

Minutes IEEE 802.3 10SPE SG AdHoc meeting September 26th

Prepared by Peter Jones

Proposed Agenda:

1. Agenda/Admin Peter Jones

Presentations posted at:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/10SPE/public/adhoc/index.html>

Agenda/Admin Peter Jones:

Meeting began at 9:05am PST.

1. Reviewed the Attendance information related to the ad hoc.
2. Displayed pre-par patent slide deck, Asked if we needed to review patent policy.
 - a. No one requested review.
3. Reminded participants to indicate full names and employer/affiliation correctly for the meeting minutes.
4. No need to approve September 7th minutes, done in Ft Worth
5. Presented the proposed agenda.
 - a. Approved without objection.

Presentations/Discussion.

Chair's Comments George Zimmerman CME etc

- Ft Worth was a good meeting, progress was possibly better than expected.
- Still a lot to do to finalize objectives, and to provide data to back up our CSDs (e.g. Market size, Economic & Technical feasibility).
- Bring forward ideas/presentations/data early. It makes building consensus much easier. Waiting till San Antonino is not a simple path to success.

Fieldbus-Cabling in Standards Bernd Hormmeyer Phoenix Contact

- Covered a survey of some currently defined industrial fieldbus definitions, standards and physical characteristics.
- Has information compiled into MS-WORD and MS-EXCEL files. Will work with SG/AH chairs to figure out where this can help stored/shared.
 - From SG chair – please discuss with other interested parties about how channel characteristics are specified, so that we have a common way to describe attributes.
- This presentation is focused on a subset of industrial use cases, particularly the “Conversion of bus topologies”.

- Presenters opinion – a link segment of up to 300m satisfies most industrial use cases, expect some additional discussion in the process control industry.
- SG chair encourages attendees to be clear about their uses cases in presentations, to help the group understand tradeoffs.

Objectives Update George Zimmerman CME etc

- Presenter walks through what's already been agreed, and what's still open.
- Avoid terms that imply we know the answer, e.g., use “optional power delivery” vs “Power over Data Line”.
- Discussion about “Optional Low Power Mode”. Is this just EEE, or something else?
- Discussion about “Fast Startup time” and “Max Startup time”. Need more on this.
- Discussion about “full duplex only” vs the media topology required. Point to point vs bus/ring/tree is the key point here. It's more about Media Access Control than full vs half duplex.
- Ground Fruit (strawberries) - “Do not preclude”
 - “Intrinsic Safety” and “Automotive Safety” are covered.
 - Are there any other “do not precludes” from other industries (e.g. Building Control)?
- Low Hanging Fruit - BER
 - Working assumption – 10^{-10}
 - Need to figure out how to test this without requiring excessive test time (economic/ technical feasibility CSDs)
 - Presentation from Ahmad
- Link Segment/PHY dependent
 - Discussion on proposals.
 - 1000m (this presentation) vs 1200m (CFI). Presentation requested, including connector count.
 - Check language on “at least one PHY at 15m” with “a PHY at 1000m”. Make sure that this is generally understood.
 - Presenter thinks this says one PHY to 1000m, and allows multiple PHYs for the 15m reach.
 - Need to check that this is clear to the broader group.
 - Presentation to be coordinated by Ludwig
- Powering – review 802.3bu objectives to see what we need to say.
 - One project or two?
 - PoDL reuse? PoDL doesn't go over 40m (correction – 6.5ohms), so we need something new, at least for the 1km reach.
 - Is the ability to operate with power and without data a key objective?
 - Interaction between short reach power (PoDL – 6.5 ohms) vs long reach power (1000m).
 - Can there be more than one power delivery specified?
 - General agreement: change “a power distribution technique” to “one or more” or “at least one”.

- What about daisy chain topology and impact on power? Call for presentations.
 - Need to include both data and power on the topology presentations
- We need examples of devices to be powered, e.g. what are they, how much power, what is the distance/resistance/cable loss.

