Corrected Minutes
IEEE 802.3 CSMA/CD PLENARY
Hyatt Hotel, San Diego, CA
July 17 - 20, 2006

http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/index.html

MONDAY, July 17, 2006

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
Mr. Robert Grow, Chair of 802.3 CSMA/CD Working Group, called the meeting to order at 1:04pm.

Mr. Grow gave some directions and information on the IEEE 802 office and registration. Mr. Grow introduced the WG website: http://www.ieee802.org/3/

Mr. Grow introduced Mr. David Law, Vice Chair of 802.3, Mr. Carlson, Executive Secretary, and Mr. Wael William Diab, Secretary of 802.3.

Mr. Grow also introduced Mr. Brad Booth, Chair of the P802.3an 10GBASE-T Task Force, Mr. Adam Healey, Chair P802.3ap Backplane Ethernet Task Force, Mr. David Cunningham, Chair of P802.3aq 10BASE-LRM Task Force, Mr. Kevin Daines, Chair of P802.3ar Congestion Management (delayed at the airport) and Chair of P802.3as Frame Expansion Task Forces, Mr. Mike McCormack who is Chair of P802.3at Power over Ethernet Plus Task Force and Mr. Glen Kramer who is Chair of 10GEPON Study Group.

Mr. Grow noted that all attendees are participating individually and that their affiliation should be available upon request per the latest guidelines from the 802 opening meeting.

Mr. Grow asked the attendees to introduce themselves and announce their affiliation.

Mr. Grow asked if anyone was attending from the press including those who would run a blog on this meeting. None responded.

Mr. Grow asked all attendees to be wearing their registration badges at all times during the meeting.

Mr. Grow acknowledged Mr. Law for his work on getting the latest project IEEE Std 802.3-2005/Cor 1-2006 published. Mr. Grow presented a certificate to Mr. Law for his effort in the maintenance project along with the corrigendum.

Mr. Grow discussed the latest 802.3 standards and drafts. Mr. Grow noted the URL for GetIEEE802. Mr. Grow also noted that the latest version of 802.3 which is 802.3-2005 has superseded all previous revisions and amendments.

Mr. Grow discussed the merit of being on the Working Group reflector especially for new attendees. Mr. Grow also introduced the Working Group decorum as described in his opening report. Please see http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_open_report.pdf.

Approving the Agenda
Mr. Grow asked if there was any objection to moving Mr. Daines's updates to the end of the agenda. None were given. Mr. Grow asked if there were any additions to agenda that was handed out.

MOTION #1

Approve the agenda.

M: B. Booth

S: G. Thompson

Passed by voice vote without opposition 17-Jul-2006 1:20PM

Mr. Grow went over the current WG documents for this meeting's business. Please see http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_open_report.pdf

Mr. Grow asked if there were any additions or corrections to the November minutes. None were given. Mr. Diab noted that they have been up on the website for over two months.

MOTION #2

Approve July 2005 Plenary Meeting Minutes

M: J. Abbot

S: D. Cunningham

Passed by voice vote without opposition 17-Jul-2006 1:21PM

802.3 Treasury
Mr. Grow gave the IEEE 802.3 Treasury report. Mr. Grow mentioned that he had been acting as the 802.3 Treasurer and asked if anyone would like to take over that responsibility. Anyone interested should contact Mr. Grow offline.

No meetings have been hosted by the 802.3 Treasury since the last plenary. The current treasury is solvent, and other than bank charges there have only been small expenses left over from January interims that have been paid since March.

Mr. Grow asked if there were any questions on Treasury. None were asked.

Attendance Books
Mr. Diab explained the operation of the Attendance books for new voters and established voters. Mr. Grow explained how to gain membership in 802.3. See http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/rules/index.html for complete information.

Mr. Diab reminded attendees to verify their email address and contact information in the voting books and to ensure that they are current. To maintain voting status, contact information must be up-to-date.

Please see http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_open_report.pdf for voter lists.

Mr. Grow went through the Potential Voters list. Mr. Diab recorded the respondents.

These individuals responded Monday requesting to become voting members:
*Barrick, Scott
Brearley, Dave
Chang, Frank
*Collum, James
Frazier, Howard
Hopwood, Keith
Jetzt, John
Kramer, Glen
Lee, Dong-Soo
Nishimura, Shinji
Noseworthy, Bob
Radhakrishnan, Prakash
Sastry, Ramesh
Schindler, Fred
Schwarzenberg, David
Trowbridge, Stephen J.
Wang, Chenxi
Yang, Yinglin (Frank)
Yoon, Bin Yeong

*After the Monday meeting it was discovered that these individuals became members in March.

Interim TF and SG Meetings Held
Mr. Grow gave an update on the interim 802.3 meetings that were held and thanked the hosts of those meetings. Below is a list of the meetings that occurred between this meeting and the last plenary:
  • Santa Clara, CA, USA 12 Apr 2006
      – P802.3an, 10GBASE-T
  • Santa Clara, CA, USA, 18 Apr 2006

- – P802.3as, Frame Format Extensions
- San Diego, CA, USA, 19 Apr 2006
  - – 802.3au, Corrigendum 1
- Beijing, China, 15-16 May 2006
  - – P802.3ar, Congestion Management
  - – P802.3as, Frame Format Extensions
- Austin, TX USA, 22-25 May 2006
  - – P802.3an, 10GBASE-T
  - – P802.3ap, Backplane Ethernet
  - – P802.3aq, 10GBASE-LRM
  - – P802.3at, DTE Power Enhancements
  - – 10G EPON SG
  - – Maintenance

802.3 Ballots since the Last Plenary

Mr. Grow gave an update on the 802.3 ballots since the last meeting. Mr. Grow also gave a brief overview of the IEEE Sponsor Ballot process and direction to the website.

Below is a summary of the ballots and ballot invitations that Mr. Grow showed and they can be found in opening slides. Please see
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_open_report.pdf
- Sponsor Ballot invitations:
  - – 1802.3 reaffirmation (closing 29 Jul)
- Working Group Ballots:
  - – P802.3ap/D2.4, D2.5 recirculation
  - – P802.3-2005/Cor1/D1.2 recirculation
- Sponsor Ballots:
  - – P802.3an/D3.2, D4.0, recirculation
  - – P802.3aq/D3.2, D4.0, recirculation
  - – P802.3as/D3.0, D3.1, D3.2 initial ballot and recirculation
  - – P802.3-2005/Cor1/D2.0 initial ballot

Mr. Thompson asked if there was any data on how many times 1802.3 was downloaded in the last year. Mr. Grow responded that he had not looked up that data. Mr. Law noted that they could ask for the information during the week.

