

From ???@??? Tue Mar 02 12:28:27 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Tue Mar 2 20:25:31 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Tue Mar 2 14:22:35 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id OAA02035 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Tue, 2 Mar 1999 14:22:35 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id PAA19016; Tue, 2 Mar 1999 15:07:51 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <005801be64e7\$cf731000\$7070fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Date: Tue, 2 Mar 1999 12:03:42 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Hi everybody,

In the Interim meeting last January in Florida some motions were passed, as you may have seen in the published minutes. Since the attendance was limited, I'd like to conduct a poll by e-mail to get a more complete picture of the opinions of all participants in the study group. I'm required to report these opinions (as well as the motions that were passed) to the Exec committee in their Monday morning meeting next week. Based on that input, the committee will vote on to proceed with the study group.

Please .... PLEASE ... cast your vote to the following question:

"Should the QoS/FC Study Group continue its work to develop a PAR for a standard to specify QoS and Flow Control support mechanisms for Layer 2 LAN/MAN Access Devices that will permit uniform Layer 3 Services across LAN/MAN connected networks."

Please respond by either: Yes, No, Abstain.

Feel free to add comments after your vote, if you'd like to.

Thanks.

Khaled Amer  
Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

From ???@??? Tue Mar 02 14:02:07 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Tue Mar 2 21:59:06 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Tue Mar 2 15:53:33 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id PAA10999 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Tue, 2 Mar 1999 15:53:33 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id QAA03384; Tue, 2 Mar 1999 16:39:39 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <007501be64f4\$9fc77780\$7070fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "Howard Frazier" <hfrazier@cisco.com>,  
"802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Cc: <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Date: Tue, 2 Mar 1999 13:35:40 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Thanks, Howard for the input.

To clarify:

- It is a straw poll.
- I'm posting it on the reflector in case the same question is on anyone's mind.
- Right now, all participants on the reflector are welcome to cast their vote on this.

The intent is to inform the exec committee of what the participants and observers of the study group feel about it.

Khaled Amer  
Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

-----Original Message-----

From: Howard Frazier <hfrazier@cisco.com>  
To: khaledamer@usa.net <khaledamer@usa.net>  
Cc: 802exec@hepnrc.hepnrc.net <802exec@hepnrc.hepnrc.net>  
Date: Tuesday, March 02, 1999 12:58 PM  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!

>  
>Khaled,  
>  
>I would like you to restate the QoS/FC Study Group voting rules before  
>you open this ballot. Are all participants on the email reflector  
>eligible to cast ballots? Are there any qualifications or requirements  
>that need to be met in order to acquire voting rights?  
>  
>Is this a straw poll? Is it a motion? If it is a motion, what  
>percentage of Yea votes is required for approval? If it is a motion,  
>it needs a second, and the chair is not normally permitted to be the  
>mover, so it really needs a mover and a seconder.  
>  
>If it is a straw poll, then you don't need to tally the abstentions,  
>but you may conduct a straw poll however you wish, provided you tell the  
>SEC how you ran the poll.  
>  
>Howard Frazier  
>  
>

From ???@??? Tue Mar 02 18:36:38 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 02:33:17 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Tue Mar 2 20:23:06 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id UAA30180 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Tue, 2 Mar 1999 20:23:06 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id VAA18162; Tue, 2 Mar 1999 21:16:52 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <3168F6EDD4A4D1118BAA00805FE6CB6C0129F5CD@xch-blv-07.ca.boeing.com>  
From: "Rigsbee, Everett O" <Everett.Rigsbee@PSS.Boeing.com>  
To: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
"Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Date: Tue, 2 Mar 1999 18:12:00 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2407.0)  
Content-Type: text/plain  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Khaled, I vote in favor of continuing the study group. I do not think  
the small group which cast their votes at the interim meeting in Miami

represented the majority interests of the total study group. Interim meetings are notorious for producing skewed distributions. I, for one, would like to hear from all of the membership on this vital issue.

Thanx, Buzz

Everett O. (Buzz) Rigsbee  
Boeing Information Services  
PO Box 24346, M/S: 7M-FM  
Seattle, WA 98124-0346  
ph: (425) 865-2443, fx: (425) 865-6721  
email: everett.o.rigsbee@boeing.com

From ???@??? Tue Mar 02 19:46:17 1999

Received: by multi14.netcomi.com for ckm

(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 03:42:51 1999)

X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Tue Mar 2 21:35:23 1999

Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by multi14.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id VAA01504 for

<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Tue, 2 Mar 1999 21:35:23 -0600

Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)

id WAA24488; Tue, 2 Mar 1999 22:21:04 -0500 (EST)

X-Sender: seifert@netcom4.netcom.com

Message-Id: <v04003a01b30257e89eb6@[207.92.174.169]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Tue, 2 Mar 1999 19:17:11 -0800

To: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>

From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>

Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!

Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org

Precedence: bulk

X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>

X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc

X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org

X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

At 12:03 PM -0800 3/2/99, Khaled Amer (AmerNet) wrote:

>

>Please .... PLEASE ... cast your vote to the following question:

>

>"Should the QoS/FC Study Group continue its work to develop a PAR for a  
>standard to specify QoS and Flow Control support mechanisms for Layer 2  
>LAN/MAN Access Devices that will permit uniform Layer 3 Services across  
>LAN/MAN connected networks."

>

Given that the Task Force has already passed the following motion:

"The EC Study group directs its chair to recommend to the 802 executive committee, on Monday morning of the next 802 plenary meeting, that the study group be disbanded.",

I believe that your request for another vote is out of order. Are you suggesting that, as chair, you do NOT intend to follow the explicit direction of the Task Force? If so, I recommend that you resign from the chair and appoint a successor, which would free you to pursue any other avenue of interest (including those in opposition to the will of the Task Force).

The Task Force has directed its chair to recommend disbanding--there was no motion or other action taken to authorize another vote, another meeting, or any additional work items.

I strongly recommend that we disband the group, since there is clearly no quorum interested in pursuing the non-issues involved.

As a matter of secondary concern, your question asks whether people are interested in QoS/FC to "permit uniform Layer 3 Services across LAN/MAN connected networks". I, for one have no idea what you are talking about. More important, such issues were never brought up in the Task Force.

I do agree with the earlier comment that it would be completely appropriate for the interested parties to go off-line, develop the issues and solution alternatives more fully, and then come back to IEEE 802 with a new request for a Study Group to pursue a more well-defined standard.

--

Rich Seifert  
seifert@netcom.com  
(408) 395-5700  
(408) 395-1966 FAX  
Networks and Communications Consulting  
21885 Bear Creek Way  
Los Gatos, CA 95033  
"... specialists in Local Area Networks and Data Communications systems"

From ???@??? Tue Mar 02 23:07:14 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 07:05:15 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 01:05:06 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id BAA12299 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 01:05:06 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id CAA16656; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 02:01:03 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <004801be6543\$c91d2fe0\$14fe2499@p2>  
From: "Nader Vijeh" <naderv@email.msn.com>  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>,  
"802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Date: Tue, 2 Mar 1999 23:02:20 -0800  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3155.0  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3155.0  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Please accept this a YES vote.

I also don't believe votes taken in an interim meeting can automatically disband a study group.

Regards,

Nader Vijeh

From ???@??? Tue Mar 02 23:47:14 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 07:45:10 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 01:39:49 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id BAA15729 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 01:39:49 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id CAA19821; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 02:38:18 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <36DCE51D.E7E2AFBA@etc-escalate.net>  
Date: Tue, 02 Mar 1999 23:30:37 -0800  
From: Ken Brinkerhoff <kbrinkerhoff@etc-escalate.net>  
Organization: Escalate Networks, Inc.  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win95; I)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
CC: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
References: <005801be64e7\$cf731000\$7070fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Yes. The study group should continue.

It was unfortunate that those who felt it should continue, such as myself, were not present at the interim meeting or perhaps were too shy to speak up.

Ken B

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 01:37:14 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 09:35:02 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 03:26:30 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id DAA20457 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 03:26:30 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)

id EAA05296; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 04:21:56 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <36DCFF26.46DD0C7B@tiuk.ti.com>  
Date: Wed, 03 Mar 1999 09:21:42 +0000  
From: Keith Balmer <keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>  
Organization: Texas Instruments Ltd  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.02 [en] (X11; I; SunOS 5.5 sun4m)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
CC: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
References: <005801be64e7\$cf731000\$7070fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Khaled Amer (AmerNet) wrote:

>The intent is to inform the exec committee of what the participants and  
>observers of the study group feel about it.

Khaled, the EC Study Group motion that passed in Miami Beach requires  
you to recommend to the Executive Committee that the study group be disbanded.  
To do otherwise would be to suggest that the Interim motion "doesn't count".

If through your straw poll you establish a desire for the work to continue  
then it can, but not as the EC Study Group. Interested participants  
may meet "off-line", continue research and development of ideas, and return  
to 802 (or whatever then seems the appropriate body to standardize the  
solutions) with a really solid proposal with supporting data.

Continuing the work outside the Study Group frees it from all constraints  
other than those self-imposed by the participants. This should be welcomed  
as a means to allow R&D to continue freely without the strain of having to  
repeatedly persuade sceptical voters of the value of the work.

Regards, Keith

From ???@??? Tue Mar 02 16:04:00 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 00:00:49 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Tue Mar 2 17:57:54 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id RAA20757 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Tue, 2 Mar 1999 17:57:54 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id SAA01881; Tue, 2 Mar 1999 18:50:39 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <36DD1360.5A7C77DB@TSAnet.com>  
Date: Wed, 03 Mar 1999 06:48:01 -0400  
From: Jim Mollenauer <jmollenauer@tsanet.com>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win95; I)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
CC: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
References: <005801be64e7\$cf731000\$7070fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

In response to your straw poll:

Yes, I would like to see the work continue.

However, I do have concerns about the structure in which it is done. A study group seems to be regarded as a group tasked to check out the Five Criteria, rather than study the problem and its potential solutions. To continue the group in the same format would seem to leave it vulnerable to further directed actions such as we have just seen. Somehow, the issue needs to be studied offline, and then with evidence in hand, those who favor dealing with the problem on an IEEE 802 level will be in a stronger position than they are now.

Jim Mollenauer

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 06:27:14 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 14:24:40 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 08:20:42 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id IAA02274 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 08:20:42 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id JAA11109; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 09:17:54 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <8E37550684B3D211A20B0090271EC59DCE55D3@tr-exchange-1.tr.unisys.com>  
From: "Chang, Edward S" <Edward.Chang@unisys.com>  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>, 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 09:15:48 -0500  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="ISO-8859-1"  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org



X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Dear Khaled:

Yes, I will recommend the QoS/FC study to continue. It is a vital issue to add one more significant characteristics to the GbE to gain even wider support from all users including ATM community.

I also appreciate those who sacrificed their own personal time and contributed so much to the QoS/FC progress.

Regards,

Edward S. Chang  
Unisys Corporation  
Edward.Chang@Unisys.com

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 06:37:14 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 14:34:40 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 08:26:11 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id IAA02723 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 08:26:11 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id JAA11871; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 09:22:05 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <36DD45CA.F4786262@atanetwork.net>  
Date: Wed, 03 Mar 1999 09:23:07 -0500  
From: drvaman <drvaman@atanetwork.net>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.03 [en]C-DIAL (WinNT; U)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
CC: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
References: <005801be64e7\$cf731000\$7070fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Dear Khaled:

I support continuation of the QoS study group. The issues on QoS is very important.

Thanks

Vaman

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 07:17:14 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 15:14:35 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 09:06:10 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id JAA08637 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 09:06:10 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id KAA18254; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 10:03:29 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <008701be6586\$71200720\$323ffea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Cc: "Howard Frazier" <hfrazier@cisco.com>,  
"Mick Seaman" <Mick\_Seaman@3com.com>,  
"Rich Seifert" <Seifert@netcom.com>, <keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>  
Subject: Fw: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 06:59:29 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

FYI ..... I guess this note from Howard takes care of the concerns that were raised by Keith, Rich and Mick.

Of course, as I mentioned explicitly in the previously posted note requesting the vote, I will (and have to) report the motions to the exec committee. Per the request of so many participants, I'm also working on providing any other input that they may need to make their decision. The fate of the study group is determined based on their decision.

Regards,  
Khaled Amer  
Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

-----Original Message-----

From: Howard Frazier <hfrazier@cisco.com>  
To: Mick\_Seaman@3com.com <Mick\_Seaman@3com.com>; tony@jeffree.co.uk  
<tony@jeffree.co.uk>  
Cc: khaledamer@usa.net <khaledamer@usa.net>; hfrazier@cisco.com  
<hfrazier@cisco.com>; 802exec@hepnrc.hep.net <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>

Date: Tuesday, March 02, 1999 4:03 PM  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!

