

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

Meeting

October 18, 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
The draft agenda constitutes official notice that action may be taken in this meeting on any or all listed items.

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of agenda

Stephan Horvath moved to approve rev1 of the agenda. plcsc-13-0048-01-PUBL-18oct2013-agenda
Jim Allen seconded.
Motion passed without opposition

3. Approval of last meeting minutes

Document TBD
Deferred to next meeting

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

- Report from Purva
- Discussion

Starting 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 and 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 16th of October.”

Report from Purva Rajkotia:

10th and 14th ad-hoc group meeting, the group had good discussions.
John Egan submitted the expected effort and the ITU liaison
PAR was worked on and input from ad-hoc group was introduced.
Ad-hoc group completed task
Amendment PAR has been distributed.

Chair Faure displayed the submitted PAR draft to the group and asked if there was new information about the discussion.

Chair Faure asked about the situation whether two PARs or one PAR approach should be taken.

John Egan stated that the ad-hoc group PAR will take 2 years to be accomplished. He still supports the approach to start with the Egan PAR (just addressing the two ITU technologies) and then tackle the ad-hoc group's PAR.

Tom Starr stated that he wants the work on 1905.1 to be done in IEEE and not ITU. He expected that the ITU group will lose its confidence if only the ad-hoc group PAR is approved. He pointed out that this would be an invitation to start a project “on their own”. He further pointed out that by approving both PARs (John Egan's PAR and ad-hoc group PAR) all the work can be done with a minimal effort in coordination.

Stephan Horvath asked John Egan if the subjects of his PAR are reflected in the ad-hoc group's PAR. John Egan confirmed that the ITU technologies have been included, but fears that the ad-hoc group's PAR will take too long to address all raised points.

Bob Heile, supported the partially the point of view of John Egan, but he would support including 802.15.4 technology since it has a broad market acceptance and distribution.

Purva commented that a PAR for 2 technologies seems to be too exclusive and not reflecting the current state of technologies. He also pointed out that the PAR length is not a good indicator for the actual work that has to be done or the time that needed to be spent to finish the work.

Marcos Martinez stated that this is a good opportunity to show that ITU requests are addressed in a timely manner. He pointed out that 2 PARs are inclusive and responded that the length of PAR is partially reflecting the amount of work that needs to spend. He brought up that idea that maybe even 3 PARs would be good to resolve the situation.

Steve Palm expressed his concerns about the possible perception of the WG members that two PHY/MAC are favored and get a special treatment compared to other existing technologies. He feared that this situation can lead to conflicts in the working group, which might result in bad working conditions and results for the whole project.

Jim Allen liked the supportive atmosphere in the discussion and pointed out that a PAR could be split when some aspects have been addressed earlier than others.

Ravi Mantri pointed out that he supports 2 PAR approach (John Egan's PAR and ad-hoc group PAR).

Chair Faure suggested going step by step. Step 1: decide on the number of PARs: Either to start for both PARs (John Egan's PAR and ad-hoc group PAR) or to start from the draft-PAR provided from the ad-hoc group. Step 2: review the draft(s), clause by clause and finalize for approval.

Alex Gelman asked if coexistence is addressed and if IEEE property is protected in both PAR approaches.

Chair Faure asked if any other potential PAR split other than the two proposed PARs (John Egan's PAR and ad-hoc group PAR) can resolve the opposing approaches of being exclusive (Egan's PAR) and being inclusive (ad-hoc group PAR).

John Egan stated that he thinks a 3 PAR split (his PAR, existing standards, further studies) would be a possible approach.

Markus asked about the possibility to add other technologies to the first PAR (John Egan's PAR).

Marcos Martinez concluded that a distinction between technology and research topic might be possible.

Don Shaver pointed out that the missing technology that already have market acceptance could feel neglected when an exclusive PAR is approved.

MOTION

Purva Rajkotia moved to approve the PAR presented by Purva Rajkotia and amended by Jean-Philippe Faure to be approved and not approve the PAR submitted by John Egan.

Stephan Horvath seconded.

Discussion:

John Egan spoke up that the chair position should not be designated when deciding about the PAR.

Stephan Horvath asked John Egan about the background of request. John pointed out that the chairmanship should not be determined. Chair Faure pointed out that the chair of the WG is determined by the PLCSC.

James Allen moved to extend the meeting by 15 minutes.

Don Shaver seconded.

No discussion.

Motion passed without opposition.

Purva moved to call the question. No opposition.

The chair asked the question.

Motion moved without opposition.

Paul Houzé abstained.

James Allen moved to instruct chair Faure to submit the finalized PAR before the deadline. Purva seconded Motion passed without opposition.

Noelle Humenick asked the sponsor to instruct the WG to deliver a schedule with time lines and status reports. She asked for assistance to answer ITU liaison letter.

Stephan Horvath moved to instruct the chair to formulate a liaison letter to inform about the progress in the PLCSC and to circulate the draft in PLCSC for approval before sending it to ITU. Purva Rajkotia seconded.

Purva moved to extend the meeting for 10 minutes.

James Allen seconded.

Motion passed without opposition.

No discussion.

Motion passed without opposition.

5. Advertising PLCSC projects and standards

6. Administrative items

7. WG reports

- P2030.5
- P1901.2
- P1909.1
- 1905.1
- 1901
- 1775

8. Next meetings

Markus moved to have the meeting after next meeting on 2nd December 09:00 to 10:30 EDT.

James Allen seconded.

No discussion.

Motion passed without opposition.

9. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned 10:55