Patent Policy

Mr. Grow asked Mr. McCormack to give the Patent Policy.

Mr. McCormack reminded the group of inappropriate topics that should not be discussed. These included territory, market share, price, ongoing litigation, threatened litigation, etc. and read the slides. Please see
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_open_report.pdf

Mr. McCormack advised that the IEEE's patent policy is consistent with the ANSI patent policy.

Patent Policy (Contd.)
Mr. Grow asked if anyone had any IP or a letter of assurance, and no one came forth. Mr. Grow also asked that Mr. Diab record that:
- No letters of assurance were submitted
- The patent policy was read
- Anyone wishing to submit a letter of assurance can do that any time by contacting Mr. Grow or the PatCom administrator.

Standards Board Report
Mr. Grow gave an update on the March and June standards board meetings. Mr. Grow showed updates on the following areas:
- ProCom
- PatCom
- RevCom
- NesCom
- Standards Board

There was a discussion on the PatCom update. Mr. Grow advised that individuals interested in this topic should advise their corporate legal departments and reference the minutes of the PatCom meeting. One interesting topic from the PatCom meeting that Mr. Grow noted was P1394c. Mr. Law noted that the status of that project was it was withdrawn from RevCom consideration and PatCom did not take a position on the project.

Mr. Grow mentioned that the PatCom group used the 802.3 commenting tool in their process.

Mr. Grow noted that all projects from 802, including 802.3's were approved by the sub-committees and the Standards Board.

Mr. Law also mentioned that a conflict of interest policy is being rigorously applied in the Standards Board meeting. Its not clear if that will trickle down to the LMSC executive committee or the 802.3 Working Group at this time.

Please see http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_open_report.pdf.

For details on the standard board minutes please refer to http://standards.ieee.org/board.

LMSC Reports
Mr. Grow gave an update in the topics being discussed at the LMSC EC. Please see http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_open_report.pdf for all the topics and the details covered.

Some highlights from the discussion
- Need January (London, UK) commitment: A poll was conducted at the end of the March Plenary. There may be flexibility with the meeting fees for January but a

commit or no commit may be required from 802.3. Mr. Carlson will be tracking that during this week's meeting.

- 802.20 suspended until 1 Oct 2006 by SASB
  – Appeals will continue
  – Website and reflectors modified
  – Mr. Upton retains EC membership
  – Comments to 802_comments@ieee.org, check requirements for submission
- Anonymous letter received with allegations about practices and procedures associated with IEEE 802 meetings
  – Dorsey & Whitney has been retained by IEEE BoD to perform an independent investigation

Mr. Grow asked Mr. Bob Pitchard, Independent Consultant who is on contract to IEEE, to comment on ISO/IEC JTC1 SC6 he invited additional US companies to join the US TAG. Mr. Thompson mentioned that participation is through national bodies and that 802.3 participants investigate supporting LMSC work through alternate national bodies as appropriate.

Mr. Grow also noted that Ms. Kenney was appointed as IEEE 802 ombudsman (802ombudsman@ieee.org). For more information please refer to the IEEE 802 opening plenary presentation.

Mr. Grow discussed P&P changes being discussed. Mr. Grow noted that there are two changes pending approval: editorial and document numbering.

One proposal being discussed is to split the LMSC P&P into OpMan and P&P.

Other EC items include a plan to extend the meeting contract with Face to Face and our current wireless contractor, Verilan. Mr. Grow asked if anyone had any input or suggestion on how he should vote in the EC on these two issues to contact him. He also mentioned that a directed position could be given by the working group.

Mr. Grow noted that there are multiple appeals in process and that an executive session of the EC was called to discuss root causes of dysfunctional cases (e.g., number of appeals, contentious issues at EC, etc.).

Mr. Grow asked that if anyone is interested in the ITU-T technical liaison for IEEE-SA to see his email to the 802.3 reflector. He also offered if anyone had any questions on this topic to contact him directly.

Mr. Grow noted that there is an interest in a joint conference concurrent with our May interim in Geneva. Mr. Grow noted that Mr. Carlson will discuss this in his future meetings update.

Mr. Grow presented the tutorials scheduled for this week.

PARS
Please see http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_open_report.pdf

Mr. Grow showed the PARs under consideration this week. Mr. Grow asked if there were any questions on any of the PARs.

PARs for this week:
- P802.1at   Stream reservation protocol
- P802.1au   Congestion notification
- P802.3ar   Modified PAR
- P802.3av   10G EPON
- P802.1H   Revison
- P802.11k   Extension
- P802.22   RP Instal and deploy 802.22
- P802.20   PAR extension

Mr. Grow asked if anyone would like to see more detail on these PARs or if anyone would like to see an ad-hoc formed to look at these PARs for WG comments.

Mr. Thompson asked if Ms. Thaler could give an overview of P802.1au. Ms. Thaler gave a brief overview.

Mr. Thompson asked Mr. Grow to report on why the P802.20 extension PARwas turned down by the EC in March. Mr. Grow gave his personal opinion, that most negative votes were based on a failure of 802.20 to follow its P&P, but also noted that he could not accurately represent that was the reason for every negative vote.

External Liaison Reports
See http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/index.html under the liaison attachments.

TR42.7 – Val Rybinski
Mr. Thompson asked when the material from SP-3-4425-AD6, d6.0, which was cancelled, would appear in the 568-C.0. Ms. Rybinski noted that it was in the early editorial phases and she did not have a schedule for review but that she would notify the IEEE 802.3 Working Group when such a document was ready.

Ms. Rybinski noted that Mr. Diab and Mr. McCormack attended the joint TR42/IEEE 802.3at session this past week from the IEEE 802.3at Task Force regarding current carrying capacity, cabling issues and heating issues as they relate to 802.3at. Ms. Rybinski noted that Mr. Diab was planning on giving a more detailed report on the session during the 802.3at session this week.