>  
>Actually, I think that any one can request a straw poll on any subject,  
>at any time, and it is up to the chair to decide whether a straw poll  
>is in order, and how the poll should be conducted. Khaled doesn't need  
>a special mandate to exercise his authority as chair of the Study  
>Group.  
>  
>However, I absolutely agree that a motion passed at a duly constituted  
>meeting carries far more weight than a straw poll, and cannot be  
>overturned by a straw poll under any circumstances, let alone the  
>circumstances under which this poll is being conducted.  
>  
>So as far as I can see, Khaled is acting within his authority in  
>calling for this poll. He is duty bound to faithfully report the  
>results from the interim meeting to the SEC, and to carry out the  
>directed position called for in the motion, but he can embellish his  
>report with additional information as he sees fit. It will be up to  
>the SEC to discern the difference between a valid motion, and a straw  
>poll result, and to note the clear and unambiguous actions called for  
>by the motion.  
>  
>Howard  
>  
>  
>----- Begin Included Message -----  
>  
>From tony@jeffree.co.uk Tue Mar 2 15:31:10 1999  
>X-SMAP-Received-From: outside  
>X-Sender: tony-jeffree@mail.u-net.com  
>Date: Tue, 02 Mar 1999 23:28:23 +0000  
>To: Mick\_Seaman@3com.com  
>From: Tony Jeffree <tony@jeffree.co.uk>  
>Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
>Cc: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>, hfrazier@cisco.com,  
> 802exec@hepncr.hep.net  
>Mime-Version: 1.0  
>  
>Excellent question Mick - and one that I believe needs answering before  
>Khaled's straw poll is conducted.  
>  
>Khaled refers to the purpose of the straw poll being to communicate to the  
>exec "...what the participants and observers of the study group feel about  
>it." The participants in the study group made a very clear statement about  
>that during the January meeting; they directed Khaled to communicate to the  
>exec their recommendation that the study group be disbanded. As Mick  
>points out, that decision was made at a properly constituted study group  
>meeting that was open to all interested parties.  
>  
>I would also point out that Khaled has no mandate from the study group to  
>carry out such a straw poll - and indeed, any reasonable interpretation of  
>the outcome of the January meeting would leave him in no doubt that he  
>would not have been given such a mandate had he requested it.  
>

>I would therefore be very concerned indeed if the poll that Khaled proposes  
>to undertake results in that decision being subverted by the views of  
>people who are so concerned about this area of work that they were not able  
>to take the time to show up at the meeting.

>

>

>Regards,

>Tony

>

>At 14:35 02/03/99 -0800, Mick\_Seaman@3com.com wrote:

>>

>>

>>Khaled, your reference to "some motions" below is a little disingenuous.

>>

>>The following is an extract from the minutes of the study group interim  
>meeting:

>>"

>>The EC QOS/FC Study Group passed the following procedural motion (Y:14,  
>>N:5, A:3): "The EC Study group directs its chair to recommend to the 802  
>>executive committee, on Monday morning of the next 802 plenary meeting,  
>>that the study group be disbanded."

>>"

>>

>>Do I take it that is your intent to conduct a straw poll, and on the basis  
of

>

>>that poll to decide personally whether or not you will follow a directed  
>motion

>>passed at properly constituted study group meeting ?

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>"Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net> on 03/02/99 01:35:40 PM

>>

>>Please respond to "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>

>>

>>To: "Howard Frazier" <hfrazier@cisco.com>, "802-qos-fc reflector"

>> <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>

>>cc: 802exec@hepnrc.hep.net (Mick Seaman/HQ/3Com)

>>Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>Thanks, Howard for the input.

>>

>>To clarify:

>>- It is a straw poll.

>>- I'm posting it on the reflector in case the same question is on anyone's  
>>mind.

>>- Right now, all participants on the reflector are welcome to cast their  
>>vote on this.

>>  
>>The intent is to inform the exec committee of what the participants and  
>>observers of the study group feel about it.  
>>  
>>Khaled Amer  
>>Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>-----Original Message-----  
>>From: Howard Frazier <hfrazier@cisco.com>  
>>To: khaledamer@usa.net <khaledamer@usa.net>  
>>Cc: 802exec@hepnrc.hep.net <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
>>Date: Tuesday, March 02, 1999 12:58 PM  
>>Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
>>  
>>  
>>>  
>>>Khaled,  
>>>  
>>>I would like you to restate the QoS/FC Study Group voting rules before  
>>>you open this ballot. Are all participants on the email reflector  
>>>eligible to cast ballots? Are there any qualifications or requirements  
>>>that need to be met in order to acquire voting rights?  
>>>  
>>>Is this a straw poll? Is it a motion? If it is a motion, what  
>>>percentage of Yea votes is required for approval? If it is a motion,  
>>>it needs a second, and the chair is not normally permitted to be the  
>>>mover, so it really needs a mover and a seconder.  
>>>  
>>>If it is a straw poll, then you don't need to tally the abstentions,  
>>>but you may conduct a straw poll however you wish, provided you tell the  
>>>SEC how you ran the poll.  
>>>  
>>>Howard Frazier  
>>>

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 07:37:18 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 15:34:39 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 09:32:36 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id JAA14531 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 09:32:36 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id KAA21509; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 10:25:01 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <37E04260A7BBD211AF0F0090272A82711C9E@odin.adc.level1.com>  
From: "Booth, Brad" <bbooth@Level1.com>  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>,  
802-qos-fc reflector  
<stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 09:18:06 -0600  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

Content-Type: text/plain  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

NO!

Although I feel that the work will possibly have some relevance, I don't think that 802 needs to perform a "make-work" project. The QoS/FC study group voted to disband the group at the last Interim Meeting in Miami Beach. Although the chair of the QoS/FC may feel that this subject is important to address, the participating members of the study group did not feel that the work should continue within 802. I think that QoS/FC should return when a PAR has been formulated (outside of 802), and there is higher level of interest in participation.

Brad Booth

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 07:57:16 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 15:54:37 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 09:45:31 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id JAA15652 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 09:45:31 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id KAA23925; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 10:41:46 -0500 (EST)  
X-Sender: seifert@netcom4.netcom.com  
Message-Id: <v04003a06b3030563244d@[209.109.233.39]>  
In-Reply-To:  
<3168F6EDD4A4D1118BAA00805FE6CB6C0129F5CD@xch-blv-07.ca.boeing.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 07:30:08 -0800  
To: "Rigsbee, Everett O" <Everett.Rigsbee@PSS.Boeing.com>  
From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Cc: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

>I do not think  
>the small group which cast their votes at the interim meeting in Miami  
>represented the majority interests of the total study group. Interim  
>meetings are notorious for producing skewed distributions. I, for one,  
>would like to hear from all of the membership on this vital issue.

Actually, I believe that in the case of this Study Group, the Interim

Meeting is a better venue than a Plenary. The time at the interim was dedicated to this particular activity--there was no contention with other meetings. At a plenary, most of those interested in attending the study group have conflicts with other meetings, in particular 802.1 and 802.3. I suspect that the "skew" would be worse during a Plenary session.

--

Rich Seifert  
seifert@netcom.com  
(408) 395-5700  
(408) 395-1966 FAX  
"... specialists in Local Area Networks and Data Communications systems"

Networks and Communications Consulting  
21885 Bear Creek Way  
Los Gatos, CA 95033

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 10:39:19 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 18:36:26 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 12:28:52 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id MAA31602 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 12:28:52 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id NAA16917; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 13:06:14 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <D565CD2ED548D211A4DA00A0C9975C69047749EA@xboi02.boi.hp.com>  
From: "THALER,PAT (HP-Roseville,ex1)" <pat\_thaler@am.exch.hp.com>  
To: "Rigsbee, Everett O" <Everett.Rigsbee@PSS.Boeing.com>,  
802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
'Khaled Amer (AmerNet)'" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 11:06:05 -0700  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Buzz,

I disagree strongly. The 802 interims I have participated in have almost always produced results which the working group accepted. If that didn't happen and the working group regularly overturned "skewed" results from interims, then it would not be worth having them. It would also be a sign of an unhealthy process.

Khaled,

The study group should be disbanded. 5 active participants willing to continue the work is not enough to tackle this subject. "Limited attendance" at the interim to me says that this subject is not engaging enough interest to continue and not a reason to try to take a different vote.

Pat Thaler

-----Original Message-----

From: Rigsbee, Everett O [mailto:Everett.Rigsbee@PSS.Boeing.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 1999 6:12 PM  
To: 802-qos-fc reflector; 'Khaled Amer (AmerNet)'  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!

Khaled, I vote in favor of continuing the study group. I do not think the small group which cast their votes at the interim meeting in Miami represented the majority interests of the total study group. Interim meetings are notorious for producing skewed distributions. I, for one, would like to hear from all of the membership on this vital issue.

Thanx, Buzz

Everett O. (Buzz) Rigsbee  
Boeing Information Services  
PO Box 24346, M/S: 7M-FM  
Seattle, WA 98124-0346  
ph: (425) 865-2443, fx: (425) 865-6721  
email: everett.o.rigsbee@boeing.com

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 13:36:38 1999

Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm

(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 21:33:38 1999)

X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 15:29:02 1999

Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by

multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id PAA17136 for

<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 15:29:02 -0600

Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)

id QAA18690; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 16:23:35 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <3168F6EDD4A4D1118BAA00805FE6CB6C0129F5D3@xch-blv-07.ca.boeing.com>

From: "Rigsbee, Everett O" <Everett.Rigsbee@PSS.Boeing.com>

To: "'Rich Seifert'" <seifert@netcom.com>

Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
"802 Exec"

<802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>

Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!

Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 13:18:33 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2407.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org

Precedence: bulk

X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>

X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc

X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org

X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Gee, Rich, I can think of an excellent way to test out your proposition: Let's revote the motion at the plenary when all of the true "participants" are likely to be in attendance. My understanding is that the purpose of the 1-day Study Group interim was to obtain some offered "helpful input" from 802.1, so many of the interested parties such, as myself, who had conflicts, felt it was



unnecessary to attend. Attendance at 802 interim meetings has always been an optional matter, and varies radically from one group to another. But there were several folks there for interim 802.1 and 802.3 meetings, who have no interest in the Study Group but who took advantage of the low Study Group turnout and open Study Group voting rules to "hijack" the meeting and run through this motion. If those folks think they are fooling anybody with these type of tactics and in preaching about the "sanctity of the directed vote," they have another think coming. What happened at the meeting was a s!

!  
!

ham, pure and simple! It's now up to the SEC to decide to do about it, and I'm sure they will.

Thanx, Buzz

Dr. Everett O. (Buzz) Rigsbee  
Boeing Information Services  
PO Box 24346, MS: 7M-FM  
Seattle, WA 98124-0346  
(425) 865-2443, FX: (425) 865-6721  
everett.o.rigsbee@boeing.com

From: Rich Seifert [SMTP:seifert@netcom.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, March 03, 1999 7:30 AM  
To: Rigsbee, Everett O  
Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!

>I do not think  
>the small group which cast their votes at the interim meeting in

Miami

>represented the majority interests of the total study group.

Interim

>meetings are notorious for producing skewed distributions. I, for

one,

>would like to hear from all of the membership on this vital issue.

Actually, I believe that in the case of this Study Group, the Interim Meeting is a better venue than a Plenary. The time at the interim was dedicated to this particular activity-there was no contention with other meetings. At a plenary, most of those interested in attending the study group have conflicts with other meetings, in particular 802.1 and 802.3. I suspect that the "skew" would be worse during a Plenary session.

Rich Seifert Networks and Communications Consulting  
seifert@netcom.com <mailto:seifert@netcom.com> 21885 Bear Creek

Way

(408) 395-5700 Los Gatos, CA 95033  
(408) 395-1966 FAX

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 15:46:10 1999

Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm

(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Wed Mar 3 23:43:01 1999)

X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 17:41:58 1999

Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by

multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id RAA28680 for

<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 17:41:58 -0600

Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)

id SAA15866; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 18:35:48 -0500 (EST)

X-Sender: tony-jeffree@mail.u-net.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0

Date: Wed, 03 Mar 1999 23:33:26 +0000

To: "Rigsbee, Everett O" <Everett.Rigsbee@PSS.Boeing.com>

From: Tony Jeffree <tony@jeffree.co.uk>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Cc: "'Rich Seifert'" <seifert@netcom.com>,  
802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
"'802 Exec'" <802exec@hepncr.hep.net>  
In-Reply-To: <3168F6EDD4A4D1118BAA00805FE6CB6C0129F5D3@xch-blv-07.ca.boeing.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Message-Id: <E10IL8P-00057U-00@serv1.isl.u-net.net>  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

So, Buzz, if I read you right, your own absence from the meeting qualifies you to:

- Make judgements as to the motives and interests of the attendees at that meeting;
- Make judgements about the validity of the views that were expressed and the actions that were taken at that meeting;
- Make judgements about the likely decisions that you & your Exec colleagues will take regarding this issue in the upcoming Exec meeting;

All based on views of what went on that have been passed to you second-3rd- or maybe nth-hand. I congratulate you, Buzz - that's quite a feat. I don't know of anyone else that can do that. With such a resource at our disposal, who knows what dizzy heights 802 can now scale. I take it that we can now dispense with the discussion at the Monday Exec meeting, safe in the knowledge that you have already mapped out the appropriate decisions to be taken. Come to think of it, why don't we just pass all of the exec, working group & study group business over to you while the rest of us head for the beach?

Regards,  
Tony

At 13:18 03/03/99 -0800, Rigsbee, Everett O wrote:

>Gee, Rich, I can think of an excellent way to test out your proposition: Let's revote the motion at the plenary when all of the true "participants" are likely to be in attendance. My understanding is that the purpose of the 1-day Study Group interim was to obtain some offered "helpful input" from 802.1, so many of the interested parties such, as myself, who had conflicts, felt it was unnecessary to attend. Attendance at 802 interim meetings has always been an optional matter, and varies radically from one group to another. But there were several folks there for interim 802.1 and 802.3 meetings, who have no interest in the Study Group but who took advantage of the low Study Group turnout and open Study Group voting rules to "hijack" the meeting and run through this motion. If those folks think they are fooling anybody with these type of tactics and in preaching about

the "sanctity of the directed vote," they have another think coming. What happened at the meeting was a s!

