

**Unconfirmed Minutes**  
**IEEE 802.3 CSMA/CD PLENARY**  
**Hilton Walf Disney World, Lake Buena Vista, FL**  
**March 15 -18, 2004**

<http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/mar04/index.html>

**MONDAY, March 15, 2004**

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

Mr. Robert Grow, Chair of 802.3 CSMA/CD Working Group called the meeting to order at 1:05PM. Mr. Grow introduced Mr. David Law, Vice Chair of 802.3, and Mr. Steve Carlson, Secretary of 802.3, Mr. Howard Frazier, Chair of the 802.3ah Task Force was also introduced, along with Brad Booth, Chair of the 10GBASE-T Study Group, add rest of guys.

Mr. Grow then had the attendees stand and introduce themselves to the group. Mr. Grow reminded the group that there is an ANSI policy regarding affiliation. Participants must state their affiliation to the Working Group.

Mr. Grow asked if there were any additions or corrections to the agenda. Geoff Thompson indicated that there is an TIA document that bears on 802.3af.

**MOTION**

Approve the agenda <Attachment A2 - 802.3 Opening Agenda>. Inquire as to liaison reports.

Moved: Richard Brand

Seconded: Brad Booth

Agenda was passed by acclamation (voice vote).

Documents: See Attachment A1 IEEE 802.3 Opening report. 802.3 must a do major revision to incorporate all amendments. Paper copies of 802.3af and 802.3ae have been sent out by mail to qualified people. A request was made to publish list on 802.3 reflector of those people who are eligible to receive 802.3aj and 802.3ak.

**Published Standards**

802.3 -2002

802.3ae -2002

802.3af - 2003

1802.3-2001

Mr. Grow presented his Opening Report <Attachment A1 - 802.3 Opening Report>.

## **MOTION**

Approve the 802.3 minutes from November 2003

M: Hugh Barass                      S: Pat Thaler

Fix typos on Thursday from SF

PASSED by acclamation (voice vote)

Plaque Awards: David Law, Bob Grow, Steve Carlson, Catherine Berger for 802.3aj

The IEEE 802 CDROMS, which are handed out at the November Plenary, are given to voters in good standing in 802.3. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Grow.

There is a Web page to signup for book distribution for P802.3ae and P802.3af. There was a discussion of Web-based distribution, i.e. direct access to a PDF copy. Several comments came from the floor requesting that the time from sign-up to fulfillment be reduced. The agreement with the IEEE is to process one list when sign-up closes, not a drip-feed of addresses as they are submitted.

Mr. Grow suggested the use of the IEEE email alias service to keep contact info current. To maintain voting status, contact information must be up-to-date.

## **Attendance Books**

Mr. Grow explained the operation of the Attendance books for new voters and established voters. Voters we cautioned that they would be subjected to public humiliation if they failed to follow the instructions. Mr. Grow explained membership in 802.3. See <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/rules/index.html> for complete information.

How to maintain your voting membership: We need your email address and affiliation! Otherwise you are out!

Mr. Grow explained about paying the registration fees and that that your registration as a voter includes the 802.3-200X CD-ROM. Mr. Grow forcefully explained that registration and the fee is mandatory. "We know who you are."

Attachment A7

IEEE 802.3 Voting member list

Attachment A8  
IEEE 802.3 Potential voter list

Attachment A9  
IEEE 802.3 Voters in peril

Attachment A10  
IEEE 802.3 Voters with bad e-mail addresses

These individuals responded Monday:

AbuGhazalah, Shadi  
Armijo, Bert  
Dupuis, Joseph E.  
Hammond, Bernie  
Hazarika, Asif  
Jaeger, John  
Pivonka, Ed  
Powell, Scott R.  
Schneiderheinze,

### **Interim Meetings:**

Vancouver, BC : January 2004 – All 802.3 TF and SG met in Vancouver January 12-16.

