

Unconfirmed Minutes
IEEE 802.3 CSMA/CD PLENARY
Austin, TX
March 8-11, 1999

MONDAY, 8 MARCH

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Mr. Geoff Thompson, Chair 802.3 CSMA/CD, opened the Working Group plenary at 1545, by welcoming meeting attendees and introducing Mr. David Law, Vice-Chair 802.3 and Mr. Robert Grow, Secretary 802.3 who recorded these minutes. He also observed how this will be a very busy meeting.

Mr. Thompson explained attendance rules, the email reflectors maintained by the committee, and described information available on the web site. The Working Group web pages contain a wealth of information about 802.3. This includes the 802.3 Operating Rules, descriptions of how to subscribe to the various email reflectors, meeting minutes and an archive of presentations to the Working Group and its Task Forces. The 802.3 home page is: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/index.html>.

The meeting agenda was distributed, and the meeting attendees were asked to introduce themselves. Mr. Thompson reviewed the voting members of the Working Group ([Attachment A2](#)) and the requirements to qualify for voting membership. He presented the voters in peril ([Attachment A3](#)), list of voters with bad contact information ([Attachment A4](#)), and the potential voter list. The following individuals asked to become voting members of 802.3 (indicated by * on [Attachment A5](#)): Arai, Ken-ichi; Bottorff, Paul; Hassoun, Marwan; Kaplan, Hadriel; Larsen, Loren; Nachman, Yaron; Schell, David; Sendelbach, Lee; Shen, Steven; Wang, Peter; and Young, Leonard.

The attendance lists were explained and circulated, the meeting attendance is [Attachment A6](#). All attendees were told of the obligation to register for the meeting and pay the \$300 meeting fee. Mr. Grow presented the Deadbeat List that includes a number of 802.3 attendees that have failed to pay the meeting fee in the past. A discounted rate of \$275 was available for this meeting, and a discounted rate of \$250 dollars will available for those pre-registering for the July meeting in Montreal. A list of future meetings and registration instructions are available through the IEEE 802 web site home page, <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802>.

Document Distribution

Since the November Albuquerque meeting, 802.3ab draft 5.0 was subject to Sponsor Ballot and two recirculation Sponsor Ballots on drafts 5.1 and 5.2. 802.3ad draft 1.0 was the subject of a Task Force ballot prior to this meeting and the document was available to 802.3 on the web site. Minutes are now published on the web site only. The IEEE had not yet mailed IEEE Std. 802.3, 1998 to those left on the distribution list; hopefully, this will be completed soon. The procedure for exchange of the IEEE standards CD-ROM (exchange available because of a corrupted file on the CD) was

explained. Individuals will also be able to exchange at the July meeting (bring your old CD-ROM to the July meeting in Montreal if you want to exchange).

Agenda (Monday-Tuesday)

MOTION:

Approve the agenda ([Attachment A1](#)).

M: Dineen, S: Quackenbush. Motion passed by acclamation.

November Minutes Approval

The minutes of the November meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico with attachments were posted to the web site prior to this meeting. Mr. Grow emailed to the 802.3 reflector a reminder to review the minutes prior to the meeting.

MOTION:

Approve the minutes of the November 1998 Albuquerque, New Mexico meeting.

M: Szostak, S: Dineen. Motion passed by acclamation.

Standards Board Report

Mr. Geoff Thompson attended the Standards Board meeting. There were no 802.3 items on the agenda. He indicated the successful publication of 802.3ac and presented plaques to Mr. Crayford and Mr. Siefert, the Task Force chair, and editor respectively.

State of Standards and Operating Rules of 802.3

Mr. David Law, Vice Chair of 802.3, reviewed IEEE Project 802.3 Working Group Standards Status ([Attachment A7](#)). Reaffirmation of 1802.3 requires 802.3 action. The ISO version of 802.3, 1998 is at ballot, and no formal response has been received. He also showed a copy of the matrix showing which clauses are changed by subsequent supplements ([Attachment A8](#)). This matrix represents the current publication status of the full 802.3 standard IEEE 802.3, 1998 (the consolidated edition) and 802.3ac, 1998. Current versions of these summaries are available on the 802.3 web site.