>!

>ham, pure and simple! It's now up to the SEC to decide to do about it, and I'm sure they will.

>Thanx, Buzz

>Dr. Everett O. (Buzz) Rigsbee

>Boeing Information Services

>PO Box 24346, MS: 7M-FM

>Seattle, WA 98124-0346

>(425) 865-2443, FX: (425) 865-6721

>everett.o.rigsbee@boeing.com

> From: Rich Seifert [SMTP:seifert@netcom.com]

> Sent: Wednesday, March 03, 1999 7:30 AM

> To: Rigsbee, Everett O

> Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector

> Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!

> >I do not think

> >the small group which cast their votes at the interim meeting in

Miami

> >represented the majority interests of the total study group.

Interim

> >meetings are notorious for producing skewed distributions. I, for one,

> >would like to hear from all of the membership on this vital issue.

> Actually, I believe that in the case of this Study Group, the Interim Meeting is a better venue than a Plenary. The time at the interim was dedicated to this particular activity-there was no contention with other meetings. At a plenary, most of those interested in attending the study group have conflicts with other meetings, in particular 802.1 and 802.3. I suspect that the "skew" would be worse during a Plenary session.

> Rich Seifert Networks and Communications Consulting

> seifert@netcom.com <mailto:seifert@netcom.com> 21885 Bear Creek

Way

> (408) 395-5700 Los Gatos, CA 95033

> (408) 395-1966 FAX

>

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 18:06:08 1999

Received: by multi14.netcomi.com for ckm

(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 02:02:49 1999)

X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 20:00:16 1999

Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by

multi14.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id UAA04854 for

<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 20:00:16 -0600

Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)

id UAA01333; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 20:48:46 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <01e401be65e0\$97528580\$2c99fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>

Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>

From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>

To: "Keith Balmer" <keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>

Cc: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,

<802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>

Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail on QoS/FC Study Group

Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 16:34:27 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

>To do otherwise would be to suggest that the Interim motion "doesn't count".

Absolutely not!!!!

Let me state this yet another time:

As chair, I'm taking a straw poll of the whole body to include in the input that I'm providing to the exec committee. Since the attendance of the Interim meeting was low, I see that this is helpful input. I'll present the results of the motions that were passed as well as the results of the straw poll.

We have to keep in mind that it's the exec committee (not the passed motions) who decide how to proceed with study group using all the input that is provided. They use the motion results as input for reaching a decision. So, it's my duty to provide them with all that information including the passed motions.

Khaled Amer  
Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

-----Original Message-----

From: Keith Balmer <keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>  
To: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) <khaledamer@usa.net>  
Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Date: Wednesday, March 03, 1999 1:21 AM  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!

>Khaled Amer (AmerNet) wrote:

>>The intent is to inform the exec committee of what the participants and  
>>observers of the study group feel about it.

>

> Khaled, the EC Study Group motion that passed in Miami Beach requires  
>you to recommend to the Executive Committee that the study group be  
disbanded.

>To do otherwise would be to suggest that the Interim motion "doesn't count".

>

> If through your straw poll you establish a desire for the work to continue  
>then it can, but not as the EC Study Group. Interested participants  
>may meet "off-line", continue research and development of ideas, and return  
>to 802 (or whatever then seems the appropriate body to standardize the  
>solutions) with a really solid proposal with supporting data.

>  
> Continuing the work outside the Study Group frees it from all constraints  
> other than those self-imposed by the participants. This should be welcomed  
> as a means to allow R&D to continue freely without the strain of having to  
> repeatedly persuade sceptical voters of the value of the work.  
>  
> Regards, Keith  
>  
>

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 17:16:11 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 01:12:53 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 19:12:46 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id TAA02274 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 19:12:46 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id TAA24373; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 19:47:25 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 99 18:45:54 CST  
From: keen@ncrssi.StPaulMN.NCR.COM (Hal Keen )  
Message-Id: <9903040045.AA24576@ncrssi.StPaulMN.NCR.COM>  
To: stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org  
Subject: RE: Vote by email...PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

From: Hal Keen  
To: Khaled Amer  
Re: requested Email vote

Khaled,

In view of the number of pickets with "Save the QoS" signs I have seen marching through the Email exploder, I believe I should contribute my dissent to the same audience. This seems necessary as a matter of courtesy, as I include specific reference to some of the other comments.

The question you raise is not whether the Study Group should continue; it is whether it should continue developing a PAR for a standard. This is confusing, in that disbanding the Study Group was, in fact, the topic of the motion passed in January. I believe one of the major problems is the assumption that the group's existence implies development of a PAR.

I am responding with a NO on the PAR question, but this is not necessarily a vote to disband the Study Group. (See Jim Mollenauer's comment for a worthwhile viewpoint in regard to this distinction.) This note contains a two-part set of comments: first, addressing the PAR question, and then some further comment on the political and procedural issues.

We use PARs for projects, not for problems. A PAR should be based on a substantial technical approach, suitable for evaluation using the five criteria. As a possible example, let us consider the specific technical measure which was under discussion in November: the explicit addition of traffic classification to the 802.3 flow control for full-duplex links.

If I had enough flow control effect to require it, I could as easily avoid the jitter problem by turning off flow control for those ports over which my jitter-sensitive traffic runs. If I required flow control for other traffic going in the same direction, I could reconfigure so that traffic is sent through a different port, where it is subjected to flow control. I could even define both these ports to exist as logical entities sharing a single adapter; this might tangle me up a bit in the existing standards language, but it would work. If I didn't know how to do all this, I could easily hire a consultant to tell me. By writing a check--for an amount which gets smaller the longer I wait to do it--I can achieve the objective without risking a new technology tweak with new side effects.

Moreover, this entire solution was already suggested over the QoS exploder--not by me--after the November meeting.

Given that available solution, I do not believe 802 could justify a project to modify 802.3 flow control and (implicitly) 802.1 bridges to achieve the same effect with all the extra headaches of new protocol. You might find "broad market support" for such a thing, but only because of Barnum's Principle (the one about the arrival frequency of suckers).

I contend this is an example of a general result. It arises from limiting 802 work generally to the Data Link Layer and below. Obeying the layer restriction naturally reduces all measures to control jitter to shortening the maximum transit delay for some messages. This can be done by traffic classification (sufficiently addressed in existing 802 work including 802.1p) and by increasing overall bandwidth (overwhelmingly and repeatedly addressed by MAC Working Groups, whenever advancing technology permits).

This point was made several years ago, when 802.1 conducted a lengthy study of "multimedia" requirements (as we called it at the time) and measures to address them. Based on those discussions, the work on 802.1p was identified as constituting those improvements which were within 802's scope, and has since been completed. We now have more than sufficient traffic classification, plus rapid advances in bandwidth.

I would be a fool to assert that additional worthwhile measures are impossible. However, they must not involve chartering a new group to muck about with existing standards (such as MAC Bridges or CSMA/CD) in defiance of expert opinion, from the creators and custodians of those standards, that the modification is ill-advised.

In addition, they should not involve devising new protocols to address problems easily and much more reliably addressed by writing a check. Alan Chambers has contributed the useful term CAPEK (Capacity Avoidance by Purchasing Enough Kit) to our lexicon. 802 must always bear in mind that CAPEK solutions are our primary competition in the market.

And now a word on the politics and procedures. I am, quite frankly, sick of the level to which the existence of the Study Group has brought us. If

the Study Group were dissolved by the LMSC Exec on Monday morning, it seems inevitable that deep political suspicions over political maneuvers would continue to poison the 802 atmosphere for some time.

Buzz is correct that the co-located interim meetings created a possibility that the meeting was heavy on 802.1 and 802.3 participants. (I don't know, as I wasn't there.) He is grossly in error in asserting that these people "have no interest in the Study Group"; as explained above, these people are the very ones who have been defending their own hard work and their own precious time against some technically questionable mucking about.

(In fairness, I should qualify that; Buzz's error is understandable, because a whole lot of people have been pushing about their positions without listening to anyone else's. A number of Exec members are apparently completely unaware of the impact of the Study Group on existing WGs.)

At any rate, this suspicion must be addressed. Procedurally, I suggest that Khaled make the presentation Monday morning, as directed by the interim meeting vote, and that the Exec defer action until Thursday night, allowing the Study Group time for further consideration. However, I strongly suggest that the Exec consider the implications of Buzz's suspicion; if you believe that 802.1 and 802.3 members are loading a vote to defend their work and their time against an active threat, you had better face up to the existence of the threat!

The next thing the Exec needs to do is work out whether a Study Group needs to focus on writing a PAR. In this case, we have an ill-described problem, and all proposed solutions I have seen are (a) clearly beyond 802's scope, (b) technically or economically irresponsible, or (c) impossible to work on without applying expertise currently residing in existing Working Groups whose standards they would directly affect.

If a Study Group cannot exist without developing a PAR, then I submit that either (a) it SHOULD be dissolved, or (b) the rule-making frenzy of the last few years has produced a situation in which the LMSC has prohibited itself from taking correct action. The Exec, having mandated that a power base be created before any real work is started, can sort that one out.

Respectfully (more or less) submitted,  
Hal Keen

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 17:56:09 1999

Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm

(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 01:52:51 1999)

X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 19:51:31 1999

Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by

multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id TAA04368 for

<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 19:51:31 -0600

Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)

id UAA00842; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 20:44:16 -0500 (EST)

X-Sender: seifert@netcom4.netcom.com

Message-Id: <v04003a03b303894c64a5@[209.109.233.39]>

In-Reply-To:

<3168F6EDD4A4D1118BAA00805FE6CB6C0129F5D3@xch-blv-07.ca.boeing.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 17:39:21 -0800  
To: "Rigsbee, Everett O" <Everett.Rigsbee@PSS.Boeing.com>  
From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
      " '802 Exec' " <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

At 1:18 PM -0800 3/3/99, Rigsbee, Everett O wrote:

>Gee, Rich, I can think of an excellent way to test out your proposition:  
>>Let's revote the motion at the plenary when all of the true  
>"participants" are >likely to be in attendance.

It seems that you believe that those who attended the interim were not "true participants". I strongly disagree with this position. Many of us (myself included) took an EXTRA DAY (in my own case, being self-employed, at my own expense) just to attend this meeting. Considering that \*you\* did not even bother to attend the meeting, it is unclear who is a "true participant".

In any case, you missed my point entirely. Everyone who attends a Study Group meeting is a participant (I will ignore the irrelevancy of how "true" they are). During the interim meeting, time was dedicated, unmultiplexed, to the task at hand. During a plenary, MANY of us have multiple hats to wear. Clearly, any issues of QoS and FC will cross Working Group boundaries; to expect that attendees devote themselves to this fledgling activity and abandon their important work-in-progress is unreasonable. My point was that the "skew" would be greater during a Plenary, since it is likely that attendance at many times during the plenary may actually be lower, and that the parties attending have a narrow focus (some would say myopic) on QoS/FC rather than the bigger picture of how it fits into the overall networking scheme.

What is happening now is that someone has decided that the way to reverse the decision of the group is to keep holding votes until it comes out the way they want. If some straw poll (or an ExCom vote) reverses the will of the Study Group, can we hold ANOTHER vote to see if we can change it back? And another one after that if that one passes?

The Study Group voted to disband. For anyone (including a ExCom member) to imply that that means that the Study Group \*doesn't\* want to disband would be a strange interpretation, indeed.

>My understanding is that the purpose of the 1-day Study Group interim was  
>to >obtain some offered "helpful input" from 802.1, so many of the  
>interested >parties such, as myself, who had conflicts, felt it was  
>unnecessary to attend.

Well, then you didn't read the agenda or the meeting announcement. (Perhaps you are not a "true" participant!) This was a scheduled interim meeting,



with a full slate of topics to discuss. It was, in particular, NOT held just to get "helpful input" from 802.1. The reason for holding it the same week as the 802.1 and 802.3 interims was because it was recognized that there would be a lot of overlap in attendees, and this minimized travel expenses.

>Attendance at 802 interim meetings has always been an optional matter, and  
>>varies radically from one group to another. But there were several folks  
>there >for interim 802.1 and 802.3 meetings, who have no interest in the  
>Study Group >but who took advantage of the low Study Group turnout and  
>open Study Group >voting rules to "hijack" the meeting and run through  
>this motion.

I can't really believe that I am hearing you say such things. First of all, attendance at interim meetings is no more optional than attendance at Plenaries. If you want to get work done, you attend. If you want your issues addressed, you attend. If you don't want these things, you don't attend.

More important, I consider your insinuation insulting, that any members of 802.1 and 802.3 (who, by the way, are ALSO members of the Study Group, since membership in that body is determined by attendance) would attend a meeting with "no interest in the Study Group", and with the intention to "hijack" a meeting. Many highly experienced network architects have spent a lot of time working on QoS and FC issues, and provided considerable input to the Study Group (most of which was summarily ignored). The fact that they may also be members of 802.1 or 802.3 does not change their professional integrity or their ability to contribute to the efforts of the Study Group. I believe you owe an apology to those attendees.

