

# **Minutes, Technology Group on Distribution 5 December 2001**

**Advanced Television Systems Committee**  
1750 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
[www.atsc.org](http://www.atsc.org)

The Advanced Television Systems Committee (ATSC), is an international, non-profit membership organization developing voluntary standards for the entire spectrum of advanced television systems.

Specifically, ATSC is working to coordinate television standards among different communications media focusing on digital television, interactive systems, and broadband multimedia communications. ATSC is also developing digital television implementation strategies and presenting educational seminars on the ATSC standards.

ATSC was formed in 1982 by the member organizations of the Joint Committee on InterSociety Coordination (JCIC): the Electronic Industries Association (EIA), the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE), the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB), the National Cable Television Association (NCTA), and the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers (SMPTE). Currently, there are approximately 190 members representing the broadcast, broadcast equipment, motion picture, consumer electronics, computer, cable, satellite, and semiconductor industries.

ATSC Digital TV Standards include digital high definition television (HDTV), standard definition television (SDTV), data broadcasting, multichannel surround-sound audio, and satellite direct-to-home broadcasting.

## Table of Contents

<b>1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AGENDA .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MINUTES OF OCTOBER 3, 2001 MEETING .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. OPENING REMARKS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1 Comments by the Executive Director	5
4.2 Status of Ballots	6
4.3 Revised ATSC Procedures and Policies	6
4.4 Other	6
<b>5. BRIEF REPORTS ON ACTIONS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING.....</b>	<b>7</b>
5.1 Action Items from October 3 Meeting	7
<b>6. NEW WORK ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
6.1 Assigned by Executive Committee	8
6.2 Implementation Subcommittee	8
6.3 Applications Subcommittee	8
6.4 Other	8
<b>7. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON DATA BROADCAST, T3/S13.....</b>	<b>8</b>
7.1 IP Multicast	8
7.1.1 IETF Coordination	8
7.2 Data Synchronization	9
7.3 Transport Stream File System	9
7.4 Corrigendum 1 to A/90	9
7.5 Corrigendum 2 to A/90	9
7.6 A/90 Corrigendum 3	10
7.7 Presentation of DVS161 (A/90) to SCTE	10
<b>8. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON SATELLITE BROADCAST, T3/S14-A.....</b>	<b>10</b>
8.1 Review of Past Meeting Progress	10
8.2 Future Meeting Plans and Issues	11
<b>9. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON DATA MULTIPLEX/TRANSPORT, T3/S8 .....</b>	<b>11</b>
9.1 Review of Annex C to A/53 and Transport Sections of A/54	11
9.2 Status of Work on Content Identification and Replacement of A/57	11
9.3 Status of Work on Advanced EPG Functionality	11
9.4 Status of Work on Code Point Issues	11
9.5 Creation of new Ad Hoc Group to Examine Transport Issues Related to Enhanced 8-VSB Transmission	12
9.6 PSIP Implementation Guidelines for Broadcasters and Receiver Manufacturers	12
9.7 DCC Amendment Issues	13
9.8 Generalized Carriage of Metadata	13
<b>10. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON DASE, T3/S17 .....</b>	<b>13</b>
10.1 Disposition of Comments for 2nd T3 ballot of Draft DASE-1 Standard	13
10.2 Consideration of Substantive Changes to Draft DASE-1 Standard	14
10.3 Consideration of Normative Reference to PNG Development Group	14
10.4 DASE-1 ATSC Ballot Disposition	15

<b>10.5 DASE-1 Follow-On</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>11. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON ARM, T3/S18 .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>11.1 Summary of the ARM Ballot Comments</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>12. REPORT OF SPECIALISTS GROUP ON TRANSACTIONAL SERVICES, T3/S16 .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>12.1 Status</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>13. REPORT OF SPECIALISTS GROUP ON VIDEO, T3/S6.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>13.1 Status</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>13.2 Proposed Amendment to A/53B</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>14. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON RF TRANSMISSION, T3/S9 .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>14.1 T3/S9 RF Transmission VSB Enhancements Update</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>14.2 Draft Revised Standard</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>14.3 Liaison with T3/S8</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>14.4 Revised Work Plan</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>15. OTHER BUSINESS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>15.1 Clarification of Issues Relating to T3-548 and T3-549</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>15.2 ATSC Reflector Management Issues</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>15.3 Other Items</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>16. SCHEDULE OF NEXT T3 MEETING.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>17. ADJOURNMENT .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b><u>Summary of Action Items</u></b>	<b>20</b>
<b><u>Attachments</u></b>	<b>22</b>

**Minutes:**  
**ATSC Technology Group on Distribution (Draft)**

December 5, 2001, 10:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m.  
National Association of Broadcasters, Conference Room A  
1771 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

**1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Chairman Ralph Justus (CEA) called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. at the headquarters of the National Association of Broadcasters in Washington, D.C. He welcomed those in attendance and asked each person to identify themselves. The attendance list is given in **Attachment 1**. He also thanked NAB for hosting the meeting.

**2. APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AGENDA**

Chairman Justus asked for consideration of the draft agenda (**Attachment 2**). Bill Miller (SMPTE) requested that agenda item 13 (T3/S6 Report) and agenda item 16 (Schedule of Next Meeting) be moved up in the order of meeting items. Chairman Justus said he would attempt to accommodate Mr. Miller's request. Bernard Lechner (Consultant) requested that two items be added to the agenda:

- 9.7 "DCC Amendment Corrigenda"
- 9.8 "Establishment of Ad Hoc Group on Generalized Carriage of Metadata"

Mr. Lechner's proposal was accepted. Glenn Adams (XFSA) requested that agenda item 10.3 ("Recommendation for ATSC Member Ballot of Draft DASE-1 Standard") and item 10.4 ("Consideration of Normative Reference to PNG Development Group") be exchanged in position on the agenda. This amendment to the agenda was accepted. Mr. Adams also requested the addition of a new item titled "DASE-1 Follow-on Work," which was inserted as agenda item 10.4.5. No further changes were offered and the agenda was accepted as amended.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MINUTES OF OCTOBER 3, 2001 MEETING**

Chairman Justus called member's attention to the draft Minutes of the October 3, 2001, T3 meeting (**Attachment 3**). Secretary Jerry Whitaker (ATSC) stated that certain editorial corrections had been identified by Mike Dolan (Consultant) and Bernie Lechner (Consultant). No further changes were requested and the draft Minutes were accepted as revised.

**4. OPENING REMARKS**

**4.1 Comments by the Executive Director**

Mark Richer (ATSC) reported on current activities of the ATSC in general, and T3 in particular. He called members' attention to the ATSC Bylaws ballot currently out to the membership. He said this was a very important step for ATSC and he urged each member to give full consideration of the issue.

Mr. Richer reported that ATSC staff is continuing to look at phone bridge alternatives for teleconferences and dial-in meeting services. He asked any members with input on this topic to forward their comments to Christy Kehlbeck at ATSC headquarters.