Mr. Law then reviewed a proposed 802.3 rule change ([Attachment A9](#)) on a 30 day notice requirement for Calls for Interest. It clarifies that the notice is to go to the Working Group chair, and that the purpose is to allow sufficient time for inclusion on the meeting agenda.

There are a number of PARs for consideration this week. They will be reviewed on Thursday.

The QOS/FC study group met in January. While there was significant interest in keeping the research going, they are not near to the point where a PAR would be appropriate. The interim meeting and email polls favored discontinuation of the study group. A meeting will be held on Tuesday to discuss the work and the future of the study group, which will be decided on Thursday night by the Exec.

An interesting proposal for making IEEE a Class 1 liaison to JTC-1 was discussed. This liaison relationship would both simplify the internationalization process and reduce the burden on those representing IEEE 802 at international meetings.

A rules change for using electronic processes for Working Group business has been under consideration. The current proposed changes include a reduction of the ballot time for electronic votes, and provision for approval of Working Group motions through an electronic vote.

The request for making the Sponsor Ballot Pool application available electronically has not been fulfilled by the IEEE staff. Mr. Grow and Mr. Law will get a scanned version of the form on the 802.3 web site.

The first tutorial, *The IETF: Standards and Non-Standards*, was held between the 802 and 802.3 opening plenaries. Mr. Thompson announced the tutorials occurring Monday and Tuesday night. Those hoping to be project chairs and editors, those that care about the ease of submitting comments, and those that participate in Sponsor Ballots for multiple WGs are strongly encouraged to attend the Monday tutorial, *Electronic Balloting The Do's & Don'ts*. Tuesday's tutorials are on *Bluetooth Architecture Overview*, and *HomeRF: Wireless Access Protocols Report*.

External Liaison Report – FO2.2

The TIA short wavelength 100 Mb/s PHY work has some problems to resolve. Their current document includes a significant amount of IEEE copyrighted material, and TIA has removed the document from their web site until copyright issues are resolved.

External Liaison Report — SC25/WG3

Mr. Thompson reported on one of the interesting items at the meeting. Work on higher quality connectors has suffered from their incompatibility with the RJ-45 connector. Two manufacturers proposed connectors that are backward compatible with RJ-45 connectors, something that engendered considerable interest.

Call for Patents

Mr. Thompson reviewed the IEEE patent policy. The IEEE requests release letters from holders of patents that may apply to standards in development. These letters state the patent holder's willingness to comply with the IEEE patent policy. 802.3 also solicits information on patents that have been filed but not yet issued, since it is easier to get release letters while company representatives are active in the working group ([Attachment A10](#)). The current patent policy as well as an example response letter can be found in the IEEE Standards Companion, or on the web at <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/patent.html>. No patent letters were presented, nor was there any expression from those attending of intent to submit a letter, in response to his request.

Internal Liaison Reports

There were no liaison reports from the other 802 Working Groups.

Other Business

Task Force and Ad-Hoc meetings of the week were scheduled. The 802.3ab Task Force will continue to work on comment responses for its Sponsor Ballot recirculation. The 802.3ad Task Force will continue to work on comment responses for its Task Force

Ballot. Ad-Hoc meetings will be scheduled for 10 Gigabit Ethernet and DTE Power via MDI.

The meeting was adjourned at 1725.

TUESDAY, 9 MARCH

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Mr. Geoff Thompson re-convened the 802.3 plenary at 0830. The attendance lists were circulated. To maximize time available for Task Force meetings, the voter, voters in peril and potential voter lists were briefly presented, as were the requirements for becoming a voter. Voters with bad contact information were warned to correct the information. The potential voter list was not reviewed, but will be before voting on Thursday. He briefly reviewed the Working Group web site.

Maintenance/Reaffirmation/Interpretation Requests

There are some maintenance requests in process, but not ready for committee action. Mr. Law has the action item to prepare maintenance items. The forms for submitting a maintenance request were presented and as with most committee items more information is available on the 802.3 web site. There are no new requests to process.

