Minutes, ATSC Technology Group on Distribution (T3)

Ralph Justus, Chairman
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m., CEA, 2500 Wilson Blvd, Arlington, VA.
February 13, 200

1) Welcome, Introductions and Determination of Quorum

Chairman Ralph Justus (CEA) called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m., at CEA headquarters in Arlington, VA. Chairman Justus welcomed those in attendance, and asked each person to state their name and company affiliation. The attendance list is given in **Attachment 1**.

2) Approval of Proposed Agenda

The agenda, given in **Attachment 2**, was approved without comment.

3) Approval of the Draft Minutes

a)   November 15, 2000 meeting

Editorial changes identified by Art Allison (NAB) were identified and accepted. By voice vote, the November Minutes were approved with the specified changes. The Approved Minutes of the November 15, 2000 T3 meeting are given in **Attachment 3**.

b)   August 16, 2000 meeting

Editorial changes identified by Mr. Allison were identified and accepted. By voice vote, the August Minutes were approved with the specified changes. The Approved Minutes of the August 16, 2000, T3 meeting are given in **Attachment 4**.

c)   May 17, 2000 meeting

Editorial changes identified by Peter Dare (Sony) were identified and accepted. By voice vote, the May Minutes were approved with the specified changes. The Approved Minutes of the May 17, 2000, T3 meeting are given in **Attachment 5**.

4) Opening Remarks

a)   Comments by the Executive Director (Mark Richer)

Mark Richer (ATSC) congratulated T3 on the hard work of its members in completing a number of milestone projects. Mr. Richer outlined the activities currently underway within the ATSC; specifically, the upcoming ATSC/ITS seminar, the planned closed captioning seminar in March, and the annual meeting on May 23. Plans also are underway to develop a DTV Store exhibit at the NAB convention, the goal being to show the wide range of DTV products now available in the marketplace. The basic concept is to bring the excitement of the DTV/HDTV product offerings demonstrated at the Consumer Electronics Show to the broadcasting community. Mr. Richer said that a wide range of products will be on display, from big-screen display devices to PC add-in cards. Mr. Richer also reported that the next issue of the ATSC newsletter, *The Standard*, will be distributed in March. He also reminded the group that following today's T3 meeting, a special meeting will be held to discuss intellectual property relating to DASE.

b)   Status of ballots

Mr. Richer outlined the status of current ballot issues. The Implementation Guidelines to A/90 were approved by T3 on November 8, 2000. There were 14 yes votes and 1 no vote. Comments were received. Therefore, at the November 15 T3 meeting, T3/S13 was directed to resolve the comments and bring the issue back to T3 for final consideration at today's meeting. This work has been completed, and will be discussed under item 11.

Mr. Richer reported on the ballot status of the A/53 audio bit rate increase, approved on October 19, 2000, by T3 and sent to full ATSC membership on January 11, 2001. This ballot close on February 22, 2001.

c)   Other items

No additional items were discussed.

5)   Brief Reports on Actions from the November Meeting

a)   Revisions to Standard A/52 (Craig Todd)

Craig Todd (Dolby) briefed the committee on issues relating to ATSC Standard A/52. At the T3 meeting held on November 15, 2000, Mr. Todd proposed a revision to the ATSC AC-3 standard to update Annex A and delete Annex B. During that meeting it was pointed out that ATSC Standards should be reviewed every 5 years, and he was asked to perform a complete review of A/52. Mr. Todd and his Dolby colleagues subsequently performed this review, referencing all of the notes and errata that they had identified over the last 5 years. On January 18, 2001, Mr. Todd posted to the T3 reflector a cover document (**Attachment 6**) describing the A/52 changes that were proposed, and a marked up copy of A/52 where every proposed change was shown with revision marks (**Attachment 7**). At today's T3 meeting, Mr. Todd characterized many of the issues identified over the last five years as "corrections of minor errors." There are other items identified, however, that were more substantial.

Discussion then ensued with regard to several items, including time code and language code issues. Chairman Justus identified two possible approaches: 1) consideration of a T3 ballot for the revised document, or 2) to refer the question to an appropriate subgroup for further study. Chairman Justus stated his preference for moving forward to a ballot by T3. Mr. Richer clarified that a revision of A/52 was being planned, not an amendment or a corrigendum. The interconnection between Standards A/52 and A/53 was discussed; specifically, whether making changes in A/52 would, by default, require that changes then be made in A/53, and if so, how this process might be handled. Mr. Dare suggested that a revision of A/52 not go forward until other issues have been identified, including any interlocking elements that could cause problems in implementation. He urged a full review of both the documents.