>If those folks think they are fooling anybody with these type of tactics  
>and in >preaching about the "sanctity of the directed vote," they have  
>another think >coming.

The directed vote directs the chair of the Study Group to take a specific action, that being: "...to recommend to the 802 executive committee, on Monday morning of the next 802 plenary meeting, that the study group be disbanded." That is both exactly, and all, that it means to me.

>What happened at the meeting was a sham, pure and simple!

You have no clue as to what happened at the meeting, since you were not there. I was. We spent an incredible amount of time trying to find A SINGLE PERSON willing to do the actual work needed to move the group forward. Lacking A SINGLE PERSON willing to do any of the needed work, we moved to disband, and that motion passed by a wide margin, clearly not the work of a few miscreants from 802.1. What would you propose the group do if it stayed in business? Keep asking people if they have changed their mind and are ready to offer the time/money/equipment needed to run the specified tests? Are you offering the resources to move the group forward, or do you just want to cast your vote for "someone else" to do something?

--

Rich Seifert  
seifert@netcom.com  
(408) 395-5700

Networks and Communications Consulting  
21885 Bear Creek Way  
Los Gatos, CA 95033

(408) 395-1966 FAX

"... specialists in Local Area Networks and Data Communications systems"

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 18:06:09 1999

Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm

(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 02:02:51 1999)

X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 20:01:41 1999

Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by

multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id UAA05071 for

<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 20:01:41 -0600

Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)

id UAA01403; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 20:49:20 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <01e901be65e0\$a5a9c940\$2c99fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>

Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>

From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>

To: "Mick Seaman" <Mick\_Seaman@3com.com>, "Tony Jeffree" <tony@jeffree.co.uk>

Cc: "Howard Frazier" <hfrazier@cisco.com>, <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>,

"802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>

Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!

Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 17:40:42 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org

Precedence: bulk

X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>

X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc

X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org

X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Tony,

To answer the point that you're making here:

>I would also point out that Khaled has no mandate from the study group to  
>carry out such a straw poll - and indeed, any reasonable interpretation of  
>the outcome of the January meeting would leave him in no doubt that he  
>would not have been given such a mandate had he requested it.

I don't need one. I need to provide all input that I see helpful to the exec committee to make their decision. Of course, I'm REQUIRED to provide them with the results of the motions that were passed in Miami in January too, and will do so.

Howard Frazier already answered this question very eloquently and clearly. Please let me know if you'd like me to send you another copy of it.

Khaled Amer

Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 18:26:08 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 02:22:45 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 20:18:28 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id UAA05970 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 20:18:28 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id VAA04371; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 21:17:39 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <D0805D3B448BD211A7990008C7B181301429B5@SOL>  
From: Andrew Smith <andrew@extremenetworks.com>  
To: "'Khaled Amer (AmerNet)'" <khaledamer@usa.net>,  
802-qos-fc reflector  
<stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 18:17:24 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

I'm really rather fed up with all this procedural nonsense.

Please show me some good technical proposals that meet the criteria that IEEE 802 LMSC imposes on its standardisation activities. Or even show me some forward progress towards this goal. But please keep anything else off this mailing list.

I do not feel qualified to take part in your "vote" since I was not able to participate in the last interim meeting and so I do not feel that I understand the current status or rate of progress of the technical ideas under discussion. I would urge others who believe that they might be qualified to "vote" but who were not at the last meeting to take a similar position. Please forward this comment to the Exec as a part of your presentation.

Andrew

From ???@??? Wed Mar 03 18:46:08 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 02:42:45 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Wed Mar 3 20:39:07 1999

Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id UAA07185 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 20:39:07 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id VAA05676; Wed, 3 Mar 1999 21:31:11 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <00ba01be65e6\$7e26ad60\$2c99fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "John Messenger" <John.Messenger@madge.com>  
Cc: "Howard Frazier" <hfrazier@cisco.com>,  
"Mick Seaman" <Mick\_Seaman@3com.com>,  
"Rich Seifert" <Seifert@netcom.com>, <keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>,  
"802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
<802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Subject: Re: Recommendation to disband QoS/FC study group  
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 18:23:18 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

John,

My duty is to report the motions, and provide any input that I feel would be  
valuable.

The decision then is up to the exec committee.

I'm just trying to do my duties as the chair, and respond to the requests of  
several participants.

I don't gain or lose anything out of this, either way.

(Well, if they decide to keep it, then I still have to deal with all the  
work it involves! But I'm willing to so if asked)

Khaled Amer

Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

-----Original Message-----

From: John Messenger <John.Messenger@madge.com>  
To: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) <khaledamer@usa.net>  
Cc: Howard Frazier <hfrazier@cisco.com>; Mick Seaman <Mick\_Seaman@3com.com>;  
Rich Seifert <Seifert@netcom.com>; keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com  
<keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>; 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>;  
802exec@hepnrc.hep.net <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Date: Wednesday, March 03, 1999 7:55 AM  
Subject: Recommendation to disband QoS/FC study group

>Khaled,  
>  
>I'm sure you're aware that your position has been directed. You can  
>present whatever you feel necessary, but your recommendation to the exec  
>must be for disbanding, unless there is something procedurally wrong with  
>the vote (which I would have expected you to point out at the time). I  
>see no opportunity for the QoS/FC study group to overturn this direction,  
>as the motion specifies that this recommendation be made on Monday. I'm  
>sure that the exec would have to take such a recommendation very  
>seriously. Regarding the issue of the attendees at the interim not  
>representing the group, this argument does not hold water. He who really  
>cares, shows up at the meeting. I see no procedural reason why the vote  
>should be invalid.  
>  
>Regards,  
> -- John  
>  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
>> [mailto:owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org]On Behalf Of Khaled  
>> Amer (AmerNet)  
>> Sent: 03 March 1999 02:59 PM  
>> To: 802-qos-fc reflector  
>> Cc: Howard Frazier; Mick Seaman; Rich Seifert; keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com  
>> Subject: Fw: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
>>  
>>  
>> FYI ..... I guess this note from Howard takes care of the  
>> concerns that were  
>> raised by Keith, Rich and Mick.  
>>  
>> Of course, as I mentioned explicitly in the previously posted note  
>> requesting the vote, I will (and have to) report the motions to the exec  
>> committee. Per the request of so many participants, I'm also working on  
>> providing any other input that they may need to make their decision. The  
>> fate of the study group is determined based on their decision.  
>>  
>> Regards,  
>> Khaled Amer  
>> Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC  
>>  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: Howard Frazier <hfrazier@cisco.com>  
>> To: Mick\_Seaman@3com.com <Mick\_Seaman@3com.com>; tony@jeffree.co.uk  
>> <tony@jeffree.co.uk>  
>> Cc: khaledamer@usa.net <khaledamer@usa.net>; hfrazier@cisco.com  
>> <hfrazier@cisco.com>; 802exec@hepnrc.hep.net <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
>> Date: Tuesday, March 02, 1999 4:03 PM  
>> Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
>>  
>>  
>> >  
>> >Actually, I think that any one can request a straw poll on any subject,  
>> >at any time, and it is up to the chair to decide whether a straw poll  
>> >is in order, and how the poll should be conducted. Khaled doesn't need  
>> >a special mandate to exercise his authority as chair of the Study  
>> >Group.

>> >  
>> >However, I absolutely agree that a motion passed at a duly constituted  
>> >meeting carries far more weight than a straw poll, and cannot be  
>> >overturned by a straw poll under any circumstances, let alone the  
>> >circumstances under which this poll is being conducted.  
>> >  
>> >So as far as I can see, Khaled is acting within his authority in  
>> >calling for this poll. He is duty bound to faithfully report the  
>> >results from the interim meeting to the SEC, and to carry out the  
>> >directed position called for in the motion, but he can embellish his  
>> >report with additional information as he sees fit. It will be up to  
>> >the SEC to discern the difference between a valid motion, and a straw  
>> >poll result, and to note the clear and unambiguous actions called for  
>> >by the motion.  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >Howard  
>> >  
>> >

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 01:55:30 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 09:53:16 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 03:45:43 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id DAA30461 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 03:45:43 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id EAA20801; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 04:41:35 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <36DE5508.44C3B18D@tiuk.ti.com>  
Date: Thu, 04 Mar 1999 09:40:24 +0000  
From: Keith Balmer <keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>  
Organization: Texas Instruments Ltd  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.02 [en] (X11; I; SunOS 5.5 sun4m)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
CC: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>, 802exec@hepncr.hep.net  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail on QoS/FC Study Group  
References: <01e401be65e0\$97528580\$2c99fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Khaled Amer (AmerNet) wrote:

>  
> >To do otherwise would be to suggest that the Interim motion "doesn't  
> count".  
>  
> Absolutely not!!!!  
>  
> Let me state this yet another time:

> As chair, I'm taking a straw poll of the whole body to include in the input  
> that I'm providing to the exec committee. Since the attendance of the  
> Interim meeting was low, I see that this is helpful input. I'll present the  
> results of the motions that were passed as well as the results of the straw  
> poll.

In light of the helpful procedural clarifications especially by Howard  
on the topic of straw polls I accept your right to gather further information  
to present to the Exec along with the result of the motion.

>  
> We have to keep in mind that it's the exec committee (not the passed  
> motions) who decide how to proceed with study group using all the input that  
> is provided. They use the motion results as input for reaching a decision.  
> So, it's my duty to provide them with all that information including the  
> passed motions.

Agreed.

Regards, Keith

>  
> Khaled Amer  
> Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Keith Balmer <keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>  
> To: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) <khaledamer@usa.net>  
> Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
> Date: Wednesday, March 03, 1999 1:21 AM  
> Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
>  
> >Khaled Amer (AmerNet) wrote:  
> >>The intent is to inform the exec committee of what the participants and  
> >>observers of the study group feel about it.  
> >  
> > Khaled, the EC Study Group motion that passed in Miami Beach requires  
> >you to recommend to the Executive Committee that the study group be  
> >disbanded.  
> >To do otherwise would be to suggest that the Interim motion "doesn't  
> >count".  
> >  
> > If through your straw poll you establish a desire for the work to continue  
> >then it can, but not as the EC Study Group. Interested participants  
> >may meet "off-line", continue research and development of ideas, and return  
> >to 802 (or whatever then seems the appropriate body to standardize the  
> >solutions) with a really solid proposal with supporting data.  
> >  
> > Continuing the work outside the Study Group frees it from all constraints  
> >other than those self-imposed by the participants. This should be welcomed  
> >as a means to allow R&D to continue freely without the strain of having to  
> >repeatedly persuade sceptical voters of the value of the work.  
> >  
> > Regards, Keith  
> >  
> >

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 07:20:07 1999  
Received: by multi14.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 15:17:27 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 09:10:38 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multi14.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id JAA18506 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 09:10:38 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id JAA00953; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 09:58:13 -0500 (EST)  
Message-Id: <199903041458.JAA12928@ieee.org>  
X-Sender: ckm@popd.mickgroup.com  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2  
Date: Thu, 04 Mar 1999 06:55:28 -0800  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>, stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org  
From: Colin Mick--The Mick Group <ckm@mickgroup.com>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
In-Reply-To: <005801be64e7\$cf731000\$7070fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

I think the work should continue, but I do not think it should continue in a "classic" study group. As we have seen, the "classic" study group brings with it a certain set of constraints and expectations are not appropriate for an issue of this type. It was clear from the start that:

- a) this was a topic that needed time to study, so it would not follow the traditional PAR path and
- b) that it was a topic of interest to multiple working groups.

I think this topic is important and I am not convinced that any current group is doing it justice. However, the EXEC didn't do us any favor by setting it up as a study group with all the associated baggage.

What we need for topics like this is an "802 research group" empowered to collect data over a long period of time and make regular progress reports to the 802 membership in preparation for convening a study group. (This might not be all that different from a TAG.)

This is, in fact, what has been going on, but the study group "baggage" has, unfortunately, generated lots of "kneejerk" reactions.

Colin K. Mick  
The Mick Group  
2130 Hanover St,  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
voice: (650) 856-3666  
FAX: (650) 494-3737  
email: ckm@mickgroup.com  
URL: www.mickgroup.com



From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 08:53:50 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
    (with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 16:51:07 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 10:48:32 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id KAA30037 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 10:48:32 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
    id LAA16078; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 11:32:28 -0500 (EST)  
From: Mick\_Seaman@3com.com  
X-Lotus-FromDomain: 3COM  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
cc: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
    hk126424@exchange.DAYTONOH.NCR.com  
Message-ID: <8825672A.005A8A0B.00@hqoutbound.ops.3com.com>  
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 1999 08:27:36 -0800  
Subject: Re: PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE! - Where to send your vote  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

I strongly suggest that anyone who cares about this copies their vote to the exploder. In the current discussion climate there should be no doubt about how many people have expressed their views and what those views are. Perhaps those who have already voted but have not done so my sending email to the exploder could do so again.

Mick

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 09:46:29 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
    (with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 17:43:41 1999)  
X-From\_: khaledamer@usa.net Thu Mar 4 11:39:15 1999  
Received: from snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.62]) by multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id LAA02093 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 11:39:15 -0600  
Received: from khaledamer (1Cust182.tnt3.sfo2.da.uu.net [208.251.193.182]) by snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id JAA18270 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 09:39:56 -0800 (PST)  
Message-ID: <007b01be6665\$7e2d9880\$1039fea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>

Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "Colin Mick--The Mick Group" <ckm@mickgroup.com>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 1999 09:01:13 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Agree!

