The meeting started 11:00pm PST.

Attendees:

Tim Godfrey (The TG chairman) – EPRI

Juha Juntunen – Meteorcomm

Menashe Shahar – Ondas Networks

Bivesh Paudyal – TTCI

Royce Connerley – Union Pacific Railroad

Sarat Eruvuru – TTCI

Daoud Serang – CML Microcircuits

Nathan Clanney – Siemens Mobility

Bob Finch – Select Spectrum

Bart Downing – CSX

Josh Allison – Norfolk Southern Railroad

Guy Simpson – Ondas Networks

John Hagger – Norfolk Southern Railroad

Josh Allison – Norfolk Southern Railroad

Padam Swar - Wabtec

Sanda Harris – Norfolk Southern Railroad

Alan Polivka – TTCI

Clark Palmer - Meteorcomm

The TG chair asked if anyone would like to be the secretary for the meeting. Juha agreed to take the meeting minutes.

The TG chair presented the agenda. There were no objections to the agenda, and it was approved with unanimous consent.

* Daoud made a point that an attendance list was missing from the last missing notes.
* The process should be changed to always include an attendee list in the minutes and ideally the meetings should include time to approve the previous meeting’s minutes.

Actions from the last meeting were discussed.

Three new contributions were identified to be discussed during the meeting.

* Peer-to-peer requirements
* System description document changes
* Security related changes

The TG chair proceeded to show the Peer-to-peer requirements and a discussion followed.

* Bivesh presented the document about the latest version of the requirements.
* Sarat explained the goal is to implement the presented changes to the .16t MAC.
* Tim pointed out there is concern about the extent of the proposed changes, such as CSMA/CA, which could introduce very drastic changes to the existing standard.
* Alan and other TTCI members discussed the fact that CSMA/CA is already included in some sub-parts of the existing standard (HR-base)
* Peer-to-peer would be operating on unique, distinct frequencies and controlled by a specific MAC features. (Was later in the discussion changed to be either unique frequency or time allocations.)
* Tim asked if the requirement is also to maintain two simultaneous connections or rather be established when needed (make before break?).
  + Menashe said the requirement does not intend to go to that level of specificity.
* Alan presented a scenario and a question - when radios experience different success with direct-peer-to-peer, would the simultaneous attempts to use of indirect-peer-to-peer require both radios to have a simultaneous base connection (otherwise the indirect peer-to-peer communication would never be successful in this scenario).
  + In Sarat’s opinion the base connection should always be established in parallel.
  + Tim pointed out due to the separate channel being used two established connections may not be technically possible simultaneously.
  + Menashe points out the separation could also be done in time domain and not necessarily in frequency domain between direct and indirect peer-to-peer. Requirement language was changed to reflect this.
* Tim raised a concern that other bridging effort (such as 802.1) could conflict with the way the proposal specifies “to be relayed” requests with the MAC PDU.
* The peer-to-peer proposal was approved to go forward (with the made changes) and the next action item is to make a corresponding system requirements document update. Menashe agreed to contribute this. The target is to review the peer-to-peer requirements in the context of the system requirements document during January meetings.

The TG chair discussed the next meeting agenda (January Plenary)

* Discussion followed about whether more than two slots would be beneficial due to anticipated volume of contributions.
* Proposed dates Jan 18 (10am PST) and Jan 24 (12pm PST).

The TG chair initiated discussion about changes to the system description document next.

* Menashe and Daoud discussed some of the latest changes to the document.
* Menashe will also consider peer-to-peer required changes to the system description document before the next meeting.

The TG chair initiated a discussion about the security related contribution next.

* Menashe presented the contribution, which includes draft security related changes needed for the specification. The changes are defined at the level of being amendments to the existing standard.
* This content will not be included in the system description document but will wait for the actual standard amendment process and reviews.

The TG chair presented a slide about the future meetings:

The TG chair asked if there was any other business, but there was none.

The TG chair called the meeting adjourned at 12:26pm PST.