Mr. Todd **moved** to send the A/52 revision document to T3 for a six week ballot, commencing in no less that two weeks from today's date. The two week delay is intended to permit any substantive issues to be identified by T3 members and then to be incorporated into the document. **Second** by Art Cosgrove (Eastman Kodak). **The motion carried on a voice vote.**

b)   Other items

At the August 16, 2000, meeting of T3, an ad-hoc group was formed to review Section 5.1.4 of A/53 as amended by Amendment Number 1 to A/53 and to create a recommended new Amendment to A/53 to align the way in which colorimetry is signaled in an ATSC bit stream with current practice in the cable TV industry and with the proposed SCTE Standard for Video Systems (DVS-258). The ad-hoc group decided to require that the colorimetry always be explicitly signaled and that a note be included warning users that legacy material exists wherein the colorimetry may not be explicitly signaled. Specific text to effect the required change to A/53 as amended by Amendment Number 1 to A/53 was subsequently developed. It was agreed at the November 15, 2000, meeting of T3 that this proposed Amendment would be sent to T3 for a two-week pre-ballot review and then balloted to T3 with a normal 6-week ballot period. The proposed amendment was submitted for consideration by T3 on January 28, 2001 (**Attachment 8**). Mr. Lehner reported that a couple of editorial items were identified during the comment period, which have now been dealt with. Mr. Lechner **moved** to issue a T3 ballot on the colorimetry document. **Second** by Merrill Weiss (Tribune). **The motion carried on a voice vote.**

6)   New Work Items for Discussion

a)   Assignments from the Executive Committee (Mark Richer)

1)   Receiver PSIP Recommended Practice (CEA)

The question of a recommended practice on PSIP receiver implementation was outlined by Mr. Richer. This item was brought to the Executive Committee (EC) at their January 9, 2001, meeting. He stated that the Implementation Subcommittee (IS) is working on a transmission-related PSIP document that will be forwarded to T3 for subcommittee action. Regarding the receiver element, the EC asked CEA to address this issue.

b)   Other items

There were no other items discussed.

7)   Report of the Specialist Group on DASE, T3/S17 (Aninda DasGupta)

T3/S17 chairman Aninda DasGupta (Philips) outlined the work completed by the subcommittee on the DASE specification (**Attachment 9**). He outlined for T3 the basic terminology and architecture of DASE, and the major system components of the specification. Mr. DasGupta reported that, with consensus, T3/S17 was submitting to T3 for formal consideration the following five documents as parts of the DASE Standard:

- Introduction, Architecture and Common Facilities (T3-528, **Attachment 10**)

- Declarative Applications (T3-529, **Attachment 11**)

- Procedural Applications (T3-530, **Attachment 12**)

- Application Programming Interfaces (T3-531, **Attachment 13**)

- Fonts (T3-532, **Attachment 14**)

These documents were posted to the T3 reflector for comment on February 9, 2001.

Mr. DasGupta reported T3/S17 consensus on a recommendation that T3 authorize a letter ballot of the five parts of the DASE Standard. There are three other documents that T3/S17 expects to bring to T3 in the near future as the remaining elements of the DASE Standard. Those parts are:

- Security (S17-102). This document currently exists as a work-in-progress draft document (**Attachment 15**)

- Conformance Statement (S17-104). A draft is currently available on the T3/S17 Web site.

- Application Reference Model (S17-103). A draft has been provided to T3 for informational purposes.

Mr. DasGupta outlined the status of additional items relating to the DASE work, specifically the broadcast infrastructure for security and policy issues, the Application Reference Model, and satisfying security-related requirements. He said considerable progress has been made on issues relating to harmonization with other standards. Following his presentation, Mr. DasGupta offered a **motion** to move forward with the five specified documents to a ballot by T3. **Second** by Robert Seidel (CBS).