802 Architecture Update – Pat Thaler
Mr. Grow noted that Ms. Thaler has accepted the position of Chair of the Congestion Management Study Group/Task Force. To that effect Mr. Grow noted that Ms. Thaler

would like to find someone to replace her as the liaison to the architecture committee for that reason. If anyone is interested they should contact Mr. Grow or Ms. Thaler.

ISO/IEC SC25/WG3 – Alan Flatman
Mr. Flatman did not have a formal report but commented that he would like to prioritize the work of his group based on a formal liaison letter from 802.3. Mr. McCormack noted that his group would be working on such a letter this week.

F0-4.1 – No report

T11.2 and SFF – Adam Healey
Mr. Healey noted that he will be reporting on T11.2/SFF as Mr. Schelto van Dorn is unable to attend 802.3 meetings.

Mr. Law asked if SFP+ will be used for 10GbE. Mr. Healey confirmed that they are looking into it and have not ruled out doing 10G in SFP+.

ITU-T SG 13 – No report

ITU-T SG15 – No Report

IETF – No Report

Internal Liaison Reports
See http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/nov05/index.html under the liaison attachments.

802.1 Internal Liaison – No Report – Glenn Parsons on behalf of Richard Brand

Mr. Grow noted that Ms. Thaler has indicated she would be willing to take over liaison responsibility for the 802.1 position as Mr. Brand has not been present for the last few sessions.

Mr. Grow asked if there was any comment on making Ms. Thaler the 802.1 liaison. Mr. Thompson noted that she may be bandwidth constrained because of her new role in chairing the 802.1 congestion management. Mr. Grow noted that he is willing to try it and Mr. Thompson was okay with that.

Mr. Grow asked for a quick poll by voice of all those in favor of Ms. Thaler being appointed as the 802.3 liaison for 802.1. There was no voice opposition.

<div align="center">Break for 10 minutes at 2.49PM. Restarted at 3:04PM</div>

State of the Standard
Mr. Law reported on the state of the standard
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_state_of_std.pdf

Mr. Grow reminded the group that the group has been solicited to contribute opinions on the value of internationalazition of IEEE Std 802.3 for over a year and nothing had been received. Mr. Group noted that past WG meeting discussions produced a very limited response for 8802-3 support. Assuming there is no positive interest in this, Mr. Grow and Mr. Thompson noted that 8802-3 would likely get even more out of sync with 802.3.

Interpretations
Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_interp_open_report.pdf.
3 new interpretations received:
- 1-07/06 -   10GBASE-X Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS)
- 2-07/06 -   100BASE-LX10 and 100BASE-BX10 receive sensitivity
- 3-07/06 -   PD classification

Available on Interpretations area of web site http://www.ieee802.org/3/interp/index.html

Mr. Law also showed the plans for the week and that a planned response to these new interpretations would be presented at the closing session of the 802.3 plenary.

Operating Rules of 802.3
There was nothing new regarding rule changes.

The latest version may be found at http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/rules/index.html

Maintenance
Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_maint_open_report.pdf.

Mr. Law showed the 20 open maintenance requests, of which
- 0 are new since the March meeting
- 13 Ready for ballot
- 1 Awaiting clarification
- 6 To be categorised

P802.3-2005/Cor1 (802.3au – Isolation)
Mr. Law presented this under maintenance as it was originally driven by a maintenance request. Mr. Law also discussed the timeline and status of this project. Mr. Law also showed the results of the ballots conducted to date. Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_maint_open_report.pdf.

Mr. Law also showed the interim report from the San Diego meeting that met Wednesday April 19th 2006 and thanked Intel for hosting.

Mr. Law noted that RevCom recommended approval 7th June and IEEE-SA Standards Board met 8th June and approved IEEE P802.3-2005/Cor 1/D2.0.

The IEEE Std 802.3-2005/Cor1-2006 was published on 26th June 2006.

Mr. Law noted that there IEEE 1802.3-2001 re-affirmation is in process and the ballot invitation closes 29th July.

Mr. Law showed the plans for the week for maintenance.

Task Force and Study Group Reports
P802.3an: 10GBASE-T TF Opening Report – Brad Booth
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_an_open_report.pdf

P802.3ap: Backplane Ethernet TF – Adam Healey
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_ap_open_report.pdf
Mr. Healey thanked Schelto van Dorn for his role up till this point as Chief Editor and noted that he will no longer serve in that role.

Mr. Healey also noted that the group would not be meeting Thursday morning due to the reduced scope of work that they have for the week.

P802.3aq: 10GBASE-LRM TF – David Cunningham
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_aq_open_report.pdf
Mr. Cunningham noted that there would be no LRM meetings this week.

Mr. Grow asked if there are any objections to Mr. Kevin Q Daines to go back into his original order as he showed up in time. No objections were given.

P802.3ar: Congestion Management TF – Kevin Q Daines
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_ar_open_report.pdf

P802.3as: Frame Extension TF – Kevin Q Daines
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_as_open_report.pdf

Power Over Ethernet Plus – Mike McCormack
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_at_open_report.pdf

Mr. Grow asked Mr. McCormack when he expects to have his first draft. Mr. McCormack did not have a firm answer based on the fact that the group was still missing cable data so it was unclear if it would be by next meeting or the following. Mr. McCormack noted that he will have a TF schedule update on Thursday.

10GEPON SG – Glen Kramer
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_10geponsg_open_report.pdf

There was a question if the objectives and PAR would be limited to 1 PMD or more. Mr. Kramer responded that the group was looking at 3 PMDs.

CFI – John D'Ambrosia
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_hssg_cfi_report.pdf

Room Assignments and TF Schedules
Mr. Carlson presented the room assignments for meetings and discussed start times.

For the final ad-hocs and agenda, an updated room assignment will be posted on the 802 announcement board where it is usually found.

A current version of the agenda and room assignments can be found at
http://ieee802.facetoface-events.com/plenary/attendee
(Note that the above link is a dynamic link)

Mr. Carlson asked if the new format with a screen in the middle of the room was helpful. It seemed favorable for having the additional screen. Mr. Frazier pointed out that it does make it harder for voters to see what is going on in the front of the room. Mr. Grow tasked Mr. Carlson to take appropriate action for Thursday with regards to the room seating and screens.

