

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P23 L37 # 2
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 The general style for Definitions in 802.3-2022 is to reference the uppermost Clause number (no precedent for a specific subclause reference).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "(see IEEE Std 802.3, 188.9)" with "(see IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 188)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P25 L31 # 74
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Management
 "30.17 Layer management for Multidrop Power over Ethernet (MPoE)" does not have a table mirroring "Table 30-10 - PoDL PSE Capabilities" or reference in 30.2.5 Capabilities.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a MPSE table mirroring Table 30-10, based on "30.17.1.1 MPSE attributes". Extend reference in 30.2.5 to include MPoE PSE and PD references. Include new box oMPSE in "Figure 30-3—DTE System entity relationship diagram". Include oMPSE in "30.2.2.1 Text description of managed objects"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Accommodated by comment #64.
 Implement text changes shown in pages 6 to 15 (section 3) in jones_3da_01_mpoe_measurement_proposal_v2.3a.pdf

Cl 30 SC 30.17 P28 L19 # 64
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Management
 It's been assumed the MPoE will provide the equivalent function to the "Power via MDI Measurements TLV" defined for 4 pair PoE, but we have not specified this in the draft.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Implement text changes shown in pages 6 to 15 (section 3) in jones_3da_01_mpoe_measurement_proposal_v2.3a.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.17.1.1.3 P29 L14 # 3
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 A combination of things infers plurality
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "MPD(s)" with "MPDs"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.17.1.1.3 P29 L17 # 7
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 189.5.1 refers to MPD types
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "MPD Class(s)" with "MPD type(s)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.17.1.1.7 P30 L3 # 27
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 typo "Capabilities" should be "Capabilities" (missing the "l" between the l and the t) this occurs 6 times.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Capabilities" to "Capabilities" at P30 L3, P30 L14, P30 L25, P32 L39, P32 L50, P33 L10.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 30 SC 30.17.1.1.9 P30 L23 # 25

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

"A count of the cumulative energy" - you don't count energy.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "A count of the cumulative energy" to "The value of the counter represents the cumulative energy"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.17.1.1.10 P30 L32 # 26

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

typo - "MEASUREMENT" (not "MEASURMENT", missing the E before the M). This occurs twice.

SuggestedRemedy

Change MEASURMENT to MEASUREMENT at P30 L32 & P33 L17 (30.17.2.1.11)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.17.2 P30 L50 # 75

Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Management

oMPD managed object class is lacking references to it.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a MPD table in the style of Table 30-10, based on "30.17.2 MPD managed object class attributes". Extend reference in 30.2.5 to include MPoE PD references. Include new box oMPD in "Figure 30-3—DTE System entity relationship diagram". Include oMPD in "30.2.2.1 Text description of managed objects"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accommodated by comment #64.

Implement text changes shown in pages 6 to 15 (section 3) in jones_3da_01_mpoe_measurement_proposal_v2.3a.pdf

Cl 30 SC 30.17.2.1.1 P31 L13 # 15

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Type, by itself, is not a proper noun.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "indicates the MPD Type" with "indicates the MPD type"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace "indicates the MPD Type" with "indicates the MPD type" on P31, L13

Editor to perform a global review to ensure that 'type' is not capitalized unless it's at the start of the sentence or being used as a proper noun (e.g., Type 0).

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.235.4 P38 L5 # 6

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Management

If 10BASE-T1M PHYs always indicate a zero in bit 1.2298.8, then reference to the T1M PHY is not needed in the first two sentences.

SuggestedRemedy

Revert the first two sentences in 45.2.1.235.4 back to the original text (and delete all revision marks) as follows, "When read as a one, bit 1.2298.9 indicates that the 10BASE-T1S PMA has the ability to detect a fault condition on the receive path."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.72.2 P40 L8 # 76

Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

The loopback path is not stated clearly. PCS has upper and lower interfaces.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from: "PCS shall accept data on the transmit path and return it on the receive path",
 To: "PCS shall accept data on the transmit path from the MII and return it on the receive path to the MII". Otherwise add "as described in 188.4.3.9"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Two options are provided in the Suggested Remedy.)

Change from: "PCS shall accept data on the transmit path and return it on the receive path"

To: "PCS shall accept data on the transmit path from the MII and return it on the receive path to the MII".

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.73.2 P41 L1 # 14

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

"that" typically refers to a specific subset, while "which" is more commonly used in relative statements to provide extra information not essential to the meaning of the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "PHYs, which do not" with "PHYs that do not" (keep text in underline)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 79 SC 79 P42 L1 # 65

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D LLDP

It's always been assumed the MPoE will use LLDP to exchange status and negotiate power for MPoE, but we have not specified this in the draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Implement text changes shown in pages 11 to 22 (sections 4.2 and 4.3) in jones_3da_01_lldp_mpo_e_proposal_v2.2a.pdf.
 Remove "Power Bus Management" row from Table 79-1 within text box on page 43.
 Remove text box on page 49 containing the "79.3.12 Dynamic Power Allocation TLV"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 79 SC 79.1.1.1 P42 L23 # 47

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R LLDP

Define LLDP Destination Address field for 10BASE-T1S/M.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the change to 79.1.1.1 as shown in lines 23-31

Response Response Status Z

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 79 SC 79.1 P42 L28 # 17

Regev, Alon Keysight
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D LLDP

While I agree that using the "Nearest bridge" group MAC address group is appropriate, I disagree with making this change just for 10BASE-T1S and 10BASE-T1M

A maintenance request should be filed to

- 1) change the reference from 802.1AB-2009 to 802.1AB-2016 (as 802.1AS-2009 was superseded by 802.1AB-2016)
- 2) require all 802.3 LLDP messages use the "Nearest bridge" group MAC addresses as they are not intended to cross bridges (for example, frame preemption capability needs to be negotiated between both partners in a link and cannot pass through ANY bridge).

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the change to 79.1.1.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: This change has not yet been made to 79.1.1.1 - see note on P42, L 15, "Unapproved text related to this has been placed in text boxes." Comment #65 replaces the Editor's notes while referencing 802.1AB-2016 and removing the specificity to 10BASE-T1S and 10BASE-T1M.)

Accommodated by comment #65.

Implement text changes shown in pages 11 to 22 (sections 4.2 and 4.3) in jones_3da_01_lldp_mpo_e_proposal_v2.2a.pdf.
 Remove "Power Bus Management" row from Table 79-1 within text box on page 43.
 Remove text box on page 49 containing the "79.3.12 Dynamic Power Allocation TLV"

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 79 SC 79.3 P43 L3 # 8

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The last row in Table 79-1 that's being revised was for "9 to 255"

SuggestedRemedy

Change Editing Instruction from, "Change the row for subtypes 10 to 255" to "Change the row for subtypes 9 to 255"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 79 SC 79.3 P43 L8 # 18

Regev, Alon Keysight
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

There seem to be two sets of editing instructions, one that adds subtype 9 and changes the "Reserved" row and a second that adds rows 9-12 and updates the "Reserved" field. If both editing instructions are followed then we will end up with 2 rows for subtype 9.