Mr. Richer noted the progress made recently regarding liaison with SCTE. He said the joint work undertaken so far is significant and encouraging. He also reminded members that the ATSC Standards Seminar, originally set for October, has been moved to February 20 and 21 in

St. Louis. He thanked the ATSC members who are sponsoring the event, and the individuals presenting technical papers.

#### 4.2 Status of Ballots

Mr. Richer outlined the status of T3 ballots that have closed since the October 3 meeting, specifically:

- **A/65A Amendment 2:** *approved* October 29, 2001, 14 yes, 2 no; editorial privilege: *approved*, 15 yes, 1 no.
- **A/65A Amendment 3:** *approved* November 29, 2001, 20 yes, 6 no; editorial privilege: *approved*, 22 yes, 4 no.
- **ARM Standard:** *approved* November 29, 2001, 13 yes, 5 no; editorial privilege: *approved*, 15 yes, 3 no.

#### 4.3 Revised ATSC Procedures and Policies

Mr. Richer reported to the committee that, as a part of the effort to incorporate ATSC, a new set of Bylaws has been sent to the full membership for approval. He gave the committee an overview of the procedural changes and the impact on specialist group activities (**Attachment 4**). In addition to a number of changes in the governance structure, there are several proposed improvements to the due process of ATSC, the primary elements of which are outlined in **Attachment 5**. These changes include a new optional step in the standardization process by which a document may be elevated to the status of "Candidate Standard" prior to final approval by the membership. This step allows time to gather feedback concerning implementation issues. The Bylaws also provide a definition of "consensus" and an option for voting within Specialist Groups. Mr. Richer said he expects these changes to be in effect early in January, after approval by the full ATSC membership.

Mr. Richer also reported that the ATSC staff has drafted a new document "Procedures For Technology Group and Specialist Group Operation." This draft document, which had been posted to the T3 reflector, is meant to complement the new Bylaws and to replace the existing "Guidelines for Technology Group Operation," E/11 (**Attachment 6**).

He added that the ATSC staff has developed a number of templates for use in specialist group activities. The following documents are now available on the ATSC Web Members-Only area ([http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Administrative\\_Documents/](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Administrative_Documents/) username = atsc, password = sg100):

- *Style Guide for Technical Documents* (including templates for True Type and Postscript fonts)
- Comment resolution spreadsheet template
- Document log spreadsheet template
- Meeting minutes template
- Sign-in sheet template
- Work plan template
- Draft agenda template

Specialist group chairs and secretaries are encouraged to migrate their work to these document templates to provide more commonality among specialist group work.

#### 4.4 Other

Art Allison (NAB) suggested that Chairman Justus should consider the disposition of comments for the three ballot items listed in agenda item 4.2. Chairman Justus noted consensus on the part of T3 to assign the comment resolution task for A/65A Amendment 2 and A/65A Amendment 3 to T3/S8. He directed Mr. Lechner to form a comment resolution task force within T3/S8 and to

report back to T3 at its next meeting. Chairman Justus likewise asked Mr. Dolan on behalf of T3/S18 to undertake a comment resolution process for the ARM document.

## 5. BRIEF REPORTS ON ACTIONS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Chairman Justus observed that activities are proceeding on action items from the October 3 meeting, with follow-up reports on today's agenda from each specialist group.

### 5.1 Action Items from October 3 Meeting

The following action items resulted from the T3 meeting of October 3, 2001.

- a) Richer to present to the EC the collision avoidance documents approved by T3 at its August 8 meeting (T3-548, "ATSC usage of the MPEG-2 Registration Descriptor," and T3-549, "Collision Avoidance for Private Fields and Ranges." These documents, the final output from the T3 Collision Avoidance Ad Hoc Group, provide a set of rules—which, if followed—allow the unique identification of all uses of private fields or ranges. At its August meeting, T3 voted to send the documents to the Executive Committee (EC) with a recommendation that they be accepted as Technology Group Reports. *Completed.*
- b) Whitaker to extract the action items from the August 8 meeting and list their status, and from this point forward, to include a separate list of action items from T3 meetings. *Completed.*
- c) Whitaker to prepare a work plan for revising ATSC engineering guide A/54 for consideration at the next T3 meeting. *Carried forward.*
- d) Pizzi to communicate with the TV Anytime Forum regarding ATSC work on advanced EPG functionality to ensure that progress continues to be made on this T3/S8 effort. *Completed.*
- e) Lechner to forward to ATSC staff T3S8-437, as amended at the October 3 T3 meeting, for the purpose of issuing a six week ballot of T3. *Completed.*
- f) Lechner and T3/S8 to continue work on the draft Recommended Practice on PSIP with the goal of having the document ready for ballot at the December 5 T3 meeting. *On agenda.*
- g) Weiss to serve a chair of an ad hoc group to study certain issues surrounding the DCC amendment that was recently approved by the ATSC membership, with the goal of formulating a plan for moving forward with a possible amendment to the document. *On agenda.*
- h) Eyer to maintain liaison with CEA regarding the ongoing work of T3/S6, specifically with regard to Active Format Description (ADF) issues. *Completed.*
- i) Crinon to work with Justus and Richer regarding disposition of comments received during the T3 rebalot of the draft IP Multicast Standard with the goal of moving the document to a ballot of the ATSC membership. *On agenda.*
- j) Crinon to work with Justus and Richer regarding disposition of comments received during the T3 ballot on the draft Synchronized/Asynchronous Trigger Standard. *On agenda.*
- k) Tollefson report to T3/S9 the following approved motion: "T3 strongly recommends to T3/S9 to obtain agreements from candidate testing organizations to comply with ATSC NDA policies before releasing an A/53 draft revision." *On agenda.*
- l) Adams to form a T3/S17 DASE comment resolution group to draft resolution of all ballot comments possible, and report back to T3 at its December meeting on progress made. *On agenda.*

- m) Richer to report to the EC the approval of the following T3 motion relating to DASE: “There are no reasonable and timely alternative technological approaches to Sun Microsystems’ Java technology that may be accessed in accordance with the draft ATSC Copyright Reference Policy. Therefore, if necessary, the EC should make an exception to Copyright Reference Policy for the Java technology.” *Completed.*
- n) Adams to report to T3/S17 the following decision of T3: “T3 has adequate evidence of DASE’s ability to be implemented, and should allow the DASE specification to move forward.” *On agenda.*
- o) Dolan to forward to ATSC staff within two weeks Rev 9 of the draft document, “ATSC Data Applications Reference Model” for the purpose of issuing a six week ballot of T3. *Completed.*
- p) Dolan to draft and forward to Richer a formal communication to CEA that it should develop a receiver model specifically to address PSI management (i.e., A/65 and A/90 tables and descriptors). *Completed.*
- q) Chernock to develop, with the assistance of Lechner and Weiss, a T3 white paper on metadata issues to bring T3 up to date on current efforts in this area. *On agenda.*

## 6. NEW WORK ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

### 6.1 Assigned by Executive Committee

There were none.