Mr. Grow discussed the difference between an amendment vs. a revision. The new IEEE rules require a full revision once the limit of 4 amendments has been reached. 802.3 will be there in 2004.

Mr. Grow also discussed P1394c and their use selector fields for auto-negotiation. The discussion from the group indicated that this function should be part of the IEEE (RAC?) to avoid confusion.

### **Executive Report**

Please see <Attachment A1 - IEEE 802.3 Opening report>

The size of 802 is causing administrative and functional problems. The possibility of splitting 802 into wireline and wireless is being discussed.

Comment on 802 reorganization from the floor. Explained that this may split the group into wireless and wireline, or find a way to make huge group work. Who is the sponsor? Should 802 become its own sponsor? Meeting Tuesday 9-11AM to discuss this issue.

Mr. Thatcher asked about CAG meeting and whether there is an 802.3 position to be taken. Mr. Grow indicated that he will be responding as the Chair of 802.3 and what is

best for the standards effort. Mr. Thatcher expressed that it would be extremely disconcerting if another organization was writing Ethernet standards. Tom Dineen indicated that he was unhappy with the idea, unless the group actually gives Mr. Grow permission. Mr. Thompson indicated that other groups have generated so-called Ethernet standards. The issue is having it done on a competitive basis by another group within IEEE. Mr. Dove indicated that corporations frequently have multiple groups that disagree on a single corporate position.

### **CAG**

Mr. Grow explained about CAGS. Mr. Thompson added that this problem can exist from any other sponsor.

Voting Rules Changes: It is not clear how these new rules work. So for now, we are voting the same as always.

**Elections:** Mr. Grow and Mr. Law are running for re-election of 802.3.

### **Patent Policy**

Mr. Law requested that Karen Kenney of IEEE and PATCOM read the IEEE Patent Policy <Attachment A4 - IEEE Patent Policy> Mr. Grow asked if anyone had any IP, and no one came forth. Mr. Grow reminded the group not to discuss territory, market share, price, ongoing litigation, threatened litigation, etc. and read the slide. Mr. Grow requested that the reading of the Patent Policy be entered into the minutes, and is so noted here. Mr. Carlson assured Mr. Frazier that the fact that Karen Kenney read the Patent Policy was clearly indicated in the minutes.

### **PARS**

Please see <Attachment A1 - IEEE 802.3 Opening report>

Mr. Thompson indicated that 802.1ag needs discussion and has requested an ad-hoc to create comments. A vote may be taken on Thursday to make this an 802.3 position. Richard Brand indicated that it is important to have this meeting.

Mr. Thompson asked that 802.3 ask how 802.11 and 802.15 plan to meet the revision requirements.

### **CFI**

Jonathan Thatcher made an announcement about Ethernet in the Data Center. It would add features to Ethernet to improve its performance and capability.

### **Liaison Reports**

TR42 – Bob Jensen for Val Rybinski  
<Attachment C4 - TIA TR-42 Liaison to IEEE 802.3>

SC25/WG3 – Alan Flatman  
< Attachment C3 - ISO/IEC SC25/WG3 report >

T11.2 and SFF– Shelto van Doorn – Mr. van Doorn missed the meeting due to flight delays. His report was not given to 802.3, but is posted on the Web site.  
< Attachment C6 - T11.2 and SFF Report >

IETF - Dan Romascanu  
<Attachment C7 – IETF Ethernet Interfaces and Hub MIB Update>

Break for 15 minutes at 2:58PM. Restarted at 3:14PM

802.1 Report – Richard Brand  
<Attachment C1 – 802.1 Report>

### **State of the Standard**

Mr. Law reported on the state of the standard <Attachment A12 - IEEE 802.3 Standards status>

### **Operating Rules of 802.3**

Mr. Law reported on the Operating Rules of P802.3. The latest updates may be found at <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/rules/index.html>

### **Interpretations**

New requests are detailed in <Attachment B11 - IEEE 802.3 Interpretations opening report>