Mr. Grow asked if there was any additional business for 802.3 to consider. Nothing was brought up.

MOTION #3

Motion to Recess.

M: T. Dineen
S: S. Carlson

Passed by voice vote without opposition 17-Jul-2006 4:49PM

Recessed.

THURSDAY, July 20, 2006

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Thursday, July 20, 2006 1PM – 5PM

Mr. Grow called the meeting to order at 1:03PM. The agenda was distributed to the group. Mr. Grow reminded the group that the agenda was quite full for the session.

Mr. Grow asked if anyone wished to modify the agenda.

MOTION #1

Motion to approve agenda:

M: H. Frazier
S: B. Booth

Passed by voice vote without opposition 20-Jul-2006 1:05PM

Attendance Books
Mr. Diab explained the operation of the Attendance books for new voters and established voters.

Mr. Diab reminded attendees to verify their email address and contact information in the voting books and to ensure that they are current. To maintain voting status, contact information must be up-to-date.

Review of Voting Membership, Request Membership
Mr. Grow displayed the current 802.3 voters list. Mr. Grow explained how to gain membership in 802.3. See http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/rules/index.html for complete information.

Mr. Grow then displayed the potential voters list and ran through it.

The following individuals indicated they wished to become 802.3 voters on Thursday:
Ahmed, Taufique

Press

Mr. Grow asked if there was a member of the press, or anybody that would blog on the meeting, present. None responded so Mr. Grow noted that there are no recording or photography then.

Mr. Booth asked if an alliance reports on the actions of the working group is that considered press. Mr. Law clarified that that action would be considered reporting on publicly available information. Mr. Grow noted that would not be considered as part of the press.

ITU-T Update – Glen Parsons

Mr. Parsons gave an update from ITU-T regarding their request to work closer with the IEEE 802.3 group and perhaps co-locate in the near future. Please refer to:

http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_itu_close_report.pdf

802.1 Liaison (Reserved Addresses) – Ms. Pat Thaler

Ms. Thaler gave an update on a request from 802.17 to 802.1 for use of a reserved addresses that would not be forwarded. Please refer to:
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_802_1_close_report.pdf

Mr. Grow asked if any found a problem with what Ms. Thaler presented either today or later to contact him as he would join the ballot group for 802.17b and submit a comment on their behalf.

Mr. Grow asked Ms. Thaler to convey that back to 802.1.

EC Update

Mr. Grow noted that there was an appeals hearing this week. There was nothing that required 802.3's immediate input.

Mr. Grow reported that there were two executive sessions held. Mr. Grow invited anyone with more interest to monitor the EC minutes and reflector.

Mr. Law reminded Mr. Grow that the budget for 2007 for Get802 was still unresolved after the 802 Chair's meeting on the topic.

MAINTENANCE – David Law

Mr. Law gave an update on the revision requirements and timeline as they may pertain to 802.3. The main issue is to identify the best time to do a revision. Potential projects that may be impacted are 10GEPON and DTE Power Enhancements.

Mr. Law concluded that this is something we need to keep monitoring, however,

Mr. Frazier asked if it would be okay to do a sponsor ballot for an amendment concurrently while you are balloting a revision in the working group. Mr. Grow and Mr.

Law responded that that is a perfectly fine option to consider and is similar to what was done for the last revision, where 802.3ah was not merged during WG ballot but was merged into P802.3REVam for sponsor ballot.

Mr. Law showed some of the download statistics for Std 1802.3-2003. He noted that the reaffirmation pool was still open and that there were no changes planned for the reaffirmation.

Mr. Law discussed progress on maintenance requests. Two requests moved to Ready for ballot
   1169 Gate Processing ONU Programming State Diagram
   1177 aFECCorrectedBlocks / aFECUncorrectableBlocks

http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_maint_close_report.pdf.

Interpretation – David Law
Mr. Law discussed interpretations. Please refer to
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_interp_close_report.pdf

Mr. Law noted that the Interpretations Ad Hoc met Wednesday and that 3 interpretations were considered:
1-07/06: 10BASE-X Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS)
2-07/06: 100BASE-LX10 and 100BASE-BX10 receive sensitivity
3-07/06 PD classification

The interpretations area of the 802.3 website can be found at
http://www.ieee802.org/3/interp/index.html

Mr. Law showed the proposed text for the responses per his closing report.

MOTION #2

IEEE 802.3 approves the proposed Interpretation responses to Interpretation requests 2-07/06 and 3-07/06 as presented without the need for a 30 day letter ballot.

M: D. Law
S: W. Diab

Tech 75%
Y:65 N:0 A:2   MOTION PASSES   Date: 20-Jul-2006 1:52PM

Mr. Law asked if there was any objection to making a motion to put the response to 1-07/06 to working group ballot rather than stepping through the lengthy response real time.

None were given.

MOTION #3

IEEE 802.3 sends the proposed Interpretation responses to Interpretation requests 1-07/06 to a Working Group letter ballot.

M: D. Law
S: G. Thompson

Tech 75%
MOTION PASSES by voice vote without opposition   Date: 20-Jul-2006 1:57PM

Discussion on the motion: Mr. Thompson asked if there was any background information or material to accompany the comment in working group ballot. Mr. Law responded that there is information from the standard that would accompany the response with an explanation.

Mr. Grow asked if there were any objections to taking the vote on motion 3 by voice vote. None were given.

Task Forces

Mr. Grow asked if there was any objection to modify the agenda such that Mr. Healey could present when his laptop was back in order. None were given.

P802.3aq – 10GBASE-LRM – David Cunningham
Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_aq_close_report.pdf

MOTION #4

Move that the IEEE 802.3 Working Group Chair request LMSC approval for submission of IEEE 802.3aq to REVCOM.

M: D. Cunningham
S: N. Swenson

Tech 75%
Y:60   N:1   A:5   MOTION PASSES   Date: 20-Jul-2006 2:08PM

Discussion on the motion: Mr. Grow asked Ms. Turner, the IEEE publication editor, to confirm that all changes proposed for editorial consideration were found to be editorial. Ms. Turner confirmed all were editorial.

Mr. Grow thanked Mr. Cunningham for his efforts in leading the Task Force and the editorial team for their effort.