I guess I'll take your vote to be a YES, for the work to be continued.  
Right?We'll  
discuss in the exec meeting how to proceed, and bring up the thoughts that  
you mentioned here.  
Will you be able to attend the Monday morning meeting?  
Khaled.

-----Original Message-----

From: Colin Mick--The Mick Group <ckm@mickgroup.com>  
To: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) <khaledamer@usa.net>; stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org  
<stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Date: Thursday, March 04, 1999 7:43 AM  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!

>I think the work should continue, but I do not think it should continue in a  
>"classic" study group. As we have seen, the "classic" study group brings  
>with it a certain set of constraints and expectations are not appropriate  
>for an issue of this type. It was clear from the start that:  
>a) this was a topic that needed time to study, so it would not follow the  
>traditional PAR path and  
>b) that it was a topic of interest to multiple working groups.  
>  
>I think this topic is important and I am not convinced that any current  
>group is doing it justice. However, the EXEC didn't do us any favor by  
>setting it up as a study group with all the associated baggage.  
>  
>What we need for topics like this is an "802 research group" empowered to  
>collect data over a long period of time and make regular progress reports  
>to the 802 membership in preparation for convening a study group. (This  
>might not be all that different from a TAG.)  
>  
>This is, in fact, what has been going on, but the study group "baggage"  
>has, unfortunately, generated lots of "kneejerk" reactions.  
>  
>Colin  
>  
>-----  
>  
>At 12:03 PM 3/2/99 -0800, you wrote:  
>>Hi everybody,

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 11:36:37 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
    (with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 19:33:39 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 13:28:47 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id NAA12113 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 13:28:47 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
    id OAA12260; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 14:14:05 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <007a01be6672\$a09cfb60\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 1999 11:01:07 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Just wanted to point out that some individuals have been complaining about running the straw poll. The validity of doing so has been discussed through several posted notes on the reflector. They have not cast their vote yet. I WILL NOT guess their votes (even though in some cases it's not hard to do so!), but I don't want to find myself reporting votes based on my guess. I would like to encourage turning in explicit votes to be taken into consideration.

Khaled Amer  
Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 12:33:10 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
    (with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 20:30:10 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 14:25:00 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id OAA17306 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 14:25:00 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
    id PAA20322; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 15:06:00 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <D0805D3B448BD211A7990008C7B181301429C5@SOL>  
From: Andrew Smith <andrew@extremenetworks.com>

To: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Don't vote by e-mail unless ...  
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 1999 12:05:55 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

And I would like to *\*discourage\** people from turning in "votes" other than abstentions unless they really think they know the status of the technical work produced to date by the Study Group. I would seriously doubt whether anyone can know that who was not at the interim meeting but maybe my standards of ethics are higher than some others who have expressed their "informed" opinions so far. An "abstain" is, IMHO, the only appropriate "vote" for all except the ~23 people who attended the Interim meeting.

Andrew

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) [mailto:khaledamer@usa.net]  
> Sent: Thursday, March 04, 1999 11:01 AM  
> To: 802-qos-fc reflector  
> Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
>  
>  
> Just wanted to point out that some individuals have been  
> complaining about  
> running the straw poll. The validity of doing so has been  
> discussed through  
> several posted notes on the reflector. They have not cast  
> their vote yet. I  
> WILL NOT guess their votes (even though in some cases it's  
> not hard to do  
> so!), but I don't want to find myself reporting votes based  
> on my guess. I  
> would like to encourage turning in explicit votes to be taken into  
> consideration.  
>  
> Khaled Amer  
> Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC  
>  
>

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 13:20:21 1999  
Received: by multi14.netcomi.com for ckm

(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 21:17:17 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 15:09:52 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id PAA21538 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 15:09:52 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id PAA27613; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 15:49:12 -0500 (EST)  
From: ross@nexen.com  
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 1999 15:48:43 -0500 (EST)  
X-Sender: ross@pop  
Message-Id: <v0214041cb3045c797a44@[172.31.0.168]>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
Cc: stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Khaled,

For the advantage of all - here is my vote (again).

vote: YES

Regards,

Floyd

>Just wanted to point out that some individuals have been complaining about  
>running the straw poll. The validity of doing so has been discussed through  
>several posted notes on the reflector. They have not cast their vote yet. I  
>WILL NOT guess their votes (even though in some cases it's not hard to do  
>so!), but I don't want to find myself reporting votes based on my guess. I  
>would like to encourage turning in explicit votes to be taken into  
>consideration.  
>  
>Khaled Amer  
>Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 13:20:38 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 21:17:34 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 15:15:42 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id PAA22067 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 15:15:42 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id PAA27964; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 15:51:20 -0500 (EST)

From: PAUL\_CONGDON@HP-Roseville-om2.om.hp.com  
X-OpenMail-Hops: 1  
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 1999 12:50:52 -0800  
Message-Id: <H00004fe1866589d@MHS>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
CC: khaledamer@usa.net  
TO: stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; name="Vote"  
Content-Disposition: inline; filename="Vote"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

NO!

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 13:49:46 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 21:46:40 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 15:38:43 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id PAA24250 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 15:38:43 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id QAA02540; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 16:23:40 -0500 (EST)  
Message-Id: <199903042120.NAA00650@ns1.sj.picazo.com>  
X-Sender: froke@ns1.sj.picazo.com  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0  
Date: Thu, 04 Mar 1999 13:29:19 -0800  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>, stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org  
From: Rich Froke <rfroke@picazo.com>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

I vote YES it should continue - but within the context of that described by Colin Mick.

Rich Froke  
Picazo Communications, Inc.  
61 Daggett Drive

San Jose, CA 95134  
Phone: 408-232-9121  
Fax: 408-383-0136

mailto:rfroke@picazo.com

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 14:10:04 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 22:06:56 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 16:05:31 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id QAA27044 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 16:05:31 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id QAA05286; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 16:42:16 -0500 (EST)  
X-Sender: seifert@netcom4.netcom.com  
Message-Id: <v04003a0ab304ac8bc31a@[209.109.233.169]>  
In-Reply-To: <007a01be6672\$a09cfb60\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 1999 13:36:10 -0800  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>,  
"802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

At 11:01 AM -0800 3/4/99, Khaled Amer (AmerNet) wrote:  
>Just wanted to point out that some individuals have been complaining about  
>running the straw poll. The validity of doing so has been discussed through  
>several posted notes on the reflector. They have not cast their vote yet. I  
>WILL NOT guess their votes (even though in some cases it's not hard to do  
>so!), but I don't want to find myself reporting votes based on my guess. I  
>would like to encourage turning in explicit votes to be taken into  
>consideration.  
>

I voted to disband the Study Group in the only "poll" that counts, a vote  
authorized by a motion and second to the Study Group. I stand by my opinion  
that the Study Group should disband.

Those interested in pursuing issues related to Data Link QoS/FC should do  
so outside the aegis of IEEE 802, and are welcome to come back with solid  
technical proposals.

--

Rich Seifert  
seifert@netcom.com  
(408) 395-5700  
(408) 395-1966 FAX

Networks and Communications Consulting  
21885 Bear Creek Way  
Los Gatos, CA 95033

"... specialists in Local Area Networks and Data Communications systems"

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 14:20:14 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 22:17:05 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 16:12:42 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id QAA27752 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 16:12:42 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id QAA06976; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 16:53:20 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 1999 13:53:06 -0800 (PST)  
From: William Quackenbush <wlq@cisco.com>  
Message-Id: <199903042153.NAA19428@tempest.cisco.com>  
To: stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Cc: wlq@cisco.com  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Having attended the January QoS/FC interim in Miami Beach  
and all but a few hours of previous meetings,

I vote NO.

Bill Quackenbush  
aka wlq@cisco.com

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 16:01:43 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Thu Mar 4 23:58:32 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 17:56:13 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id RAA03829 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 17:56:13 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id SAA01460; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 18:46:35 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <19990304234659.13141.rocketmail@send204.yahoomail.com>  
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 1999 15:46:59 -0800 (PST)  
From: farzin firoozmand <ffiroozmand@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
To: "Khaled Amer \ (AmerNet\)" <khaledamer@usa.net>,  
802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org



Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

I could not attend the Miami meeting, but if I had I would have voted YES.

I vote YES to Khaled's request.

Farzin Firoozmand  
408 218 6869 (Mobile)  
925 484 9878 (Home)  
ffiroozmand@yahoo.com

---

DO YOU YAHOO!?

Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 23:32:26 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
    (with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 07:30:24 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 01:20:58 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id BAA31753 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 01:20:58 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
    id CAA15702; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 02:07:18 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <000701be66d6\$438e8240\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "Rich Seifert" <seifert@netcom.com>  
Cc: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 1999 17:32:20 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

OK, Rich ....

So I take it that you're asking me NOT to include your vote in the poll that I'm conducting by e-mail. I'll respect your desire.

Khaled Amer  
Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

-----Original Message-----

From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>  
To: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) <khaledamer@usa.net>; 802-qos-fc reflector  
<stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Date: Thursday, March 04, 1999 1:42 PM  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail

>At 11:01 AM -0800 3/4/99, Khaled Amer (AmerNet) wrote:  
>>Just wanted to point out that some individuals have been complaining about  
>>running the straw poll. The validity of doing so has been discussed  
through  
>>several posted notes on the reflector. They have not cast their vote yet.  
I  
>>WILL NOT guess their votes (even though in some cases it's not hard to do  
>>so!), but I don't want to find myself reporting votes based on my guess. I  
>>would like to encourage turning in explicit votes to be taken into  
>>consideration.  
>>  
>  
>I voted to disband the Study Group in the only "poll" that counts, a vote  
>authorized by a motion and second to the Study Group. I stand by my opinion  
>that the Study Group should disband.  
>  
>Those interested in pursuing issues related to Data Link QoS/FC should do  
>so outside the aegis of IEEE 802, and are welcome to come back with solid  
>technical proposals.  
>  
>--  
>Rich Seifert  
>seifert@netcom.com  
>(408) 395-5700  
>(408) 395-1966 FAX  
>"... specialists in Local Area Networks and Data Communications systems"  
>  
>

From ???@??? Thu Mar 04 18:33:30 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 02:30:09 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Thu Mar 4 20:22:52 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id UAA14302 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 20:22:52 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id VAA18236; Thu, 4 Mar 1999 21:16:54 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <312419998E3CD211A52900A0C991A47A07681E@gordan.pl.gadzoos.com>  
From: Gabriel Hecht <ghecht@gadzoos.com>  
To: "'Khaled Amer (AmerNet)'" <khaledamer@usa.net>,  
802-qos-fc reflector

<stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail .... PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 1999 18:17:46 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Khaled,

My vote is Yes. I believe we should continue studying to determine if we need a standard that provides selective flow control and treats packets differently. Looking at what exists and dominates the market today is only part of this study, the other part would be the possibility to enable new applications (and few existing ones) to operate efficiently or at all. Ethernet is becoming the RS232 of the next decade and will be used in many different ways; we should not limit its capabilities.

The strong effort and time spent by people trying to close this group, from the get-go, makes me think the group is dealing with important issues. One of the obstacles facing the group is the resource drain from having to constantly be on the defensive fending off the attacks of individuals (or companies) who are preventing those who want to study these issues to do so.

Gaby Hecht

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 00:22:25 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 08:20:22 1999)  
X-From: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 02:11:52 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id CAA01113 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 02:11:52 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id DAA19775; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 03:09:33 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 03:09:06 -0500  
From: Alan Flatman <a\_flatman@compuserve.com>  
Subject: QoS/FC Study Group Vote  
To: IEEE802QoS/FC <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
Message-ID: <199903050309\_MC2-6CC9-E61@compuserve.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by ruebert.ietf.org id DAA19771  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ietf.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ietf.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ietf.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ietf.org

Khaled,

Straw poll or not - I very much support the continuation of the QoS/FC Study Group, so please take my response as a YES VOTE.

I believe that this area of work is vital to the industry and I would like to see a PAR BEFORE we decide what to do next.

Strikes me that you were ambushed in Miami.

I welcome the action your are taking - real signs of leadership and democracy. You deserve to succeed in what you are doing. Good luck.

Regards,

Alan Flatman  
Principal Consultant  
LAN Technologies UK

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 02:42:25 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 10:40:09 1999)  
X-From: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ietf.org Fri Mar 5 04:39:50 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ietf.org (ruebert.ietf.org [199.172.136.3]) by multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id EAA06737 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 04:39:50 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ietf.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id FAA11219; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 05:36:56 -0500 (EST)  
X-Sender: tony-jeffree@mail.u-net.com  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0  
Date: Fri, 05 Mar 1999 10:21:51 +0000  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: Tony Jeffree <tony@jeffree.co.uk>  
Subject: Re: Who does the work for the Study Group on QoS/FC  
Cc: <PAT\_THALER@HP-Roseville-oml.om.hp.com>, <802exec@hepncr.hep.net>, "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ietf.org>  
In-Reply-To: <00c601be66a0\$baa61680\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Message-Id: <E10IrjI-0000V7-00@serv1.isl.u-net.net>  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ietf.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ietf.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ietf.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ietf.org

Khaled -

It is not just a question of how many people are prepared to \*do\* the work. 1000 consultants ready, able & qualified to do the work is of no consequence whatsoever if there is no-one prepared to \*fund\* it.