SuggestedRemedy

remove the first set of editing instructions, but leave the second

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

There are two instructions (one change and one insert) for the table as follows:

- 1) The numbering for the reserved row needs to be changed (comment #12 corrects the instruction - it should read, "Change the row for subtypes 9 to 255 in Table 79-1"), and
- 2) a new subtype row (9) for the PLCA TLV) needs to be inserted

CI 79 SC 79.3.9.1 P44 L26 # 81

Baggett, Tim Microchip
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PLCA

Add PLCA TLVs for the following:

- * PLCA Node Count
- * D-PLCA Coordinator Role Allowed

SuggestedRemedy

For D-PLCA Coordinator Role Allowed, add the following field definition to the PLCA Support/Status Field of Table 79-21 (P44 L42):

- * Field definitions: Bit 5 - D-PLCA Coordinator Role Allowed
- * Value/Values: 1 = TRUE, 0 = FALSE
- * Notes: 30.16.1.1.10

Adjust the reserved field bits for the PLCA Support/Status Field of Table 79-21 (P44 L43):

- * Field Definitions: Change "Bits 5 to 15" to "Bits 6 to 15"

For PLCA Node Count, add to table 79-21 a new entry (P44 L46):

- * Field: PLCA nodeCount
- * Length (octets): 1
- * Format: Unsigned Integer
- * Field definitions: 0-255
- * Value/Values: 0-255
- * Notes: 30.16.1.1.3

Add new section "79.3.9.2 PLCA nodeCount" P45 L5 with the following text:

The PLCA nodeCount field contains an unsigned integer value indicating the number of transmit opportunities between beacons transmitted by the coordinator. If PLCA is not enabled, this field reports 0. If the coordinator mode is not enabled and the PLCA nodeID is zero, this field may report 0 or the number of transmit opportunities the fllwer detects between received beacons.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 79 SC 79.3.9.3 P45 L8 # 48

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status D LLDP

Delete un-needed text. The LLDP DA is now defined in 79.1.1.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "Since this TLV is intended to inform a link partner of capabilities, the PLCA TLV should be sent in an LLDPDU addressed to the Nearest Bridge group address (see IEEE 802.1Q)."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The statement is particular to the PLCA TLV in 79.3.9.3 and should remain in case the changes to 79.1.1.1 are reverted at some point in the balloting process.

Cl 147 SC 147.1 P53 L10 # 111

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type T Comment Status D 10BASE-T1S

The change to "provided" would make the current definitions for multidrop within clause 147 obsolete. Additionally, current implementations of 10BASE-T1S multidrop, which are already out in the field might not be compliant anymore.

SuggestedRemedy

change provided to "enhanced"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.1 P54 L28 # 28

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

"The PLCA node should be configured appropriately before transmit functions are enabled to achieve error free operation when D-PLCA is not enabled." reads odd. The condition usually goes first.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The PLCA node should be configured appropriately before transmit functions are enabled to achieve error free operation when D-PLCA is not enabled." to "When D-PLCA is not enabled, the PLCA node should be configured appropriately before transmit functions are enabled."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.2 P55 L9 # 20

Regev, Alon Keysight
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial

three state machines seem to have slightly different definitions for COL and CRS. It would be good to harmonize these as they refer to the same signals.

Current data in 148.4.4.2:

COL
 The MII signal COL.
 Values: TRUE or FALSE

CRS
 The MII signal CRS.
 Values: TRUE or FALSE

RX_DV
 The MII signal RX_DV.
 Values: TRUE or FALSE

TX_EN
 The MII signal TX_EN.
 Values: TRUE or FALSE

Current data in 148.4.5.2:

COL
 The MII signal COL specified in 22.2.2.12.

CRS
 The MII signal CRS (see 22.2.2.11).

TXD
 The MII signals TXD<3:0> specified in 22.2.2.4.

TX_EN
 The MII signal TX_EN specified in 22.2.2.3.

TX_ER
 The MII signal TX_ER specified in 22.2.2.5.

Current data in 148.4.7.2;

COL
 The MII signal COL.
 Values: TRUE or FALSE

COR
 The MII signal COR.
 Values: TRUE or FALSE

SuggestedRemedy

change all 3 locations (148.4.4.2, 148.4.5.2, and 148.4.7.2) to the following defintions (only populate these where used):

COL
 The MII signal COL (see 22.2.2.12).
 Values: TRUE or FALSE

CRS

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

The MII signal CRS (see 22.2.2.11).
Values: TRUE or FALSE

RX_DV
The MII signal RX_DV.
Values: TRUE or FALSE

TXD
The MII signals TXD<3:0> (see 22.2.2.4).

TX_EN
The MII signal TX_EN.(see 22.2.2.3)
Values: TRUE or FALSE

TX_ER
The MII signal TX_ER (see 22.2.2.5)
Values: TRUE or FALSE

Proposed Response Response Status **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: There are some extraenous marks following CRS and TXD in the Suggested Remedy that don't belong.)

Align the definitions in 148.4.4.2, 148.4.5.2, and 148.4.7.2 with the following (only populate these where used):

COL
The MII signal COL (see 22.2.2.12).
Values: TRUE or FALSE

CRS
The MII signal CRS (see 22.2.2.11).
Values: TRUE or FALSE

RX_DV
The MII signal RX_DV.
Values: TRUE or FALSE

TXD
The MII signals TXD<3:0> (see 22.2.2.4).

TX_EN
The MII signal TX_EN.(see 22.2.2.3)
Values: TRUE or FALSE

TX_ER
The MII signal TX_ER (see 22.2.2.5)
Values: TRUE or FALSE

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.2 P55 L22 # 83

McClellan, Brett Marvell
Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ

per remedy of comment 323 on D2.0, dplca_en should have values defined as follows:
Values:
TRUE: The D-PLCA function is enabled
FALSE: The D-PLCA function is disabled or not present

SuggestedRemedy
Change "Values: TRUE or FALSE" to
"Values:
TRUE: The D-PLCA function is enabled
FALSE: The D-PLCA function is disabled or not present"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.6 P56 L6 # 82

McClellan, Brett Marvell
Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ

typo change 'TRASNSMIT' to 'TRANSMIT'

SuggestedRemedy
change "TRASNSMIT" to "TRANSMIT"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.6 P56 L6 # 29

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor
Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ

typo "TRASNSMIT"

SuggestedRemedy
change "TRASNSMIT" to "TRANSMIT"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accommodated by comment #82.

change 'TRASNSMIT' to 'TRANSMIT'

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4 P58 L24 # 36

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PLCA

The left hand exit arc from COMMIT to itself cannot ever be true. When the PLCA Control diagram enters COMMIT, committed gets set to true, and the PLCA Data state diagram exits the HOLD state to tag "B". This sets packetPending to FALSE, making the arc impossible. The assertion of COL will drop TXEN causing the right hand branch to be taken to ABORT.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the left hand recirculating branch on COMMIT.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TFTD

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.6 P58 L35 # 68

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D PLCA

In the BURST state there is no "stop_append_commit_timer" So if you re-eter BURST state won't the append_commit_timer_done be true? Which means you'd enter ABORT instead of waiting out the burst_timer if you have max_bc > 0.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "stop_append_commit_timer" before the IF statement in BURST state of Figure 148-4, part b

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The suggesting re-entry doesn't happen after append_commit_timer is started. Looping occurs if BURST exits to "F", going to TRANSMIT, which then comes back to BURST, which only happens when max_bc > 0. (in this case BURST/TRANSMIT loop until either the burst count (bc) is >= max_bc, in which case it moves on, to the next TO, or the burst_timer is complete and TX_EN has dropped. append_commit_timer isn't started in this loop. append_commit_timer is only started when max_bc is = 0, and in this case, burst_timer is not started, so BURST waits until append_commit_timer is done before exiting to ABORT. Note that max_bc is not changed in the state diagram (it maps to a management attribute - and if these are changed, then it is likely plca needs a reset).

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.6 P58 L50 # 66

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The exit transition from NEXT_TX_OPPORTUNITY to hop G appears to begin with a "local_nodeID! = 0) where there is a space between the ! and the = is trying to be a not equal check, but you use the crossed through = sign for the compare to 255.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the != to a crossed through equal sign

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.6 P58 L50 # 67

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Editorial

The exit transitions from NEXT_TX_OPPORTUNITY to B does a greater than or equal to compare to plca_node_count and it looks like the exit to G does a less than or equal to comparison. If so then which branch are you supposed to take if curID is equal to plca_node_count.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the transition to G to be just a less than compare to plca_node_count.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

No change to draft. The Commenter appears to have misread the use of < and underline (to indicate inserted text) as a less than or equal to sign on the exit condition to branch G.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P62 L15 # 49

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Improve text clarity

SuggestedRemedy

Change
 "When using D-PLCA with statically assigned IDs, values in the range of 0 to 7 should be use first."
 to
 "When using D-PLCA with statically assigned IDs, values in the range of 0 to 7 should be assigned first."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P62 L16 # 101

Law, David HPE
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Suggest that '... as part of the nodeID assignment ...' should read '... as part of the local_nodeID assignment ...' to match the references to local_nodeID in the first sentence of this paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy
 See comment

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P62 L26 # 50

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Align text with state diagram terminology

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "switches" with "transitions"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P62 L28 # 51

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Align text with state diagram terminology

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "switching " with "transitioning"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P62 L34 # 52

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Align text with state diagram terminology

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "will switch" with "transitions"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P62 L37 # 9

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Shrinks is more commonly associated with making something physically smaller as opposed to reducing the number of things

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "also shrinks" with "also reduces"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: The Suggested Remedy includes a space before "shrinks" that should not be removed.)