P802.3ap – Backplane Ethernet – Adam Healey
Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_ap_close_report.pdf

Mr. Healey showed an update on progress for the week as well as the ballot results thus far.

Mr. Thompson asked for a summary of the 23 unsatisfied comments remaining against the draft. Mr. Healey went through the comments and topics.

MOTION #5

Move that the IEEE 802.3 requests that the IEEE 802 LMSC EC forwards IEEE 802.3ap/D3.0 to sponsor ballot.

M: A. Healey
S: C. Moore

Tech 75%
Y:55   N:3   A:5   MOTION PASSES   Date: 20-Jul-2006 2:20PM

P802.3ar – Congestion Management – Kevin Q Daines
Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_ar_close_report.pdf

Mr. Daines showed an update from this week and updated objectives. Mr. Daines apologized for showing an inaccurate list of objectives in the opening session on Monday.

MOTION #6
Request 802.3 WG approve the P802.3ar TF objectives

http://www.ieee802.org/3/ar/public/0605/802.3ar_revised_objectives.pdf

M: Kevin Daines
S: Hugh Barrass

Tech 75%
Y:24   N:10   A:27   MOTION FAILS   Date: 20-Jul-2006 2:45PM

Discussion on the above Motion:
- Mr. Thompson expressed concern over approving new objectives without first approving the new PAR. Mr. Kim expressed a similar concern.
- Mr. Thompson also expressed concern that the working group was being asked to approve a PAR, objectives and draft in one step.
- Mr. Dineen asked if there were multiple mechanisms being used to do the rate limiting. Mr. Daines responded that the number of mechanisms is a matter of

opinion. Some interpret as one mechanism with three parameters while others view it as three separate mechanisms.

Mr. Grow asked Mr. Law to Chair the meeting at 2.32pm and to run the vote and other associated with this motion. Mr. Grow then got in the queue in order to speak in favor of this motion.

Discussion on the above motion continued:
- Mr. Grow noted that we have a draft that is within the original PAR. Further the original PAR mentions the possibility that the work would be split into two groups, which has been done.
- Mr. Grow noted that this is a modified PAR not a new PAR
- Mr. Thompson noted that we should not approve a draft to support work in 802.1 until that work is more formally defined
- Mr. Grow disagreed with Mr. Thompson noting that there is nothing in the draft that is in specific support of 802.1 Congestion Management but were contained to the modified objectives
- Mr. Barrass noted that it should be fine to consider PAR, objectives and 5 criteria. Mr. Barrass spoke in favor of the motion
- Mr. Frazier spoke against the motion as the objectives as stated are not addressing a need for a throttling mechanism in the industry. Further, Mr. Frazier also noted that there were better and more intelligent mechanisms to do rate limiting in the industry
- Mr. Muller noted that the broader point is that there is still disagreement on the number of mechanisms and perhaps there is no need for a mechanism altogether. Instead a notification mechanism of congestion is the requirement, which is not being done in this project. Further, the method of the rate limiting is not the most interesting work, and may not be the most economically feasible across different applications. Mr. Muller spoke against the motion.
- Mr. Daines noted that the rate limiting variables being proposed could be invisible to higher layer controls such as software.

Mr. Grow moved to call the question. There was an objection to calling the question by Mr. Kim.

Calling the Question
Calling Motion 6
M: R. Grow
Proc 50%
Y:26   N:15   QUESTION CALLED   Date: 20-Jul-2006 2:43PM

Mr. Frazier asked if the threshold was a majority or supermajority for calling the question.

Mr. Law ruled it was 50% based on 802.3 traditions supported by LMSC P&P.

MOTION #7
Request 802.3 WG approve revised PAR title, scope, 5.3 (dependency), 5.4 (purpose),
5.5 (need), 5.6 (stakeholders):
        http://www.ieee802.org/3/ar/public/0605/802.3ar_revised_PAR.pdf

M: K. Daines
S: R. Grow

Tech 75%
MOTION WITHDRAWN

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Barrass asked if there was any input from other groups this week. Mr. Daines responded that there was not.
- Mr. Finn noted that they had discussed this topic in multiple areas in 802.1. Mr. Finn spoke in favor of this motion and that it would be a helpful feature to have in the MAC.
- Mr. Dawe was surprised that there was no formal report from 802.1 on this topic.
- Mr. Frazier noted that 802.3 typically approve and evaluate a PAR after the 5 criteria were presented and approved and that we had not done that.
- Mr. Frazier expressed concern that this project, with an open loop mechanism, could meet technical feasibility since there was no mechanism for communicating parameters from the receiver to the transmitter.
- Mr. Finn spoke in favor of the motion and expressed concern that without such a project there is no mechanism to do rate limiting.
- Mr. Daines tried to reflect the consensus of the group in the ordering of the motions. Mr. Daines was open to allowing the 5 criteria to go first.

Mr. Daines withdrew motion 7 and moved to the 5 criteria.

MOTION #8
Request 802.3 WG approve revised Broad Market Potential criteria

http://www.ieee802.org/3/ar/public/0605/802.3ar_revised_5_criteria.pdf

M: K. Daines
S: T. Mathey

Tech 75%
Y:19   N:11   A:27   MOTION FAILS   Date: 20-Jul-2006 3:20PM

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Dineen noted that there is a lack for broad market potential. Mr. Dineen spoke against this motion.

- Mr. Frazier spoke against the motion as the market for this mechanism is very limited with little market need. Mr. Frazier noted that there is a possibility for everyone to change their MAC implementation for very little gain.
- Mr. Kim spoke against the motion.
- Mr. Muller spoke against the motion. Mr. Muller pointed out that 802.3 has put in rate limiting mechanisms when needed for the application like 10G. In this particular case there doesn't seem to be a need for this feature and thus it would be disruptive and costly to the industry. Mr. Muller did not believe that this is simply a broad market potential issue but also a feasibility issue.
- Mr. Thompson spoke against this motion and noted that the group has not seen any presentations that this rate limiting mechanism has broad market potential.
- Mr. Thompson also noted that a number of 802.3 members with experience have expressed concern over this mechanism. Mr. Thompson expressed concern that this rate limiting mechanism was close to being a provisioning mechanism which has been deemed out of scope of 802.3 in the past.
- Mr. Daines spoke in favor of the motion noting that spinning a MAC for frame expansion could easily accommodate rate limiting and thus could meet feasibility.
- Mr. Grow echoed Mr. Daines's comment and spoke in favor of this motion.
- Mr. Zimmerman expressed concern that there was no discussion in the Task Force level but a huge amount of discussion at the Working Group.
- A participant spoke against the motion and attempted to call the question but Mr. Law ruled that one could not speak to the motion and then move to call the question
- Mr. Ganga spoke in favor of this motion noting that several presentations were made to the Task Force showing applications for such a mechanism.

