IEEE 802 LMSC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES FOR REVIEW -- Thursday, 12NOV98   Albequerque

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER
Mtg. called to order

7:30pm attendance PN, RL, PT, BL, VH, Bob Grow(treas. elect) , BR, GT, DC, RR, JMI, CB, JC
KM attending in place of H Frazier to take SEC mtg minutes
not attending: HF, DV, KA
guests: T. DeCourcelle (IEEE staff), K Dittmann (IEEE staff), S Diamond (IEEE SA BOG)
approx. 15 WG members

2. APPROVE OR MODIFY AGENDA
BL- add electronic ballot PAR request
GT- remove 5.6 802.5 virtual bridge networks from consent agenda
MOTION: PN/RL approve as modified 10-0-0

3. APPROVE / MODIFY MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING
MOTION: 3. PN/DC   approve 3/98, 7/98 minutes 9-0-2
JC- H Frazier will post the draft copy of November minutes on SEC reflector

4.   TREASURER'S REPORT and ATTENDANCE PROJECTIONS -Thaler
PN- attendace this mtg. approx. 350 (BR: about 375 now)
- over next 3 meetings could drop by 100
BR- any estimate of new attendance for new project areas (nwest, QoS)
JMI- about 20 persons at NWEST mtg without 802 badges
BR- about 40 people involved total
PT- [review of estim. stmt. of operations]
- 363 registrations (211 advance, 152 on-site)
- copying cost is decreasing, fewer documents are on paper
- $12k increase in operating reserve
- re unpaid attendees, should be sure that any new SG organizer tells the group that 802
registration is expected
- need to decide if registration fee should be decreased to $250; have calculated operating
reserve based on 75% preregistration, and assuming $10k capital eqpt 7/99
- looks OK to change to $250 fee in July
MOTION: 4. reduce advance registration to $250 in July '99 10-1-0
(please see motion foil attached)
RR- no vote since we should maintain in anticipation of lower attendance
PT- have included in calculation

5.1 DT Action Items From Last Meeting   -Carlo
JC- PN & HF will both work on email archive pointer
[review of other action items]
PN- who's maintaining 802.4 experts group
JC- take later on agenda [deferred]
- updated meeting services rules: will update with assistance of IEEE staff
- Mar/Jul action item done
- remind all that SG's need to be reaffirmed [each plenary]

JC- want to note that we're considering how to more easily hook up to projector

5.2 ME FCC Letter   -Hayes
Don Johnson (802.11) - WLAN interested in avoiding interference that could be caused by new
microwave lighting technology
-NPRM action on microwave lighting is completed, FCC OET is almost ready to make
recommendation to the commisioners
- OET is open to comments

- method for comment is letter to sec'y of FCC, with copy to commisioners, etc.
- 802.11 WG has unanimously agreed on this letter
JC- letter needs to be correct legal wording, [how to review]
VH- will have printed for signature & sent by courier to FCC
- had email from home RF, no interest since uwave lighting just in factories
DJ- Harris has done legal review
- at least some Bluetooth members are interested in this action
MOTION: 5.2 802 SEC submit letter to FCC on uwave lighting   VH/PN 9-0-0
ACTION: 5.2 VH/JC letter to FCC and copy to SEC

5.3 ME Standards Due 5-Year Review   -Carlo
JC- [review slide on process / 802.5, 1802.3, 1802.3d]
- [slide on 15802-2, 15802-4, 802.1Q]
- 802.10b,e,f   (all incorp. in .10Rev2)
- 802.6c,f,h,k
JMI- no commercial interest now, should be retired
- superseded mostly by Bellcore / ETSI specs/docs
Hal Keen- 802.6k is part of .1 MAC bridges, so no separate std.
BL- sent note to IEEE about .6k one month ago
MOTION: 5.3 JMI/DC .6c,f,h withdrawal 8-0-0
ACTION: 5.3 JC 20Nov. submit summary letter to RevCom Secy - 5yr project status

