

**IEEE Communication Society  
Power Line Communication Standards Committee**

**Meeting**

October 7, 2013 9:00-10:30 AM EDT  
Via teleconference.

**Agenda**

Chair: Jean-Philippe Faure, Progilon, affiliated with Panasonic  
Meeting recorder: Markus Rindchen, Power Plus Communications AG (PPC)

**1. Call to Order**

- Roll call according to plcsc-12-0057-12-PLCC-plcsc-roster.xlsx
- Quorum was achieved

**2. Approval of agenda**

James Allen moved to approve the agenda. Stephan Horvath seconded.  
Motion passed without opposition.

**3. Approval of last meeting minutes**

Document plcsc-13-0043-00-PLCC-19august2013-unapproved-minutes  
James Allen moved to approve the minutes. Don Shaver seconded.  
No further discussion.  
Motion passed without opposition

Document plcsc-13-0044-00-PLCC-16sept2013-unapproved-minutes  
James Allen moved to approve the minutes. Don Shaver seconded.  
No further discussion.  
Motion passed without opposition.

**4. 1905.1 new PAR for inclusion of ITU-T G.hn**

- Report from Purva

Based on motion from last meeting “*Paul Houzé moved to postpone consideration of the plcsc-13-0038-00-PLCC-p1905-1a-par-submitted-by-john-egan to the next meeting and to appoint Purva as Mentor to aggregate the stakeholders’ interests to prepare a PAR for next PLCS meeting.*”

Purva Rajkotia reported the progress on collecting items for the next PAR:

Strong participation from various stakeholders was determined, in the first step no single solution and technology was identified.

Several ideas have been presented also to tackle the task of creating a generic way of including new PHY/MAC technologies into IEEE1905.1.

Feedback was taken from everybody, even non-IEEE members.

During the process John Egan’s PAR has not been discussed in Ad-hoc group.

Purva presented the summary of feature list with weighting of the topics performed by all stakeholders and the resulting Draft-PAR for amendment. Both documents have been circulated with the beginning of the meeting.

The final verbal recommendation of Purva was to create an inclusive PAR that combines different new technologies to be included into IEEE1905.1

- Discussion

John Egan is not sure, if the items proposed still fit an amendment PAR.

Tom Star, made the observation, that one of the main issues is the question of creating one or two PARs. He pointed out that there are different interest groups / stakeholders in the area of IEEE1905.1. He expressed his concerns that, if the all discussed changes are put in "one big PAR" that tries to resolves everything in one group is not resolving the issue in a timely manner. If the changes are split two PARs, he sees a better chance to proceed faster. If the work is structured in a way to take time, he sees the danger that ITU WG will start a project on its own.

The question how to split the PARs was raised. And Tom expressed his point of view that the best way of proceeding would be to take ITU G.hn and HomePNA PHY/MACs in one PAR and all the rest to a second PAR.

John Egan pointed out that the average function in excel was used to weight the different features, from his point of view non-votes should not be taken into account for computing the average.

Stephan Horvath suggested that a new PAR should to created, since the (John Egan's PAR) is not taking the other topics into account and the draft PAR provided by Purva Rajkotia is not mature.

Jim Allen pointed out that there is the rule of having one PAR one project one document (in this case standard)

Chair Faure pointed out that PARs are approved by PLCSC.

Stephan Horvath pointed out that the group of stakeholders should provide a draft PAR

John Egan complained that the excel sheet is not reflecting the stakeholders priorities. And he moved PLCSC should take a vote

Barbara Stark interpreted the results of the spread-sheet in a way that there is extreme polarization between different stakeholders

Jim Allen, PAR is always defined very broad to attract as many people as possible. PARs can be split. Reasonable to start something with something like that

Purva reminds that the IEEE always had the approach to create inclusive PARs

Don Shaver stated that he sees a lot of different opinions. But is open on voting the PAR presented by Purva.

Paul Houzé pointed out that the draft-PAR provided by the ad-hoc group has not been circulated and is not reviewed in the ah-hoc group. Stakeholders should provide a reviewed version with enough time for circulation and preparation for the PLC-SC members.

Steve Palm pointed out that IEEE is always driving a process that tries to combine the diversity of views, to bring them together and get a compromise.

Markus Rindchen pointed out the there is a need for consensus driven process, a compromise between the stakeholders should be achieved.

Aron, believes that the consensus driven approach is required

#### MOTION:

James Allen moved to table the decision about John Egan's PAR until next meeting and instruct the leader of the ad-hoc group Purva Rajkotia to circulate Egan's and Rajkotia's PAR and the database to the ad-hoc group. To set up the necessary number of meetings to discuss before the next PLCSC meeting (18.10.20013). The input to PLCSC has to be submitted not later than the 16<sup>th</sup> of October.

Stephan Horvath seconded.

Discussion: James Allen encouraged John Egan to circulate the changes his PAR would require to the standard document

Motion passed without opposition.

**5. Advertising PLCSC projects and standards**

Ad-hoc meeting has been set up for October 9, 10:00-11:00 AM EDT

**6. Administrative items**

**7. WG reports**

- P2030.5: Is at Rev-Com
- P1901.2: No feedback from RevCom, 87 comments from editor, all have been addressed by the WG
- P1909.1: Draft passed mandatory editorial review, invitation for ballot group has been sent
- 1905.1: See topic above
- 1901: meeting tomorrow
- 1775

**8. Next meetings**

Will be scheduled on 18<sup>th</sup> of October

**9. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned 10:30