### 6.2 Implementation Subcommittee

Mr. Allison briefed the committee on the IS “Finding on Essential Data to be Carried in Digital Television Program Streams,” posted to the T3 reflector on November 7 (**Attachment 7**). He suggested that T3 consider need for a Recommended Practice on this subject. Chairman Justus said the committee would consider this issue during its discussion of T3/S8 items.

### 6.3 Applications Subcommittee

There were none.

### 6.4 Other

There were none.

## 7. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON DATA BROADCAST, T3/S13

Regis Crinon (Intel) reported on the recent work of T3/S13 (**Attachment 8**). Specific items are covered in the following sections.

### 7.1 IP Multicast

Mr. Crinon reported that T3/S13 has successfully completed the disposition of comments from the second T3 ballot on the draft IP Multicast with Sessions Standard (**Attachment 9**). He said that all of the comments were editorial in nature.

Mr. Crinon **moved** that the IP Multicast Session document be sent to a 6 weeks ballot of the ATSC membership. **Second** by Rich Chernock. Mr. Allison suggested a numbering change to make the new version of the document a new T3 number. The amendment to the motion was accepted. The motion was **approved** by a voice vote.

#### 7.1.1 IETF Coordination

Mr. Crinon briefed the committee on an IETF board meeting set for next week to discuss IP over DVB. He said the tentative charter of the group is to implement more efficient encapsulation, signaling of IPv4 and IPv6, address resolution, support of multiple gateways (networks), and



synchronization across streams. Mr. Crinon said he has contacted the organizer to communicate the ATSC IP Multicast specification and make them aware of the MPEG System amendment. Mr. Crinon observed that coordination with other groups was important and that he intended to keep T3 informed on progress in this area.

## 7.2 Data Synchronization

Mr. Crinon reported that T3/S13 has successfully completed the disposition of comments received during the T3 ballot on the draft Synchronized/Asynchronous Trigger Standard. (**Attachment 10**). He **moved** that the document, with appropriate T3 numbering, be reballoted to T3 for a period of 4 weeks. **Second** by Mr. Chernock. Mr. Allison suggested that the comment resolution spreadsheet (S13-189r5) accompany the ballot. Chairman Justus directed ATSC staff to do so. The motion was **approved** on a voice vote.

## 7.3 Transport Stream File System

Mr. Crinon reported on the status of document S13-160, which is still under review in the specialist group. He said that among the specialist group objectives is to maintain a high level of compatibility with DVB. Mr. Crinon said that several teleconferences have been held, with good progress being made. He said a new draft specification is in the works, with expected completion by the end of January 2002.

## 7.4 Corrigendum 1 to A/90

Mr. Crinon explained that the purpose of this corrigendum is to clarify an ambiguity in the A/90 standard (**Attachment 11**). The corrigendum clarifies the calculation of checksum for the DSM-CC Section Syntax and DSM-CC Addressable Section Syntax. The original DSM-CC standard (13818-6) normatively describes the checksum calculation as a series of one's complement additions and then incorrectly (parenthetically—informatively) describes this operation as being equivalent to Exclusive-OR (XOR) calculations. These two operations are not equivalent. A corrigendum to 13818-6 (DSM-CC) has been issued to correct this issue (Technical Corrigendum 2 to 13818-6), but is not published as of yet.

The changes provided by Corrigendum 1 to ATSC Standard A/90 remove the ambiguity in A/90 by incorporating the text of the 13818-6 corrigendum, which removes the reference to XOR calculations.

Mr. Crinon said additional clarification is required before the document would be ready for ballot, but that the remaining work is editorial in nature and could be completed by Friday, December 14. Therefore, Mr. Crinon **moved** that T3 authorize a three week ballot of the finished document. **Second** by Gomer Thomas (Triveni). The motion was **approved** on a voice vote.

## 7.5 Corrigendum 2 to A/90

Mr. Crinon explained that the purpose of this corrigendum is to clarify another—but separate—ambiguity in the A/90 Standard (**Attachment 12**). The `app_id_description` field of the DST currently defines one specific value, "DASE application". The intent of this field was to scope the syntax and semantics of the `app_id_byte` field. As written, this is too vague and leaves a gap between the ARM and DASE standards for its use in any interoperable manner. Since the original drafting of A/90, ATSC has decided to institute a registry to handle the assignment of these types of fields. Because A/90 does not define the meaning of the value "DASE application," this is best fixed by deferring to the registry, and thus the standards that build on A/90. Furthermore, this field allocated some values as "user private" which has been shown to induce other interoperability problems. These changes (and related editorial items) are addressed in Corrigendum #2.

Mr. Crinon **moved** that this document be sent to a three week ballot of T3. **Second** by Mr. Allison. Adam Goldberg (Sharp Labs) questioned whether the two A/90 corrigendum documents could not be combined into a single document. Mr. Crinon argued in favor of keeping the ballots separate because, he said, different issues are addressed. Mr. Allison observed that Corrigendum 2 is more appropriately classified as an Amendment. Mr. Lechner agreed. In response, Mr. Crinon and Mr. Dolan explained their reasoning for calling the document a corrigendum. Following a brief discussion, the consensus of the group was to keep the original description. Chairman Justus called the question. It was **approved** on a voice vote.

#### 7.6 A/90 Corrigendum 3

Mr. Crinon reported that a third A/90 Corrigendum was being developed by T3/S13 to resolve a conflict of `table_type` field values between ATSC A/90 and DVS 234. He said the impact of this change would be minimal. Mr. Crinon said he expected A/90 Corrigendum 3 to be ready for consideration by T3 at its February meeting.

Mr. Allison observed that this proposal, because it would make substantive changes, should be considered an amendment. He went on to suggest that, because the issue involved is rather straightforward, perhaps this amendment could move forward without the need for another meeting cycle. Mark Eyer (Sony) suggested that moving forward on this issue should involve coordination with the new code points registry process that will be considered by T3 later today.

Mr. Crinon **moved** that he be authorized, as the chairman of T3/S13 to draft Amendment 1 to A/90 to resolve the `table_type` field values conflict between A/90 and DVS 234 and that the ATSC Registrar assign the appropriate code point values, after which draft Amendment 1 to A/90 will be sent to a three week ballot of T3. **Second** by Mr. Chernock. The motion was **approved** on a voice vote.

#### 7.7 Presentation of DVS161 (A/90) to SCTE

Mr. Crinon identified cooperation with SCTE as an important area of ongoing and future work. He said the SCTE DVS chairman invited T3/S13 to make a presentation on A/90 at the November 27 DVS meeting. Mr. Crinon reported that a group was subsequently formed to turn DVS161 into a cable standard, with Eddie Schwalb as the chair. He said he would keep T3 apprised of the progress of these liaison efforts.

### 8. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON SATELLITE BROADCAST, T3/S14-A

Dipak Shah (DIRECTV) was unable to attend the meeting in person, but he did provide a written status report, which is summarized below.

