

Unapproved Minutes
IEEE 802.3 – Residential Ethernet Study Group
November 17-18, 2004
San Antonio, TX
Prepared by Dennis Lou

Approximately 36 people were present in the room.

At 8:30am Steve Carlson, the study group chair, called the meeting to order. Introductory comments were made and the rules, patent policy, project flow, and study group Internet information were disclosed. With respect to the 6-month lifetime of the study group, Richard Brand raised the question of “when does the clock start?” The conclusion was that the available level of granularity of the “clock” makes that question difficult to answer. An agenda was also presented.

The following presentations were made:

#1 Geoff Thompson, Nortel – Spyder-LAN

(see Spider-LAN.ppt)

Discussion:

- 1394 compatibility
- 100Mbps compatibility
- Can spyder mode be originated and best-effort data be later sent from the same DTE
- Can spider elements be cascaded?
- TDM frames
- Can 802.1D bridge core be removed or repositioned?
- What originated the delay/jitter requirements

#2 Alexei Beliaev, Gibson – Latency Requirements

(see alexei_gibson_16nov04.pdf)

Discussion:

- Allowable number of endpoints
- Media delay vs. store-forward delay clarified

#3 Dennis Lou, Pioneer – CE Requirements

(see CEreqs.pdf)

Discussion:

- Clarification of certain timing values
- How stringent are the timing values?

#4 Daniel Feldman, Power Dsine – Power Over Ethernet for Residential Ethernet

(see feldman_1_1104.pdf)

Discussion:

- IEEE1394 power vs. PoE power
- Power limits

Break occurred at 10:28am, reconvened at approx. 10:45am

#5 Michael Johas Teener, Plumblinks – Possible Structuring of RE Services

(see services.pdf-link.pdf)

Discussion:

- Timing requirements

#6 David James, JGG – Clock Synchronization

(see dvjTimeSyncSlides2004Nov13.pdf)

Discussion:

- What are the tradeoffs of fractional seconds vs. implementation cost

Lunch break at 11:59am, reconvened at approx. 1:30pm

Richard Brand filled in as temporary chair

#7 Seong-Soon Joo, ETRI – Considerations on Synchronous Frame

(see ssjoo SynchFrame 2004Nov17.pdf)

Discussion:

- Definition of granularity
- 100Mbs channel applicability

#8 John Gildred, Pioneer – Bandwidth Problem At Any Speed

(see gildred_re_more.pdf)

Discussion:

- Who defines priorities?
- How should priorities be set?
- What work should be done in 802.1 vs. 802.3?
- Relative merits of priorities
- Should scheduling mechanism be put in the MAC?

Following the presentations, the group reviewed the study items from CFI. A point to multipoint presentation (MPCP) was requested for next meeting. A short review of objectives ensued.

Break at 2:37pm, reconvened at 3:02pm

Steve Carlson resumed as chair

Straw Poll #1

Upon reconvening, the group revised the draft list of objectives from the September interim meeting in Ottawa. A number of items were stricken as being out of scope but still desirable. Other items were deleted as being irrelevant. Some items were revised for clarification.

A straw poll was taken to adopt above the revised list of objectives.

Results:

Yes - 25

No - 0

Abstain - 4

The objectives were then re-arranged so that out of scope items were moved to the bottom of the page.

Questions were raised with regards to start drafting a PAR. It was disclosed that this was to be addressed by the chair. Another question was raised with regards to starting work within 802.1. It was decided that this was best deferred.

At 4:48pm, the meeting was adjourned, to be resumed at 8am the next day.

At 8:22am, the group reconvened and Steve Carlson, the study group chair called the meeting to order. The 802.3 processes were quickly reviewed and a straw man 5 criteria was presented and refined.

Broad Market Potential – There was concern that functionality can be done with other solutions. However being still a green field, no other solution dominates. A suggestion originated from the floor that the IEEE 802 template be examined and followed. Comments ensued that the slide should address market growth due to study group's efforts.

Compatibility – A number of main bullet points were augmented with sub-bullets for clarification.

Distinct Identity – A bullet point expressing the expectation for a separate clause was added. A mention of augmentation of the MAC-client interface was added.

Technical Feasibility – Some points were rearranged to highlight technology re-use. They were later changed to reflect that feasibility is proven by existing technologies. A mention of time-sensitive services present in other technologies was added.

Economic Feasibility – The 'R' from 'R&D' was removed. 'High product value' was expanded to include increased capabilities. A bullet point was added addressing cost reduction at system level. A sub-bullet was added to address the enabling of significantly higher levels of functionality.

Straw Poll #2

A straw poll was taken whether to adopt the above 5 criteria as a first draft.

Results:

Yes – 23

No – 0

Abstain – 0

Straw Poll #3

A straw poll taken whether to extend RESG through march 2005 plenary meeting.

Results:

Yes – 25

No – 0

Abstain – 0

The future IEEE 802.3 Interim meeting at Hyatt Regency, Vancouver Jan24-28 was announced.

802.1 interactions were discussed. A March plenary joint meeting was suggested and discussed.

At 10:37am, the meeting was adjourned.