Replace "also shrinks" with "also reduces"

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P62 L39 # 53

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Align text with state diagram terminology

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "will switch" with "transitions"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P62 L48 # 54
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 Align text with state diagram terminology
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "switch" with " transition"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P63 L1 # 10
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** Editorial
 The phrase "at any time" is not needed here.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "If at any time BEACONS cease to be regularly" with "If BEACONS cease to be regularly"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P63 L1 # 55
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 Align text with state diagram terminology
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "will switch" with "transition"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.16 P63 L3 # 79
 Baggett, Tim Microchip
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** D-PLCA
 D-PLCA Aging stage diagram descriptive text is missing.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Receive proposed descriptive text from Tim for inclusion at end of section 148.4.7.1 or as a new section before 148.4.7.6 on P67 L1.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.2 P63 L14 # 30
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 typo - "COR" should be "CRS". (2 instances)
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "COR" and "The MII signal COR." to "CRS" and "The MII signal CRS."
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Accommodated by comment #19.
 change "COR" to "CRS" on page 63 lines 15 and 16

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.2 P63 L15 # 19
 Regev, Alon Keysight
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** EZ
 COR should be CRS (2 locations)
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "COR" to "CRS" on page 63 lines 15 and 16
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.2 P63 L15 # 102

Law, David HPE
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

A variable 'COR' is defined as the 'The MII signal COR.'. This should be 'CRS'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the two instances of 'COR' to 'CRS'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accommodated by comment #19.

change "COR" to "CRS" on page 63 lines 15 and 16

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.3 P65 L20 # 56

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Improve text clarity

SuggestedRemedy

Change
 it shall not return an ID greater than the highest HARD claimed in the table, unless there is no ID available less than the highest HARD claimed in the table. If there is no ID available less than the highest HARD claimed in the table, the function will return the next TO immediately following the highest HARD claimed TO in the table.
 to
 It returns an available ID less than the highest HARD claimed ID if possible. If not, it returns the next ID after the highest HARD claimed ID.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: 'It' should not be capitalized as it appears at the start of a lettered list.)

Replace, "it shall not return an ID greater than the highest HARD claimed in the table, unless there is no ID available less than the highest HARD claimed in the table. If there is no ID available less than the highest HARD claimed in the table, the function will return the next TO immediately following the highest HARD claimed TO in the table.

With, "it returns an available ID less than the highest HARD claimed ID if possible. If not, it returns the next ID after the highest HARD claimed ID.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.3 P65 L22 # 103

Law, David HPE
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The second sentence of the first paragraph of the PICK_FREE_TXOP function description says, 'It returns any ID that ...'. Item (b) of the description then starts, 'it shall not return an ID greater ...'. The last sentence, however, says, '... the function will return the next TO immediately following the highest HARD claimed TO in the table ...'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the two instances of 'TO' to 'ID'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.3 P66 L14 # 104

Law, David HPE
 Comment Type T Comment Status D D-PLCA

The description of the PICK_FREE_TXOP function says that 'It returns any ID that is not marked as HARD or SOFT claimed in the table ...'. It, however, does not define what should happen when no IDs are free (i.e., all are marked as either HARD or SOFT).

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that an item (c) is added to the exceptions list that reads:

c. it shall return 255 if all IDs in the table are marked HARD or SOFT).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.5 P66 L24 # 105

Law, David HPE
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D D-PLCA

On review of the PHY delay constraints defined in table 188-4 '10BASE-T1M delay constraints', it appears the CRS signal resulting from a looped back BEACON can be de-asserted before the associated RX_ER and RXD BEACON encoding, see loopback_230225.jpg. Worse case, the maximum time to the RX_ER and RXD BEACON encoding appears to be TX_CLK cycle time + TX_ER sampled to TCI output + TCI input to RX_ER asserted = 400 + 440 + 4000 = 4840 ns. In the best case, the maximum time to CRS de-assertion appears to be TX_CLK cycle time + TX_ER sampled to TCI output + beacon_timer + TCI input to CRS de-asserted = 400 + 440 + 2050 + 1120 = 4010 ns; however, it could be shorter. Either way, this is less than the worse-case maximum time to the RX_ER and RXD BEACON encoding. As a result, the Figure 148-8 'D-PLCA Control State Diagram' will exit the LOOPBACK state due to the reassertion of the CRS signal and then will consider the subsequent associated RX_ER and RXD BEACON encoding as a separate BEACON. This defeats the purpose of the LOOPBACK state; see comment #333 on IEEE P802.3da draft D2.0.

To address the above, a timer would need to be started on entry to the LOOPBACK state, which expires shortly after the maximum time to RX_ER and RXD BEACON encoding. The LOOPBACK state should not be exited until this timer has expired.

SuggestedRemedy

[1] Add a new timer to subclause 148.4.7.4 'Timers' as follows:

loopback_timer
 Represents the maximum time for a BAECON to loop back on the MII received path.
 Duration: 4250 ns.
 Tolerance: ± 250 ns.

[2] In the figure 148-8 'D-PLCA Control State Diagram':

[a] Add the action 'start loopback_timer' to the LOOPBACK state.
 [b] Change the exit condition from the LOOPBACK state to read 'loopback_timer_done * (rx_cmd != BEACON) * !CRS * !COL'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.5 P66 L45 # 106

Law, David HPE
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D D-PLCA

I noted the MAC ExcessDefer counter being incremented when a node is added.

Since the node being added is receiving BEACONS, the PLCA Control state diagram will enter the SYNCING state, setting plca_active to TRUE. This causes the PLCA Status state diagram to enter the ACTIVE state, setting plca_status to OK. As a result, the PLCA DATA state diagram will exit the NORMAL state, where it defaults to CSMA/CD operation, and start PLCA operation.

The D-PLCA Control State Diagram (Figure 148-8) on the node being added, however, cannot exit the LEARNING state and enter the FOLLOWER state until dplca_new_age is true (among other conditions). The local_nodeID variable is set to 255 in the WAIT_BEACON and LEARNING state, which inhibits transmission and is only set to a value other than 255, which will permit transmission on entry to the FOLLOWER state.

The dplca_new_age variable, however, will only be set true once long_cnt, which is incremented on each BEACON, equals hard_aging_cycles in the TXOP_END state in the D-PLCA Aging State Diagram (Figure 148-9). As a result, the node being added will not be able to transmit until the number of BEACONS it has received equals hard_aging_cycles. This is a reasonably short time in the absence of other transmissions, but if there are other nodes transmitting during the Transmit Opportunities between these BEACONS, it can be quite a bit longer. It is this delay that causes the ExcessDefer error counter to increment.

I've captured this in the two traces. All nodes are configured to support D-PLCA, with node 0 configured with coordinator_role_allowed set true. Nodes 0, 2 and 3 are enabled at time 0. Node 1 is enabled at 15 ms, and the first Node 1 packet transmission request is at 16 ms. In the first trace (excess_defer_1_220225.jpg), there are no transmissions on the segment from nodes 0, 2 or 3. As a result, a node ID is allocated to node 1 shortly after it is enabled. The node 1 packet transmission request at 16 ms (the dte_node_1.MAC.MA_DATA_request.MA_DATA_request event) is, therefore, serviced immediately.