#### 8.1 Review of Past Meeting Progress

Mr. Shah reported that T3/S14-A met twice since the last (October 3) T3 meeting. The first meeting (on October 18th) was held at Motorola in San Diego and the second (on November 19th) was held via teleconference. The primary focus of these two meetings was to develop a proposed approach to PSIP for satellite service. T3/S8 Doc. 241 (a Scientific Atlanta proposal) served as the basis to review and debate T3/S14-A requirements. Mr. Eyer updated and revised the document, given in **Attachment 13**. Mr. Eyer said the document was edited to reflect changes to various tables, in addition to other specific changes relating to satellite services. He described the document as a good step forward, and a basis to move ahead.

Mr. Shah requested T3 members review the proposed document and provide comments. He also reported completion of a review of the transport requirements section. Sam Narasimhan (Motorola) has been tasked to compile a document for review and further discussion.

## 8.2 Future Meeting Plans and Issues

The next meetings of T3/S14-A is on January 15, 2002, at Motorola, San Diego. The primary focus of this meeting will be to complete the review of T3/S8 Doc. 241, and to begin the process of consolidating various sections into a single document.

Mr. Chernock identified the importance of including data broadcast issues in the revised document. Chairman Justus asked Mr. Chernock to forward his observations on this issue to Mr. Shah.

The meeting broke for lunch at 11:50 a.m. It resumed at 12:30 p.m.

## 9. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON DATA MULTIPLEX/TRANSPORT, T3/S8

T3/S8 chairman Bernie Lechner briefed the committee on specific activities in his specialist group.

### 9.1 Review of Annex C to A/53 and Transport Sections of A/54

Mr. Lechner reported that work on Annex C is currently underway within the specialist group. A list of items for consideration have been developed, and it is expected that a draft amendment to will be available for formal consideration by T3/S8 in time for its next scheduled meeting. After the work on Annex C is completed, revision of A/54 will be undertaken.

### 9.2 Status of Work on Content Identification and Replacement of A/57

Mr. Lechner said this work continues, with considerable progress of late. He called members attention to T3/S8462, an updated draft requirements document that is being offered to T3 for informational purposes. This document is intended to be a guide to the creation of standards in television content distribution by related organizations including SMPTE, ATSC, SCTE, CEA and others. Mr. Lechner added that work on V-ISAN is being led by SMPTE, with Mr. Miller and Merrill Weiss (Tribune) carrying the ball for the most part.

Regarding the method of carriage of content identification information, this issue is addressed by work on a draft document currently underway that would eventually replace ATSC Standard A/57.

### 9.3 Status of Work on Advanced EPG Functionality

Mr. Lechner reported that the Ad Hoc Group on Advanced EPG Functionality, chaired by Mr. Thomas, has renewed its efforts to move forward with its consideration of this issue. He reported good progress, with the goal of developing a rough draft document for consideration by T3/S8 in time for its next scheduled meeting.

### 9.4 Status of Work on Code Point Issues

Mr. Lechner reported that the Ad Hoc Group on Code Point Issues, chaired by Michael Isnardi (Sarnoff) has completed its work and issued a final report (**Attachment 14**). He went on to outline the group's plans for moving forward, a major component of which is close liaison with SCTE.

Mr. Lechner discussed the process for establishment of the Code Points Registry. The Ad Hoc Group has reviewed code points used or defined by ATSC standards and has determined that no conflicts currently exist within current ATSC standards. Moving forward, the T3/S8 AHG recommend that the ATSC:

- Set up a database, called the *Code Points Registry*, to document the assigned values of all existing ATSC code points.
- Publish the Registry on the ATSC Web site.
- Administer assignment of future ATSC code points.

- Establish a procedure for retiring outdated code points, once the procedure for assigning them has stabilized.
- Review all code points at the video and audio layers.
- Require that all ATSC Specialist Groups become familiar with the assignment process.

Mr. Lechner said a preliminary Code Points Registry document has been developed, but that further work is needed, including more specificity with regard to the process for code point assignment. He said a draft Code Points Registry document is expected to eventually be offered to T3 for consideration as a Technology Group Report.

Mr. **Lechner** moved that T3S8452r4 be accepted as a Informational Document of the ATSC. **Second** by Mr. Chernock. Mr. Krauss observed that this document is only one component of the registry process, and that the AHG report as it currently stands is quite ATSC-focused. Mr. Allison urged that the document be edited to be less ATSC-focused and formatted as a Technology Group Report. Mr. Richer said, technically, this report should be referred to as an "Informational Document." He explained that, upon receiving the necessary 2/3 approval, the document would go to the ATSC Board, which would make a determination about whether the document will be considered a Technology Group Report or be balloted to the full membership for approval as an Engineering Guide. Mr. Lechner suggested that T3/S8 perform additional work on the report before proceeding to a ballot. Mr. Weiss agreed, however, he suggested that it could be approved for ballot with the understanding that T3/S8 will make the necessary editorial changes to make the document less ATSC-focused. Chairman Justus suggested that a comment/edit period of three weeks be established with the understanding that once the editorial process is completed, the document will be sent to a 4 week ballot. His suggestion was accepted as an amendment to the motion on the floor by Mr. Lechner and Mr. Chernock. The motion was **approved** by a voice vote.

Mr. Lechner reported that at last week's DVS meeting, SCTE passed a motion to use the ATSC Registrar to assign future code points, and that Mr. Eyer was selected to serve as their liaison. Mr. Lechner characterized this as an important step forward.

Mr. Allison observed that SCTE is likely to expect some role in the code point registration process. Mr. Lechner said that Mr. Whitaker has begun the Code Points Registry document, but that additional work is needed. Mr. Weiss suggested that liaison efforts should include not only SCTE but also ARIB and DVB to make it a truly international database. Subsequent commenters questioned whether such activities were practical. Mr. Lechner said the code point work already completed has attempted to include ARIB and DVB wherever possible.

#### 9.5 Creation of new Ad Hoc Group to Examine Transport Issues Related to Enhanced 8-VSB Transmission

Mr. Lechner reported that an AHG has been established to examine the transport issues relating to the enhanced 8-VSB work being carried on by T3/S9. The group, chaired by Mr. Allison, has met by teleconference and is currently working on a draft document. Mr. Lechner reported that Mr. Allison has invited VSB system proponents to become involved in the work of the AHG.

#### 9.6 PSIP Implementation Guidelines for Broadcasters and Receiver Manufacturers

Mr. Lechner reported that the PSIP Recommended Practice Ad Hoc Group has completed its work and issued the draft document, "Recommended Practice: Program and System Information Protocol Implementation Guidelines for Broadcasters" (**Attachment 15**). This document, T3/S8-456Rev3, received final approval from T3/S8 on December 4 with consensus that it be sent to T3 with a recommendation to ballot. Mr. Lechner said that one editorial item identified as a useful change to the document would be to highlight in one form or another the specific recommendations to broadcasters within the text of the RP. He said Mr. Whitaker, the document

editor, would make that change to the draft RP—which is strictly editorial—before the document is sent out to a T3 ballot.