Chairman Justus recognize Pat Griffis (Microsoft), who outlined his company's concern relating to certain intellectual property rights (IPR) issues (**Attachment 16**) and the potential effects that such issues could have on the proposed DASE Standard. He argued that T-3 should not proceed to ballot on any DASE document that relies on SUN Java IP until there has been a resolution of issues regarding the terms on which Sun will license its IP to DASE implementers. Mr. Griffis said it is not sufficient at this point to rely on a basic statement that Sun will license its IP on Reasonable And Non-Discriminatory ("RAND") terms in compliance with ATSC's IP policy, since the draft MOU makes clear that Sun intends to impose "unusual restrictions" on supersetting, use of test suites, etc. that are not normal in an open standards process and are not compatible with RAND terms. He argued that these issues need to be resolved by elimination of those restrictions from a complete set of licensing terms that Sun commits to before ATSC commits to using java technology.

Mr. Richer addressed the IP issue, saying that while he agreed that there are important issues to be resolved, he did not believe that declining to ballot these documents was necessary or warranted. He reminded the group that a meeting on this very subject was scheduled for later in the afternoon. Mr. Richer observed that there are two basic issues regarding DASE. First, he said, we must make sure that ATSC patent policy is followed; this is a rules issues issue that will be enforced. Second, he said, was the individual rights of T3 members, and ultimately ATSC members, to vote on the standard—either for or against, for whatever reason.

Mr. Richer said progress has been made on the Sun IP issue; specifically, a revised draft agreement exists. Mr. Richer said he will have no choice but to stop the documents from moving forward to a full ATSC membership vote until the IP issues, including copyright, are resolved. He said there would be more than enough time to deal with the IP issues between the time T3 votes on the DASE documents and the point at which these documents finally move to the full membership.

Mr. Richer stated there were many good reasons to move the five DASE documents toward a T3 ballot. First, he said, hope remains that it may be possible to work with the cable industry and DVB if ATSC has documents that are at the T3 ballot stage. Second, he said, the only way for T3/S17 to move forward on these documents is to receive T3 level comments.

In response to a question from Wendy Aylsworth (Warner Bros.), Mr. Richer outlined the process for approval of these documents. He explained that the ATSC patent policy requires a statement from patent owners in form and content that is acceptable to the EC. The issue of the multiple-part ballot was also discussed.

Mr. Allison expressed some concern over the multiple part nature of the document submission from T3/S17, arguing that the full set of parts should be required to be voted upon and approved at the T3 level before any of the DASE documents go forward to a ballot of the full ATSC membership. Still, he urged that T3 move forward to ballot the documents submitted by T3/S17.

Mr. Adams indicated that he did not feel the IP issue would be critical to moving forward with DASE. He recommended moving forward. He stated support Mr. Allison's idea of holding all of the DASE documents until they have been approved by T3.

Other commenters asked for clarification of the procedural issues involved, and they were outlined in some detail by Chairman Justus and Mr. Richer.

Mr. DasGupta reminded the group that T3/S17 brought these documents to T3 with consensus of the subcommittee. He stated confidence that his group would be willing to move forward with Mr. Allison's conditions, as outlined previously. He also said that Mr. Adams had gone to great lengths to remove IP dependencies, so that the documents could be voted upon without the requirement of finalizing a MOU before hand.

Craig Tanner (Sharp) stated his company's support for moving forward to the T3 ballot, stating that IP issues should not hold up the process.

Mr. Allison offered an **amendment** to the motion on the table, specifically, to place the five DASE documents recommended by T3/S17 on a six week T3 ballot, with the "condition that independent of the ballot outcome of these five parts, that no parts go forward to an ATSC membership vote until all parts of the DASE standard have been passed by T3, and that T3 in its judgment believes that the implementation experience of those evaluating the standard from a practical standpoint is sufficient to go forward to a ballot of the full ATSC membership." Mr. DasGupta accepted the amendment; Mr. Seidel accepted.

Chairman Justus asked for a voice vote on the amendment. Mr. Tanner asked for clarification of the amendment, which Mr. Allison gave in some detail. Chairman Justus called the question, and the amendment to the motion was **accepted**. Chairman Justus then called for a vote on the motion, as amended by Mr. Allison. The motion **passed** by a vote of 21 yes to 2 no.

Chairman Justus congratulated Mr. DasGupta and his subcommittee on its hard work.

a)   Tentative plans for DASE-2

Mr. DasGupta explained that there are some specifications in DASE Level 1 that the specialist group would like to enhance, and that these issues would be addressed in DASE Level 2. Support for multiple concurrent applications is one such specification/feature. Work will begin on these issues after work is completed on DASE Level 1.

b)   Other T3/S17 issues

1)   Future directions, assignments

Chairman Justus told T3 that Mr. DasGupta was leaving as chairman of T3/S17 because of other pressing obligations. He congratulated Mr. DasGupta on his hard work to bring the DASE documents to reality. Chairman Justus announced that Mr. Adams has agreed to serve as interim chair of T3/S17.