In the second trace(excess_defer_2_230225.jpg), a burst of 40 maximum-length packets starts being transmitted by node 2 at 8 ms, meaning that node 1 is enabled in the middle of these transmissions. Since dplca_new_age will not become true in node 1 until the number of BEACONS it has received equals HARD_AGING_CYCLES (long_cnt = hard_aging_cycles), and since the node 2 transmissions increase the time between BEACONS, a node ID is not allocated to node 1 until about 36 ms. Only then can the node 1 packet transmission request at 16 ms be serviced. This is well in excess of the normal maximum deferral time. Hence, the node 1 MAC ExcessDefer error counter is incremented.

The above traces are with hard_aging_cycles = 25; however, the default value of hard_aging_cycles added in draft D1.4 is 1000. Worse case, neglecting the inter-packet gap and beacon duration, it appears the delay could be in excess of:

Max size packet transmit time x number of nodes x value of HARD_AGING_CYCLES

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Using the example of 1500 bytes packets, 4 nodes, and hard_aging_cycles set to the suggested default of 1000 yields:

$$1500 \times 8 \times 100 \text{ ns} \times 4 \times 1000 = 4.8 \text{ seconds}$$

The above assumes that the 4 nodes on the network are continuously transmitting maximum-size packets for 4.8 seconds, which may not be realistic but shows how long the delay can be before a new node can transmit on a busy segment.

SuggestedRemedy

On review of the contribution 'Dynamic PLCA Node ID Assignment' dated 4 November 2020, I see slide 18 'Mixing "cg" and "da" nodes' <https://www.ieee802.org/3/da/public/110420/beruto_3da_01_110420.pdf#page=18> says 'In this case, the D-PLCA node won't be able to achieve enumeration and will keep working in plain CSMA/CD mode creating random collisions.'. This seems to imply that the intent may have been for a D-PLCA node to operate in CSMA/CD mode until it is allocated a nodeID. If this is correct, the state diagrams should be updated to support CSMA/CD operations while local_nodeID = 255.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TFTD

Change the exit condition from NORMAL to IDLE in the PLCA Data state diagram, part a from
 plca_en * (!plca_reset) * (!CRS) * (plca_status = OK)
 to
 plca_en * (!plca_reset) * (!CRS) * (plca_status = OK) * (local_nodeID != 255)

where "!=" is the not equals sign.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.5 P 66 L 49 # 69

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *EZ*

The SOFT_CLAIMING has an extra indent in the FOLLOWER re-entry branch of Figure 148-1

SuggestedRemedy

Align HARD and SOFT CLAIMING text

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.6 P 67 L 18 # 80

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *EZ*

The logic in the TXOP_END state is incorrectly indented making readability difficult.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text in TXOP_END state to:

```
IF dplca_txop_id = 0 THEN
  IF short_cnt = soft_aging_cycles THEN
    CLEAR_SOFT_CLAIMS(txop_claim_table)
    CLEAR_SOFT_CLAIMS(txop_claim_table_new)
    short_cnt <= 0
  ELSE
    short_cnt <= short_cnt + 1
  END
END

IF long_cnt = hard_aging_cycles THEN
  txop_claim_table <= txop_claim_table_new
  CLEAR_TXOP_TABLE(txop_claim_table_new)
  dplca_new_age <= TRUE
  long_cnt <= 0
ELSE
  long_cnt <= long_cnt + 1
END
END
```

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.6 P67 L19 # 21

Regev, Alon Keysight
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

The multi-level IF-THEN-ELSE-END statement in the TXOP_STATE does not have consistent indentation, making it confusing to read

SuggestedRemedy

```
change
"
IF dplca_txop_id = 0 THEN
  IF short_cnt = soft_aging_cycles THEN
    CLEAR_SOFT_CLAIMS(txop_claim_table)
    CLEAR_SOFT_CLAIMS(txop_claim_table_new)
    short_cnt <= 0
  ELSE
    short_cnt <= short_cnt + 1
  END
  IF long_cnt = hard_aging_cycles THEN
    txop_claim_table <= txop_claim_table_new
    CLEAR_TXOP_TABLE(txop_claim_table_new)
    dplca_new_age <= TRUE
    long_cnt <= 0
  ELSE
    long_cnt <= long_cnt + 1
  END
END"

```

```
to
"
IF dplca_txop_id = 0 THEN
  IF short_cnt = soft_aging_cycles THEN
    CLEAR_SOFT_CLAIMS(txop_claim_table)
    CLEAR_SOFT_CLAIMS(txop_claim_table_new)
    short_cnt <= 0
  ELSE
    short_cnt <= short_cnt + 1
  END

  IF long_cnt = hard_aging_cycles THEN
    txop_claim_table <= txop_claim_table_new
    CLEAR_TXOP_TABLE(txop_claim_table_new)
    dplca_new_age <= TRUE
    long_cnt <= 0
  ELSE
    long_cnt <= long_cnt + 1
  END
END"

```

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accommodated by comment #80.

Change text in TXOP_END state to:

```
IF dplca_txop_id = 0 THEN
  IF short_cnt = soft_aging_cycles THEN
    CLEAR_SOFT_CLAIMS(txop_claim_table)
    CLEAR_SOFT_CLAIMS(txop_claim_table_new)
    short_cnt <= 0
  ELSE
    short_cnt <= short_cnt + 1
  END

  IF long_cnt = hard_aging_cycles THEN
    txop_claim_table <= txop_claim_table_new
    CLEAR_TXOP_TABLE(txop_claim_table_new)
    dplca_new_age <= TRUE
    long_cnt <= 0
  ELSE
    long_cnt <= long_cnt + 1
  END
END

```

Cl 188 SC 188.1.1 P71 L18 # 107

Law, David HPE
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

A medium 'box' with a vertical left end usually signifies the end of the point-to-point media at the MDI. A shared media is signified by a vertical zig-zag at both ends (see IEEE std 802.3-2022 Figure 1-1).

SuggestedRemedy

Change the medium 'box' vertical left end to be a vertical zig-zag.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.1.2 P71 L31 # 112
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 Text passage contains the word "MDI" several times.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "MDI" to "TCI"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 188 SC 188.2 P72 L10 # 108
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest that '!... PHY supports only shared media ...' should read '!... PHY only supports shared media ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 188 SC 188.2 P72 L16 # 109
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial
 Suggest that 'Larger PHY count and reach can ...' should read 'Larger PHY count and longer reach can ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.2 P77 L36 # 22
 Regev, Alon Keysight
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial
 The definition of TX_ER is somewhat outdated. TX_ER does not necessarily indicate an errored transmission (errors are indicated if BOTH TX_EN and TX_ER are asserted), but rather it is also used (typically more commonly) for COMMIT, BEACON, and LPI indications

SuggestedRemedy
 change
 "TX_ER"
 The TX_ER signal of the MII as specified in 22.2.2.5.
 When set to FALSE it indicates a non-errored transmission.
 When set to TRUE it indicates an errored transmission.
 Values: TRUE or FALSE"
 to:
 "TX_ER"
 The TX_ER signal of the MII as specified in 22.2.2.5 and 22.2.2.4.
 When set to TRUE it indicates an errored transmission (if TX_EN is TRUE) or a special indication (if TX_EN is FALSE)
 When set to FALSE it indicates a non-errored transmission and no special incation
 Values: TRUE or FALSE"

alternatively, remove these details from TX_ER (and TX_EN) and refer to clause 22.2.2.4 and 22.2.2.5 which define the behavior.

Note that even though 22.2.2.4 defines TX_EN, I think that TX_ER should also reference this clause as all the indications using combinations of TX_ER and TX_EN is in section 22.2.2.4 and not 22.2.2.5.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Two Suggested Remedies are proposed. Editors recommend removing the details and referring to 22.2.2.4 and 22.2.2.5 to avoid redefining this signal inadvertently.)