5.4 ME SC6 Items   -Carlson
DC- reviewed SC6 items for 802 action on Monday
- one was SC6 10925 Generic cabling; any US position?
JC- if document sent direct from SC25 to 802, can reply direct with copy to interested org's
GT - affects Cat. 7 connectors, no current projects using this type
DC- 10927 1000M &   10928 maint rev #5, 100BaseT; both on fast track, need to have any
needed inputs ready for next meeting of WG3 unless fast track process doesn't need input
- 10944 cancellation of projects; should 802 send anything to SC6 to back up withdrawal of .6 &
other PARs
JC- if default ballot to cancel, then no input, just relay 802 discussion if needed
DC- 10975 Berlin meeting date;
JC- SC6 tag took a position on meeting date, comment sent out, no 802 action needed
DC - 10976 SC6 program of work
- projects behind sched / SC6 agenda / review of SC6 POW
DC - if no motion here, will not take any 802 position on the other documents
JC- believe that that is true [no other 802 positions]
DC- if any one is planning to go, need to get on list of delegates

5.5 *ME 802.5rev3 PAR (Token Ring Consolidation and Maintenance) -Love
[approved via consent agenda]
ACTION: 5.5 RL 1Dec. submit PAR form to IEEE office, PAR to JC

5.6 *ME 802.5x PAR (Virtual Bridged Networks)   -Love
[removed from consent agenda per GT request]
RL- are there anything needed beyond what was in packet
GT- need transparencies in future
PT- when in folders?   RL- on Tuesday and Wednesday
GT- 802.3 WG had difficulty understanding this
- 802.1Q only applies to transparent bridges, not SR bridges
- since transp. bridges have only one path, no added function from SR via them
- if PAR is to extend .1Q to SR bridges, then PAR should be modified to say that
RL- PAR states "Extend 802.1Q to specify support for the source route bridging method"

Thomas Dineen- [VLAN support in .1Q nets]
Rosemary __- way to adapt this is carry SR info over VLAN part of path
RL- John Messenger of 802.5 due later, can discuss
JC, RL- postpone further discussion until later in agenda

resumed discussion:

Neal Jarvis (802.5)- haven't identified SR rules to fit VLANs, but know that existing rules for transport through a VLAN cloud in .1Q don't work with multiple entry points to VLAN
- need to modify for SR support if possible, if not possible then would [look at transp. bridging]
- problem would be solved if forwarding rules replaced by SR rules
- 'VLAN works over spanning tree..
JC- need to defer the technical discussion, clear that the groups need to work together
- can either: approve PAR or table until March '99 802 meeting
T Dineen- my questions only to understand it
JC- can include liaisons in PAR
NJarvis- have already had liaison to 802.1
[WG ballot vote to submit the PAR 11-0-0]
MOTION: 5.6 RL/DC   forward 802.5x PAR to NesCom   11-0-0
ACTION: 5.6 1Dec.   reword scope for 802.5x PAR, circ. to SEC, submit to NesCom
BL- support the comment that there's active liaison with .1
GT- agree, not against this project, just want it to be more clear
JC- OK to add wording on clarity of scope? RL- yes

5.7 *ME 802.5z PAR (Aggregation of Multiple Link Segments) -Love
[approved via consent agenda]
ACTION: 5.6 RL 1Dec. submit PAR form to IEEE office, PAR to JC

5.8 *ME 802.1r PAR (GPRP for 802.1D - Already on NesCom Agenda) -Lidinsky
[approved via consent agenda]

5.9 ME 802.3 Request for coordination with 1394   -Thompson
GT- seemed at Tuesday eve. that there are overlaps, coordination in sponsor ballot process needed
- would be to comment, but not vote on ballot
MOTION: 5.9 GT/PT   11-0-0
ACTION: 5.9 add coordination for 802 on 1394
JC- talked to presenter, also can check with Dave Gustafson (coord. for ___)
- blv this was not from 1394, but brought up by 802.3 members who felt coord. was needed
JC- note that any SA member can request to be on sponsor ballot pool (send request to stds office)
[back to 5.6]

5.10 ME Withdraw PARs for 802.9rev and 802.9b   -Carlo
JC- have motions to withdraw PARs and hibernate .9
MOTION: 5.10 GT/PN withdraw 802.9b

[rewording of process notes in motion] GT- don't accept amendment
JC- have rules change later in agenda
PT- [re close date of ballot extension]   - should request immediate close of ballot if motion passed
GT- accept amendment
PN- request to postpone PN/VH   [no objs to calling the question]
vote on postpone 7-2-1 (postpone until after agenda item 5.19 / 5.26)