### **Maintenance**

Current maintenance requests are in <Attachment B13 - IEEE 802.3 Maintenance opening report>

### **802.3 10GBASE-CX4 SG Final Report – Dan Dove**

<Attachment B3 - IEEE P802.3ak 10GBASE-CX4 Task Force final report>

### **802.3ah EFM Opening Report – Howard Frazier**

<Attachment B1 - IEEE P802.3ah Ethernet in the first mile Task Force opening report>

### **802.3 10GBASE-T SG Opening Report – Brad Booth**

<Attachment B4 - IEEE 802.3 10GBASE-T Study Group opening report >

Straw Poll on May Interim Meeting location:

Monterey, CA	Anaheim, CA	Long Beach, CA
26	4	25

**Backplane Ethernet Study Group – Adam Healey**

<Attachment B6 - IEEE 802.3 Backplane Ethernet Study Group opening report >

**10GMMF Study Group – Bruce Tolley**

<Attachment B8 - IEEE 802.3 10Gb/s Ethernet on FDDI-grade MM Fiber Study Group opening report >

**Room Assignments and TF Schedules**

Mr. Law presented the room assignments.

Captains Quarter's Near restaurant) 9-6PM Tuesday  
DTE - TIA Wednesday morning or Tuesday afternoon

Dan Dove asked for a moment to credit Jeff Warren and other members of the group.

Motion to adjourn by at 4: PM. Passed by acclamation.  
Moved by: Scott Simon

**IEEE 802.3 CSMA/CD PLENARY  
Hilton Walf Disney World, Lake Buena Vista, FL  
March 15 -18, 2004**

**THURSDAY, March 18, 2004**

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

Thursday, March 18, 2004 1PM – 5PM

Mr. Grow called the meeting to order at 1:05PM. The agenda was distributed to the group. Mr. Grow asked if anyone wished to modify the agenda. David Law requested that Maintenance and Interpretations be moved to the end. Mr. Carlson ran through the attendance books and lectured people about signing.

Motion to approve agenda:

M: Langston S: Thompson

Passed by acclamation 1:10PM

Mr. Grow displayed the current 802.3 voters list. He then displayed the potential voters list and ran through it. The following individuals indicated they wished to become 802.3 voters: Chopra, Rahul; Hurwitz, Walter K.; Rao, Sailesh K.; Tellado, Jose

**Update of Call for Patents** – Mr. Grow asked if anyone had a Letter of Assurance to submit.

802.3ah – A letter from Alcatel has been sent on Monday

**Elections** 802.3 voters only. Mr. Grow turned the meeting over to Mr. Law for the vote for WG Chair. Mr. Grow was running unopposed.

**VOTE FOR 802.3 WG CHAIR**

Robert M. Grow

Y: 81 N: 0 A: 0  
802.3 voters

50% procedural 1:25PM

**PASSES**

VOTE FOR 802.3 WG VICE-CHAIR

David Law

Y: 84 N: 0 A: 0

802.3 voters

50% procedural 1:30PM

PASSES

**Liaison and Ad Hoc Reports**

DTE Tia Ad Hoc Report – Mike McCormack

<Attachment C5 - Ad Hoc report re: TIA “DTE Power” draft (D3.0) >

MOTION #1

Motion:

802.3 endorse the comments generated by the ad hoc.

802.3 direct that the chair submit these comments to TIA editor and Chair of TIA TR-42

Moved: Steve Carlson

Second: Geoff Thompson

YES\_\_55\_\_ NO\_\_3\_\_ Abstain\_\_8\_\_

802.3 voters

Technical PASS

75% technical 1:45PM

PASSES

**Report on 802.1/802.3 Joint Plenary Meeting**

Richard Brand reported

<Attachment C2 - Summary Report of Joint 802.1/802.3 Meeting>

Glen Parsons indicated a proposed PAR for 802.1 Item #1 (jumbo frames) of at least 1650 bytes. This may be presented by 802.1 at the end of the meeting.