Mike Dolan (DirecTV) addressed the interrelation of the DASE ARM document with other ATSC documents. He stated that coordination of this work with one or more T3 subcommittees might be appropriate. Mr. Adams asked T3 for a new work item to bring about a stand-alone document to deal with the issues identified by Mr. Dolan. Because the requested work item was agreed to be within T3 scope, Mr. Allison urged that all of the work product be shared with T3/S8 and T3/S13. Chairman Justus asked Mr. Adam and Mr. Dolan to draft the proper language to amend the scope of the work for T3/S17 so that this work can go forward, and to then bring that language back to T3 for approval at the March meeting. Mr. Allison argued for a different approach; rather than reopening the scope of T3/S17, he felt that a new work item from T3 was appropriate. Mr. Adams concurred. Mr. Justus agreed, asking Mr. Adams and Mr. Dolan to draft the work item .

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m. for lunch

The meeting was reconvened at 1:15 p.m.

8)   Report of the Specialist Group on Data Multiplex/Transport, T3/S8 (Bernie Lechner)

a)   Review of A/55, A/56, A/58 and Annex C to A/53

Mr. Lechner outlined the work of T3/S8 relating to review of the subject documents. Specifically, A/56 was found to be used in some terrestrial satellite applications (or at least parts of it). The conclusion of T3/S8 discussions on this point was to suggest that SCTE modify certain documents to cover the cable and satellite areas. Given this, A/56 could be considered for withdrawl. Regarding A/55, Nagravision has been identified to be using the document; further research is planned on the issue. Regarding A/58, further work is being conducted by T3/S8. The PSIP adhoc group of T3/S8 is currently looking at Annex C to A/53.

b)   Revision to Directed Channel Change Amendment to A/65A

Mr. Lechner reported on the resolution of comments received. This document (**Attachment 17**) was sent to T3 for a two week comment period on January 23, 2001, and as soon as the comments are resolved—which is expected shortly—the document should be balloted to T3. Questions were raised relating to implementation issues, and Mr. Richer said that these would be best addressed by CEA or IS. **Chairman Justus directed that the document be balloted to T3 as soon as these issues are addressed.**

c) Status of next corrigendum/amendment to A/65A

Mr. Lechner reported that a list of some 42 items have been identified, with nearly all of them addressed at this point. Most are editorial in nature, however, some are substantative. At the last T3/S8 meeting, it was decided to collect all items into a single document, rather than in a series of amendments and/or corrigenda.

d) Standard for use of PSIP in Taiwan

This document (**Attachment 18**) was posted to the T3 reflector on January 23, 2001, for a two week coment period. Some comments were received, and those suggestions have been integrated into a revised docment. Mr. Lechner stated that this item is ready for ballot. **Chairman Justus directed that the document move to a six week ballot by T3.**

e) Status of work on content identification and replacement of A/57

Mr. Lechner reported that the joint adhoc group of SMPTE, ISAN, and ATSC have reached agreement on certain key issues, and have compiled a first draft syntax for the transport stream. He said work is continuing on this issue. Mr. Dolan reported on other work in this area. Mr. Lechner said there are politial issues as well as technical ones that must be addressed.

f) Request for proposals for advanced EPG functionality

Mr. Lechner reported on the requirements documents and RFP relating to electronic program guide enhancements (**Attachment 19**). At least two companies have indicated an interest in submitting proposals in response to the RFP. Mr. Lechner said that T3/S8 is not necessarily looking for a single solution, but rather for a range of sollutions that could be combined to provide significant enhancements in EPG functionaltiy.

Mr. Lecher also reported that Richard Chernock's (IBM) ad-hoc group on private fields and ranges made a presentation to T3/S8 regarding their work. T3/S8 offered to serve as a laision with SCTE on the issue.

Mr. Dare brought up the issue of MPEG 95 and MPEG 2000, and what areas the ATSC plans to support—or not support. Mr. Richer agreed that the issue should be examined, and that it should be an important element in the review of A/53 and other documents. Mr. Lechner said that this concern will be kept in mind during T3/S8's review of the existing ATSC standards.

