common problems
- \* Inter-group complaints/relationships
- \* Succession training
- \* Process changes/tool needs/operational philosophy (lease or buy?) etc.
- \* Scope and scope definition of 802
- \* Does/Should the family of 802 Standards have an architecture?
- \* IEEE-SA relationship issues
- \* Distribution of standards and drafts
- \* Scope of 802.21
- \* (Additions to the above list are welcome, please mail to Geoff/Buzz/Paul)

Topic discussions (per list above, ~ 1 hour each)

- \* Problem statements/discussion
- \* Brainstorming/General discussion
- \* Define homework assignments/stuckees.

DAY 2

- \* Action plan proposal presentations by homework teams (per topic)
- \* Refinement & consensus by group as a whole (per topic)
- \* About a half hour each (This means the major work really has to be done day 1)
  
- \* One more topic if there is time.
- \* Wrap-up and critique (1/2 hour)

Alfvín spoke regarding network services. VeriLAN replaced all of the local LAN so that they had control over the infrastructure.

One issue is that people go to mentor to get documents. This goes slowly due to restrictions on mentor.

Advocate that the EC look for bandwidth sponsors. Last year, Comcast provided a 100 Mb/s for free in exchange for a thank you from the group and an advertisement.

Law suggested this be added to the workshop.

Issue with mentor server. The fix is to add a separate server for syncing docs, needs the EC to approve the expense.

The help desk was busy, for two reasons. One was attendance, which requires an on site person to debug. The second was handling requests for where things were in the hotel.

Hawkins, perhaps we should think about how to discriminate on bandwidth use to restrict access for some applications (e.g., capping live video streaming). Network costs are increasing.

Thompson, no legitimate applications require streaming. If that could be used as a differentiator then it could be used as a method to attack the problem.

Alfvín, VPNs hide this, best would be to get a group together to discuss them.

11.05 II Liaison letter to Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers (SMPTE)

Jeffree

3 05:31 PM

11.06 II Liaison response letter to Broadband Forum

Jeffree

5 05:31 PM

Jeffree simply wanted to state that they are sending these letters to the bodies.

11.07 II Liaison letters to TTA and ARIB

Marks

5 05:32 PM

Marks indicated that the letters had been sent to the reflector and that these are normal communications with other standards bodies.

The 802.19 TV Whitespace discussion, new item added to agenda.

Shellhammer presented 19-09-0051-00-tvws-study-group-extension-request.ppt .

Marks, voting on the title, scope and purpose is close to creating a PAR, which was forbidden. Suggests that we have a motion to change the charter to allow the SG to create a PAR.

Shellhammer, this SG does not have a restriction on generating a PAR and 5C.

Gilb read the minutes, in which the SG was forbidden from creating a PAR and 5C.

Marks wanted to know if the SG also worked on the other assignments.

Nikolich related that when they discussed continuing as an SG, he suggested drafting the title, scope and purpose to focus further activity.

Shellhammer, he developed a task list and an electronic straw poll. The SG agreed only to do one task, coexistence scenarios

Thompson, the group is in violation of the charter.

Shellhammer made a motion "To empower the 802.19 TVWS SG to draft a PAR and 5C."

Seconded by Sherman

Thompson, speaks in opposition as they have not finished the work they were tasked with.

Shellhammer, the SG has not empowered him to negotiate. They only allowed him to do a PAR.

Kraemer, the rationale for canceling the PAR, was that no one wanted to do coexistence mechanisms, yet this PAR is to work on coexistence mechanisms.

Kwak, failure is always an option, but while they may create documents, they may fail to produce the document.

Marks, a set of documents is not the same as a document. The ECSG report had a list of task and the results.

Shellhammer, the plan was presented a month after the previous plenary.

Sherman, the extension is because the work was not completed.

Vote 12/0/2, motion passes.

# TVWS Coexistence Study Group Extension Request

Date: 2009-07-16

## Authors:

Name	Company	Address	Phone	E-mail
Steve Shellhammer	Qualcomm	5775 Morehouse Dr San Diego, CA 92121	(858) 658-1874	Shellhammer@ieee.org

**Notice:** This document has been prepared to assist IEEE 802.19. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.

**Release:** The contributor grants a free, irrevocable license to the IEEE to incorporate material contained in this contribution, and any modifications thereof, in the creation of an IEEE Standards publication; to copyright in the IEEE's name any IEEE Standards publication even though it may include portions of this contribution; and at the IEEE's sole discretion to permit others to reproduce in whole or in part the resulting IEEE Standards publication. The contributor also acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made public by IEEE 802.19.

**Patent Policy and Procedures:** The contributor is familiar with the IEEE 802 Patent Policy and Procedures <[http:// ieee802.org/guides/bylaws/sb-bylaws.pdf](http://ieee802.org/guides/bylaws/sb-bylaws.pdf)>, including the statement "IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder or applicant with respect to patents essential for compliance with both mandatory and optional portions of the standard." Early disclosure to the TAG of patent information that might be relevant to the standard is essential to reduce the possibility for delays in the development process and increase the likelihood that the draft publication will be approved for publication. Please notify the Chair <shellhammer@ieee.org> as early as possible, in written or electronic form, if patented technology (or technology under patent application) might be incorporated into a draft standard being developed within the IEEE 802.19 TAG. **If you have questions, contact the IEEE Patent Committee Administrator at <[patcom@ieee.org](mailto:patcom@ieee.org)>.**



# TV White Space Coexistence SG

- **The SG developed and adopted a document on TV white space Use Cases and Coexistence Scenarios**
- **SG Motion**
  - Move that the 802.19 TVWS Coexistence Study Group adopt document IEEE 802.19-09-0026-04
  - Vote: 15/0/13

# **SG Extension Request with intension to Develop a PAR**

- **SG Motion**
  - Move to extend the study group to write a PAR for a coexistence standard in the TV white space
  - Vote: 34/1/2
- **The 802 Chair was in attendance at the SG meeting and recommended that the SG start to develop a draft PAR title, scope and purpose**
  - Provide clarity on the SG's intensions

# DRAFT PAR Title & Scope

- **Draft Title**

- Standard for coexistence of IEEE 802-based devices operating in the white spaces of the TV bands
- Vote: 33/0/4

- **Draft Scope**

- The standard provides a mechanism for IEEE 802-based heterogeneous networks to collaborate in order to coexist in the TV white space when there are a limited and dynamic number of channels. The mechanism will comply with regulatory requirements for the protection of licensed incumbent services

# DRAFT PAR Purpose

- **Draft Purpose**

- Given that a number of regulatory domains have opened up additional spectrum in the TV band for unlicensed devices, known as TV white space, it is important these TV white space devices coexist. The purpose of this standard is to provide a reasonably equitable mechanism for multiple heterogeneous networks to coexist in the TV white space when there are very few channels available. The mechanism considers: how TV white space devices connect for coexistence related communications, what information the TV white space devices exchange, and algorithms for TV white space devices to achieve coexistence.
- Vote on Scope and Purpose: 28/0/6

## EC Motion

- **Move to extend the 802.19 TV white space coexistence study group with the intension to write a PAR on coexistence in the TV white space**
- **Move: Steve Shellhammer**
- **Second:**
- **Vote:**
  - Yes:
  - No:
  - Abstain:

Meeting is adjourned at 5:57 pm.

12.00

ADJOURN SEC MEETING

Nikolich

06:00 PM

Respectfully submitted

James Gilb

IEEE 802 recording secretary