Mr. Lechner **moved** that T3 authorize T3S8-456r3, with the editorial change noted above, be balloted for a six week period. **Second** Mr. Allison. The motion was **approved** on a voice vote.

Mr. Lecher reported that work continues on the complementary receiver PSIP Recommended Practice being developed by CEA.

#### 9.7 DCC Amendment Issues

Mr. Lechner reported that an Ad Hoc Group has been formed within T3/S8 to consider a possible Directed Channel Change amendment to address certain substantive points identified during balloting of the recently approved DCC PSIP amendment. The AHG plans to draft a new amendment to the DCC section of A/65A to resolve the issues.

#### 9.8 Generalized Carriage of Metadata

Mr. Lechner reported that T3/S8 has agreed to recommended to T3 the formation of a new Ad Hoc Group to focus on Generalized Carriage of Metadata. He reported that T3/S8 recognized the importance of this work and that Richard Chernock (IBM) has agreed to serve as the chair. Mr. Lechner asked for the approval of T3 to proceed along these lines. Chairman Justus invited questions on the T3/S8 request. Comments were offered from Mr. Crinon and Edwin Heredia (Microsoft) regarding coordination of this effort with other specialist group activities. Chairman Justus determined consensus on the part of T3 to proceed with the work, and he directed Mr. Chernock to post a note to the applicable ATSC reflectors calling attention to the AHG work and the expected scope. Mr. Chernock asked any individuals interested in working on this group contact him via e-mail.

### 10. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON DASE, T3/S17

Glenn Adams, T3/S17 chair, reported on the work underway in T3/S17 (**Attachment 16**), specific elements of which are covered in the following agenda items.

#### 10.1 Disposition of Comments for 2nd T3 ballot of Draft DASE-1 Standard

Mr. Adams reported that, at the behest of T3, T3/S17 has completed its work on preparing recommended disposition of comments from the 2nd T3 ballot of DASE-1. The recommended dispositions are given in **Attachment 17**. An additional document that enumerates substantive changes as well as final editorial changes was distributed prior to the T3 meeting (**Attachment 18**). The final revised text of DASE-1, now denoted as Parts 1 through 8, can be found in **Attachment 19**. The previous revision of DASE-1, which contains all substantive changes made as a result of disposing of the 2nd T3 ballot, is given in **Attachment 20**. Mr. Adams went on to detail the disposition of comments relating to the ballot of DASE-1, specifically:

- 113 comments disposed
- 3 disposed as “noted” (DOM-2 HTML not yet finalized, expect finalization in January 2002; ARM not yet finalized, expect finalization in Q1 2002; IPR issue resolution awaiting action by the Executive Committee).
- 10 disposed as “deferred” (functionality deferred which is expected to be addressed by DASE-2 or following work: better standards compatibility, return channel, persistent plug-ins, multiple applications, content authentication, “javascript” URI scheme, generic triggers, and cable bindings).
- Remainder disposed as accepted, resolved, not accepted, or withdrawn

Mr. Adams **moved** that T3 accept the comment resolution report as submitted by T3/S17 in document T3-539r1. **Second** by Alan Mink (NIST). The motion was **approved** on a voice vote.

## 10.2 Consideration of Substantive Changes to Draft DASE-1 Standard

Mr. Adams reported that T3/S17 agreed in teleconference on November 11, 2001, to recommend that T3 take direct action at its upcoming meeting to accept the recommended disposition of comments and furthermore, to accept the substantive changes. He noted that all substantive changes have been available for T3 review for a little more than one month. No substantive changes occurred during final editorial work between October 31 and the final revisions made available in advance of today's T3 meeting.

Mr. Adams went on to outline for the committee the substantive changes made to the DASE-1 draft documents during the comment resolution process. He said there were one functional addition, two functional removals, 34 functional changes, one normative reference change, and five conformance keyword changes.

Mr. Adams **moved** that T3 accept the substantive changes in T3-540r1 without the need for a further ballot of T3. **Second** by Mr. Mink. Clarification of the motion was requested by several members, leading to further discussion of the motion. Mr. Weiss spoke against the motion, saying that the large number of changes that have gone into the DASE-1 suite of documents makes it important to go to a formal rebalot. Mr. Allison spoke in favor of the motion as adopting reasonable compromises to the comments received during the ballot process. Mr. Richer agreed with Mr. Allison, pointing out that two ballots have already been held on this set of documents. He went on to strongly urge T3 to show progress on this standard. He said the comment resolution issues have been well distributed and thoroughly discussed. Chairman Justus called the question; it was **approved** on a roll call vote (21 yes, 7 no).

## 10.3 Consideration of Normative Reference to PNG Development Group

Mr. Adams outlined the issues relating to normative references to the PNG Development Group. He said DASE-1 Part 1 (T3-528) contains two normative references to specifications developed by the [PNG Development Group](#). This organization is an informal group of developer/contributors that have developed and promulgated a number of "Publicly Available Specifications" (PAS) for use in the representation of still and animated (multiple-image) graphical content. Their two primary specifications are known as [PNG](#) (Portable Network Graphics) and [MNG](#) (Multiple-Image Network Graphics).

Mr. Adams explained that, since its inception, the group has developed its work so as to strictly avoid the required use of any patented technology. Nevertheless, due to the rather informal organization of this group, there is some question as to whether it may satisfy the new ATSC Policy on Copyright and Normative References, which states, in part:

"A normative reference in an ATSC Standard or Recommended Practice must be to a document developed by consensus and approved by a recognized standards development organization or industry consortium that operates in a manner substantially consistent with ATSC's open standards process rules and policies."

Mr. Adams said the record is clear that the PNG Development Group has developed the PNG and MNG specifications in a public, consensus-based process; however, this group is clearly not a recognized standards development organization (SDO), and it may or may not be construed as an industry consortium. As to whether it "operates in a manner substantially consistent with ATSC's open standards process rules and policies," this determination requires a subjective judgment.

Mr. Adams explained that, in the case that the ATSC EC has doubts about whether the PNG Development Group satisfies the new policy, he believed it was appropriate to assert that there are no "reasonable and timely alternatives" to these references in DASE-1.

Mr. Adams said it is worth noting, as a further point of reference, the ARIB B24 Data Broadcast Standard makes a normative reference to the MNG specification from this group; therefore, he said, there is a precedent among national television standards for such a reference.

Mr. Adams **moved** that T3 recommend to the Executive Committee that DASE references to the PNG Development Group specifications be allowed because there are no reasonable and timely alternative technological approaches that may be accessed in a manner consistent with Sections IIa-d of the Copyright and Reference Policy. **Second** by Adam Goldberg (Sharp Labs). The motion was **approved** on a voice vote.