The 1802.3 standard is up for reaffirmation. We will need to conduct a Sponsor Ballot for that document. Mr. Law has the action item to prepare for the reaffirmation ballot.

The 802.3 email archive is at <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/reflectarcs.html>, username 802.3 and password *****.

No interpretation requests have been submitted for work this meeting.

1000BASE-T (802.3ab)

Mr. George Eisler, Chair 802.3ab, reported on the progress of the Task Force. The group held an interim meeting in January in North Miami Beach Florida. The 802.3ab draft has been the subject of Sponsor Ballot and recirculations. The last recirculation met response rate and approval rate requirements, but did produce six negative comments, four of which were on the issue of proof of technical feasibility.

The work of the Task Force is largely complete, though they will meet tomorrow to finalize their work on comments and finalize a new draft. The Working Group will need to approve the comment responses, and determine if 802.3ab will remain on the RevCom agenda for later in this month, or if it should be removed from the agenda.

Mr. Thompson reviewed in detail the RevCom process. RevCom is a subcommittee of the IEEE Standards Board, the group that approves all IEEE standards. RevCom reviews proposed standards and makes recommendations to the Standards Board. The submittal package to RevCom includes the draft standard, PAR and ballot results. RevCom reviews the package to see if procedures have been followed. To get on the RevCom agenda a package must be submitted 45 days in advance. In November 802.3 authorized a submittal to allow consideration at the March RevCom (next week) meeting.

We do not need to have all of the balloting done to submit a draft to RevCom, and we took advantage of this. The RevCom requirement is that when the recirculation closes, there be no new negatives and no technical changes to the draft. The comments from the 802.3ab recirculation are largely editorial; but we have outstanding negative comments, plus one new negative comment on resistance to ringing voltage.

We can leave 802.3ab on the RevCom agenda with a rejection of the new negative comment with the rationale for rejection, but in Mr. Thompson's opinion the chances of getting through RevCom would be slim. If the submittal is rejected, the next opportunity for approval is in June.

The two original comments on proof of technical feasibility have no remedy other than delaying the submission, this is not a problem with the draft. The two new comments propose approval of the standard for trial use. This complicates the status of the submission. RevCom would have to decide if the proposed remedy makes the two recirculation comments "new" comments.

If all comments are withdrawn, RevCom does not see any issue and the submission would likely be approved by RevCom.

Mr. Mick pointed out that the only technical change since July and one that doesn't affect implementations of Task Force participants has been to the common mode tests. It has not yet known if accepting the resistance to ring voltage comment would affect current implementations.

LINK AGGREGATION TASK FORCE (802.3ad)

Mr. Steve Haddock, Chair 802.3ad, reported on the progress of the Task Force. The group held an interim meeting in January in North Miami Beach Florida. The work of the Task Force is ahead of schedule, and therefore, it was decided at the meeting to conduct a Task Force ballot on 802.3ad/D1.0. While not a formal ballot, it does allow for written comment submission to improve the quality of the draft. That ballot closed prior to the meeting and the Task Force met on Monday to begin addressing comments from the TF ballot. It is possible that the Task Force will recommend a Working Group ballot at the end of this week, but that will require successful completion of a significant volume of work.

Almost 400 comments were received with about half technical or technical required. 162 comments were on Clause 30 management and editorial. A few subsections drew many redundant comments. The biggest single technical change is the possibility of merging two state machines.

CALLS FOR INTEREST

DTE Power via MDI

Mr. David Law presented on the product needs and benefits of power distribution via the MDI to DTEs ([Attachment G1](#)). It would be used for devices like web cams, ethernet phones, and wireless LAN access points. The scope of work would include how

much power, which pairs of wire to use, interoperability with 10, 100 and 1000 b/s, how this would affect other standards using RJ-45 connectors, and how power distribution would affect noise immunity. An ad-hoc meeting will be held on Wednesday.