Bruce Tolley indicated that there was no actual vote on the increase of the frame size in 802.1.



Mr. Grow indicated that there would be discussion on whether a CFI on this was required. Geoff Thompson pointed out that our CFI process is not well aligned with the other 802 groups. He said that he was unclear about what was being asked for. He wants one SG Plenary cycle before a new CFI is presented. Pat Thaler pointed out that we have precedent to do small projects without a CFI or SG. Sometimes this has been done in Maintenance. Mr. Grow said that he will schedule a meeting in July.

### **Liaison Letters**

Joint letter to ITU-T-Q12/15 <Attachment C11- Joint letter to ITU-T-Q12/15>

MOTION 2

Move to accept liaison letter above

M: McCormack S. McCloud

Passes by acclamation (voice vote)

75% technical 2:00PM

PASSES

Alan Flatman hopes for comments on the new EMC provisions. Next meeting is the third week in June in Japan.

### **LMSC Chairs Meeting Report**

Several LMSC chairs meetings were held. One discussed 802 reorganization. There are two positions: split and don't split. The interest in this has cooled way down and the issue may die a natural death.

Meetings were held with IEEE staff on cooperation/support. The sense was that these meeting had gone well.

IEEE 802 vs. the CAG – The concerns are not LMSC vs. CAG, but the central problem of one sponsor in IEEE-SA sponsoring an amendment to revision to an active standard held by another IEEE group.

Geoff Thompson displayed a draft of a letter from the SEC to the BOG stating 802's position. Paul Nikolich directed him to present this letter:

“Given that this issue arose with respect to a project proposal by the CAG (for a project that 802.3 elected to not pursue), there has been a great

deal of confusion with respect to the 802 attitude towards the CAG.

We do not believe that this issue is related to the CAG but is rather an issue of a project's involvement with multiple sponsors.

Our position is:

We believe that Sponsor (or equivalent entity) within the IEEE should not be allowed to start a project that is properly an amendment, revision or corrigenda to an existing standard of another active Sponsor who is the nominal custodian (The Custodian) of the existing standard. Appropriate exception to this would be where The Custodian explicitly asserts that such a project and sponsor is appropriate.

This position does not apply to new projects that are truly not material appropriate to an existing standard.

We believe that for the IEEE-SA to operate otherwise has significant negative consequences”

Question from the floor in exactly what is meant by the above. Mr. Thompson indicated that it means that the SA should not sponsor a CAG which overturns the vote within an existing WG. Richard Brand added his support for this position. Howard Frazier asked if the draft has this statement and offered strong support for this. Jonathan Thatcher spoke to the issue of the word “properly” and how it might be interpreted with regard to dependent vs. an independent standard. Bruce Tolley said that this addressed the symptom, not the disease. The BOG does not believe that the CAG vs. WG is a problem.

George Eisler wanted to know what the next step would be? The letter will go to everybody on the food chain.

### MOTION 3

The 802.3 WG supports in principle the text submitted by Geoff Thompson to the EC regarding sponsor conflict over standard development

M: McCloud S. Dove

Y: 59 N: 0 A: 12

802.3 voters

75% technical 2:25PM

PASSES

Dna Dove thinks our current system works quite well.

**802.3ah Ethernet First Mile (EFM) – Howard Frazier**

< Attachment B2 - IEEE P802.3ah Ethernet in the first mile Task Force closing report>

Mr. Frazier indicated that there were several open TRS:

David James and the Style Manual TR (Comment 591 in the database for D3.1)

Disapprove Balloters : Thompson, Grow, James, Fitzgerald, Booth

**MOTION #4**

Produce D3.2 based on the comment responses as recorded in the database. Conduct 15-day sponsor recirculation ballot(s) with only the changed material open for comment. Request sponsor authorization to submit to RevCom upon successful completion of the recirculation process.