Replace,
 "TX_EN"
 The TX_EN signal of the MII as specified in 22.2.2.3.
 When set to FALSE transmission is disabled.
 When set to TRUE transmission is enabled.
 Values: TRUE or FALSE

TX_ER
 The TX_ER signal of the MII as specified in 22.2.2.5.
 When set to FALSE it indicates a non-errored transmission.
 When set to TRUE it indicates an errored transmission.
 Values: TRUE or FALSE"

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

with,
 "TX_EN
 The TX_EN signal of the MII as specified in 22.2.2.3.

TX_ER
 The TX_ER signal of the MII as specified in 22.2.2.4 and 22.2.2.5."

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.7 P80 L16 # 23

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

The "COMMIT" state is not setting tx_sym so based on the current state machine, COMMIT will never be transmitted (instead SILENCE will continue during the commit cycle

SuggestedRemedy

Add "tx_sym <= COMMIT" in the COMMIT state

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.7 P81 L9 # 70

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Editorial

"not_done" is not a timer property, just "_done"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "xmit_max_timer_not_done" to "!xmit_max_timer_done" in the ESD -> GOOD_ESD and DATA -> DATA transitions in Figure 188-5 part b

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: No change to Suggested Remedy, but Commenter may wish to submit a Maintenance request to also make this change to Figure 147-5.)

Change "xmit_max_timer_not_done" to "!xmit_max_timer_done" in the ESD -> GOOD_ESD and DATA -> DATA transitions in Figure 188-5 part b

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.7 P81 L32 # 71

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D PCS

The unjab_timer is optional so starting it can only occur when it's supported.

SuggestedRemedy

Split the UNJAB_WAIT into two states.
 TX_SILENCE with tx_sym <= SILENCE
 UNJAB_WAIT with start unjab_timer.
 BAD_ESD goes to TX_SILENCE
 TX_SILENCE goes to UNJAB_WAIT with UCT
 Move the dotted box to encompass the UNJAB_WAIT state and its exit.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: No change to Suggested Remedy, but Commenter may wish to submit a Maintenance request to also make this change to Figure 147-5.)

Split the UNJAB_WAIT into two states.
 TX_SILENCE with tx_sym <= SILENCE
 UNJAB_WAIT with start unjab_timer.
 BAD_ESD goes to TX_SILENCE
 TX_SILENCE goes to UNJAB_WAIT with UCT
 Move the dotted box to encompass the UNJAB_WAIT state and its exit.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.9 P82 L16 # 72

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D PCS

A PHY who's Jabber function triggers will silence itself. It will do so until it's reset or if it supports the optional unjab_timer for at least the timers duration. A reset could be shorter than the unjab_timer.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "This sequence notifies the receivers and inhibits further transmissions for at least the duration of unjab_timer. The PCS Transmit may return to normal operation automatically after unjab_timer has elapsed and the error condition has been cleared (i.e., TX_EN has been released). If PCS Transmit does not return to normal, then it keeps silent until reset."

to:

"This sequence notifies the receivers and silences its transmission.

The PCS Transmit remains silent until reset or, when it supports the optional unjab_timer, after the unjab_timer has elapsed and the error condition has been cleared (i.e., TX_EN has been released)."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Extra "." and spaces removed from the end of the Suggested Remedy.)

Change "This sequence notifies the receivers and inhibits further transmissions for at least the duration of unjab_timer. The PCS Transmit may return to normal operation automatically after unjab_timer has elapsed and the error condition has been cleared (i.e., TX_EN has been released). If PCS Transmit does not return to normal, then it keeps silent until reset."

to:

"This sequence notifies the receivers and silences its transmission. The PCS Transmit remains silent until reset or, when it supports the optional unjab_timer, after the unjab_timer has elapsed and the error condition has been cleared (i.e., TX_EN has been released)."

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.9 P82 L16 # 57

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Improve text clarity.
The text says "This sequence notifies the receivers" but it's not clear what it notifies them of.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "This sequence notifies the receivers" with ""This sequence notifies the receivers of the transmitter jabber event"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Remove double quotes.)

Replace "This sequence notifies the receivers" with "This sequence notifies the receivers of the transmitter jabber event"

Cl 188 SC 188.5.3 P90 L24 # 11

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial

It's unclear what exactly "the PMA and PCS Receive functions have at most 800 ns from when the first DME symbol after SILENCE is detected to find the 5B boundary, and to synchronize on the DME stream respectively" is requiring.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "In order to meet the specifications of 188.6.5.1, the PMA and PCS Receive functions have at most 800 ns from when the first DME symbol after SILENCE is detected to find the 5B boundary, and to synchronize on the DME stream respectively."

with "In order to meet the specifications of 188.6.5.1, the PMA and PCS Receive functions must find the 5B boundary and synchronize on the DME stream within 800 ns of when the first DME symbol after SILENCE is detected."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.6.2.1 P91 L5 # 113

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Mixing Segment

Text ends with "TCI". The TCI is a logical interface - and must not be a physical part. Thus, th mode conversion is caused by all parts of the cabling system and the node.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "TCI" to "node"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: This test really doesn't only test the cabling system or the TCI. It tests the entire system, including the DTE.)

Change "electromagnetic interference coupling to the cabling system. Additional differential mode (DM) noise at the PHY is generated from the CM noise by mode conversion of all parts of the cabling system and the TCI."

to "electromagnetic interference coupling prior to the PHY input. For example, additional differential mode (DM) noise at the PHY is generated from CM noise by mode conversion in the cabling system, including connecting components, and in the front-end interface components within the DTE."

Cl 188 SC 188.6.4 P92 L37 # 78

Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial

States: "it is recommended that the PHY provide access to TX_CLK". PICS PMAE8 shows Mandatory.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to shall or change PICs to O.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Two Suggested Remedies are provided.)

Replace PICS PMAE8 entry "M" with "O".

Cl 188 SC 188.8 P96 L13 # 110

Law, David HPE
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Suggest that '10BASE-T1M PHYs are designed to operate ...' should read 'The 10BASE-T1M PHY is specified to operate ...'.

SuggestedRemedy
 See comment

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 188 SC 188.8.1 P97 L6 # 122

Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Late

It is unclear if the IL between edge terminations with reference impedance of 100 Ohms is meant to be made with the terminators removed or kept in place. PICS MXS2 does not clarify. The measurement would see the terminator and the line in parallel.

SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest: "The mixing segment insertion loss, with DTEs or representative simulated DTE loads attached, shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-3), measured between edge termination reference planes by substituting the measurement probes for the edge terminators." Some similar change should be made in the PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: No change to Suggested Remedy. Add PICS.)

(P97 L26): Change "The mixing segment insertion loss, with DTEs or representative simulated DTE loads attached, shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-3) between edge termination attachment points."

to "The mixing segment insertion loss, with DTEs or representative simulated DTE loads attached, shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-3), measured between edge termination reference planes by substituting the measurement probes for the edge terminators."

Change PICS item MXS2 (P109 L9), by adding "Measurement probes substituted for the edge terminators." to the existing Value/Comment information.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.8.2 P98 L6 # 121

Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Late

It is unclear if the RL at the edge terminations with reference impedance of 100 Ohms is meant to be made with the terminator removed or kept in place. PICS MXS3 does not clarify. The measurement would see the terminator and the line in parallel.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest: "The mixing segment with DTEs attached shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-4), measured at each edge termination reference plane by substituting the measurement instrument for the respective edge terminator." Some similar change should be made in the PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: No change to Suggested Remedy. Add PICS.)

(P98 L6): Change "The mixing segment with DTEs attached shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-4) at the edge terminations."

to "The mixing segment with DTEs attached shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-4), measured at each edge termination reference plane by substituting the measurement instrument for the respective edge terminator."

Change PICS item MXS3 (P109 L11), by adding "Measurement instrument substituted for the respective edge terminator." to the existing Value/Comment information.

Cl 188 SC 188.8.3 P98 L25 # 123

Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Late

No instruction is given on where to measure the mode conversion.

SuggestedRemedy

In ODVA we measure TCL and TCTL with setup similar to RL and IL. Needs some discussion

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Presentation required.)