10 Gigabit Ethernet

Mr. Johnathan Thatcher presented on the market need and industry activities for higher speed versions of ethernet ([Attachment H1](#)). The existence of parallel OC-192 links indicate that technology is ready for the speed, but to explain the advantages and if now is the right time to initiate a project really requires having a set of objectives, something that this Working Group is best able to define. A project would be expected to be primarily a PHY effort. Some small MAC changes could make the MAC pascal code insensitive to speed changes for full-duplex operation.

Mr. Thatcher also presented a potential schedule if a study group were initiated in response to the call for interest, what the objective of the study group would be, and goals for the ad-hoc meetings to be held this week.

MOTION:

It is moved that 802.3 adopt the “Order of the Day (with rules of engagement)” as the modus operandi for this week’s presentations and discussion for “10 Gigabit Ethernet”.

All attendees were allowed to vote on the motion, and by voice vote, it was approved without objection.

Mr. Thatcher outlined the agenda for the meeting. In asking for interest on the subject, most of the hands in the room were raised. Presenters were asked to provide 250 copies of presentations.

Breakout meeting schedule

The schedule for Task Force and ad-hoc meetings was established and rooms assigned. Meetings were scheduled for 802.3ab, 802.3ad, DTE power over the MDI Ad-Hoc, 10 Gb/s Ad-Hoc, and 802.3 Rules.

802.3 was recessed at 1035.

THURSDAY, 11 MARCH

ADMINISTRATIVE MATERS

Mr. Geoff Thompson, Chair 802.3, opened the Working Group closing plenary at 0830 and welcomed those attending the meeting. The attendance lists were circulated.

MOTION:

Approve the agenda. ([Attachment A11](#))

The agenda was accepted and approved without objection.

The potential voter, voters in peril, voters with contact problems lists were posted during the week, again presented, and the following individuals asked to become voting members of 802.3 (indicated by > on [Attachment A5](#)): Bridgers, Vince; Kato, Toyoyuki;

and Kimmitt, Myles. Museley, Simon; was added to the potential voters list and he requested to become a voter. Attendees were reminded that only voting members were allowed to vote on motions.

Working Group Positions on Executive Matters:

The Working Group was not able to review the PARS proposed for Executive Committee approval. Mr. Thompson indicated his intention to abstain because of this. Considerable sentiment was expressed that Mr. Thompson should vote. A straw poll was held on the organizational location for the WPAN PAR: within 802.11, 2; as a new WG, 10, chair's prerogative 32, abstain, 28. There was also expression of support from WG members for the BWA PAR.

On the recommendation of our liaison, it was suggested Mr. Thompson support the PARS and given the opportunity, no one objected.

An 802 rules change was also briefly discussed. Mr. Thompson express his reservation that there was no time limit on the electronic motion portion of the change, and that he intended to oppose the change unless a time limit is added. There was no opposition to Mr. Thompson using his own judgment on how to vote the issue.

Book Distribution

New voting members (added at this meeting) will be able to pick up CD-ROMs.

External Liaison – SC25/WG3

Mr Tad Szostak presented an issue on the types of cable construction allowed by ISO/IEC 11801. The recommendation is that both tight and loose buffer construction be allowed by altering the attenuation specification. Mr. Szostak requested approval for the chair to submit a letter in support of the recommendation. Mr. Thompson asked for any objection to this action, there was none.

External Liaison – SC6

Mr. Thompson indicated his intent to oppose a recommendation to move portions of our standard into an Annex. There was no opposition. The response letter is attached as [Attachment B1](#).

External Liaison – Home PNA

Mr. Thompson presented the Home PNA response ([Attachment B3](#)) to our letter ([Attachment B2](#)) on confusion that could be created in their work being associated with 802.3 standards. They will make efforts to eliminate any claim or implication of compliance to 802.3 in their documents. Their intention is to only refer to Home Ethernet.

External Liaison – TIA FO-2.2

Mr. Thompson and Mr. Stozstak reported on the recommendation to add another bandwidth class for 62.5 micron multimode fiber [Attachment B4](#). The position of TIA is to not add that additional classification as expressed in [Attachment B5](#).

External Liaison – TIA TR42

Mr. Chris Diminico gave an update on some restructuring within TIA TR42 ([Attachment B6](#)). Some of these changes change where work related to our standards. There are issues with patch cords and return loss is important. These issues affect 1000BASE-X. Time was limited, so WG members are requested to review his presentation.