5.11 ME Submit 802.14 for Sponsor Ballot   -Russell
RR- had a good meeting, WG voted for 802.14 to go to sponsor ballot (WG vote 37-0-0)
- 28-10-5 vote resolved to 38-0-5; favorable review from NIST
MOTION: 5.11 RR/JMI 802.14 to sponsor ballot   10-0-0
ACTION: 5.11 RR 1Dec. initiate sponsor ballot process for 802.14, to close by Mar'99 plenary

5.12 ME Modify title for 802.14 PAR   -Russell
RR- had some revisions to PAR since last update '96:   CATV -> bband cable,
also acknowledge DOCSIS std , also WG chair address
PT - should have full title as on PAR   BL- IEEE needs exact title
KDittmann- don't need to have ISO title type, since going through ITU
MOTION: 5.12 RR/JMI 802.14 PAR corrections   10-0-0
ACTION: 5.12 JC   15Nov submit PAR rev. to NesCom for 802.14
DC- any intention to submit to ISO? JC- no
DC- and 802.9 docs to ISO? JC- no

5.13 ME Conditional Approval: 802.0 for LMSC Sponsor Ballot -Lidinsky
BL- overview & architecture finally done, WG vote was 18-0-1
MOTION: 5.13 BL/PN 802.0 O&A to sponsor ballot   9-0-0
GT- what was WG ballot result?   BL- don't have number
JC- email WG ballot result to SEC after meeting

5.14 ME Conditional Approval: 802.3ab for LMSC Sponsor Ballot & RevCom -Thompson
GT- 802.3ab passed WG ballot (results avail later)
- comment resolution in Sept.,   recirculation closed Nov
 (92-12-16-27 draft 4.0 WG ballot result)
GT- need short notice to interim meeting date; Dec. 7,8
- wanted shorter meeting notice rather than shorter ballot period
- was No vote from HFrazier at initial WG ballot (no existence proof, wanted operation over w.c.
cabling) - this comment was carried forward but rejected by the WG 42-0-2
- expect that demonstration of the technology to be done part-way through sponsor ballot
PT- would have no votes in sponsor ballot if no demo by end of sponsor ballot
- WG vote for meeting notice was 42-1-2, vote to forward to sponsor ballot 44-0-2
MOTION: 5.14 GT/PT   fwd 802.3ab to sponsor ballot/ RevCom 9-0-0

GT- interim meeting Dec. 7,8 host Level One, Sacremento, cancel by Dec. 1st if not needed
- comment resol. mtg (along with link aggreg.) Jan 19-22 S. Florida (host: Level One)

5.15 ME Resolution of 802.8 Sponsor Ballot   -Benson
CB- want to review ballot results
- 70 in ballot group, 54 return (77%) 43-4-7 (passed)   neg votes: JC, GT, PT, HFrazier
- HF vote resolved
- had meeting to resolve No's, one change proposed was not to pursue Rec. Practice
but instead publish on WWW;   JC not in favor
JC- vote has passed 91%, so not correct to pull it off rec prac. track to resolve the negatives
- maybe could do as a guide and then recirculate; so asked that CB cover difference between RP
and Guide
CB- Rec. Pract. is procedures/etc. preferred by IEEE,   Guide is alternatives that are suggested
PT- not a negative connotation to this, just that it's another method (e.g. w.c. budget or statistical
in cable plant analysis)
DC- what were the negative comments
GT- feel that world has changed, now TIA and ISO are doing comprehensive cabling documents,
they are active technical arenas where this work is done & maintained
PT- that's accurate, also the document mostly relates the options but making few
recommendations
JC- felt it was light compared to what's needed for full standard
JMI- after SEC approved it for sponsor ballot, have several members voting No on sponsor ballot
PT- voted against forwarding, had liaison comments at that time

GT- when 75% approval is acheived, IEEE req's for consensus are met, and resolution of negative comments [should not delay further processing too much]

JC- HFrazier had comments to scope, etc. of PAR; what was resolution

CB- HF comment said that .8 RP doesn't cover 802.3z

- this is since LED based mmode systems were anticipated

- have added LED note to scope of PAR, this now matches what's in RecPract. itself