Regards,  
Tony

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 04:12:25 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 12:10:04 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 06:04:32 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id GAA10037 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 06:04:32 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id HAA23889; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 07:00:18 -0500 (EST)  
From: "John Messenger" <John.Messenger@madge.com>  
To: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 11:52:10 -0000  
Message-ID: <000701be66fe\$9a113d60\$238f81c2@curl.yk.madge.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2377.0  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
In-Reply-To: <v04003a0ab304ac8bc31a@[209.109.233.169]>  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

I vote NO. The study group has now made its recommendation to the EXEC (which is what the rules require) and the rules then require that the study group terminates.

-- John

--

John Messenger (John.Messenger@8025.org)  
Development Manager, Madge Networks, York UK  
Vice-Chair, IEEE P802.5 Token Ring  
Tel: +44-1904-693409 Fax: +44-1904-693067  
<http://www.8025.org/~jlm/>  
"Mind like parachute: only works when open" -- Charlie Chang

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
> [mailto:owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org]On Behalf Of Rich  
> Seifert  
> Sent: 04 March 1999 09:36 PM  
> To: Khaled Amer (AmerNet); 802-qos-fc reflector  
> Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
>  
>  
> At 11:01 AM -0800 3/4/99, Khaled Amer (AmerNet) wrote:  
> >Just wanted to point out that some individuals have been  
> complaining about  
> >running the straw poll. The validity of doing so has been  
> discussed through  
> >several posted notes on the reflector. They have not cast  
> their vote yet. I  
> >WILL NOT guess their votes (even though in some cases it's not  
> hard to do  
> >so!), but I don't want to find myself reporting votes based on  
> my guess. I  
> >would like to encourage turning in explicit votes to be taken into  
> >consideration.  
> >  
>  
> I voted to disband the Study Group in the only "poll" that  
> counts, a vote  
> authorized by a motion and second to the Study Group. I stand  
> by my opinion  
> that the Study Group should disband.  
>  
> Those interested in pursuing issues related to Data Link QoS/FC  
> should do  
> so outside the aegis of IEEE 802, and are welcome to come back  
> with solid  
> technical proposals.  
>  
> --  
> Rich Seifert  
> seifert@netcom.com  
> (408) 395-5700  
> (408) 395-1966 FAX  
> "... specialists in Local Area Networks and Data Communications systems"  
>  
>  
>

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 07:22:27 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 15:19:48 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 09:14:56 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id JAA27000 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 09:14:56 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id KAA15968; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 10:09:38 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <36DFF3A0.9CEEC077@tiuk.ti.com>  
Date: Fri, 05 Mar 1999 15:09:20 +0000  
From: Keith Balmer <keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>  
Organization: Texas Instruments Ltd  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.02 [en] (X11; I; SunOS 5.5 sun4m)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
CC: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
References: <007a01be6672\$a09cfb60\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Khaled Amer (AmerNet) wrote:

>  
> Just wanted to point out that some individuals have been complaining about  
> running the straw poll. The validity of doing so has been discussed through  
> several posted notes on the reflector. They have not cast their vote yet. I  
> WILL NOT guess their votes (even though in some cases it's not hard to do  
> so!), but I don't want to find myself reporting votes based on my guess. I  
> would like to encourage turning in explicit votes to be taken into  
> consideration.  
>  
> Khaled Amer  
> Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

Having attended all the QoS/FC Plenary and Interim meetings including the one in Miami Beach I vote 'No'.

Please note that in Albuquerque when similar votes were being taken in 802.3 (to direct the Working Group's Chair's vote at the Exec) I voted for the continuation of the QoS/FC Study Group's activities (i.e. the equivalent of 'Yes' in this poll). The weak support for the work of this group that I observed at the January Interim is the reason why I am unwilling to repeat my vote of support.

Regards, Keith

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 07:53:23 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 15:50:44 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 09:45:53 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id JAA30151 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 09:45:53 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id KAA20838; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 10:42:42 -0500 (EST)  
X-Sender: seifert@netcom4.netcom.com  
Message-Id: <v04003a10b305a8731129@[209.109.233.169]>

In-Reply-To: <000701be66d6\$438e8240\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 07:28:18 -0800  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
Cc: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

At 5:32 PM -0800 3/4/99, Khaled Amer (AmerNet) wrote:

>OK, Rich ....

>So I take it that you're asking me NOT to include your vote in the poll that  
>I'm conducting by e-mail. I'll respect your desire.

>

I said no such thing, and you should infer no such desire. Please re-read  
my note.

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>

>To: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) <khaledamer@usa.net>; 802-qos-fc reflector

><stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>

>Date: Thursday, March 04, 1999 1:42 PM

>Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail

>

>

Rich Seifert

seifert@netcom.com

(408) 395-5700

(408) 395-1966 FAX

Networks and Communications Consulting

21885 Bear Creek Way

Los Gatos, CA 95033

"... specialists in Local Area Networks and Data Communications systems"

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 07:42:31 1999

Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm

(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 15:39:52 1999)

X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 09:39:24 1999

Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by

multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id JAA29643 for

<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 09:39:24 -0600

Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)

id KAA19428; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 10:33:34 -0500 (EST)

From: ross@nexen.com

Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 10:32:55 -0500 (EST)

X-Sender: ross@pop

Message-Id: <v02140421b305631d6a4f@[172.31.0.168]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

To: khaledamer@usa.net



Subject: RE: Vote by email...PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
Cc: stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

>Date: Wed, 3 Mar 99 18:45:54 CST  
>From: keen@ncrssi.StPaulMN.NCR.COM (Hal Keen )  
>To: stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org  
>Subject: RE: Vote by email...PLEASE CAST YOUR VOTE!  
>Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
>Precedence: bulk  
>X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
>X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
>X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org  
>  
>From: Hal Keen  
>To: Khaled Amer  
>Re: requested Email vote  
>

Hal Keen wrote:

>Khaled,  
>

>At any rate, this suspicion must be addressed. Procedurally, I suggest that  
>Khaled make the presentation Monday morning, as directed by the interim  
>meeting vote, and that the Exec defer action until Thursday night, allowing  
>the Study Group time for further consideration. However, I strongly suggest  
>that the Exec consider the implications of Buzz's suspicion; if you believe  
>that 802.1 and 802.3 members are loading a vote to defend their work and  
>their time against an active threat, you had better face up to the existence  
>of the threat!

Hal has made a good suggestion! Thursday night is the time for  
highly-charged political decisions anyway.

Regards,

Floyd

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 10:12:55 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 18:10:06 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 12:00:56 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id MAA09709 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 12:00:56 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id MAA19807; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 12:57:34 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <004201be6730\$4e0823c0\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "Tony Jeffree" <tony@jeffree.co.uk>  
Cc: <PAT\_THALER@HP-Roseville-oml.om.hp.com>, <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>, "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Re: Who does the work for the Study Group on QoS/FC  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 09:47:52 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Agree .... Some companies are indicating interest in funding it.

Since this came up on the reflector, I'd like to open the door (as I did in the January interim meeting) to anyone else who would like to participate in this effort. If others are interested in steering and funding the work, please let me know. Several companies are interested in doing so.

Khaled Amer  
Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 10:32:42 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 18:29:53 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 12:23:46 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id MAA11941 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 12:23:46 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id NAA23092; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 13:20:19 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <034201be6734\$44ea03e0\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "John Messenger" <John.Messenger@madge.com>  
Cc: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>, <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 10:16:18 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

I disagree!

The termination of the study group is not dictated by the vote, but by the executive committee. The committee makes the appropriate decision based on all input that they have at their hands (including the passed motions). Then, they have the responsibility (and freedom) to make their decision.

Howard Frazier worded it very eloquently and crisply in a note that was posted on the exec committee reflector. Hope he doesn't mind me including it here, since I see that it has useful information that can help us all. I'll attach a cut-and-paste of it at the end of my note.

(Of course, your 'NO' vote will be included in the count)

Khaled Amer  
Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

---

Actually, I think that any one can request a straw poll on any subject, at any time, and it is up to the chair to decide whether a straw poll is in order, and how the poll should be conducted. Khaled doesn't need a special mandate to exercise his authority as chair of the Study Group.

However, I absolutely agree that a motion passed at a duly constituted meeting carries far more weight than a straw poll, and cannot be overturned by a straw poll under any circumstances, let alone the circumstances under which this poll is being conducted.

So as far as I can see, Khaled is acting within his authority in calling for this poll. He is duty bound to faithfully report the results from the interim meeting to the SEC, and to carry out the directed position called for in the motion, but he can embellish his report with additional information as he sees fit. It will be up to the SEC to discern the difference between a valid motion, and a straw poll result, and to note the clear and unambiguous actions called for by the motion.

Howard

-----Original Message-----

From: John Messenger <John.Messenger@madge.com>

To: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Date: Friday, March 05, 1999 4:21 AM  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail

>I vote NO. The study group has now made its recommendation to the EXEC  
>(which is what the rules require) and the rules then require that the  
>study group terminates.  
> -- John  
>--  
>John Messenger (John.Messenger@8025.org)  
>Development Manager, Madge Networks, York UK  
>Vice-Chair, IEEE P802.5 Token Ring  
>Tel: +44-1904-693409 Fax: +44-1904-693067  
>http://www.8025.org/~jlm/  
>"Mind like parachute: only works when open" -- Charlie Chang  
>  
>

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 10:42:44 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 18:39:54 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 12:33:34 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id MAA12885 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 12:33:34 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id NAA24140; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 13:28:05 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <035901be6735\$5ec8d420\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "Keith Balmer" <keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>  
Cc: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 10:24:11 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

OK ....

However, I would like to encourage the votes to be based on personal  
opinions of whether this is work that should be done, and how important it  
is to establish a standard in that area; not on the support that the group  
is getting. In other words, I would like your independent vote, as opposed

to a vote based on what you observe other votes to be!

However, it's completely up to you to cast a vote based on your opinion, or on the opinion of others!

Khaled Amer

Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

-----Original Message-----

From: Keith Balmer <keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>

To: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) <khaledamer@usa.net>

Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>

Date: Friday, March 05, 1999 7:09 AM

Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail

> Having attended all the QoS/FC Plenary and Interim meetings including the  
>one in Miami Beach I vote 'No'.

>

> Please note that in Albuquerque when similar votes were being taken in  
802.3

>(to direct the Working Group's Chair's vote at the Exec) I voted for the  
>continuation of the QoS/FC Study Group's activities (i.e. the equivalent  
>of 'Yes' in this poll). The weak support for the work of this group that I  
>observed at the January Interim is the reason why I am unwilling to repeat  
>my vote of support.

>

> Regards, Keith

>

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 11:02:51 1999

Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm

(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 19:00:01 1999)

X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 12:51:53 1999

Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id MAA14659 for

<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 12:51:53 -0600

Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)

id NAA26637; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 13:43:00 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <037801be6737\$71811620\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>

Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>

From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>

To: "Rich Seifert" <seifert@netcom.com>

Cc: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>

Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail

Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 10:39:02 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org

Precedence: bulk

X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Come, Rich!

Please tell me in plain English what you want me to do regarding your vote.

You mentioned that :

>>>I voted to disband the Study Group in the only "poll" that counts, a vote  
>>>authorized by a motion and second to the Study Group. I stand by my  
opinion  
>>>that the Study Group should disband.

To me, this means that you only want to vote in the only "poll that counts",  
and that in your opinion, a straw poll without a motion and someone to  
second the motion doesn't count (which I obviously disagree with!)

Please tell me in PLAIN ENGLISH if you want to participate in the vote, and  
give me one of the three choices:

YES, NO, Abstain.

I shouldn't be going around inferring from people's responses whether they  
want to participate in the poll, and what their vote is!

Thanks.

Khaled Amer  
Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

-----Original Message-----

From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>  
To: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) <khaledamer@usa.net>  
Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Date: Friday, March 05, 1999 7:51 AM  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail

>At 5:32 PM -0800 3/4/99, Khaled Amer (AmerNet) wrote:

>>OK, Rich ....

>>So I take it that you're asking me NOT to include your vote in the poll  
that

>>I'm conducting by e-mail. I'll respect your desire.

>>

>

>I said no such thing, and you should infer no such desire. Please re-read  
>my note.

>

>>-----Original Message-----

>>From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>  
>>To: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) <khaledamer@usa.net>; 802-qos-fc reflector  
>><stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
>>Date: Thursday, March 04, 1999 1:42 PM  
>>Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail

>>

>>

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 11:02:55 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
    (with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 19:00:06 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 12:54:20 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id MAA14929 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 12:54:20 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
    id NAA26865; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 13:44:35 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <D0805D3B448BD211A7990008C7B181301429D6@SOL>  
From: Andrew Smith <andrew@extremenetworks.com>  
To: "'Khaled Amer (AmerNet)'" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
    "'802 Exec'"  
    <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 10:43:19 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Khaled,

Again, you are muddying the waters here. You are now asking people to combine the answers to 2 completely orthogonal questions into a single YES/NO answer. This is precisely why formal motions are made so that everyone is clear on what they are voting for. Do you now want everyone who submitted an answer to your previous question to resubmit their opinions on the 2 separate questions you pose in your latest message?

The question that you are trying to get answered is really not at all clear to me any more - what exactly is "the work that should be done" in your first question below? Please point me at the appropriate reference.