Operating Rules

Mr. Law again reviewed the proposed rules change on calls for interest ([Attachment A9](#)). Mr. Thompson requested a minor change from “35 days in advance” to “at least 35 days in advance” which was acceptable to the group.

TECHNICAL MOTION:

That 802.3 approves the proposed Rules revision as presented without a 30 day WG letter ballot.

M: Mr. W. Quackenbush, S: Mr. R. Siefert
Y: 59 N: 0 A: 1 Approved.

Executive Committee

Mr. Thompson displayed the proposed SEC motion to change the relationship of IEEE 802 to ISO ([Attachment A12](#)). He indicated his intent to support the motion, and no one wanted to discuss the matter or expressed opposition to his position.

LINK AGGREGATION (802.3ad)

Mr. Stephen Haddock reported on the 802.3ad Task Force meeting held Monday through Wednesday ([Attachment F](#)). The Task Force ballot on the draft produced 387 comments. Management was the subject of the bulk of comments, most editorial and many redundant. The Task Force approved the response to technical and major editorial comments and authorized production of Draft 1.1. Mr. Haddock also explained the major changes to the document. There are no known unresolved technical issues.

The Task Force is on schedule, and it has been some time since addition of the last feature. The interim meeting schedule will be established later in this meeting.

1000BASE-T (802.3ab)

Mr. George Eisler presented the report on the 802.3ab Task Force meeting held Tuesday and Wednesday ([Attachment E](#)). The recently completed recirculation Sponsor Ballot met response rate and approval thresholds. The detail statistics on the ballot are included in his presentation. The task force believes 802.3ab will be ready for consideration at the June RevCom meeting.

The four disapprove ballots related to demonstration of technical feasibility through working hardware were the subject of considerable discussion. A detailed response to this issue was generated and approved unanimously by the Task Force. He also presented a representation by eight companies of their confidence in the draft.

Mr. Colin Mick presented the original comments included in the comment database on this subject. Both during and after the presentation of comments there was considerable discussion of the associated issues. These issues include:

- the lack of market success of 802.3 options where standardization preceded implementation (10BASE-FP, 100BASE-T2);
- the expression by motion adopted by 802.3 in November that existence proofs were expected within the Sponsor Ballot period being unfulfilled;
- the ballot comments were generated by the desire to test implementations to see if the standard meets its objectives or has technical flaws;
- DSP techniques are proven and implemented in other standards;
- is requiring demonstration of technical feasibility changing the rules during the project development process;
- would or should existence proofs of technical feasibility become a precedence for future projects;
- if proposed actions were in accordance with 802 and Standards Board rules;
- should the Working Group continue to attempt to accelerate the standardization process through conditional approval?

TECHNICAL MOTION:

Move that the 802.3 WG accepts and approves the comment resolution from 802.3ab drafts 5.0 and 5.1; and that that 802.3 direct the WG chair to forward 802.3ab Draft 6.0 to the 802 Executive Committee for submission to REVCOM for consideration at the June 1999 meeting, under the 802 contingent approval policy.

M: Mr. C. Mick, S: Mr. T. Dineen
Y: 37 N: 13 A: 12 Failed.

The committee entered into procedural discussion as well as discussion on the motion. Mr. Thompson asked for a straw poll if the Working Group felt sufficiently informed to consider the motion before completing the review of technical comments (40 for considering the motion, 13 to further review the comments).

Discussion on the motion then centered on the contingent approval portion of the above motion. Multiple people expressed the point that contingent approval should not be granted.

MOTION TO AMEND:

Delete “contingent” and replace with “normal”; strike “for consideration at the June 1999 meeting”.

M: Mr. H. Frazier, S: Mr. R. Seifert
Y: 12 N: 37 A: 17 Failed.

The chair indicated that “normal” means that 802.3 would review the results of a ballot then move to forward to RevCom. This would increase the probability of being able to test implementations prior to submission to RevCom. It was pointed out that this

would not be accomplished because the subject of the recirculation ballot would be changes to the draft.