Chairman Justus asked Mr. Lechner to consider how best to proceed on MPEG liason issues. Mr. Richer outlined the options available to T3, and he suggested the need for a specialist group to look into this issues involved. Mr. Justus said he would ask Bill Miller (SMPTE), as the interim chair of T3/S6, to pursue this issue and make the appropriate suggestions. Mr. Lechner offered on behalf of T3/S8 to review the transport stream issues involved. **Chairman Justus directed T3/S6 and T3/S8 to investigate the situation and report back at the next T3 meeting.**

9) Report of the Specialist Group on Satellite Broadcast, T3/S14-A (Dipak Shah)

a) Status update

Dipak Shah (DirecTV) reported on the work of T3/S14-A (**Attachment 20**). His report included a summary of actions from the January 25, 2001, meeting. Specifically, T3/S14-A successfully reviewed T3/S13 comments listed in three categories: announcement parameters, application signaling parameters, and encapsulation parameters. The subcommittee also reviewed draft requirements in several areas and content advisory descriptors to support multiple ratings—one for each region, U.S., Canada, and Mexico. The next meeting of T3/S14-A is set for March 13. Major discussion topics include the following:

• Discuss comments (if any) on the Draft Requirement Document

• Begin to develop specifications

• Develop a plan for a joint T3/S14-A and T3/S8 meeting (tentatively planned for March 21, 2001).

10) Report of the Specialist Group on RF Transmission, T3/S9 (John Tollefson)

a) Status update

John Tollefson (PBS) reported on the work of T3/S9 (**Attachment 21**). He outlined the scope of the subcommittee's work and the timetable for accomplishing its task. Mr. Tollefson acknowledged that the work plan for T3/S9 is aggressive, but necessary. He said that an RFP was issued by T3/S9 on January 25, 2001 (**Attachment 22**).

Mr. Tollefson, in response to a question, discussed the testing procedure as it is now envisioned. Mr. Richer also discussed the equipment testing issue, saying that he did not expected ATSC to do the testing itself, but rather to work with an independent entity. Mr. Todd raised the question of hierarchical coding, and suggested that such a proposal—if accepted in some form by T3/S9—could have a significant impact on documents developed by other ATSC subcommittees.

Mr. Richer suggested that T3, after responses to the RFP are received, examine certain issues such as heirarchial coding to see what implications there may be from various proposals on the work of other subcommittees. **Mr. Tollefson was asked to identify, in time for the next T3 meeting, whether proposals have been made that could require consideration by other technical subgroups.**

Mr. Tollefson explained, in response to questions from T3 members, the process that will be used to evaluate and ultimately select a particular proposal. Mr. Seidel questioned whether consideration of proposals that are designed to facilitate mobile operation would be of value.

Mr. Richer was asked about the process and funding of lab and field testing of systems proposed in response to the T3/S9 RFP. Although nothing solid has been identified, Mr. Richer said that preliminary discussions have been held with industry organizations. He said he did not expect ATSC to be directly involved in this work. Mr. Richer said he would ask the EC to address this issue.

b)　Field Test Recommended Practice draft document

Mr. Tollefson gave an overview of the work item given to T3/S9 to develop a Recommended Practice on field testing DTV systems.. A draft RP document was posted to the T3 reflector on February 9, 2001, for comment (**Attachment 23**). Mr. Tollefson **moved** to send the Draft Recommended Practice to a vote of T3. **Second** by Dave Elliott (Sanyo). Chairman Justus called for a voice vote. The motion was **approved**. Chairman Justus directed that the Draft Recommended Practice be send to T3 for a six week ballot.

11) **Report of the Specialist Group on Data Broadcast, T3/S13** (Regis Crinon)

Mr. Crinon gave a presentation on the status of T3/S13 work (**Attachment 24.**) His remarks focused on the resolution of comments received during the A/90 Implementation Guideline ballot, IP multicast activities, data synchronization issues, MPEG liaison, and coordination with other subgroups.

a)　A/90 Implementation Guideline

Mr. Crinon stated that all of the comments received on the A/90 Implementation Guideline document (**Attachment 25**) have been carefully considered, with concensus on achieved on all points. Mr. Adams questioned whether the document should be returned for another T3 vote before sending it to a vote of the ATSC membership. Mr. Allison stated that if the document is a Recommended Practice, not a Standard, it should move to the ATSC membership. Chairman Justus asked for Mr. Richer's opinion on the proper way to proceed, since a number of changes and comments have been integrated into the document. Mr. Richer outlined the available options. Mr. Crinon **moved** that the document be advanced to a vote of the ATSC membership. **Second** by Mr. Chernock. **Approved** on a voice vote. Chairman Justus asked Mr. Crinon take into consideration the points brought up at the meeting and forward to ATSC staff the finished document, which will be put to a vote of the full ATSC membership.