You are really not doing a very good job of chairing this discussion. I'd like to propose my own straw poll: who would like to find a study group chair for this issue who can help IEEE 802 LMSC come to a sensible resolution of this topic?

Andrew

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) [mailto:khaledamer@usa.net]  
> Sent: Friday, March 05, 1999 10:24 AM  
> To: Keith Balmer  
> Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector

> Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
>  
>  
> OK ....  
>  
> However, I would like to encourage the votes to be based on personal  
> opinions of whether this is work that should be done, and how  
> important it  
> is to establish a standard in that area; not on the support  
> that the group  
> is getting. In other words, I would like your independent  
> vote, as opposed  
> to a vote based on what you observe other votes to be!  
>  
> However, it's completely up to you to cast a vote based on  
> your opinion, or  
> on the opinion of others!  
>  
> Khaled Amer  
> Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Keith Balmer <keith.balmer@tiuk.ti.com>  
> To: Khaled Amer (AmerNet) <khaledamer@usa.net>  
> Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
> Date: Friday, March 05, 1999 7:09 AM  
> Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
>  
>

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 11:43:12 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 19:40:18 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 13:37:07 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id NAA19184 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 13:37:07 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id OAA04986; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 14:27:39 -0500 (EST)  
Message-Id: <199903051927.OAA14769@ieee.org>  
X-Sender: ckm@popd.mickgroup.com  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2  
Date: Fri, 05 Mar 1999 11:29:16 -0800  
To: Andrew Smith <andrew@extremenetworks.com>,  
" 'Khaled Amer (AmerNet)' " <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: Colin Mick--The Mick Group <ckm@mickgroup.com>  
Subject: TIME OUT!!!  
Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
" '802 Exec' " <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
In-Reply-To: <D0805D3B448BD211A7990008C7B181301429D6@SOL>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc



X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

This is all getting far too convoluted.

May I propose:

1. We schedule another meeting for next week to get closure on a recommendation to the Exec (to be determined by formal ballot.)
2. Khaled reports the results of the Interim vote to the Exec on Monday am and a CONCISE summary of the subsequent email traffic. Khaled asks the Exec to put the future of the QOS/FC study group on the agenda for Thursday night, at which time he will bring a summary of the results of the meeting.
3. We hold the meeting to discuss the future of the QOS/FC group in a pre-defined, concise, and objective manner. All agree on time frame, discussion rules and the fact that the meeting will end with a ballot.

Personally I'd like to see a 3 phase meeting: discussion (see below), motion presentation and vote including discussion of motions as per below.)

Discussion should be limited to two statements per person: an opening statement and a rebuttal following the round opening statements.

We discuss; we craft motions; we vote.

4. Khaled reports the results Thursday nite.

Colin

Colin K. Mick  
The Mick Group  
2130 Hanover St,  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
voice: (650) 856-3666  
FAX: (650) 494-3737  
email: ckm@mickgroup.com  
URL: www.mickgroup.com

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 11:52:10 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 19:49:16 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 13:47:33 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id NAA20146 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 13:47:33 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id OAA07960; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 14:44:11 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 99 13:42:05 CST  
From: keen@ncrssi.StPaulMN.NCR.COM (Hal Keen )  
Message-Id: <9903051942.AA26701@ncrssi.StPaulMN.NCR.COM>  
To: 802exec@hepnrc.hep.net, stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org

Subject: QoS/FC Study Group issues  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Apologies to those Exec members who are on the QoS reflector and receive a duplicate of this.

So far, the straw poll has revealed a few individuals (on both sides) who seem happy with the idea of killing or perpetuating the Study Group by means of the good old 18-carat procedural finagle. It has revealed a much larger set of individuals who are upset by the notion that the Other Side (whichever they happen to be on) are finagling.

There are also a number of people who approve in principle of Quality of Service but have failed to reveal whether they know anything about the technical issues surrounding work in 802. There are a whole lot of people who are extremely well grounded in one side of the argument, but ignorant of the other.

Among all these, a few Voices of Reason have emerged. Several of these have suggested the Study Group might yet be of value, but only with a serious change in emphasis.

Right now, the most important thing for the future health of the LMSC is that the Exec action, whatever it may be, not be seen as the result of a procedural "fast one" on either side. We have lived through the aftermath of other situations in which substance was ignored in favor of procedural gamesmanship. The stink doesn't wash away very quickly; the Exec might just as well purchase a large dead whale and ship it to the next few plenaries, as far as I'm concerned.

I repeat my suggestion that Khaled meet his obligation on Monday morning by presenting the interim meeting resolution, and that the Exec allow at least until Thursday evening to sort things out. I now add a plea to all parties to spend a little time considering the other side's viewpoint.

Hal Keen

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 12:36:02 1999  
Received: by multi14.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 20:33:03 1999)  
X-From\_: a\_flatman@compuserve.com Fri Mar 5 14:26:13 1999  
Received: from arl-img-10.compuserve.com (arl-img-10.compuserve.com [149.174.217.140]) by multi14.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id OAA23926 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 14:26:13 -0600  
Received: (from mailgate@localhost)  
by arl-img-10.compuserve.com (8.8.6/8.8.6/2.18) id PAA23961  
for ckm@mickgroup.com; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 15:26:41 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 15:25:28 -0500  
From: Alan Flatman <a\_flatman@compuserve.com>

Subject: TIME OUT!!!  
Sender: Alan Flatman <a\_flatman@compuserve.com>  
To: Colin Mick--The Mick Group <ckm@mickgroup.com>  
Message-ID: <199903051526\_MC2-6CE5-58FE@compuserve.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Disposition: inline

I fully support Colin Mick's proposal and actually believe that the "blood letting" on the reflector over the last few days has been useful experience, for me at least.

Colin's proposal is entirely sensible and democratic, and opposing forces should have nothing to fear in sharing their position with a larger group. After all, if they are correct in their judgement, their views will only be magnified, and we will get the outcome we are all able to live with.

Regards,

Alan Flatman

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 12:36:03 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 20:33:04 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 14:30:58 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id OAA24330 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 14:30:58 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id PAA15568; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 15:30:09 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 15:28:21 -0500  
From: Alan Flatman <a\_flatman@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Colin Mick's Proposal  
To: IEEE802QoS/FC <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
Message-ID: <199903051529\_MC2-6CE5-5933@compuserve.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by ruebert.ieee.org id  
PAA15560  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

I fully support Colin Mick's proposal and actually believe that the "blood letting" on the reflector over the last few days has been useful experience, for me at least.

Colin's proposal is entirely sensible and democratic, and opposing forces

should have nothing to fear in sharing their position with a larger group. After all, if they are correct in their judgement, their views will only be magnified, and we will get the outcome we are all able to live with.

Regards,

Alan Flatman

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 13:06:43 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 21:03:44 1999)  
X-From\_: lidinsky@hep.net Fri Mar 5 14:55:54 1999  
Received: from utah.hep.net (utah.hep.net [131.225.80.59]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id OAA26467 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 14:55:54 -0600  
Received: from hep.net (nhmpp0.fnal.gov [131.225.80.64])  
by utah.hep.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id OAA29771;  
Fri, 5 Mar 1999 14:56:32 -0600 (CST)  
Message-ID: <36E04465.1D56A02@hep.net>  
Date: Fri, 05 Mar 1999 14:53:57 -0600  
From: Bill Lidinsky <lidinsky@hep.net>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (WinNT; I)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Colin Mick--The Mick Group <ckm@mickgroup.com>  
CC: Andrew Smith <andrew@extremenetworks.com>,  
"Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>,  
802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
"802 Exec" <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Subject: Re: TIME OUT!!!  
References: <199903051927.NAA09235@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Colin:

I think that I have a real problem with this proposal. Reading between the lines, what you propose will, I suspect, take quite a bit of time. 802.1 already has a very full plate for this meeting. If we do what you suggest then 802.1 will not get some important work done.

My sense of the 802.1 Working Group is that if there is much time spent on this whole issue at the meeting next week, 802.1 members will begrudgingly feel it necessary to attend. We will be sort of "shanghaied" into attending, thus precluding other 802.1 work.

Bill Lidinsky

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 13:06:45 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 21:03:46 1999)  
X-From\_: khaledamer@usa.net Fri Mar 5 15:02:43 1999

Received: from dfw-ix16.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix16.ix.netcom.com [206.214.98.16])  
by multi14.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id PAA27247 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 15:02:43 -0600  
Received: (from smap@localhost)  
by dfw-ix16.ix.netcom.com (8.8.4/8.8.4)  
id PAA10867 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 15:03:35 -0600  
(CST)  
Received: from swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net(207.217.120.123) by dfw-  
ix16.ix.netcom.com via smap (V1.3)  
id rma010709; Fri Mar 5 15:03:08 1999  
Received: from khaledamer (1Cust136.tnt3.sfo2.da.uu.net [208.251.193.136])  
by swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id NAA17749;  
Fri, 5 Mar 1999 13:02:58 -0800 (PST)  
Message-ID: <03ca01be674b\$049a9400\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "Andrew Smith" <andrew@extremenetworks.com>,  
"Colin Mick--The Mick Group" <ckm@mickgroup.com>  
Cc: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
"802 Exec" <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Subject: Re: TIME OUT!!!  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 12:56:19 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Sounds good to me.

Let's emphasize 'objective manner'. I'd also like to add 'professional'!

Khaled Amer  
Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

-----Original Message-----

From: Colin Mick--The Mick Group <ckm@mickgroup.com>  
To: Andrew Smith <andrew@extremenetworks.com>; 'Khaled Amer (AmerNet)'  
<khaledamer@usa.net>  
Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>; '802 Exec'  
<802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Date: Friday, March 05, 1999 11:43 AM  
Subject: TIME OUT!!!

>This is all getting far too convoluted.

>

>May I propose:

>

>1. We schedule another meeting for next week to get closure on a  
>recommendation to the Exec (to be determined by formal ballot.)

>

>2. Khaled reports the results of the Interim vote to the Exec on Monday am

>and a CONCISE summary of the subsequent email traffic. Khaled asks the Exec  
>to put the future of the QOS/FC study group on the agenda for Thursday  
>night, at which time he will bring a summary of the results of the meeting.  
>  
>3. We hold the meeting to discuss the future of the QOS/FC group in a  
>pre-defined, concise, and objective manner. All agree on time frame,  
>discussion rules and the fact that the meeting will end with a ballot.  
>  
>Personally I'd like to see a 3 phase meeting: discussion (see below),  
>motion presentation and vote including discussion of motions as per below.)  
>  
>Discussion should be limited to two statements per person: an opening  
>statement and a rebuttal following the round opening statements.  
>  
>We discuss; we craft motions; we vote.  
>  
>4. Khaled reports the results Thursday nite.  
>  
>  
>Colin  
>  
>  
>Colin K. Mick  
>The Mick Group  
>2130 Hanover St,  
>Palo Alto, CA 94306  
>voice: (650) 856-3666  
>FAX: (650) 494-3737  
>email: ckm@mickgroup.com  
>URL: www.mickgroup.com

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 13:16:40 1999  
Received: by multi4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 21:13:37 1999)  
X-From\_: Everett.Rigsbee@PSS.Boeing.com Fri Mar 5 15:10:21 1999  
Received: from stl-smtpout-01.boeing.com (stl-smtpout-01.boeing.com  
[192.161.36.9]) by multi4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id PAA27949 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 15:10:21 -0600  
Received: from xch-pssbh-03.ca.boeing.com ([134.52.9.169])  
by stl-smtpout-01.boeing.com (8.9.0/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id NAA14939;  
Fri, 5 Mar 1999 13:11:22 -0800 (PST)  
Received: by xch-pssbh-03.ca.boeing.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2407.0)  
id <FXWF7PL1>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 13:11:21 -0800  
Message-ID: <3168F6EDD4A4D1118BAA00805FE6CB6C0129F5EC@xch-blv-07.ca.boeing.com>  
From: "Rigsbee, Everett O" <Everett.Rigsbee@PSS.Boeing.com>  
To: "'Bill Lidinsky'" <lidinsky@hep.net>,  
Colin Mick--The Mick Group  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>  
Cc: Andrew Smith <andrew@extremenetworks.com>,  
"Khaled Amer (AmerNet)"  
<khaledamer@usa.net>,  
802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
"802 Exec" <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Subject: RE: TIME OUT!!!  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 13:06:32 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2407.0)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Bill, I agree with your concerns. Why not substitute this session for the Technical Plenary, Wednesday morning, which most folks are free to attend, make it a closed-end time slot and a vote at the end as Colin suggested. At least we could get some closure and get on with our other important tasks. {My \$.02 worth.}

Thanx, Buzz

Dr. Everett O. (Buzz) Rigsbee  
Boeing Information Services  
PO Box 24346, MS: 7M-FM  
Seattle, WA 98124-0346  
(425) 865-2443, FX: (425) 865-6721  
everett.o.rigsbee@boeing.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill Lidinsky [SMTP:lidinsky@hep.net]  
Sent: Friday, March 05, 1999 12:54 PM  
To: Colin Mick--The Mick Group  
Cc: Andrew Smith; 'Khaled Amer (AmerNet)'; 802-qos-fc reflector; '802

Exec'

Subject: Re: TIME OUT!!!

Colin:

I think that I have a real problem with this proposal. Reading between the lines, what you propose will, I suspect, take quite a bit of time.