Moved: Howard Frazier

Second: Hugh Barass

Y: 64 N: 0 A: 4

Tech >=75% Pass. 2:52PM

Mr. Frazier presented three liaison letters:

Attachment C8 - Liaison letter to T1E1 from IEEE P802.3ah Ethernet in the First Mile Task Force

Attachment C9 - Liaison letter to ITU-T Q4/15 from IEEE P802.3ah Ethernet in the First Mile Task Force

Attachment C10 - Liaison letter to ITU-T Q14/4 from IEEE P802.3ah Ethernet in the First Mile Task Force

Break for 15 minutes at 3:10PM. Resumed at 3:32PM.

**10GBASE-T Study Group – Brad Booth**

< Attachment B5 - IEEE 802.3 10GBASE-T Study Group closing report>

Mr. Booth presented liaison letters to be sent to Val Rybinski at TIA.

<Attachment C3 - ISO/IEC SC25/WG3 liaison report>

<Attachment C4 - TIA TR-42 liaison report>

MOTION #5

802.3 approve and forward the two liaison letters,  
with appropriate edits by the Chair, to TIA TR-42  
and ISO/IEC 11801 JTC 1/SC 25/WG 3.

TIA TR42: tia\_1\_0304.pdf

ISO/IEC: iso\_1\_0304.pdf

M: B. Booth

S: S. Muller

Technical (>75%)

Passed by acclamation

PASSES/FAILS

Date: 18-March 2004 3:37PM

Passes by acclamation

**MAINTENANCE – David Law**

< See < Attachment B14 - IEEE 802.3 Maintenance closing report>

**INTERPRETATIONS – David Law**

< Attachment B12 - IEEE 802.3 Interpretations closing report>

MOTION #7

IEEE P802.3 approves the proposed Interpretation response to Interpretation request 1 –  
03-04 as presented without the need for a 30-day letter ballot.

M: David Law S: Steve Carlson Tech 75%

PASSED Date: 18-March 2004 4:00PM 802.3 voters

Y: 51 N: 0 A: 4

**Study Groups**

**Backplane Ethernet – Adam Healey**

< Attachment B7 - IEEE 802.3 Closing Report Backplane Ethernet>

MOTION #8

Move that 802.3 approve the Backplane Objectives document, per objectives \_1\_0304.pdf.

M: Adam Healy on behalf of the Study Group  
S: N/A

Date: 18-March 2004 4:22PM 802.3 voters Tech 75%

Y: 56 N: 0 A: 3 MOTION PASSES

There was a discussion on what is meant by enhanced FR-4 (PCB material.) Mr. Thompson suggests that this needs to be further researched and defined. Experts say that the SG will have to do this work.

Motion to amend the objectives twice:

MOTION #9

Change the text on the objectives\_1\_0304.pdf to add the text shown in red in the presentation.

M: Healy S. N/A

Passed by almost acclamation  
75% technical 4:14PM

PASSES

MOTION #10

Change the text on the objectives\_1\_0304.pdf to add the text shown in red in the presentation to fix the exponent. i.e.  $10^{-12}$

M: Petroff S. Dineen

Passed by acclamation  
75% technical 4:19PM

Passes by acclamation

PASSES

Discussion about phrasing of limits. No motion results.

MOTION #11

Move that 802.3 approve the Backplane Ethernet 5 Criteria, Broad Market Potential, per critters\_1\_0303.pdf.

M: Healey                      S. N/A

Y: 46 N: 0    A: 3

75% technical 4:30

PASSES

MOTION #12

Move that 802.3 approve Compatibility with existing standard, critters\_1\_0303.pdf.

M: Healy                      S. NA

Y: 53 N: 0    A: 1

75% technical 4:32PM

PASSES

MOTION #13

Move that Distinct Identity as amended in the slide set be accepted.