- no title change

- this scope change was proposed (in place of TAG voted change from Rec. Prac. to Guide) late today, so don't have TAG vote

GT- TAG had already voted on document that matches the revised PAR scope

MOTION: 5.15a CB/JMI add LED to scope of PAR   9-0-2
call the question: DC
S Diamond: if scope of project changed, then have to reballot   PT- have had PAR changes in
past   GT- this scope is from the draft RP, so sponsor ballot already approves this scope
- PAR change would be submitted ahead of Rec. Prac. to RevCom
DC- believe 91% approve says that it's OK already
CB- HF comment was that PAR scope not matching document would be a problem at RevCom
PT- [agree]
RL- any impact if scope is changed?   PT - impact at RevCom if scope isn't changed
JMI- PAR scope as proposed would just match Rec. Prac.
GT- PAR not sent with sponsor ballot
GT- call question [no objection]
[5.15a voted: 9-0-2]
PT- make sure that the RP is not mistaken as applying for Gbit Ethernet

MOTION: 5.15b PN/GT change 802.8 to Guide   3-6-2
BR- changing it in this way is out of line for SEC, should not go against WG
JMI, BL- agree [that it's not appropriate to change to Guide]
ACTION: 5.15   JC 15Nov.   submit PAR revision to NesCom
ACTION: 5.15b CB sponsor ballot resolution and recirculation ballot

5.16 ME   not used   -

5.17 MI Short Meeting Notice Authorization   -Thompson
[already covered in item 5.14]

5.18 MI Sponsor Ballot Conduction by IEEE 802 rather than IEEE Staff -Lidinsky
[keep on table or withdraw motion]
ACTION: 5.18 HF 8Mar resume tabled motion(BL author) on ballot conduction by 802

5.19 MI Rules change motions   -Nikolich
MOTION: 5.19 PN/CB
MOTION: 5.19a reject hibernation rule 8-2-1   (no further consideration, fewer than 4 not
rejecting)
BR- rule is to vote to continue consideration of the rule
JC- PN to check if a different motion is needed
MOTION: 5.19b accept add'n of 5crit to PAR procedure   10-1-0
RR- was 5 criteria wording changed? PN - yes
RL- question on procedure; says that rule should be presented in meeting
MOTION: 5.19c accept CD-ROM distribution rule   9-0-0
MOTION: 5.19d accept withdrawn PAR rule 8-0-1
ACTION: PN 1Dec. complete rules change process, announcement

5.B   BREAK   -

JC- RL has commented that rules should be presented, and that 2/3 of all SEC voting members
should approve; need full participation
-need to redo the vote, either at end of agenda or Friday morning
MOTION: move to reconsider rules change motions   [motion not seconded, not needed]
PN- [review slides of rules change}

JC- original vote invalid, so need to revote
MOTION: 5.19b accept add'n of 5crit to PAR procedure   12-0-0 (passes)
MOTION: 5.19c accept CD-ROM distribution 12-0-0 (passes)

MOTION: 5.19d accept withdrawn PAR rule 12-0-0 (passes)

MOTION: 5.19e PN/BL continue further study on auto-hibernation rule   4-8-0 (not more than 1/3, no further consideration)
BL- 802.1 has had strong conviction that there must be an auto-hibernation rule

motion on 802.9b PAR withdrawal re-opened:
MOTION: 5.10 GT/PN   withdraw 802.9b par   10-0-1
MOTION: 5.10b CB/VH   withdraw 802.9rev PAR   11-0-0
ACTION: 5.10 letters for withdrawal of 802.9b, 802.9rev
ACTION: 5.10 DV 1Dec. post draft on Web per 802 oper rules

5.20 MI Electronic Votes within a WG   -Hayes
VH- [reading of proposed rule for email ballots, incl. 15d min. time]
MOTION: 5.20 VH/RL   start proposed rule vote in SEC - email ballots   10-0-2 (OK for LB)
(at least 5 votes for further study,   at least 10 votes to go to LB)
PT- need at least 50% response requirement, ex. in SEC need 50% voting affirmatively
VH- [accept as amdmt to motion]
ACTION: 5.20 PN 1Dec. get email ballot rules chg to mailing and SEC ballot