#### 10.4 DASE-1 ATSC Ballot Disposition

Having laid the necessary groundwork, Mr. Adams **moved** that the DASE-1 specification dated November 20, 2001, be approved for a ballot of the full membership of ATSC, and that the ballot be structured as a single question to accept the entire DASE-1 specification consisting of documents T3-528R4, T3-529R4, T3-530R4, T3-531R4, T3-533R2, T3-534R2, T3-535R2, and T3-536R2. all dated November 20, 2001. **Second** by Mr. Goldberg. In response to an inquiry from Mr. Heredia, Mr. Richer clarified the position of the Executive Director, which is that the DASE suite of documents would not go forward to membership ballot until the outstanding IPR issues are resolved. Mr. Allison said he agreed with the proposal to advance all of the documents as a package, however, he spoke against the motion saying that the DASE-1 specification as it now stands lacks certain important elements necessary for market success. Mr. Crinon spoke against the motion, saying that it was more appropriate to ballot the DASE parts individually. Mr. Adams responded that the elements of the draft standard are interlocked and cannot be separated without substantive changes. Chairman Justus called the question; it **failed** on a roll call vote (12 yes, 13 no, 8 abstentions).

Discussion ensued regarding how to move forward. Chairman Justus summarized the options, including balloting the DASE-1 standard as individual documents or approving the document as a Candidate Standard. Chairman Justus sense consensus that the DASE-1 standard be advanced to Candidate Standard status. Mr. Richer addressed the options available to T3. He outlined the process for moving forward by designating the suite of documents as a Candidate Standard, and how comments would be handled.

Mr. Adams **moved** that the DASE-1 specification (documents T3-528R4, T3-529R4, T3-530R4, T3-531R4, T3-533R2, T3-534R2, T3-535R2, and T3-536R2) dated November 20, 2001 be approved as a Candidate Standard for a period of 6 months, contingent upon approval by the ATSC membership of pending ATSC Bylaw changes which establish the Candidate Standard class of document. **Second** by Mr. Thomas. The motion was **approved** on a voice vote.

#### 10.5 DASE-1 Follow-On

Mr. Adams outlined for T3 his plan for going forward with the DASE effort. He encouraged interested individuals to contribute to the ongoing work. Specific items include:

- Corrigenda process to begin compiling items that require attention
- Compliance testing to identify an appropriate group for developing a compliance testing specification
- Certification process to identify an appropriate group for developing certification specifications

Mr. Allison suggested that a key element of the DASE-1 follow-up should focus on adding return channel functionality and a standard method of discovery of DASE platform resources. He said there needs to be an expedited effort to add these functionalities. Chairman Justus observed consensus that the items noted above are all important and properly belong within the domain of

T3/S17. He added, however, that compliance testing and the certification process proposals should not be pursued pending further direction from the Executive Committee.

Regarding plans for DASE-2, Mr. Adams said requirements work is progressing on a definition of needs. General requirements include return channel and enhancements to security as the highest priorities. Detailed requirements specification should be completed before the next T3 meeting on February 13, 2002. Mr. Adams said he expects to work with the ATSC Applications Subcommittee to receive input and review draft output.

## **11. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON ARM, T3/S18**

Mike Dolan, T3/S18 chair, reported on the work completed to date in the Application Reference Model specialist group (**Attachment 21**).

### **11.1 Summary of the ARM Ballot Comments**

Mr. Dolan provided a summary of activities in specialist group T3/S18, concentrating on the ballot comments received from the T3 vote on the draft ARM standard. He said a teleconference was held to discuss a proposed resolution plan. He summarized of ballot comments as follows:

- Total of 138 comments received from nine companies
- There were nine open editorial comments left from T3/S18 (code points, references to works in progress, etc.)
- Major issues identified include dependencies on T3/S13 work in progress, triggers, TSFS work, and the state model.

Mr. Dolan said substantive changes are likely in the draft document. He went on to outline the group's proposed resolution plan, specifically:

- Each commenter submit proposed language addressing their comments to the chair by January 18
- Prepare redline version of the document and revise within T3/S18
- Provide revised redline to T3 for disposition at its February 13 meeting

Mr. Dolan acknowledged that T3 has appointed T3/S18 as the comment resolution team. He went on to request that ATSC staff address code point registry issues and IEEE OUI registration. Mr. Richer said that the ATSC staff would pursue obtaining an OUI from IEEE. Chairman Justus directed Mr. Dolan to work with Mr. Whitaker regarding the code point assignment.

## **12. REPORT OF SPECIALISTS GROUP ON TRANSACTIONAL SERVICES, T3/S16**

Rich Chernock, T3/S16 chair, reported on recent work of the specialist group on Transactional Services.

### **12.1 Status**

Mr. Chernock said the work is progressing, with approximately six months time expected to be required for completion of a document ready for ballot. He urged interested members to participate in the work of the T3/S16 specialist group.

Current activity in T3/S16 is focused on refining comparison and beginning to work on what is necessary to "port" the DVB NIP standard to the ATSC and OCAP framework.

## **13. REPORT OF SPECIALISTS GROUP ON VIDEO, T3/S6**

T3/S6 chair Mark Eyer (Sony) reported on the status of work in the specialist group, with specific items addressed in the following sections (**Attachment 22**).



### 13.1 Status

Mr. Eyer reported that the specialist group has enjoyed good participation in its early efforts. The first assigned task of T3/S6 is to add aspect ratio signaling to the ATSC DTV Standard. Three teleconference meetings have been held since the October 3 T3 meeting, with active participation by broadcasters. Issues discussed include:

- Use of DVB Active Format Description data
- Limitations of DVB AFD
- Inclusion of “original” aspect ratio information

Mr. Miller suggested that the draft document being developed by T3/S6 be forwarded to SMPTE for consideration in its work. Mr. Allison agreed that SMPTE input on the ATSC work is important. Chairman Justus asked Mr. Eyer to facilitate communication with SMPTE. Mr. Eyer added that he was monitoring CEA efforts in this area.

### 13.2 Proposed Amendment to A/53B

Mr. Eyer reported that T3/S6 has developed a draft amendment to A/53B Annex A (**Attachment 23**) that addresses the needs and issues raised relating to aspect ratio signaling in a comprehensive way. The draft amendment proposes:

- Use DVB AFD “as-is”
- Specify “bar data” in ATSC user data
- States: “should” include AFD and bar data when “rectangular picture area containing useful information does not extend to the full height or width of the coded frame.”
- Bar data assumed pixel-accurate if present
- AFD, bar data can be frame-accurate

Mr. Eyer **moved** that document T3/S6-146 be placed in a three week comment period, after which if no substantive comments are received, the document will go to a four week ballot of T3. If substantive comments are received, the document will be returned to T3/S6 for further work and subsequent resubmission to T3 at its February meeting. **Second** by Mr. Weiss. The motion was **approved** on a voice vote.

## 14. REPORT OF SPECIALIST GROUP ON RF TRANSMISSION, T3/S9

John Tollefson (PBS) reported on activities within the T3/S9 VSB enhancement specialist group (**Attachment 24**).