M: Healy                      S. NA

Y: 51 N: 0    A: 1

75% technical 4:43PM

PASSES

Motion to amend:

MOTION #14

The standard will define at most one PHY for 1Gb/operation and at most one PHY for 10Gb/s operations

M: Bradshaw S. Kollesar

Passes by acclamation

75% technical 4:40PM

PASSES

MOTION #15

Move that Technical Feasibility per critters\_1\_0303.pdf be accepted.

M: Healy S. N/A

Y: 51 N: 0 A: 1

75% technical 4:45PM

PASSES

MOTION #16

Move that Economic Feasibility per critters\_1\_0303.pdf be accepted.

M: Healy S. N/A

Y: 49 N: 0 A: 1

75% technical 4:48PM

PASSES

MOTION #17

Move to forward 5 Criteria to SEC for approval.

M: Healey                    S. N/A

Y: 47 N: 0    A: 0

75% technical 4:57PM

PASSES

MOTION #18

Move to forward the PAR to the LMSC Exec.

M: Healey                    S. N/A

Y: 55 N: 0    A: 0

75% technical 4:50PM

PASSES

MOTION #19

Move to extend the Backplane Ethernet SG for one additional meeting cycle.

M: Healey                    S. N/A

Passes by acclamation (voice vote)

75% technical 4:55PM

PASSES



MOTION #20

Authorize the formation of a SG to for congestion management.

M: Healey                      S. N/A

Y: 23 N: 18 A: 15

50% proc 5:40PM

PASSES

Mr. Frazier asked if this was in the original SG scope. Mr. Grow indicated that it was. Mr. McCormack: why just limit this to backplanes? Mr. Healey said that they didn't feel they were experts at Layer 2. Ms. Thaler said that this might be a sub-layer, and not go in the MAC. Mr. Thompson asserts that this is very different topic than backplanes, and wants to see a focused CFI.

Mr. Frazier is concerned about forming this new SG. He feels that the topic didn't get enough thought in BPE. The topic needs a formal CFI--- and urged the group not to form the SG without a CFI. Mr. Mueller agrees that we should have a CFI, as does Mr. Thatcher.

Ms. Thaler suggest that it not be restricted to PBE; and urges the group to go forward with the motion. She doesn't want the delay—do it now. Mr. Dineen doesn't want to do it without a CFI: congestion management is a big topic and the scope is too broad. Mr. Frazier says use the process---do a CFI. Mr. Booth that it should go forward, based on experience from 1G. Mr. Thompson thinks this is a way to bootleg data center Ethernet. Ms. Thaler speaks in favor because the Data Center CFI was too broad; but congestion management is something that is of interest. Mr. Frazier asked who will chair the new SG; Mr. Grow said that Ben Brown would do it.

MOTION #21

Motion to amend Motion #20 ...including the needs... of BPE

M: Thaler                      S. Thatcher

Y: 14 N: 10 A: 7

50% procedural 5:15PM

PASSES

More discussion: Mr. Thompson says don't do it without a CFI. Mr. Dove doesn't think this is the right way to do an SG and also wants a CFI. Mr. Thatcher speaks in support for the motion to amend. After more debate, the question is called on the motion. Mr. Grow cited the 50% rule.

Straw Poll: Individuals who would participate in a Congestion SG: 23; Companies: 16

Mr. Barass: wants a tutorial on the subject next July. Mr. Frazier: What's the rush? Why are we doing this? Mr. Tolley: Why are we doing a CFI in the middle of a SG report? Mr. McCloud is very interested, but the Operating Rules state that an SG is formed by a CFI. The question was called, resulting in Motion #20.

**10Gigabit on FDDI-Grade MMF – Bruce Tolley**

< Attachment B9 - IEEE 802.3 10Gb/s Ethernet on FDDI-grade MM Fiber Study Group closing report >

Mr. Thompson asked: why the elaborate spec for the fiber? We already have one.