A motion to call the question on the above motion to amend passed Y: 40, N: 6, A: 8. The motion to amend failed as recorded above.

There was no objection to calling the question. Mr. Thompson explained that Draft 6.0 is not available; but he would submit it to the Executive Committee for email ballot hopefully in time to make the May 7 deadline. The motion narrowly failed as recorded above.

TECHNICAL MOTION:

Move that the 802.3 WG accepts and approves the comment resolution from 802.3ab Drafts 5.0 and 5.1.

M: Mr. W. Wery, S: Mr. C. Mick
Y: 38 N: 8 A: 5 Approved.

Without objection, the question on the motion was called.

Another proposed motion was ruled out of order as being substantively the same as the earlier motion that failed.

TECHNICAL MOTION:

Move that 802.3 WG direct the WG chair to forward 802.3ab Draft 6.0 to the Executive Committee for submission to RevCom for consideration at the June 1999 meeting under the 802 contingent approval policy and if prototypes are available.

M: Mr. J. Jover, S: Mr. B. Booth
Tabled without objection.

It was pointed out that the motion was technically flawed in that it places no criteria on what a prototype is, its functionality, and who judges availability. Without objection, a motion to table passed.

MOTION:

802.3 maintain precedent, and not establish a new requirement that technology be demonstrated prior to submission of drafts to RevCom.

M: Mr. W. Wery, S: Mr. C. Mick

The motion was ruled out of order as being off the agenda.

A motion to remove Mr. Jover's motion from the table was made by Mr. Jover, seconded by Mr. Dineen and passed Y: 21, N: 16, A: 6. A friendly amendment was accepted to make the motion read as follows:

TECHNICAL MOTION:

Move that 802.3 WG direct the WG chair to forward 802.3ab Draft 6.0 to the Executive Committee for submission to RevCom for consideration at the June 1999 meeting under the 802 contingent approval policy and no unresolved negative ballots.

M: Mr. W. Wery, S: Mr. C. Mick
Y: 14 N: 11 A: 18 Failed.

In discussion, the point was raised that the original negative comments offered no remedy that could be implemented in the draft. After being questioned on this, Mr. Thompson ruled that the two original comments (Mr. Frazier and Ms. Thaler) were out of order in that they provided no remedy that could be implemented by changes in the draft. Mr. Siefert's recirculation comment was ruled in order in that it proposed a specific remedy changing the draft and therefore was sufficiently different to require an additional recirculation.

A motion to call the question failed Y: 6, N: 12.

Discussion continued, mostly focused on requiring demonstration as a precedent for approval of a standard, how this was not a requirement at the beginning of the process, has not be a requirement in the past and is a bad requirement for the future.

Without objection the question was called, and the motion failed as recorded above.

A similar motion was offered, changing the additional requirement to the technology being demonstrated publicly. Discussion was allowed to help the chair determine if the motion was out of order as being substantially the same as previous motions rejected by the WG. The chair ruled the motion out of order, and comments were made in support of the chairs ruling.

Mr. Eisler presented the request of the Task Force to hold a contingent meeting based on need as determined by the editor on April 13, in Irvine, CA or possibly by teleconference. A second interim if necessary in San Jose, CA or teleconference on April 27. Status of meetings will be announced on the Task Force email reflector.

DTE POWER VIA THE MDI (Ad Hoc on Call for Interest)

Mr. Law reported on the meeting held to further discuss the call for interest ([Attachment G2](#)). The scope of the work is something quite different than recent projects done within the Working Group. The meeting produced a recommendation to hold another ad hoc meeting in July. Mr. Thompson expressed his very strong concern that this is not a good practice because it does not have the controls placed on a study group. Mr. Thompson stated that he will exercise all his influence to kill study groups that are not moving toward a PAR. As a one time exception, he will grant the request to meet on an ad hoc basis to allow for further education of the interested parties.