### 14.1 T3/S9 RF Transmission VSB Enhancements Update

Mr. Tollefson reported that T3/S9 issued a Request for Evaluation of VSB enhancement proposals and has received Letters of Intent from the VSB Enhancement Testing Consortium (VETC) and Sinclair Broadcast Group. He went on to outline the T3/S9 and testing entity relationship, specifically:

- The testing program is voluntary and self-funding
- Testing entity determines which tests to perform
- Testing entity will report to T3/S9 periodically, and issue a final report in April 2002

He said that CEA has provided a list of legacy receivers, which will be useful in compatibility testing. Systems to be tested are NxtWave/Zenith, Philips, and Oren.

### 14.2 Draft Revised Standard

Mr. Tollefson reported that a draft Revised A/53B Standard is currently being worked on. He said a rough draft of the document has been completed, with a refined document ready in January 2002.

### 14.3 Liaison with T3/S8

Mr. Tollefson reported on the status of liaison work with T3/S8. He said an ad hoc group has been formed within T3/S8 to study possible transport stream issues relating to proposed enhancements to the VSB system. Mr. Allison chairs the AHG. Among the questions to be answered:

- How should the robust stream be related to main stream?
- How could multiple program streams change the present transport structure?
- What is the impact on PSIP?
- What are the implications for receivers?

Mr. Tollefson said that this work is ongoing and will proceed in tandem with the VSB testing program.

### 14.4 Revised Work Plan

Mr. Tollefson outlined the revised work plan for T3/S9. Major milestones include the following:

- 12/03/01 – Hardware and test procedures due
- January through March 2002 – Interim reports due
- 4/30/02 – Evaluation reports due
- 5/14/02 – T3/S9 review evaluation reports
- 5/30/02 – Revision to A/53B recommended by T3/S9

Future meetings of T3/S9 include December 11, 2001; January 23, 2002; and February 12, 2002.

## 15. OTHER BUSINESS

### 15.1 Clarification of Issues Relating to T3-548 and T3-549

Mr. Whitaker reminded committee members of the Executive Committee action regarding the collision avoidance documents approved by T3 at its August 8 meeting (T3-548, “ATSC usage of the MPEG-2 Registration Descriptor,” and T3-549, “Collision Avoidance for Private Fields and Ranges.” These documents, the final output from the T3 Collision Avoidance Ad Hoc Group, provide a set of rules—which, if followed—allow the unique identification of all uses of private fields or ranges. At its August meeting, T3 voted to send the documents to the Executive Committee with a recommendation that they be accepted as Technology Group Reports. The EC accepted the recommendation and voted to so designate the documents.

Mr. Whitaker explained that this issue was back at T3 because the Minutes of the August 8 meeting state only that the motion to send T3-548 and T3-549 to the EC was approved. The Minutes do not state that the motion was approved by the necessary 2/3rds majority. Mr. Whitaker, therefore, asked Chairman Justus to entertain a motion to clarify the situation so it can be recorded in the minutes of this meeting.

Mr. Goldberg **moved** that T3 reaffirm that documents T3-548 and T3-549 were approved by T3 at its August 8 meeting unanimously. **Second** by Mr. Adams. The motion was **approved** unanimously.

### 15.2 ATSC Reflector Management Issues

Mr. Whitaker discussed several issues relating to the ATSC reflector, specifically:

- Limiting the maximum message/attachment size to 500 kB on all reflector messages, except for the Executive Committee. The rationale is that all specialist groups and subcommittees (T3, IS, and AS) have Web site document repositories, and that large attachment files slow down the system and make it very difficult for members to access mail while on the road.

Comments were voiced from Mr. Adams, Mr. Goldberg, Taylor Kidd (OpenTV), and Mr. Allison. Chairman Justus asked ATSC staff to take the input into consideration as it moves forward.

- Changing the reflector routing configuration so that when a member replies to a message from the reflector, the reply is addressed to the originator, not the reflector itself. The rationale here is to limit reflector traffic to that specifically intended for the reflector. There have been numerous incidents where individuals have posted to the reflector when they intended to respond only to the originator. Any member would still be able to post to a given reflector; it would just require the extra step of specifically adding the reflector to the “to” address.

Comments were received from Mr. Chernock, Mr. Allison, and Mr. Goldberg. The consensus was to leave the reflector configuration as it is.

Mr. Whitaker went on to outline the procedures for setting up temporary (ad hoc group) reflectors. He said ATSC staff can set up a reflector for any purpose, however, he suggested that in some instances, creating a simple e-mail list is the preferred approach.

### 15.3 Other Items

There were none.

## 16. SCHEDULE OF NEXT T3 MEETING

The next meeting of the Technology Group on Distribution will be held on February 13, 2002, at the headquarters of the National Association of Broadcasters in Washington, D.C.

Chairman Justus reviewed the schedule for 2002, specifically: February 13, April 17, June 12, August 14, October 10, and December 4.

Mr. Miller identified a SMPTE conflict for the planned June 12 meeting. After a brief discussion, the meeting was moved to June 25.

Chairman Justus identified another conflict with the planned October 10 meeting date, specifically the IEEE Broadcast Symposium. He suggested moving the meeting date to October 8. The change was accepted.

Jeff Krause (NCTA) identified a conflict with the December 4 meeting date of the Western Cable Show. December 2 on the West Coast was suggested as a possible solution. The proposal was accepted.

The revised 2002 meeting date schedule is as follows:

- February 13, 2002
- April 17, 2002
- June 25, 2002
- October 8, 2002
- December 2, 2002

ATSC staff was asked to update the Web meeting schedule page and to post the revised meeting dates to the T3 reflector.

## 17. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before T3, Chairman Justus adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

## Summary of Action Items

The following action items resulted from the T3 meeting of October 3, 2001.