TFTD

Cl 188 SC 188.8.2 P98 L36 # 114

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Mixing Segment

The usage of "simulated DTE load" is different than on other positions in this document. Typically, the "Simulated DTE load" is used to simulate a PHY to the TCI. At this position, it is instead used to simulate a whole DTE including the TCI. The simplest way of performing the measurement would be to connect both cable ends from TC1 and TC2 together. This can be made for all cases. (Not only when the TCI is expected to be incorporated within the DTE).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: The mode conversion loss measurement may be made with the cable segments connected in line.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The proposed change would eliminate any impact of the TCI on the mode conversion and make the test not representative of the completed mixing segment. The simulated load does not represent the 'whole DTE', but rather just the interface to the mixing segment including the TCI.

Cl 188 SC 188.9.1.1 P100 L7 # 116

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Mixing Segment

"0.16 dB" has to digits precision, which might be hard to measure. Additionally, TCI insertion loss might be affected by the TCI return loss change of 189.9.1.2 which has to be considered

SuggestedRemedy

Change "0.16 to 0.2" (in $1 \leq f < 10$) and -0.454 to -0.494 (in $10 \leq f < 24$)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Rounding off here adds 25% to each TCI insertion loss component, adding 0.64 dB to the IL at 16 nodes and more than a dB at 32 nodes, limiting use cases.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.9.1.2 P100 L22 # 35

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor

Comment Type T Comment Status D Mixing Segment

"When the TCI is not an MPI," raises the issue that the TCI return loss is related to power. The TCI Return Loss needs to apply regardless of whether the DTE is powered or not. This is true whether or not power is supplied over the mixing segment.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert the following text at the end of the first paragraph 188.9.1.2. "This requirement applies independent of whether the TCI and PMA are powered."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert the following text at the end of the first paragraph 188.9.1.2:

"This requirement applies regardless of whether the PHY is powered."

Cl 188 SC 188.9.1.2 P100 L20 # 115

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type T Comment Status D Unit Load

Having TCI return loss specifications in two places - 188.9.1.2 and 189.6.1 is confusing. Additionally, the TCI specifications are given for one unit load of power. Please consider this comment with the following one.

SuggestedRemedy

Merge unit load concept of 189.6.1 into 188.9.1.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The unit load concept only applies when clause 189 is implemented. Moving it to clause 188 would necessitate defining and explaining it here, adding confusion.

Cl 188 SC 188.12.4.1 P105 L35 # 73

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PCS

There should be PICS for the unjab_timer

SuggestedRemedy

Add a PICS for the unjab_timer point to 188.4.2.9 with a Status of O and Yes / NA options

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 189 SC 189.1 P110 L8 # 31

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

The defined entities are listed as MPD & MPSE (in that order), but are described in the reverse order (supply power / draw power).

SuggestedRemedy

Change "These entities allow devices to supply/draw power using the..." to "These entities allow devices to draw power or supply power using the ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Not necessary to mention power twice.)

Change "These entities allow devices to supply/draw power using the..."

to "These entities allow devices to draw or supply power using the ..."

Cl 189 SC 189.1.1 P110 L32 # 32

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor

Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial

"that incorporate compliant MPoE TCIs" - we call these "MPIs that are also TCIs" and they are "also compatible" with their Physical Layer standards.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "DTEs that incorporate compliant MPoE TCIs are compatible ..." to "DTEs that incorporate MPIs that are also TCIs are also compatible..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Not necessary to say 'also' twice.)

Change "DTEs that incorporate compliant MPoE TCIs are compatible ..."

to "DTEs that incorporate MPIs that are also TCIs are compatible..."

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 189 SC 189.1.2 P110 L42 # 33

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

We only have one pair, so why do we say "over the same pairs as data"?

SuggestedRemedy

P110 L42 change "pairs as the data" to "pair as the data" and "dedicated pairs" to "dedicated pair"

P110 L44 Change "When power is provided over the same pairs as data" to "When power is provided over the same pair as data"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Need an 'a' before "dedicated pair". Incorporate text proposed in comment #59.)

P110 L42 change "pairs as the data" to "pair as the data" and "dedicated pairs" to "a dedicated pair"

P110 L44 Change "When power is provided over the same pairs as data" to "When power and data are carried on the same pair"

Cl 189 SC 189.1.2 P110 L42 # 58

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

Clean up text to remove references to multiple pairs.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "the power may be provided over the same pairs as the data or over dedicated pairs with power only" with "the power may be provided over the same pair as the data or over a dedicated pair with power only."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accommodated by comment #33.

P110 L42 change "pairs as the data" to "pair as the data" and "dedicated pairs" to "a dedicated pair"

P110 L44 Change "When power is provided over the same pairs as data" to "When power and data are carried on the same pair"

Cl 189 SC 189.1.2 P110 L42 # 118

Potterf, Jason Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Late

MPoE uses a single pair for power, use of the plural pairs is incorrect unless multiple disparate mixing segments are being discussed.

SuggestedRemedy

Alter the following sentences to make pairs singular:

An MPSE or MPD may or may not be co-located with a DTE, and the power may be provided over the same pair as the data or over a dedicated pair with power only.

...

When the power is provided over the same pair as data, the MPI and the TCI are the same connection to the medium and the MPI must also meet the requirements for the TCI needed for the PHY (e.g., see 188.9).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accommodated by comment #33.

P110 L42 change "pairs as the data" to "pair as the data" and "dedicated pairs" to "a dedicated pair"

P110 L44 Change "When power is provided over the same pairs as data" to "When power and data are carried on the same pair"

Cl 189 SC 189.1.2 P110 L44 # 59

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

Clean up text to remove references to multiple pairs.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "When the power is provided over the same pairs as data" with "When power and data are carried on the same pair"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accommodated by comment #33.

P110 L42 change "pairs as the data" to "pair as the data" and "dedicated pairs" to "a dedicated pair"

P110 L44 Change "When power is provided over the same pairs as data" to "When power and data are carried on the same pair"

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 189 SC 189.1.2 P110 L46 # 60
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Power
 Clean up text to remove references to multiple pairs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "when data and power are carried on separate conductors," with "when data and power are carried on a separate pair,"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Pull from EZ Bucket. Conductors may have been used instead of pair purposely. For example, the power may not be over one pair - it could be three-phase or it could be over multiple pairs. Note that the suggested Remedy inserts an extra space between "on" and "a". Also, power and data would be carried on separate pairs - not separate pair.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.2 P111 L44 # 88
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X** Mixing Segment
 100mOhm resistance through each node is probably impractical at this time. Target 200mOhm instead.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 100mOhm to 200mOhm. See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.3 P112 L11 # 4
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 MPD types is a broad topic, so "discussion of" would be grammatically preferred.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "for further discussion on MPD types" with "for further discussion of MPD types"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 189 SC 189.3 P112 L15 # 37
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Unit Load
 "The sum of unit load levels on a mixing segment shall not exceed 16"
 This shall is the only statement that would make engineered systems non-compliant. I'd like to soften the statement (make it optional) such that someone that has taken the time to understand the limitations and designed a system to exceed 16 unit loads can call it compliant This statement prevents them from being compliant and simultaneously limits a Type 0 system to 16 W of MPD load and a Type 1 system to 32 W of MPD load (while being able to provide 26 W and 45 W respectively).
 As I look at it, the leading text states that a mixing segment can support 16 unit loads and therefore, deletion of this sentence is all the softening needed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete "The sum of unit load levels on a mixing segment shall not exceed 16"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: The mixing segment still needs to meet the requirements in 188 to support data. PICS needs adjustment as well.)
 Delete "The sum of unit load levels on a mixing segment shall not exceed 16"
 Delete PICS MS2 at P140 L27 (189.8.4.1)

Cl 189 SC 189.3 P112 L16 # 61
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** Unit Load
 The text says "The sum of unit load levels on a mixing segment shall not exceed 16." I don't see how we can mandate this or how it would make sense as a PICS.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "The sum of unit load levels on a mixing segment shall not exceed 16." with "It is recommended that the sum of unit load levels on a mixing segment not exceed 16."
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Accommodated by comment #37.
 Delete "The sum of unit load levels on a mixing segment shall not exceed 16"
 Delete PICS MS2 at P140 L27 (189.8.4.1)

