

(DRAFT) MEETING 1 MINUTES:

Call to Order UPAMD Conformity/Certification meeting -- Bob Noseworthy 7am PT 24 August 2011

- I. Introductions/Attendance
Bob Davis, Bob Noseworthy, Ravi Subramaniam
- II. Approval of previous Meeting Notes (Placeholder)
- III. Approval of Agenda
Introductions/Attendance
Approval of previous Conformity Subgroup Meeting Notes (Null)
Approval of 08/24/2011 Conformity Subgroup Agenda
Patent Slides reviewed
Technical Review/Updates
Administrative Review/Updates
New business?

IV. IEEE Call for Patents. See

<https://development.standards.ieee.org/myproject/Public/mytools/mob/slideset.pdf>

V. Technical Review/Updates

Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS) Standards Writing review:

- 1 The most relevant suggestion I can make is to encourage the P1823 specification to include PICS (Protocol Implementation Conformance Statements). If you're unfamiliar with these, they are perhaps best defined in section 21.6 of IEEE 802.3, but they are used in many IEEE standards. For examples in this same document, see the end of each clause, such as section 28.5, or section 31.8.

http://standards.ieee.org/getieee802/download/802.3-2008_section2.pdf

Essentially PICS are the standard's requirements distilled into a tabular form. If there is a "shall", "shall not", "should", or "should not" in the spec, then it should be in the PICS table (assuming P1823 follows the IEEE standard nomenclature for requirements, per the style manual {section 13, especially 13.1

http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/msc/upamd/private/UPAMDDrafts/2009_Style_Manual.pdf })

- 1 I see the most recent draft (July 18) has 9 shalls, an improvement over the Mar 27 version with no "shalls", still - for such an early draft, this doesn't surprise me at all.

PICS can generally be written once the last technical changes are in place, SO LONG as the spec has been written with test in mind and the proper use of "shall", etc - thus developing and maintaining PICS early enough to ensure the committee is considering what is a mandatory vs optional test, whether any requirement is truly testable, etc, is well worth doing from an early stage.

Review of "Shall" statements from July 18th draft document:

9 Shall (there ultimately must be many more)

1. p14L9 5. UPAMD Ports: "All ports from adapters shall be enumerated."
2. p51L11 10.1.1.1: "The power supply shall be capable of supplying full rated output power over the input range of 90 VAC RMS to 265 VAC RMS"
3. p51L12 10.1.1.1: "The power supply shall be capable of start-up (power-on) at 90 VAC and 50 Hz minimum."
4. p51L17 10.1.1.3: "The power supply shall accept the full input range"
5. p51L19 10.1.1.4: "The supply shall operate with an input frequency of 47 – 63 Hz AC."

6. p52L2 10.1.1.5: "Maximum steady state input current shall be less than x.x Amperes RMS at 90 VAC and maximum load"
7. p52L8 10.1.1.7: "Maximum inrush current, from power-on (with power on at any point on the AC sine wave) and including, but not limited to, three line cycles, shall be" TBD
8. p52L13 10.1.1.8: "The power supply shall not be damaged by applying an input voltage below the minimum specified in Section 1.1.1.1"
9. p52L15 10.1.1.8: "The power supply shall operate within Specifications under the following conditions: Transients as defined in IEC 801-4"

Other Technical Topics: review/overview of UPAMD in the certification space:

Comms: Logical Channel 3 Test & Qualification possible uses

Data- how did the user know he didn't buy a piece of junk

Data set registers to report to the customer:

- 1 Descriptor of the product - vendor name, model number and serial number, certification document pointer

- 1 Also have an EUI (unique per device)

{Davis}: Angela Thomas (RAC Administrator) is possible to setup a database - give it a 64bit number that can be read out of the device, and then plug into the database to provide the certification documents (such as PDF or HTML)

Individually certifiable -

certified device (laptop) / certified device (adapter) / certified device (cable)

FCC wants the adapter and the cable that is shipped with the unit

How do we work with the FCC to overcome any existing requirements (if any) for certifying a laptop (for example) with "any" certified adapter and "any" certified cable.

Eventually need to solicit participation/awareness from:

FCC, UL / (Asli Solmaz-Kaiser / Paul Kelly) , ETL/Intertek , CE , TUV , CSA, etc...

Will hazardous locations be covered? We are below the ignition potential for hydrogen (<15uJ for spark)

{Davis}: We will not certify for any hazardous location UL913(explosive environments) or 10xxx - won't prevent those implementing UPAMD to meet those requirements.

Medical environments - under the energy to work in the 'worst' environment for Oxygen/etc - but UPAMD won't require this either - but again, won't prevent those implementing UPAMD to meet IEC 60601-1 requirements.

Review:

http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/msc/upamd/pub_docs/UPAMDLowEnergyConnectDisconnect201103171637clean.pdf

Others?

Additional notes: Review of UPAMD goals

- 1 Intent: include everything on the desktop - phones, laptop, displays, lamps, audio systems
- 1 Press is saying - Every place there's a standard ac outlet, there should be two UPAMD outlets.
- 1 Anything <240W should/could use UPAMD
- 1 Up to 60V is legit (current UPAMD spec), anything >60V would require additional testing

VI. Administrative Review/Updates

- Status:
 - RAC (EUI block has been secured)
 - Per-unit EUI
 - Potential: Per-device-implementation Certification registry to store cert
 - IEEE-SA (Claire Topp - IEEE-SA Legal Counsel)
 - IEEE ISTO / ICAP.

UPAMD Conformity / Certification Meeting Minutes: Meeting 1 - 24 August 2011

- Timeframe discussion
 - Standard Ballot – this year
 - USB pushing 100W by/in 2012
 - HDBase-T pushing 100W on Cat5 Ethernet
 - IEEE PoE may develop 100W as well (non-bundled cable env)
- Scope of conformity/certification
 - Not safety / regulatory – left to regional services (FCC, UL, etc)
 - Self-certification allowed? (internal testing should be enabled) 3rd party testing required? Sample testing? In-field auditing?

VII. New Business.

Adjourned circa 8:45am PT

Future Meetings:

5pm Pacific, Wednesday, September 7
7am Pacific, Wednesday, September 21
5pm Pacific, Wednesday, October 5