- Discussion Items/Work Items
 - Power
 - Do we need an objective for “optional classification of power requirements” to support “plug and play power delivery” in additional to engineered systems (e.g. a car).
 - Support for daisy chain/bus/multipoint gets interesting with supporting power. Needs careful thought. Complexity tradeoff coming.
 - Bus/Multipoint topologies
 - Needs careful evaluation.
 - Data and power complexity may drive Multipoint into a separate project
 - Would probably need a tutorial to explain/teach people how this would work in the 802.3 environment.
 - Deadline for formal tutorial to 802 at plenary has already passed.
 - Can be done as “802.3 presentation” as part of NG-ECDC AdHoc, or evening meeting of Study Group.
 - Evening Study group session most likely. SG chair to investigate scheduling.
 - Participants in favor of Bus/Multipoint topologies need to drive towards building this material to explain why and how to the broader 802.3 group.
 - Proposals need to come forward QUICKLY, and before the November meeting.
 - Fast Startup vs Cold start
 - Automotive listed these – fast_startup vs max_startup
 - What about building/industrial?
 - If this is a key requirement, presentations are requested so that we know how to right our objectives.
 - Is there an additional “fault-recovery” startup requirement?

Meeting closed – ~10:30 PT

Attendees (from Webex + emails)

| Name | Affiliation | attended 9/26 |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| Amrik Bains | Cisco | y |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Ahmad Chini | Broadcom | y |
| Andy Gardner | Linear Technology | n |
| Bob Lounsbury | Rockwell Automation | n |
| Bernd Hormmeyer | Phoenix Contact | y |
| Brett McClellan | Marvell | y |
| Chris Diminico | MC Communications/Panduit | n |
| Chad Jones | Cisco | y |
| Ching-Yao Su | Realtek | y |
| Claude Gauthier | OmniPHY | y |
| Daniel Wiesmayer | DRÄXLMAIER | y |
| Dave Karpenske | PCN Technology | n |
| David Abramson | TI | y |
| David Brandt | Rockwell Automation | y |
| David Hoglund | Johnson Controls | y |
| David Law | HPE | y |
| David Malicoat | HPE | y |
| Dayin Xu | Rockwell Automation | n |
| Derek Cassidy | ICRG | n |
| Dick Caro | CMC Associates | n |
| Dieter Schicketanz | Consultant, Reutlingen University | y |
| dingdong53224 | ??? | y |
| Eric DiBiaso | TE | y |
| Frank Schewe | Phoenix Contact | n |
| Geoff Thompson | Independent | n |
| George Zimmerman | CME Consulting / Commscope, LTC & Aquantia | y |
| Hans-Peter Schmidt | OTH Amberg-Weiden | n |
| Harald Müller | Endress+Hauser | n |
| Heath Stewart | Linear Technology | n |
| Helge Zinner | Continental Corp. | y |
| Hossein Sedarat | Aquantia | y |
| Jacky Chang | HPE | y |
| James Withey | ?? | n |
| Jay Cordaro | Broadcom | n |
| Jean Picard | TI | n |
| Jeff Marvin | Linear Technology | y |
| Jens Gottron | Siemens | y |
| Jim Bird | TI | y |
| Joe Byrne | NXP | n |
| Joerg Haehnicke | Endress+Hauser | n |
| Kirsten Matheus | BMW | n |

| | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|----|
| Laura Schweitz | Turck | y |
| Lennart Yseboodt | Phillips | n |
| Ludwig Winkel | Siemens | y |
| Maris Graube | Relcom Inc. | y |
| Markus Wucher | Endress+Hauser | y |
| Masood Shariff | CommScope | n |
| Matthias Fritsche | HARTING Electronics GmbH | y |
| Matthias Wendt | Phillips | n |
| Mehmet Tazebay | Broadcom | n |
| Mick McCarthy | Analog Devices | y |
| Mohammad Ahmed | TE | n |
| Paul Mooney | Sprirent | n |
| Peter Jones | Cisco | y |
| Peter Wu | Marvell | y |
| Qing Xu | Belden | y |
| Richard Mei | CommScope | n |
| Ron Muir | JAE | n |
| Stefan Buntz | Daimler | n |
| Steffen Grabber | Pepperl+Fuchs | y |
| Steve Carlson | HSD | n |
| Theo Brillhart | Fluke | y |
| Woo-Suk Ko | LGE | n |
| Yong Kim | Broadcom | n |
| Attendee count | | 33 |