Channel Model Adhoc Teleconference

Chair: Charles Moore
Attendence 18

Notes:

- charles moores asked attendees to send e-mail to him

Interim submissions
- to post send by Tuesday; but may accept walk-ins
- would like to hear by next Tuesday so he can plan
- reminder forthcoming

Plan for February as of last meeting

a) Channel loss
Presentations:

John D'Ambrosia: dambrosia_C1_0106
Rich Mellitz: mellitz_c1_0106C
Joe Abler: abler_c1_0106
Prakash Radhakrishnan: krooswyk_c1_0106

Some discussion leading to first straw poll:

Straw Poll #1
Do we keep the current relationship between EIT channel and informative
model???
Yes -   10
No -   3
Abstain - 1

Strong support for Keeping the current relationship.

Straw Poll #2
How much should the channel attenuation be reduced at the Nyquist
frequency?
1. None --   2
2. Some but less than 3 dB -- 7
3. 3 dB --   7
4. More than 3 dB --   1
Vote for one only

Strong support for some reduction, possibly up to 3dB.

Should we specify return loss for the EIT channel?
Charles asks if there are any objection?
Agreed without objection.

Straw Poll #3
How should the shape of Amax change:
1. same shape, scaled only - 1
2. Nyquist is scaled more than lower frequencies - 2
3. We don't have sufficient information - 13

John D'Ambrosia will work with Joel Goergen to define shape of reduced
attenuation line

Straw Poll #4
Do we need to keep the same channel model for all three PHY types?

Yes -- 7
No -- 6
Abstain — 2
Unclear result but no support for splitting the channels.

Concludes channel loss discussion.

How are we going to make progress???

b) Reduced crosstalk.

Presentations
moore_c1_0106 - Charles Moore
brown_c1_0106 - Matt Brown
brown_c2_0106 - Matt Brown

Meeting was cut off by teleconference service at after 1hour 50 minutes.