With no further discussion, Mr. Law asked for any objection to calling the question. There was none and the motion failed as recorded above.

Mr. Law noted that without the first criteria then we do not have 5 criteria to move forward.

Mr. Grow noted that since there was a high abstain count then perhaps the most appropriate thing to do is to do a tutorial in November to educate the group and postpone any further consideration till that point.

MOTION #9
Move that the 802.3 WG approve withdraw the PAR and return it to NESCOM.

Friendly amendment to:
Move that the 802.3 WG approve withdraw the IEEE P802.3ar PAR and return it to NESCOM.

Friendly amendment to:

Move that the 802.3 WG approve withdraw the IEEE P802.3ar PAR and return it to NESCOM, by authorizing the WG chair to fill out the appropriate form and presenting it to 802 EC.

M: T. Dineen
S: H. Frazier

Tech 75%

Y: N: A: MOTION POSTPONED by Motion 10   Date: 20-Jul-2006 3:45PM

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Dineen noted that a tutorial would not change the majority of the group's mind. Mr. Dineen spoke for this motion.
- Mr. Barrass spoke against the above motion especially since much work had been done to address deficiencies since the last meeting.
- Mr. Frazier expressed that his initial motivation was to have the PAR and 5 criteria reflect the work in the project. The Task Force did that coming into this meeting. Now that he has been done and that the 5 criteria and objectives reflect the work it has become clear that the work does not meet the 5 criteria.
- Mr. Grow requested an interpretation from Mr. Law of the effect of the motion as the process to withdraw a PAR is to submit a PAR to withdraw an approved PAR. The question to Mr. Law was whether this was a motion that would require further WG action or rely on the WG Chair to complete the work.
- Mr. Law ruled that the motion would be interpreted as requiring no further action from the working group.
- Mr. Grow noted that there is a 48 hour rule for maintenance items but it isn't clear if a withdrawl PAR qualifies as a maintenance item. Mr. Frazier pointed out that the EC has had a 30-day notice for non-maintenance PARs.
- Mr. Thompson again clarified that this is the last vote for action by the WG to withdraw the PAR. Mr. Law confirmed.
- Ms. Thaler pointed out that it is within the EC rules that if work no longer matches the PAR then it is the responsibility of the WG to monitor this and bring changes back to the EC.
- Ms. Thaler also expressed that this may be too sudden to withdraw the PAR at this point.
- Mr. Cunningham expressed that he would abstain on this but observes withdrawl is contentious. So he would like to postpone this decision.

MOTION #10 (Non-Debatable)
Motion to postpone until the November 2006 Plenary at the discretion of the 802.3 WG chair.

M: D. Cunningham
S: G. Thompson

Proc 50%				
Y:38	N:5	A:3	MOTION PASSES	Date: 20-Jul-2006 3:45PM

Mr. Daines showed upcoming meetings.

Mr. Barrass asked what the Task Force would do at the next meeting. Mr. Law suggested the Task Force work on making the PAR and 5 criteria match the work. Ms. Thaler suggested that it may be better for the group collocate with 802.3 instead of 802.1 as it is 802.3 that needs to be convinced on the PAR, objectives and 5 criteria.

Break for 10 minutes at 3.51pm. Mr. Law announced that Mr. Grow would be the chair when the group starts up again. Resumed at 4.03pm with Mr. Grow as Chair.

P802.3as – Frame Expansion – Kevin Q Daines
Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_as_close_report.pdf

---

MOTION #11
Request 802.3 WG approval to submit P802.3as to 802 EC for conditional approval to be placed on September RevCom agenda.

M: On behalf of the 802.3as TF

Tech 75%

Y: N: A:

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Thompson asked to see a list of the unsatisfied comments from D3.0
- Mr. Daines noted that there were 0 unsatisfied from D3.2
- Mr. Kramer noted that since all his comments were addressed he would like to change his ballot to the approve status. Mr. Grow also reminded Mr. Kramer to submit an email reminder.
- Mr. Parsons did not have a list of the unresolved comments ready but could show the comment database.

Motion 11 withdrawn to allow Mr. Parsons (editor) to organize unsatisfied comments.

Mr. Grow asked if there was objection to modifying the agenda to give more time to Mr. Parsons to prepare his comments. None were given.

P802.3at – Power Over Ethernet Plus Study Group – Mike McCormack
Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_at_close_report.pdf

Mr. McCormack showed the progress of the group and noted good progress. Mr. McCormack showed an updated schedule. Mr. Diab noted that this schedule depends on adopting baseline proposals in the September 2006 interim.

MOTION #12

Request that the chair of 802.3 WG submit a liaison request to ISO/IEC SC25 WG and TIA TR42 using mccormack_1_0706.pdf as a basis.

M: Mike McCormack on behalf of Task Force

Tech 75%

MOTION PASSES by voice vote without opposition   20-Jul-2006 4:35PM

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. DiMinico expressed interest in having closure on some of these issues on both sides
- Mr. Flatman expressed that he had requested a formal liaison from the WG as all previous communications have been informal
- Mr. Diab noted that the above motion does not explicitly give the Chair editorial privileges. Mr. Grow noted that he would interpret the motion to allow for editorial changes.
- Mr. Grow asked if there was any objection to doing this by voice vote. None were given.
- There was no further discussion on the motion or objection to calling the question.

10G EPON SG – **Glen Kramer**
Please refer to
http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_10geponsg_close_report.pdf

Mr. Kramer gave an update on the SG that met this week. Mr. Kramer showed the PAR. Mr. Kramer asked if any further questions or explanations needed. None were given.