- 1) Whitaker to distribute via the T3 reflector a copy of Mark Richer's ATSC Bylaws PowerPoint presentation.
- 2) Lechner to form, under T3/S8 a comment resolution task force to consider comments received during the T3 ballot of A/65A Amendment 2 and A/65A Amendment 3, and to report back to T3 at its February meeting.
- 3) Dolan to address within T3/S18 the comments received during the T3 ballot of the ARM specification and to report back to T3 at its February meeting.
- 4) Crinon to work with Whitaker to assign a new document number for the draft standard, "IP Multicast with Sessions over ATSC Data Broadcast," and to send the draft standard to a 6 week ballot of the full membership.
- 5) Crinon to work with Whitaker to assign a new document number for the draft standard, "Synchronized/Asynchronous Trigger," and to send the document to a 4 week reballot of T3. ATSC staff is further directed to include the comment resolution spreadsheet (S13-189r5) with the ballot.
- 6) Crinon to complete the remaining editorial work on draft Corrigendum 1 to A/90 and to forward the document to the ATSC office no later than December 14, 2001, for the issuance of a three week ballot of T3. Before issuance of the ballot, the document shall receive a T3 number.
- 7) Crinon to forward draft Corrigendum 2 to A/90 for the issuance of a three week ballot of T3. Before issuance of the ballot, the document shall receive a T3 number.
- 8) Crinon to draft Amendment 1 to A/90 to resolve the `table_type` field values conflict between A/90 and DVS 234 and Whitaker—as ATSC Registrar—to assign the appropriate code point values, after which draft Amendment 1 to A/90 shall be sent to a three week ballot of T3.
- 9) Chernock to forward to Shah his observations regarding the importance of including data broadcast issues in the work of T3/S14-A relating to revision of document T3S8-241.
- 10) Lechner to work with Whitaker (and others as appropriate) to edit T3S8452r4 to make the document less ATSC-focused and to format it as an "Informational Document," of the ATSC. Following this editorial work, the report shall be delivered to ATSC staff for a four week ballot of T3.
- 11) Whitaker to develop an updated Code Points Registry document for further consideration at the February 13 T3 meeting.
- 12) Whitaker to make certain editorial changes to T3S8-456r3 ("Recommended Practice: Program and System Information Protocol Implementation Guidelines for Broadcasters) identified by T3/S8 in its meeting of December 4. Upon completion of this work, the document shall be sent to a 6 week ballot of T3.
- 13) Chernock to activate a new Ad Hoc Group on Generalized Carriage of Metadata under the umbrella of T3/S8. Chernock to post a note to applicable ATSC reflectors calling attention to the AHG work and the expected scope of the effort.
- 14) Richer to report to the Executive Committee the T3 decision that, "The draft DASE-1 Standard includes two references to the PNG Development Group, and that there are no reasonable and timely alternatives to use of these references. Therefore, T3 recommends that the PNG Development Group be added to the ATSC Normative References Organization list.

- 15) Adams to forward to ATSC staff the DASE-1 suite of documents (T3-528R4, T3-529R4, T3-530R4, T3-531R4, T3-533R2, T3-534R2, T3-535R2, and T3-536R2, dated November 20, 2001) for posting on the ATSC Web site as a Candidate Standard for a period of 6 months, contingent upon approval by the ATSC membership of pending ATSC Bylaw changes which establish the Candidate Standard class of document.
- 16) ATSC staff to post list of approved normative references on the ATSC Web site.
- 17) Whitaker to place a copy of the T3/S17 Status report on the ATSC Web site Members' Only area in the T3 subdirectory.
- 18) Richer to pursue obtaining an OUI from IEEE for work relating to T3/S18.
- 19) Whitaker to work with Dolan regarding code point registry issues as they apply to the draft ARM standard.
- 20) Eyer to apprise SMPTE of T3/S6 work in the area of active format descriptors.
- 21) Eyer to work with Whitaker to post document T3/S6-146 to the T3 reflector with an explanation that the document is in a three week comment period, after which if no substantive comments are received, the draft Amendment 1 to A/53B will go to a four week ballot of T3. If substantive comments are received, the document will be return to T3/S6 for further work and subsequent resubmission to T3 at its February meeting.
- 22) ATSC staff to confirm revised T3 meeting dates for 2002, update the Web meeting schedule page, and post the revised meeting dates to the T3 reflector.

## Attachments

**Attachment 1:** Attendance List

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_1\\_Attendance\\_List.doc](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_1_Attendance_List.doc)

**Attachment 2:** Draft Agenda

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_2\\_t3\\_draft\\_agenda.pdf](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_2_t3_draft_agenda.pdf)

**Attachment 3:** Minutes of October 3, 2001 Meeting

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Oct\\_3\\_2001/T3\\_Minutes\\_Oct\\_3\\_2001.pdf](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Oct_3_2001/T3_Minutes_Oct_3_2001.pdf)

**Attachment 4:** Overview of ATSC Bylaws Changes

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_4\\_Bylaws\\_and\\_Procedures.ppt](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_4_Bylaws_and_Procedures.ppt)

**Attachment 5:** Proposed Process Changes

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_5\\_process\\_sections.doc](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_5_process_sections.doc)

**Attachment 6:** Proposed Revised Procedures

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_6\\_Procedures\\_draft.DOC](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_6_Procedures_draft.DOC)

**Attachment 7:** IS Metadata Status Report

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_7\\_IS-190r5.doc](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_7_IS-190r5.doc)

**Attachment 8:** T3/S13 Status Report Presentation

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_8\\_s13report.ppt](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_8_s13report.ppt)

**Attachment 9:** IP Multicast With Sessions Comment Resolution

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_9\\_S13-188r3.DOC](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_9_S13-188r3.DOC)

**Attachment 10:** Data Synchronization Ballot Comment Resolution

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_10\\_S13\\_189r5.DOC](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_10_S13_189r5.DOC)

**Attachment 11:** Draft Corrigendum 1 to A/90

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_11\\_A90Corr1DraftFmt.doc](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_11_A90Corr1DraftFmt.doc)

**Attachment 12:** Draft Corrigendum 2 to A/90

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_12\\_A90Corr2DraftFmt\\_R1.doc](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_12_A90Corr2DraftFmt_R1.doc)

**Attachment 13:** PSIP for Satellite Draft Proposal

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_13\\_T3s8241r1d.doc](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_13_T3s8241r1d.doc)

**Attachment 14:** T3/S8-452 Code Points AHG Report

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_14\\_T3S8452r4.doc](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_14_T3S8452r4.doc)

**Attachment 15:** Draft PSIP Implementations Guidelines RP

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_15\\_T3S8\\_456r3.pdf](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_15_T3S8_456r3.pdf)

**Attachment 16:** T3/S17 Status Report

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_16\\_T3S17REPORT.ppt](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_16_T3S17REPORT.ppt)

**Attachment 17:** DASE-1 Ballot Disposition of Comments

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_17\\_T3\\_539R1.doc](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_17_T3_539R1.doc)

**Attachment 18:** Changes from 2<sup>nd</sup> DASE-1 Ballot

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_18\\_T3\\_540R1.doc](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_18_T3_540R1.doc)

**Attachment 19:** DASE-1 Final Revised Text

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_19\\_DASE\\_1\\_20011120.zip](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_19_DASE_1_20011120.zip)

**Attachment 20:** DASE-1 with Substantive Changes

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_20\\_DASE\\_1\\_20011031.zip](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_20_DASE_1_20011031.zip)

**Attachment 21:** T3.S17 Status Report

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_21\\_ARM027R\\_Status.ppt](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_21_ARM027R_Status.ppt)

**Attachment 22:** T3/S6 Status Report

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_22\\_T3S6\\_Status\\_12\\_01.ppt](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_22_T3S6_Status_12_01.ppt)

**Attachment 23:** Draft Amendment 1 to A/53B

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_23\\_T3S6\\_146r2.doc](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_23_T3S6_146r2.doc)

**Attachment 24:** T3/S9 Status Report

[http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec\\_5\\_2001/Documents/Attachment\\_24\\_T3S9\\_Report\\_12\\_5\\_01.ppt](http://www.atsc.org/sg/T3/Dec_5_2001/Documents/Attachment_24_T3S9_Report_12_5_01.ppt)