5.21 MI Treasurer Appointment   -Carlo
MOTION: 5.21   affirm appointment of Bob Grow as Treasurer   10-1-0
[GT not approving due to loss of 802.3 secretary]
ACTION: 5.21 JC notify IEEE/CS of Bob Grow -Treas. appointment

5.22 MI Study Group Charter - QOS/FC   -Amer
KA- [review status slides]
- in SG, had motion to request extension of SG until March '99: 20-0-3 vote
MOTION: 5.22 JMI/CB extend QoS/FC SG to 3/99
BL- 802.1 discussed at length this week, .1 members attended SG
- 802.1 concerns: SG reference to QoS harms 802 stds / 802 stds meet QoS needs / better as TAG than WG / backpressure FC not benefit to TCP flows / SG not yet accepted input from other 802 groups / SG members need to get up to speed on current 802, IETF work / little content in proposals so far / not ready for PAR
- 802.1 views: 50%: abolish SG   35%: limit to FC in MAC   5% keep __: don't know
- 802.1 motion requesting FC-only SG (WG vote 19-0-0)
JMI- BL raised considerations, concur that FC and QoS are not the same thing; maybe right way to handle QoS is leave with 802.1p, had presentation on video, not same as data flows
- in FC, some thought TCP/IP does fine, if realtime flows not considered, then TCP/IP work TBD
RR- given that many participated, where would SG members go if 802.1 proposal to stop work is followed
DC- note that 802.2 LLC has annex on FC in bridged environments, not sure how appropriate to do FC in MAC sublayer
GT- procedural question; BL has possible motion   JC- not a motion
BR- more than 19 interested parties in SG list, shouldn't tell them not to work on something
KAmer- to answer 802.1 concerns:
- re current stds OK for QoS: had presentation re video requirements, also simulation how differentiating classes of svc reduces delays; have ongoing work
- re backpressure FC: open issue in SG, looking into this (including effect with TCP)
- re not accepted input from other 802 grps: have encouraged input, have invited presentations; don't understand this point
- re interaction with IETF; have several members working on it, and in action plan
request input from anyone with concerns, and welcome input from others

- re amount of content: feel that have had presentations, etc.
Colin Mick- agree that this is a thorny problem, have seen that there's different understanding of the terms,
Thomas Dineen- disagree that SG is deleterious to 802; it's 802's future; 802 doesn't address QoS
- backpressure problem not demonstrated
- have accepted input from other groups; am from 802.3
- am familiar with 802.1 stds, member of IETF reflector
- have had good proposals, disagree about no content comment
- agree not ready for PAR, not asking for it now
Rosemary ____- like to see sim's using 802.1p
BL- don't assume all attendees of SG support the work
- 802.1p does provide differentiated service, does address delay issue
- Andrew ___ from .1 attended interim, felt that input was not followed up on
BR- from personal pt of view, 802 support for QoS is not true, in own experience at Boeing existing network does not support voice & video well
RR- why not in 802.1 rather than in ECSG
KA- appreciate specific suggestions
- did follow up Andrew's ISLL leads
RL- against moving SG to 802.1 at this time, maybe after PAR
BL- wasn't clear about SG going into 802.1 or 802.3
PT- rules say that a WG or the SEC can charter a SG, SEC can affirm a WGSG, but SEC can not push a SG into a WG
BR- SG needs encouragement and championship to grow, 802.1 is antagonistic to the work
GT- 802 is stds organization; goal of SG is a long term simulation study - needs to be towards end of simulation before PAR, should be in another place until then
MOTION: 5.22 vote on motion to extend SG
BL- suggest friendly amdt   JC- finished debate, would like to take vote
MOTION: 5.22 GT/VH move to table 3-6-1
BL- 802.1 would like SG to go forward if QoS is removed from title and scope of SG work
JMI- amendment out of order
JC- consider in
DC- call question [no objections]
MOTION: 5.22 vote on motion to extend QoS / FC SG 7-0-3 (study group extended to 3/99)
ACTION: 5.22 JC recharter study groups until 3/99 meeting

5.23 MI Study Group Charter -WPAN Extension   -Hayes
Bob Heile (WPAN SG) - [reviewed status slides]
- approved WG LB on PAR for WPAN
MOTION: 5.23 VH/CB extend WPAN WGSG to 3/99 meeting 9-0-1
PN- should this be a separate WG from 802.11?   BHeile - don't think so, it does tie to 802.11 MAC & PHY
JC- note that the PAR can be in or out of 802.11