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 189 SC 189.3 P112 L26 # 1
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Insert space between value and unit
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "30V" with "30 V" and "50V" with "50 V"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 189 SC 189.3 P112 L31 # 87
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X Power
 Vpse,min has a typo. This is my unsatisfied comment from last round
 SuggestedRemedy
 26 should be 21.6? The numbers for channel resistance and power need to be adjusted if the parameter moves. See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.3 P112 L34 # 92
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Power
 check consistency of IPSE_Min versus iCUT and Ilimit
 SuggestedRemedy
 See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.3 P112 L34 # 89
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Power
 Increase ipse type0 min current for 1.1W devices. This will align with 802.3da type0 with ODVA devices.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.3 P112 L36 # 90
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Power
 ppse type0 min for 1.1W devices
 SuggestedRemedy
 See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.3 P112 L37 # 91
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Unit Load
 ppm_d_1u for 1.1W devices
 SuggestedRemedy
 See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 189 SC 189.3 P112 L39 # 99
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Power
 Add retrun loss curve modifications to accommodate variable power coupling inductance that tracks unit load value
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add subsection to 189.3. See presentation mpaul_da_01_20250310.pdf for text.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.4.4 P114 L30 # 62
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D MPSE
 Simplify text
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "no MPDs remain attached or there have been changes in the network topology" with "no MPDs are attached"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: This text describes examples, reducing to a single instance leads the reader to think this should be a point requirement, not an example of why the MPSE might remove power.)
 Replace, "For example, the management entity could monitor the mixing segment to determine if no MPDs remain attached or there have been changes in the network topology."
 with, "The management entity may set mpse_enable to disable for any reason. For example, the management entity could monitor the mixing segment to determine if no MPDs remain attached or there have been changes in the network topology (e.g., MPD(s) additions or removals)."

Cl 189 SC 189.4.4.2 P114 L44 # 34
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 state names should be all caps (4 instances), also , high state name is incorrect (3 instances)
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "most recent discover_high or discover_low" state to most recent "DISCOVERY_HIGH_MARK or DISCOVERY_LOW state" (P114 L44, 48, and 51)
 Change "later discovery_low" to "later DISCOVERY_LOW" (P115 L2)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 189 SC 189.4.5 P120 L19 # 38
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 paragraph justification has left this line with HUGE spaces. Please fix.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix spacing of paragraph.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 189 SC 189.4.5 P120 L27 # 39
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Need the oxford comma after DISCOVERY_LOWx, other wise the sentence can be read to say that all the discovery events are DISCOVERY_LOWx and DISCOVER_HIGH_MARKx.
 SuggestedRemedy
 please add comma
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 189 SC 189.4.5 P121 L2 # 40

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** MPSE

Table 189-3. The additional information column has problems and I think the best way to solve them is to delete the column.
 First, item 9 includes "I[Tare]" which appears nowhere else in this document. Therefore it should be deleted.
 Item 8 has I[Discovery] - I[Mark] with no explanation. Not sure this provides any service to the reader.
 The note in item 11 does have a little information but not sure it's required. We could move it to a footnote of the table if we wanted to keep it, but I'm going to just suggest to delete the column in my remedy.
 Lastly, I'd request that we use the width of the deleted column to widen the "Symbol" column so that the names didn't break across lines.

SuggestedRemedy
 Delete additional information column. Widen "Symbol" column so that names don't break across lines.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Items 8 and 9 do not appear in the draft.)

Delete additional information column.
 Delete rows for items 8 and 9.
 Widen "Symbol" column so that names don't break across lines.

CI 189 SC 189.4.5 P121 L25 # 41

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** MPSE

symbol name of item 9 missing a 't' at the end: I[Type_presen] should be I[Type_present]

SuggestedRemedy
 Change I[Type_presen] to I[Type_present]

Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Resolve after comment #40, which would delete this Item if accepted.)

CI 189 SC 189.4.5 P121 L25 # 98

Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** MPSE

Symbol 'I_{Type_present}' missing a 't'

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the symbols so it says I_{Type_present}

Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Resolve after comment #40, which would delete this Item if accepted.)

CI 189 SC 189.4.6 P122 L6 # 85

Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ

Table 189-5 Should be titled MPSE output requirements

SuggestedRemedy
 Change PSE to MPSE

Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 189 SC 189.4.6 P122 L11 # 93

Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X** Power

Vmpse needs to stay consistent with changes we make in section 189.3

SuggestedRemedy
 See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Presentation required.)

TFTD

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 189 SC 189.4.6 P122 L11 # 94
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Power
 Pmpse needs to stay consistent with changes we make in section 189.3
 SuggestedRemedy
 See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.4.6 P122 L19 # 95
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Power
 llim needs to stay consistent with changes we make in section 189.3
 SuggestedRemedy
 See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.4.6 P122 L14 # 43
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MPSE
 Table 189-5, items 2 and 4 contradict each other, specifically the max power 100 W numbers in item 2.
 If my short circuit current is 1.4 A, that means the max power I can deliver is 36.4 W and 63 W from Type 0 and Type 1 MPSEs respectively (and only if I[LIM] is set at the top end of the range, it can be as low as 28.6 and 49.5 W if I[LIM] is 1.1 A). I think we should leave the max power unspecified in the table, replacing 100 with an emdash. Additional information points the reader to 189.4.7 and I think we add a sentence there explaining why it is undefined in the table (we already talk about this a little, just need a few more words).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 189-5, item 2, replace "100" with "-" in two spots.
 Page 122, line 45, add "(P[MPSE] max)" after "...MPSE can supply..."
 Page 122, line 47, add the sentence: "Therefore, P[MPSE] max is left undefined in Table 189.5."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 189 SC 189.4.6 P122 L20 # 84
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Power
 llim max and PPSE are in conflict for type 0
 SuggestedRemedy
 differentiate item 4 for type 0 and type 1. Add row on item 4 that allows type 1 MPDs to current limit with 1.1A min and 100W / 21.6V = 4.62A max. See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.4.8 P122 L53 # 42
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MPSE
 "The minimum value of I[CUT] is P[MPSE] min/V[MPSE] to ..."
 P[MPSE] min contradicts Table 189-5 item 11. Either we need to add min to the table or delete it here. I think it needs added to the table and that's gonna be ugly as we need to wider the "min" column to prevent it from breaking the line.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "P[MPSE]" to "P[MPSE] min" in Table 189-5 item 11.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 189 SC 189.5 P123 L40 # 63
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D MPD
 MPDs can draw power without requesting it.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "An MPD requesting power from the MPI may simultaneously draw power from an alternate power source." with "An MPD drawing power from the MPI may simultaneously draw power from an alternate power source."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 189 SC 189.6.1.1 P125 L43 # 119
 Potterf, Jason Cisco
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X Late
 The Isolation language requires significant updates. An isolation adhoc was proposed but not held. To ensure this is addressed, a presentation will be brought to the task force to propose a possible way forward.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Presentation to follow comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC Figure 189-8 P129 L31 # 120
 Potterf, Jason Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Late
 The state PON_NO_POWER that appears in this state diagram as well as in a few other places in the text should be renamed to PON_IDLE for clarity and parity with the descriptions in the Clause 30 management objects, or another name that is equally descriptive.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Rename PON_NO_POWER to PON_IDLE in figure and in all other instances in document.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 189 SC 189.5.4 P129 L50 # 44
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 "...MPI enters the V[MPD_mark] specification as defined in Table 189-7..." not sure how we 'enter a specification', I think we meant 'enter the range'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 replace 'specification' with 'range'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 189 SC 189.5.4 P130 L40 # 5
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 A comma always follows "i.e."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "i.e." with "i.e.,"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 189 SC 189.5.5 P131 L35 # 96
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Power
 Update unit power for type 0 consistent with decisions made in section 189.3
 SuggestedRemedy
 See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 189 SC 189.5.5 P131 L35 # 86
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 missing emdashes in 189-9 item 2
 SuggestedRemedy
 add missing emdashes in item 2 "Min" column
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 add missing Em dashes in item 2 "Min" column
 Editor to perform a global replacement of En dash with Em dash in empty table cells.