802.1 already has a very full plate for this meeting. If we do what you suggest then 802.1 will not get some important work done.

My sense of the 802.1 Working Group is that if there is much time spent on this whole issue at the meeting next week, 802.1 members will begrudgingly feel it necessary to attend. We will be sort of "shanghaied" into attending, thus precluding other 802.1 work.

Bill Lidinsky

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 14:16:50 1999

Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm

(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 22:13:42 1999)

X-From\_: khaledamer@usa.net Fri Mar 5 16:03:45 1999

Received: from dfw-ix2.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix2.ix.netcom.com [206.214.98.2]) by multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id QAA00471 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 16:03:45 -0600

Received: (from smap@localhost)

by dfw-ix2.ix.netcom.com (8.8.4/8.8.4)

id QAA06693 for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 16:04:14 -0600

(CST)

Received: from swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net(207.217.120.123) by dfw-ix2.ix.netcom.com via smap (V1.3)

id rma006666; Fri Mar 5 16:03:52 1999

Received: from khaledamer (1Cust136.tnt3.sfo2.da.uu.net [208.251.193.136])

by swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id OAA13857;

Fri, 5 Mar 1999 14:03:40 -0800 (PST)

Message-ID: <03eb01be6753\$7fala8c0\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>

Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>

From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>

To: "Rigsbee, Everett O" <Everett.Rigsbee@PSS.Boeing.com>,  
      " 'Bill Lidinsky' " <lidinsky@hep.net>,  
      "Colin Mick--The Mick Group" <ckm@mickgroup.com>  
Cc: "Andrew Smith" <andrew@extremenetworks.com>,  
      "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
      " '802 Exec' " <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Subject: Re: TIME OUT!!!  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 13:59:50 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
              charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Sounds good to me.  
In this case, I'd like to request that Jim Carlo attend and moderate the  
meeting.  
Khaled.

-----Original Message-----

From: Rigsbee, Everett O <Everett.Rigsbee@PSS.Boeing.com>  
To: 'Bill Lidinsky' <lidinsky@hep.net>; Colin Mick--The Mick Group  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>  
Cc: Andrew Smith <andrew@extremenetworks.com>; 'Khaled Amer (AmerNet)'  
<khaledamer@usa.net>; 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>; '802  
Exec' <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Date: Friday, March 05, 1999 1:26 PM  
Subject: RE: TIME OUT!!!

>Bill, I agree with your concerns. Why not substitute this session for the  
Technical Plenary, Wednesday morning, which most folks are free to attend,  
make it a closed-end time slot and a vote at the end as Colin suggested. At  
least we could get some closure and get on with our other important tasks.  
{My \$.02 worth.}  
>Thanx, Buzz  
>Dr. Everett O. (Buzz) Rigsbee  
>Boeing Information Services  
>PO Box 24346, MS: 7M-FM  
>Seattle, WA 98124-0346  
>(425) 865-2443, FX: (425) 865-6721  
>everett.o.rigsbee@boeing.com

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 14:46:43 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Fri Mar 5 22:43:35 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 16:41:28 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id QAA03402 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 16:41:28 -0600



Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id RAA04551; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 17:37:33 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <044b01be6758\$1e09e320\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "Hal Keen " <keen@ncrssi.StPaulMN.NCR.COM>, <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>,  
<stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
Subject: Re: QoS/FC Study Group issues  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 14:24:08 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Hal,

>I repeat my suggestion that Khaled meet his obligation on Monday  
>morning by presenting the interim meeting resolution, and that the  
>Exec allow at least until Thursday evening to sort things out. I  
>now add a plea to all parties to spend a little time considering  
>the other side's viewpoint.

This is very well put, and I feel that this is really good input.

As far as for me, I'll certainly meet my obligation and report the motions and results that were passed in the Interim meeting on Monday morning, as well as any other input that can provide.

Thanks for the input.

Khaled Amer  
Chairman, IEEE 802 Study Group on QoS/FC

From ???@??? Fri Mar 05 20:54:21 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Sat Mar 6 04:50:46 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Fri Mar 5 22:47:43 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id WAA24407 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 22:47:43 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id XAA14597; Fri, 5 Mar 1999 23:38:44 -0500 (EST)  
Message-Id: <199903060438.XAA29986@ieee.org>  
X-Sender: ckm@popd.mickgroup.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2  
Date: Fri, 05 Mar 1999 20:34:05 -0800  
To: stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org  
From: Colin Mick--The Mick Group <ckm@mickgroup.com>  
Subject: Forwarding vote from Tom Dineen  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

Colin:

Thanks for forwarding this to me.

I really need to get an email account set up and rejoin the reflectors but I have been very busy.

"Should the QoS/FC Study Group continue its work to develop a PAR for a standard to specify QoS and Flow Control support mechanisms for Layer 2 LAN/MAN Access Devices that will permit uniform Layer 3 Services across LAN/MAN connected networks."

Please respond by either: Yes, No, Abstain.

My Vote: No

But remember this is a vote NO on the motion only!

I still support the QOS/FC work!

This work should be continued in other private forums.

At the last meeting we voted to close the work down and I believe that we must maintain respect for the rules, process, and other participants so that means we must stick with that decision. A decision taken by motion at an official IEEE meeting, under IEEE rules.

I am not surprised there was a large flame this is really out of order.

Colin thanks for the help and do please do suppress this email address.

See you in Austin.

Thomas Dineen

Colin K. Mick  
The Mick Group  
2130 Hanover St,  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
voice: (650) 856-3666  
FAX: (650) 494-3737  
email: ckm@mickgroup.com  
URL: www.mickgroup.com

From ???@??? Sat Mar 06 08:04:22 1999

Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm

(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Sat Mar 6 16:02:00 1999)

X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Sat Mar 6 09:54:25 1999

Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id JAA26766 for

<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Sat, 6 Mar 1999 09:54:25 -0600

Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)

id KAA27153; Sat, 6 Mar 1999 10:50:15 -0500 (EST)

X-Sender: seifert@netcom4.netcom.com

Message-Id: <v04003a19b306fb9732bb@[209.109.233.169]>

In-Reply-To: <037801be6737\$71811620\$5a523ea2@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Date: Sat, 6 Mar 1999 07:36:49 -0800  
To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>  
Subject: Re: Vote by e-mail  
Cc: "802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

>Come, Rich!  
>Please tell me in plain English what you want me to do regarding your vote.  
>

Fine. I want you to report my vote to the ExCom as follows:

>  
>I voted to disband the Study Group in the only "poll" that should count, a  
>vote  
>authorized by a motion and second to the Study Group. I stand by my opinion  
>that the Study Group should disband.  
>  
>Those interested in pursuing issues related to Data Link QoS/FC should do  
>so outside the aegis of IEEE 802, and are welcome to come back with solid  
>technical proposals.  
>

--

Rich Seifert  
seifert@netcom.com  
(408) 395-5700  
(408) 395-1966 FAX  
Networks and Communications Consulting  
21885 Bear Creek Way  
Los Gatos, CA 95033  
"... specialists in Local Area Networks and Data Communications systems"

From ???@??? Sat Mar 06 08:04:23 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Sat Mar 6 16:02:01 1999)  
X-From\_: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org Sat Mar 6 09:54:29 1999  
Received: from ruebert.ieee.org (ruebert.ieee.org [199.172.136.3]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id JAA26781 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Sat, 6 Mar 1999 09:54:29 -0600  
Received: by ruebert.ieee.org (8.8.8/8.8.8)  
id KAA27164; Sat, 6 Mar 1999 10:50:19 -0500 (EST)  
X-Sender: seifert@netcom4.netcom.com  
Message-Id: <v04003a1bb306fc3858a2@[209.109.233.169]>  
In-Reply-To: <D0805D3B448BD211A7990008C7B181301429D6@SOL>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Date: Sat, 6 Mar 1999 07:38:22 -0800

To: Andrew Smith <andrew@extremenetworks.com>,  
      "'Khaled Amer (AmerNet)'" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>  
Subject: RE: Vote by e-mail  
Cc: 802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
      "'802 Exec'" <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Sender: owner-stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org  
Precedence: bulk  
X-Resent-To: Multiple Recipients <stds-802-qos-fc@majordomo.ieee.org>  
X-Listname: stds-802-qos-fc  
X-Info: [Un]Subscribe requests to majordomo@majordomo.ieee.org  
X-Moderator-Address: stds-802-qos-fc-approval@majordomo.ieee.org

At 10:43 AM -0800 3/5/99, Andrew Smith wrote:

>

>You are really not doing a very good job of chairing this discussion. I'd  
>like to propose my own straw poll: who would like to find a study group  
>chair for this issue who can help IEEE 802 LMSC come to a sensible  
>resolution of this topic?

>

I vote an unqualified "YES, I WOULD!" to this poll.

--

Rich Seifert  
seifert@netcom.com  
(408) 395-5700  
(408) 395-1966 FAX  
Networks and Communications Consulting  
21885 Bear Creek Way  
Los Gatos, CA 95033  
"... specialists in Local Area Networks and Data Communications systems"

From ???@??? Sat Mar 06 07:54:23 1999  
Received: by multil4.netcomi.com for ckm  
      (with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Sat Mar 6 15:52:01 1999)  
X-From\_: seifert@netcom.com Sat Mar 6 09:50:14 1999  
Received: from dfw-ix6.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix6.ix.netcom.com [206.214.98.6]) by  
multil4.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTTP id JAA26608 for  
<ckm@mickgroup.com>; Sat, 6 Mar 1999 09:50:14 -0600  
Received: (from smap@localhost)  
      by dfw-ix6.ix.netcom.com (8.8.4/8.8.4)  
      id JAA28875; Sat, 6 Mar 1999 09:50:06 -0600 (CST)  
Received: from sji-ca41-148.ix.netcom.com(209.111.208.148) by dfw-  
ix6.ix.netcom.com via smap (V1.3)  
      id rma028816; Sat Mar 6 09:49:43 1999  
X-Sender: seifert@netcom4.netcom.com  
Message-Id: <v04003alcb306fd0b8a30@[209.109.233.169]>  
In-Reply-To: <36E04465.1D56A02@hep.net>  
References: <199903051927.NAA09235@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Date: Sat, 6 Mar 1999 07:43:32 -0800  
To: Bill Lidinsky <lidinsky@hep.net>,  
      Colin Mick--The Mick Group <ckm@mickgroup.com>  
From: Rich Seifert <seifert@netcom.com>  
Subject: Re: TIME OUT!!!

Cc: Andrew Smith <andrew@extremenetworks.com>,  
"Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>,  
802-qos-fc reflector <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
"802 Exec" <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>

At 2:53 PM -0600 3/5/99, Bill Lidinsky wrote:

>  
>I think that I have a real problem with this proposal. Reading between  
>the lines, what you propose will, I suspect, take quite a bit of time.  
>802.1 already has a very full plate for this meeting. If we do what you  
>suggest then 802.1 will not get some important work done.  
>  
>My sense of the 802.1 Working Group is that if there is much time spent  
>on this whole issue at the meeting next week, 802.1 members will  
>begrudgingly feel it necessary to attend. We will be sort of  
>"shanghaied" into attending, thus precluding other 802.1 work.  
>

The same problem exists with 802.3 folks who will be at Link Aggregation  
and other Task Force meetings. The proposal seems intended to leverage the  
exact "skew" that I discussed in earlier postings, where many of those  
knowledgeable of the issues cannot attend during Plenary due to obligations  
to existing work occurring under authorized PARs. That is why the Interim  
meeting is actual a better venue than a Plenary.

--

Rich Seifert  
seifert@netcom.com  
(408) 395-5700  
(408) 395-1966 FAX  
"... specialists in Local Area Networks and Data Communications systems"

Networks and Communications Consulting  
21885 Bear Creek Way  
Los Gatos, CA 95033

From ???@??? Sat Mar 06 08:34:22 1999  
Received: by multi14.netcomi.com for ckm  
(with Netcom Interactive pop3d (v1.21.1 1998/05/07) Sat Mar 6 16:31:57 1999)  
X-From\_: khaledamer@usa.net Sat Mar 6 10:29:36 1999  
Received: from snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net  
[207.217.120.62]) by multi14.netcomi.com (8.8.5/8.7.4) with ESMTP id KAA28406  
for <ckm@mickgroup.com>; Sat, 6 Mar 1999 10:29:36 -0600  
Received: from khaledamer (pool009-max7.ds20-ca-us.dialup.earthlink.net  
[209.179.17.109])  
by snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id IAA00617;  
Sat, 6 Mar 1999 08:30:13 -0800 (PST)  
Message-ID: <00d801be67ee\$13c4e220\$4d8afea9@khaledamer.earthlink.net>  
Reply-To: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
From: "Khaled Amer (AmerNet)" <khaledamer@usa.net>  
To: "Bill Lidinsky" <lidinsky@hep.net>,  
"Colin Mick--The Mick Group" <ckm@mickgroup.com>,  
"Rich Seifert" <seifert@netcom.com>  
Cc: "Andrew Smith" <andrew@extremenetworks.com>,  
"802-qos-fc reflector" <stds-802-qos-fc@ieee.org>,  
"802 Exec" <802exec@hepnrc.hep.net>  
Subject: Re: TIME OUT!!!  
Date: Sat, 6 Mar 1999 08:26:22 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Rich,  
I believe that discussing this in the Technical Plenary on Wed takes care of  
that problem.  
Khaled.

>