12) **Report of the Specialist Group on Interactive Services, T3/S16** (Rich Chernock)

a)　Report on the meeting to determine the future of T3/S16

Mr. Chernock, in his capacity as interim chair of T3/S16, reported on the conclusions reached at the recent meeting of the specialist group. He stated that a clear set of requirements is needed to move forward. Mr. Chernock reported on suggestions to create a liaison with DVB and to reconvene T3/S16 in May. A meeting date has been set for May 7. A document repository has also been established for T3/S16.

Mr. Seidel stated that the issue of interactive services has taken on increased importance with a recently-issued Notice of Inquiry (NOI) from the FCC. Mr. Chernock said the type of activity he expects for T3/S16 relates to the network return path. A set of protocols would be identified, with the goal of interoperability among various infrastructures.

Mr. Richer stated that he would work to identify individuals to serve in a liaison function with SCTE, DVB, OpenCable, and other organizations working in the area of interactive television. Regarding DVB, **Mr. Richer asked Mr. Chernock to provide the suggested wording, which he would craft into a request for liaison on an informal basis.**

13) **Other Business**

a)　ATSC Glossary project (Glenn Adams)

Mr. Adams reported on the work of the ATSC glossary project. He expected to have a document ready for T3 consideration by the next meting, with advanced distribution

b) Normative reference issue update (Mike Dolan)

Mr. Dolan reported on the progress made on this issue since the last T3 meeting, having posted a draft document to the T3 reflector on February 1, 2001 (**Attachment 26**). Mr. Dolan outlined the issues involved and the need for agreement on the use of normative references in ATSC documents. He said the guidelines were intended to give guidance to persons writing standards documents with regard to normative and informative references. Mr. Dolan asked for feedback from T3 on the existing work and for comments as to where T3 should move from this point forward.

Mr. Richer, commenting on the suggested guidelines, said he felt this work was important and that it should eventually become part of the ATSC Administrative Procedures document. He felt, therefore, that these items should be incorporated into the process change work currently underway, and ultimately taken to the EC for final consideration.

Mr. Allison said he felt such guidelines were needed for T3, and ultimately perhaps submitted to the EC for approval. He said he would like to see T3 adopt the document, or some version of it. Mr. Adams supported that approach and wanted to move forward, although he had some issues with the specifics of the document as it currently stands. Mr. DasGupta agreed, suggesting however that some exceptions to the guidelines might be appropriate.

Chairman Justus directed Mr. Dolan to move forward with developing a document that could be brought back to T3 at the April meeting. Mr. Richer said he would—concurrently—work to integrate these items into the process change activities currently underway.

c) Private fields/ranges status (Rich Chernock)

Mr. Chernock reported on the work underway to mitigate collision issues relating to private fields/ranges. This subject has been discussed in T3/S8, DIWG, and T3/S13. In the T3/S13 and DIWG discussions, some key issues were identified. He said the next step will be to set up another round of meetings on this subject, and hopefully to come with a recommendation that can be brought to T3, hopefully by the next meeting.

d) Liaison reports

1) Implementation Subcommittee (Art Allison)

Mr. Allison reported on current IS work activities. He said that, at the present point, no additional items have been identified by the IS on which T3 needs to take action. Mr. Allison said a review is underway of the current suite of ATSC Standards . He said he will address in IS the substantive issues in A/54, and leave to T3 the decision of whether the document should become a Recommended Practice or a Standard.

2) Other reports

There were none.

e) Document archive/repository options (Jerry Whitaker)

Mr. Whitaker outlined available options for document distribution, which include Web-based and interactive meeting notices. **Chairman Justus directed Mr. Whitaker to pursue setting up an FTP site for T3 documents and to explore possible alternative distribution methods for T3 documents.**

14) Schedule of Next T3 Meetings

a) Next meeting April 4, 2001, NAB, Washington, D.C.

b) Future meetings:

- May 31, 2001, NAB, Washington, D.C.
- August 8, 2001, NAB, Washington, D.C.
- October 3, 2001, PBS, Alexandria, VA
- November 28, 2001, NAB, Washington, D.C.

15) Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jerry Whitaker, T3 Secretary