

## Unconfirmed Minutes - Multiple MCS IEEE 802.3bn EPoC Ad Hoc - 012313

### Attendance

Attendee	Present
Alan Brown – Aurora	x
Andrea Garavaglia – Qualcomm	x
Avi Kliger – Broadcom	
Bill Powell – ALU	x
Charaf Hanna – ST Micro	
Christian Pietsch – Qualcomm	x
Curtis Knittle – CableLabs	x
Dave Barr – Entropic	x
Dave Urban – Comcast	
David Law – HP	
Duane Remein – Huawei	x
Dylan Ko – Qualcomm	
Ed Boyd – Broadcom	x
Ed Mallette - Brighthouse	
Eugene Dai – Cox	x
George Hart – Rogers	
Guansheng	
Hesham ElBakoury – Huawei	x
Jim Farmer – Aurora	
Joe Solomon – Comcast	x
John Dickinson – Brighthouse	
John Ulm – Motorola	x
Jorge Salinger – Comcast	
Juergen Seidenberg – BK Tel	x
Juan Montojo – Qualcomm	x
Leo Montreuil – Broadcom	
Lup Ng – Cortina	
Marek Hajduczenia – ZTE	x
Mark Laubach – Broadcom	
Matt Schmitt – CableLabs	
Michel Allard – Cogeco	x
Mike Darling – Shaw	x
Mike Emmendorfer – Arris	x
Nicola Varanese – Qualcomm	x
Ony Anglade – Cox	
Patrick Stupar – Qualcomm	
Peter Wolff – Titan Photonics	
Raanan Ivry – Wide Pass	
Ramdane Krikeb – Videotron	

Saif Rahman – Comcast	x
Sanjay Kasturia – Qualcomm	x
Satish Mudugere – Intel	
Steve Shellhammer – Qualcomm	
Thushara Hewavithana – Intel	x
Tim Brophy – Cisco	
Tom Staniec – Cohere	x
Tom Williams –Cablelabs	
Venkat Arunarthi – Cortina	
Victor Hou – Broadcom	x
Volker Lisse - CEL	
Yitshak Ohana - Broadcom	

## Patents Policy

- Everyone familiar with the policy; no response to call for patents

## Review of Ad Hoc Activities and Status – Slides

If we expand the scope, we are taking more work when we haven't yet met the original objective

- Chair: We are very close on making the decision on what to do; probably within the next few meetings
  - If we do decide to proceed, then the second objective would be very worthwhile. If we do not proceed, then the second objective is moot
- Suggested to make the second objective an “if” statement to make this clear

Feel that this continues to delay the standard, due to the fact that it fundamentally changes EPON

- Expands the project
- Chair: Understand, and this is a main rationale to NOT include in the project
- Commentor: Don't agree, since PON has 2 rates, 1 G and 10 G, it's not a fundamental change
- Commentor: 1G and 10G compatibility is not an equal comparison to the rate changes in MMP

## Straw Polls

1. Exclude MMP from the EPOC Standard

Yes: 8      No: 14

2. Make MMP an optional feature in the EPOC Standard

Yes: 13      No: 9

3. Make MMP required for TDD

Yes: 10      No: 12

4. Make MMP required for FDD

Yes: 10 No: 14

5. Include MMP as a requirement in the EPOC Standard

Yes: 11 No: 12

We did not achieve 75% consensus on any of these polls.

Should we have a poll for optional inclusion in TDD?

- Is that really that much different than the other polls?
- Even if we did make it optional for TDD, it still greatly adds to the amount of work we need to do. That is one of our biggest obstacles.
- Time to accomplish a goal isn't necessarily a barrier; if we could stop arguing about whether we do it, we could have proposals very soon
  - But it does impact other things as well
  - The time commitment for this ad hoc to date has been significant

Since we have a separate track for TDD, the PHY will still be common

The number of calls we already have are burdensome; if we are only rehashing the same arguments, it's not a good use of time

There are those that say they need additional information to make a decision: we need specific issues to focus on to keep this moving forward effectively

- Jorge to work on creating this list

What can we do to close this question in 2 weeks? Can we really come to consensus.

If we had separate PHYs for FDD and TDD, would the straw poll be different?

- Is that one or 2 standards?
  - Doesn't matter how they get executed; question is whether splitting helps this decision

Straw Poll #6: Assuming that we were working on a separate PHY for TDD, make MMP required for TDD

Yes: 5 No: 6 Many abstentions

- Assume that there IS a separate PHY for TDD in this question
- Isn't it separate MAC messages?
  - No, this is all PHY
  - There would be a separate PHY spec that includes the needed signaling in the PHY to enable

Also need to think about how we reach consensus.