MOTION #22

Move that 802.3 approve the SG objectives as amended by SG 18.March.04

M: Bruce Tolley

S: N/A

Date: 18-March 2004 Time: 6:10PM Tech 75% 802.3 voters

Y: 30 N: 0 A: 12 MOTION PASSES

Mr. Thatcher wants to know the wavelength. Mr. Tolley says it's a long-wavelength solution. Mr. Frazier asks for distinct identity. How is this different from 802.3ae? Mr. Tolley says it will have higher port density.

MOTION #23

Amendment: strike last bullet on objectives slide.

M: Booth

S: Bradshaw

Y: 9 N: 20 A: 8

75% technical 6:00PM

FAILS

Mr. Dove doesn't want the last line out. Mr. Swanson wants the 1<sup>st</sup>. bullet to say 300M if the last line goes. Mr. Tolley rebuts Mr. Booth on reach objectives. Comments from the floor indicate that it is a serial interface optical module. This is distinct in the view of the group.

MOTION #24

Move that 802.3 approve the broad market potential criterion

M: Tolley                      S. NA

Y: 33   N: 0   A: 9

75% technical 6:10PM

PASSES

MOTION #25

Move that 802.3 approve the compatibility criterion.

M: Tolley                      S. NA

Y: 33   N: 0   A: 10

75% technical 6:15PM

PASSES

MOTION #26

Move that 802.3 approve the distinct identity criterion as amended by the WG

M: Tolley                      S. NA

Y: 39   N: 6   A: 6

75% technical 6:00PM

PASSES

MOTION #27

Insert words “and that supports” in Identity motion

M: Barass      S. Dineen

Passes by acclamation (voice vote)

75% technical 6:13PM

PASSES

More comments from the floor about a lack of distinct identity.

MOTION #28

Add the word serial in front of multimode PHY

M: Booth      S. Brand

Passes by acclamation

75% technical 6:20PM

PASSES

MOTION #29

Strike words from “interface to end of PMA”.

M: Booth              S. Thatcher

Passes by acclamation (voice vote)

75% technical 1:20PM

PASSES

MOTION #30

Move that 802.3 approve the technical feasibility criterion

M: Tolley                      S. N/A

Y: 38 N: 0    A: 6

75% technical 1:20PM

PASSES

MOTION #31

Move that 802.3 approve the economic feasibility criterion

M: Tolley                      S. N/A

Y: 39 N: 3    A: 7

75% technical 6:45PM

PASSES

Mr. Thatcher has reservations on 3X-4X number. Is this good enough? This serial solution has to be better than the existing solution. Mr. Booth is also worried and wants to see cost comparisons. Mr. Swanson is concerned about the discussion on the 5 Criteria. We are not being rigorous enough. The question was called.

MOTION #32

Move that 802.3 WG forward the 10G MMF SG Five Criteria to the 802 SEC for approval

M: Tolley                      S. NA

Y: 39 N: 0    A: 9

75% technical 6:43PM

PASSES

MOTION #33

Move that 802.3 WG approve the 10GBASE-LRM amended PAR and to forward the PAR and five Criteria to the 802 SEC for approval (please consider under continuous process).

M: Tolley                      S: N/A

Y: 43   N: 0   A: 3

75% technical 6:52PM

PASSES

MOTION #34

Change words per slide

M: Barrass                      S. Dineen

Passes by acclamation (voice vote)

75% technical 6:50PM

PASSES

MOTION #35

Move that 802.3 WG approve the extension of the SG until the close of the July Plenary.

M: Tolley                      S. N/A

Passes by acclamation (voice vote)

75% technical 6:52PM

PASSES

## **Call for Interest**

### **Data Center Ethernet – Jonathan Thatcher**

< Attachment B10 - IEEE 802.3 Call for Interest report: Data Center Ethernet >  
No motions came from this CFI, and no SG was formed.

Mr. Grow indicated that the 802.1 doc on frame size will be posted to the Web.

Motion to adjourn at by Mr. Brand at 7:01PM