5.24 MI Study Group Charter - Broadband Wireless Access -Marks
Roger Marks- this would be a unique project for 802
- have experience with IEEE stds (uwave theory & techniques)
- [review proposed scope]
- [org's & companies supporting this project / participants]
- [market & spectrum info / timeline for PAR]
- other countries plan to coordinate spectrum to take advantage of future lowcost eqpt from US, but need standards to develop market
PN- don't understand including coexistence up front
RMarks- need this to set some of the system framework, system comes before tech. details

PT-

JC- feel having the two items [LMDS system and coexistence] is good because it alerts interested parties

MOTION: 5.24a VH/JMI   charter ECSG for BB wireless access 10-0-0

MOTION: 5.24b VH/JMI   appt. Rogers Marks as chair for SG   9-1-0

JC- does NIST support RM for this?   RM- yes, primary job for year is stds

GT- feel shouldn't have government

5.25 MI Study Group Charter - Enhanced Source Routing Operation -Love

RL- motion for new WGSG; approved in WG 12-0-0

MOTION: 5.25 RL/CB affirm WGSG for enh. SR operation   10-0-0

- chair will be Christian Thryso/e

5.26 MI Hibernate IEEE 802.9 Project   -Carlo

JC- DV requested hibernation motion to be made

MOTION: 5.26 BL/DC approve request to hibernate 802.9   10-0-0

- reflector and list of experts will be set up

ACTION: 5.26 DV 1Dec.   initiate hibernation process per rules

5.27 MI Conditional Approval: 802.11rev to RevCom   -Hayes
VH-
MOTION: 5.27 VH/DC cond. approval .11rev to RevCom   10-0-0
JC- amend to add " LMSC sponsor ballot recirc" DC- OK

5.28 MI   not used   -

5.29 DT Tutorials Survey   -Carlo
JC - defer for email (want evaluation of this week's tutorials)

5.30 DT IEEE 802 Operational Guidelines   -Nikolich
PN- plan to publish on WWW after SEC review
[no objections]
ACTION: 5.30 PN   SEC review of guidelines, upload to Web site

5.31 DT IEEE 802 Internationalization of Standards   -Carlo
JC- have memo for SEC review, drafted with Tony Jeffree
- want to get comments on this
BL- don't see issue of relevance of JTC1 to 802 standardization
ACTION: 5.31 JC 25Nov initiate 802 int'lization value survey (SEC then general mailing)

5.32 DT   not used   -

5.33 II HomePhone Network Aliance Liaison Letter   -Thompson
GT- as result of tutorial, WG decided to send liaison letter to express interest in the work, but also
to communicate concern that the BER would be too high for the CSMA/CD MAC error recovery;
adhoc group in 802.3 to formulate letter
JC- request to see letter; also note that JC sends letter to each presenter
ACTION: 5.33 GT initiate letter to HomePhone consort., JC to review

5.34 II 10/100 Shortwave fiber in TIA F0-2.2 Liaison letter -Thompson
GT- had pres. on TIA stds. process (no broad mkt potential required, small group of members
can start it, but goes to general ballot in TIA)
- part of 802.3 objection was in conduct of meeting
JC- suggest letter thanking presenter, keep communication open

5.35 II Guidelines for use of LCDs/Printers at Interim Meetings -Rigsbee
BR- [review shipping/storage/insurance points]
ACTION: 5.35 BR, JC conduct email review, possible ballot of BR draft LCD proj guidelines

5.36 II Disposition of depreciated assets   -Rigsbee
MOTION: 5.36 BR/CB loan LJ4 to CCI   11-0-0
ACTION: 5.36 KM ship LJ4 to CCI

5.37 II Future meeting venues   -Rigsbee
BR- have hundreds of choices for future meeting sites
ACTION: 5.37 BR email & get SEC response re future meeting sites

5.38 II Request for electronic ballot for PAR   - Lidinsky
BL- will be requesting email ballot on an 802.1 PAR
JC- suggest pre-submittal to NesCom, then vote in March meeting
ACTION: 5.38 BL- presubmit PAR to Nescom

adjourned 12:00am