Mr. Grow pointed out that the amendment will apply to "the then current edition of 802.3". Mr. Grow asked if there were any objections to making that addition to the explanations section of the PAR. None were given.

Mr. Kramer also showed the 5 criteria and objectives slides.

MOTION #13

Move that 802.3 WG approve the 10 Gb/s PHY for EPON Study Group Objectives, as shown in 10gepon_objectives_0706.pdf.

M: G. Kramer
S: H. Frazier

Tech 75%

| Y:46 | N:0 | A:7 | MOTION PASSES | Date: 20-Jul-2006 5:13PM |

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Obara asked if the first objective means compatible with current MPCP. Mr. Kramer answered that the first objective is not related to MPCP.
- Mr. Kramer pointed out that there was no real reason to have an MPCP objective. Changing the encoding should not affect anything above the PHY.
- Mr. Obara also asked if OAM will be changed. Mr. Kramer answered that it is too early to comment on adding new variables to the MIB.
- Mr. Thompson asked if it was Mr. Kramer's expectation would be that the timing of the protocol would be changed. Mr. Kramer answered that the current MPCP is not aware of the underlying link speed.
- Mr. Ghiazi asked about symmetric vs. asymmetric, if an implementation could do both. Mr. Kramer responded that such an implementation should not be precluded but that this is too early to predict implementation. Mr. Grow commented that the objectives do not preclude or require dual implementations.
- Mr. Tolley commented that these were good objectives and were close to the original objective for EPON in EFM and that EPON was the most successful technology out of EFM.

MOTION #14

Move that 802.3 WG approve the 10 Gb/s PHY for EPON Study Group Broad Market Potential criterion, as shown in 10gepon_5criteria_0506.pdf.

M: G. Kramer
S: T. Mathey

Tech 75%

| Y:45 | N:1 | A:9 | MOTION PASSES | Date: 20-Jul-2006 5:17PM |

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Thompson spoke against the motion because he did not see an upgrade path from 1Gig to 10Gig but rather a replacement.
- There was no other discussion or objection to calling the question.

MOTION #15

Move that 802.3 WG approve the 10 Gb/s PHY for EPON Study Group Compatibility criterion, as shown in 10gepon_5criteria_0506.pdf.

M: G. Kramer
S: W. Diab

Tech 75%

| Y:47 | N:0 | A:4 | MOTION PASSES | Date: 20-Jul-2006 5:19PM |

Discussion on the above motion:
- There was no discussion or objection to calling the question.

MOTION #16
Move that 802.3 WG approve the 10 Gb/s PHY for EPON Study Group Distinct Identity criterion, as shown in 10gepon_5criteria_0506.pdf.

M: G. Kramer
S: T. Dineen

Tech 75%

Y:49   N:1   A:5   MOTION PASSES   Date: 20-Jul-2006 5:25PM

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Thompson noted that the last bullet on this criterion was confusing. Mr. Thompson spoke against the motion.
- Mr. Frazier noted that he couldn't recall a time when a document structure had to be displayed at this point of the process.
- Mr. Kramer noted that this is his personal opinion, not the opinion as chair, that the document structure would parallel that of EPON with a clause for optical parameters and a clause for the PHY.
- There was no other discussion or objection to calling the question.

MOTION #17
Move that 802.3 WG approve the 10 Gb/s PHY for EPON Study Group Technical Feasibility criterion, as shown in 10gepon_5criteria_0506.pdf.

M: G. Kramer
S: H. Frazier

Tech 75%

Y:52   N:1   A:6   MOTION PASSES   Date: 20-Jul-2006 5:27PM

Discussion on the above motion:
- There was no discussion on the motion or objection to calling the question.

MOTION #18
Move that 802.3 WG approve the 10 Gb/s PHY for EPON Study Group Economic Feasibility criterion, as shown in 10gepon_5criteria_0506.pdf.

M: G. Kramer
S: D. Remein

Tech 75%

Y:42   N:2   A:11   MOTION PASSES   Date: 20-Jul-2006 5:35PM

Discussion on the above motion:

- Mr. Dudek noted that the cost structure did not match that of the 1 Gig EPON. Mr. Dudek spoke against this motion
- Mr. Dudek said if cost per bit is the measure then he withdraws his comment
- Mr. Kramer noted that cost per bit is a vague measure
- Mr. Frazier noted that it is reasonable cost per performance. Mr. Frazier noted that 10G optics will be more costly than one Gigabit optics but it is the relative gain of performance and the cost trend over the life of the project that is important. Mr. Frazier spoke in favor of the motion.
- Mr. Dawe noted that some of the new materials required to build these PMDs are new and still not commercialized. However, Mr. Dawe noted that over time the performance gain and commercialization may help.
- Mr. Remein spoke in favor of the motion.
- There was no other discussion on the motion or objection to calling the question.

MOTION #19

Move that 802.3 WG approve the 10 Gb/s PHY for EPON Study Group PAR, as shown in 10gepon_PAR_0506.pdf, and forward the PAR to the 802 SEC and NesCom for approval.

Friendly amendment by Mr. Grow changed to:
Move that 802.3 WG approve the 10 Gb/s PHY for EPON Study Group PAR, as shown in 10gepon_PAR_0506.pdf, with appropriate modifications to indicate the current revision of 802.3, and forward the PAR to the 802 SEC and NesCom for approval.

M: G. Kramer
S: H. Frazier

Tech 75%

Y:45   N:1   A:9   MOTION PASSES   Date: 20-Jul-2006 5:38PM

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Grow asked for the above friendly amendment
- There was no other discussion on the motion or objection to calling the question.

Mr. Frazier commented that there was originally some controversy that in the end the Study Group voted unanimously and the group is now cohesive. Mr. Frazier congratulated the Study Group.

P802.3as – Frame Expansion (Continued) – Kevin Q Daines
Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_as_close_report.pdf

Mr. Daines showed more details on the disapprove comments.

MOTION #20
Request 802.3 WG approval to submit P802.3as to 802 EC for conditional approval to be placed on September RevCom agenda.