Cl 189 SC 189.5.5 P131 L40 # 97
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Power
 Update input power for type 0 consistent with decisions made in section 189.3
 SuggestedRemedy
 See presentation mpaul_da_02_20250310.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.5.5 P131 L44 # 100
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices
 Comment Type T Comment Status X Power
 MPD inrush current is 10mA max. I think we want 10mA typical, we should increase it to 20mA to increase inrush speed and ensure the PD is issuing a TPS report during inrush.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change item 5 I_{Inrush_MPD} maximum to '20'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (Editor's note: Presentation required.)
 TFTD

Cl 189 SC 189.5.5 P131 L47 # 45
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MPD
 last cycle we added Type 0/1 to the document. Table 189-9 item 6 and 7 define the Type voltage threshold, but we make no mention of Type 0/1. It should go without saying that the Type 0/1 should conform to the requirements of the MPD Type that is compatible with the MPSE Type powering the mixing segment. We can make that clear by adding a footnote to the table.
 SuggestedRemedy
 add a superscript 'a' to the parameter column for items 6 and 7.
 add note at bottom of table: "a Type 0/1 MPDs conform to the thresholds compatible with the MPSE type powering the mixing segment."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: The thresholds (items 6 and 7) apply independently and are used as part of the state diagram. For example, dropping below Vtype0_th will cause any type (0, 1, or 0/1) MPD to mismatch or drop out of the PON_LOAD_ON state. A Type 0/1 MPD will use both Vtype0_th and Vtype1_th to determine which type MPSE is currently supplying power. You can see this in the PON_LOAD_ON exit conditions. It's believed the Commenter is referring to the power supply limits in items 1 through 5 which should be dependent on the MPSE type.)

Add superscript 'a' to the parameter column for items 1 through 5.

Add note at the bottom of table: "a Type 0/1 MPDs conform to the power supply limits compatible with the MPSE type powering the mixing segment."

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 189 SC 189.5.5 P132 L11 # 46

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MPD

Revisiting the 180uF max Cport value. I calculated charging times for these caps using our inrush limitations. At 10 mA, we can only charge 10 uF in the 50 ms of minimum inrush time (this is Type 1, 0 to 50V. For Type 0, it's 16.7 uF). Once out of inrush, an MPD can now start drawing operation power. For a one unit load MPD, that would be 40 mA (the rest of the analysis is T1 only. I've left T0 as an exercise for the reader). It would take an additional 212 ms to finish charging the 180 uF at 40 mA. Alternately, an MPD IC could choose to enforce the 10 mA inrush until Cport is fully charged, which would take 900 ms.
 The 180 uF number came from the 4P PoE chapters, and that number was picked to signify the point where a PD IC wouldn't need any special inrush consideration, but linrush is 400 mA in those chapters. If we are following that lead, we've failed the reader. To make this match the concept in Clause 33 and 145, 180 should be reduced to 10. And I'd make it 10 per unit load, such that higher power MPDs can have more Cport. We can break item 10 into T0 and Type one and make it 16.7 and 10 if desired.
 We can add a new section 189.5.5.5 to explain if needed.

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 189-9, item 10, change "180" to "10".
 In item 10, additional information, add "per unit load. See 189.5.5.5
 add new section 189.5.5.5 as found in companion document cjones_da_01_0325_V0.pdf.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TFTD

In Table 189-9, item 10, change "180" to "10", and add (in additional information) "per unit load".

Add new section 189.5.5.5 as found in cjones_da_01_0325_V0.pdf with changes of "POWER_ON" (an MPSE state) to "INRUSH and PON_LOAD_ON" (the MPD states).

Cl 189 SC 189.6.1 P134 L35 # 12

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Unit Load

This requirement is really confusing. I will try to parse what I think it means, but this deserves careful review.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "When the MPI is a TCI, the TCI return loss at TC1 and TC2 shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-7) with the other trunk TC (i.e., TC2 or TC1, respectively) terminated in 100 W with a DTE or simulated DTE load present at the TCI, plus $10\log_{10}(N_load)$, where N_load is the maximum number of unit loads for the DTE."

with "When the MPI is also a TCI, the TCI return loss at TC1 and TC2 shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-7) + $10\log_{10}(N_load)$, where N_load is the maximum number of unit loads for the DTE. TC1 and TC2 shall meet the values when the other trunk TC (i.e., TC2 or TC1, respectively) is terminated in 100 W with a DTE or simulated DTE load present at the TCI."

note: W = ohms symbol

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: The Suggested Remedy introduces a new 'shall'. Return loss decreases when unit load increases.)

Replace "When the MPI is a TCI, the TCI return loss at TC1 and TC2 shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-7) with the other trunk TC (i.e., TC2 or TC1, respectively) terminated in 100 W with a DTE or simulated DTE load present at the TCI, plus $10\log_{10}(N_load)$, where N_load is the maximum number of unit loads for the DTE."

with "When the MPI is also a TCI, the TCI return loss at TC1 and TC2 shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-7) - $10\log_{10}(N_load)$, where N_load is the maximum number of unit loads for the DTE. TC1 and TC2 values are met when the other trunk TC (i.e., TC2 or TC1, respectively) is terminated in 100 W with a DTE or simulated DTE load present at the TCI."

note: W = ohms symbol

IEEE P802.3da D2.1 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 189 SC 189.6.1 P134 L37 # 117

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Unit Load

plus 10log... indicates, that RL becomes better with more unit loads. Think it should become worse.

SuggestedRemedy
 change plus to minus

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: Editor to paste in the resolution to comment #12 if it is modified by the Task Force.)

Accommodated by comment #12.

Replace "When the MPI is a TCI, the TCI return loss at TC1 and TC2 shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-7) with the other trunk TC (i.e., TC2 or TC1, respectively) terminated in 100 W with a DTE or simulated DTE load present at the TCI, plus 10log10(N_load), where N_load is the maximum number of unit loads for the DTE."

with "When the MPI is also a TCI, the TCI return loss at TC1 and TC2 shall meet the values determined using Equation (188-7) - 10log10(N_load), where N_load is the maximum number of unit loads for the DTE. TC1 and TC2 values are met when the other trunk TC (i.e., TC2 or TC1, respectively) is terminated in 100 W with a DTE or simulated DTE load present at the TCI."

Cl 189 SC 189.6.1 P134 L38 # 24

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Sor
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Mixing Segment

"When the MPI is a TCI" raises the issue that the TCI return loss is related to power. An unpowered MPI might not be considered an MPI, but when it is a TCI it still needs to connect a compliant mixing segment. The TCI Return Loss needs to apply regardless of whether the DTE is powered or not. This is true whether or not power is supplied over the mixing segmen

SuggestedRemedy
 Insert the following text at the end of the first paragraph 189.6.1. "This requirement applies independent of whether the TCI and PMA are powered."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert the following text at the end of the first paragraph 189.6.1:

"This requirement applies regardless of whether the PHY is powered."

Cl 189 SC 189.6.2.1.3 P136 L15 # 77

Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Isolation

"An Environment C multiport NID does not require electrical power isolation between link segments." Do we mean "mixing segments"? Possibly the NID can have a mix of link segments and mixing segments?

SuggestedRemedy
 Change from "between link segments" to "between each mixing segment and other mixing segments or link segments".

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 188 SC 188.9.1.2 P137 L # 13

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"e.g.," examples should be contained within parenthesis.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace ", e.g., NFPA70- the National Electrical Code® (NEC®) relevant to the maximum class supported." with " (e.g., NFPA70- the National Electrical Code® (NEC®) relevant to the maximum class supported)."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 189 SC 189.7.8 P138 L13 # 16

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"Category" is not capitalized in the ANSI/TIA-568 series of Standards unless it appears at the start of a sentence.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "TIA Category" with "TIA category"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.