10 GIGABIT ETHERNET

Mr. Johnathan Thatcher presented on the ad hoc meeting held this week to discuss the call for interest on 10 Gigabit Ethernet ([Attachment H2](#)) including brief summaries of the presentations available in full on the 802.3 web site archive. The expectation is that a project would support a broad market potential with many possible applications, even within metropolitan and regional networks. The group agreed that operation would only be defined for full-duplex. Presentations supported that multiple PHY technologies could be applied, and that multiple semiconductor technologies exist for implementing PHYs at these speeds. The group also generated a list of issues to be addressed.

TECHNICAL MOTION:

In response to the 10 Gigabit Ethernet Call for Interest, that 802.3 approve the creation of a Higher Speed Study Group and authorize an interim meeting.

M: Mr. J. Thatcher, S: Mr. P. Wong
Y: 45 N: 0 A: 3 Approved.

The motion was called without objection, and was approved. A tentative meeting date has been established, but hotel arrangements must still be finalized. The meeting will be announced on the 802.3 reflector. A reflector for the Higher Speed Study Group will be established and announced on the 802.3 reflector, with subscription instructions also posted to the 802.3 web site.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Future Meetings

None of the interim meetings is finalized. The final dates and hotel information will be announced over the 802.3 reflector and the appropriate Task Force or Study Group reflector, and posted on the web site. Tentative dates and locations are:

1000BASE-T (802.3ab)	Irvine, CA	13 April (contingent)
	San Jose, CA	27 April (contingent)
Link Aggregation (802.3ad)	Boulder, CO	3-4 June (tentative)
Higher Speed Study Group (HSSG)	Boulder, CO	1-3 June (tentative)
802.3 Working Group Plenary	Montreal, PQ	5-8 July
	Kuail, HI	8-11 November

Action Items

Grow/Law	Place Sponsor Balloting Pool form on web site
Law	Process maintenance requests
Law	Prepare for 1802.3 reaffirmation ballot
Szostak/Thompson	Prepare a letter by April 20 in support of ISO/IEC change
Benson	Send a letter to FO2.2 requesting an update on their work
Thompson	Request two tutorial slots at the July meeting for HSSG
Task Force Chairs	Finalize and announce interim meeting arrangements
Thatcher	Establish HSSG reflector

Mr. Thompson thanked all for their participation and without objection the meeting adjourned at 1450.

Respectfully submitted 12 March 1999

Robert Grow

IEEE 802.3 Secretary

bob@xlnt.com

ATTACHMENTS:

- [A1 Monday/Tuesday 802.3 Agenda](#)
- [A2 802.3 Voting Member List](#)
- [A3 802.3 Voters in Peril](#)
- [A4 802.3 Voters With Bad Contact Information](#)
- [A5 802.3 Potential Voter List](#)
- [A6 March 1998 Attendance List](#)
- [A7 802.3 Standards Status](#)
- [A8 8802.3 Clause Change Matrix](#)
- [A9 Proposed rule change—electronic notice and document distribution](#)
- [A10 Call for patents and example response letter](#)
- [A11 Thursday 802.3 Agenda](#)
- [A12 SEC Motion on 802 relationship to ISO](#)

- [B1 802.3 letter to SC6](#)
- [B2 802.3 letter to Home PNA](#)
- [B3 Home PNA response letter](#)
- [B4 Recommendations for an additional bandwidth class for 62.5 fiber \(Stozstak\)](#)
- [B5 TIA position on additional bandwidth class for 62.5 fiber](#)
- [B6 TIA TR42 liaison report \(Diminico\)](#)

- C No maintenance or interpretation requests at this meeting
- D No PAR detail was presented at this meeting, the PARs discussed for action by the Executive Committee should be available on the respective WG web sites.

- [E Thursday 802.3ab Task Force report \(Eisler/Mick\)](#)
- [F Thursday 802.3ad Task Force report \(Haddock\)](#)

- [G1 DTE Power via MDI Call for Interest \(Law\)](#)
- [G2 Thursday Report on DTE Power via MDI Ad Hoc \(Law\)](#)

- [H1 10 Gig Ethernet Call for Interest \(Thatcher\)](#)
- [H2 Thursday Report on 10 Gig Ethernet Ad Hoc \(Thatcher\)](#)