M: On behalf of the 802.3as TF

Tech 75%

Y:39   N:0   A:13   MOTION PASSES   Date: 20-Jul-2006 5:50PM

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Grow asked if all unsatisfied comments were re-circulated. Mr. Daines and Mr. Parsons confirmed they were.
- Mr. Frazier asked why the motion called for conditional approval if all comments were recirculated. Mr. Grow responded that there were substantive changes made to the draft.
- There was no other discussion on the motion or objection to calling the question.

MOTION #21
"Request 802.3 WG approve MEF liaison response (communication_MEF_0607.pdf). "

Modified by Motion #22 below to:

"Request 802.3 WG approve MEF liaison response (communication_MEF_0607.pdf) with appropriate modifications to indicate imminent changes in availability in the draft."

M: Kevin Daines on behalf of Task Force

Tech 75%

MOTION PASSES by voice vote without opposition   20-Jul-2006 6:00PM

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Thompson suggested adding text to the effect that it should be noted that IEEE-SA policy that drafts would no longer be available on our website at publication. Mr. Grow accepted that addition as an appropriate modification.
- Mr. Law clarified that the material may be accessed but not from our website.
- Mr. Grow asked if there was any objection to doing this by voice vote. None were given.
- There was no further discussion on the motion or objection to calling the question.

MOTION #22
To amend Motion 21 from:

"Request 802.3 WG approve MEF liaison response (communication_MEF_0607.pdf). "

Modified by Motion #22 below to:

> "Request 802.3 WG approve MEF liaison response (communication_MEF_0607.pdf) with appropriate modifications to indicate imminent changes in availability in the draft."
>
> M: J. Lynch
> S: T. Dineen
>
> Tech 75%
>
> MOTION PASSES by voice vote without opposition   20-Jul-2006 5:59PM

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Grow asked if there was any objection to doing this by voice vote. None were given.
- There was no further discussion on the motion or objection to calling the question.

HSSG CFI – John D'Ambrosia
Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_interim.pdf

> **MOTION #23**
> Move the IEEE 802.3 Working Group requests formation of a "Higher Speed Study Group" to evaluate definition of greater than 10 Gb/s MAC data rate and related PHY capability to IEEE Std 802.3. The Study Group may recommend one or more PARs..
>
> M: J. D'Ambrosia
> S: M. Bennett
>
> 50%
>
> Y:53   N:3   A:3   MOTION PASSES   Date: 20-Jul-2006 6:11PM

Discussion on the above motion:
- Mr. Muller asked if this was a procedural. Mr. Grow responded that it is not procedural but per the rules it requires only a 50% threshold.
- Mr. Thompson expressed disappointment with some of the CFI materials presented, however, he did receive better responses outside the presentation. Mr. Thompson hoped that the presentation material would be improved upon when the PAR(s) are presented.
- Mr. Grow noted that it is not his expectation that this will produce a PAR in November and that it is a significant amount of work. Mr. Grow also expected some sort of tutorial along with the PAR(s) when ready.
- There was no other discussion on the motion or objection to calling the question.

Mr. Grow noted that it is his intent to appoint Mr. D'Ambrosia as the chair of the study group. Mr. Grow noted that it is also his intent to ask the WGAC for a advice on the appointment and ask the study group for a vote of affirmation at their next meeting as required by 802.3 rules.

Future Meetings – Steve Carlson

Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/jul06/0706_interim.pdf

Mr. Carlson showed the updated fees for the proposed London interim in January of 2007. Mr. Law asked if the London fees include VAT and Mr. Carlson confirmed that they did.

WORKING GROUP POLL #1
Move the IEEE 802.3 Working Group accept the 802 hosting offer for hosting for January 2007 Interim in London.

M: S. Carlson
S: W. Diab

Proc 50%
(All in the room)

Y:0   N:51 A:13   POLL FAILS   Date: 20-Jul-2006 6:31PM

Discussion of the above motion:
- Mr. Booth pointed out that for some people the daily rate may already be high at $200
- Mr. Grow reminded the group that 802 is encouraging out of North American meetings and that this is an opportunity to do that. Mr. Grow asked if anyone would like for him to recuse himself from running the vote for making that statement. No one requested recusal.
- Mr. Frazier noted that he is in favor of meetings out of North America but that this was not a good deal.
- Mr. Trowbridge also noted that we have an opportunity to go to Geneva in May, which may also be costly.
- Mr. Dineen wanted to echo that this is not a good deal.
- Mr. Hawkins noted that it is our first opportunity in recent times to have a presence outside of North America for all of 802. Mr. Hawkins also encouraged those with alternate ideas to bring them forward to 802. Mr. Hawkins also noted that the cost model changes when we go outside of North America.
- Ms. Thaler also noted that not all WGs feel the same way about fees etc. and that EC members voted in reflection of their constituency.
- Mr. Frazier asked Mr. Hawkins if the impact of this would be positive or negative on the 802 treasury. Mr. Hawkins expected a loss on this but that would depend on how many people join.
- Mr. Grow asked Mr. Hawkins if 802.3 does not show up, what the impact would be. Mr. Hawkins expected that roughly 1000 people showing up would mean break-even. If 802.3 didn't show up that may be roughly 200 people less and that the losses would be more.
- Mr. Hawkins noted that the vote on the EC was unanimous.
- Mr. Obara offered Asia as a suggestion for outside of North America.

With no further discussion, the poll was taken with everyone in the room allowed to vote as both members and observers attend meetings.

WORKING GROUP POLL #2

Number of 802.3 members who would attend a May 2007 Interim hosted by ITU in Geneva. No meeting fee, hotel rooms $120 – $150.

Proc 50%
(All in the room)

Y:52   N:1   Date: 20-Jul-2006 6:35PM

Mr. Carlson also noted that they will continue engaging with people offering to host in Korea.

Mr. Frazier asked where the September 2006 interim will be held. Mr. Carlson replied that it will be September 18th hopefully in Montreal or Ottawa.

Mr. Frazier noted on behalf of Mr. Kramer that it would be nice to stagger HSSG and 10GEPON to avoid expertise overlap.

Please visit http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/interims/index.html for interim meeting details.

Please refer to http://www.ieee802.org/meeting/index.html for plenary meeting details.

MOTION #24

Motion to adjourn.

M: T. Dineen
S: J. D'Ambrosia
Procedural 50%

MOTION PASSES by voice vote without opposition Date: 20-Jul-2006 6:38 PM

Adjourned.