Cl **147** *SC* **147.8.1** *P* **199** *L* **52** # 42

Kim, Yong NIO

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *Mixing Segment*

The mixing segment shall meet the insertion loss characteristics specified for link segments in 147.7.1
between any two MDI attachment points. And from 147.8 "A mixing segment is specified based on cabling that supports up to at least 8 nodes and 25 m in reach". From both of this statement, this specification is requiring 28 (combination of any two) measurement taken. And any added nodes requires all combinations to be measured again, and with no assurances that the prior conformant MDI may fall out of range.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide better medium specifcation and cable design considerations that can be followed assured scaleable MDI and medium construction.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cg D2.3 and D2.4 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Commenter provides insufficient remedy.

Commenter mistakes 147.8 explanatory text with the specification ("is specified" vs. "shall meet...")

Commenter may choose to resubmit this comment at Sponsor ballot.

Straw Poll:
I support the above proposed response to comments #42 and #43 (same response)
Y:38
N:1
A:10

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 44

Kim, Yong NIO

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *PLCA scope*

[CSD] One of the responsibilities as a balloter is to ensure that draft is consistent with the criteria for standards development (CSD) responses which are available at <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/18/ec-18-0079-00-ACSD-802-3cg.pdf>. An Approve vote indicates your agreement that the draft is consistent with the CSD responses.

Fullfilling my responsibilities as a balloter, I am attaching a file that summerizes CSD as well as PAR concern, with the filename 802.3 cg PAR and CSD Issues D2-4_v1_Kim_2019-03-08.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Posted CSD no longer represents the expectation it set compared to the draft standard in regard to PLCA RS operation on shared medium. Modify the CSD as appropriate to match 802.3cg draft contents.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
Comment is a collection of restatements of previously rejected comments from the same commenter, including comments 210, 264, 265 on draft 2.2, and 289 and 637 on draft 2.0.

Commenter is incorrect - see
http://www.ieee802.org/3/cg/public/Jan2019/Tutorial_cg_0119_final.pdf,
http://www.ieee802.org/3/cg/public/Jan2019/baggett_3cg_01_0119.pdf, and
http://www.ieee802.org/3/cg/public/July2018/PLCA%20overview.pdf for rebuttals and information on demonstrated compatibility.

Commenter fails to show compatibility issues with conformant implementations and incorrectly posits PLCA is a new MAC.

Further, with regards to distinct identity, commenter creates different interoperability classes by suggesting deleting half duplex point to point, which is the required interoperable root. Then, as a consequence of deleting the interoperable root, commenter claims that the options are different phy types.

Commenter additionally claims new issues for economic feasibility, based on text out-of-scope for this recirculation (147.8), and incorrectly claims the draft requires numerous measurements when the requirement could be met by design.

STRAW POLL:
I support the proposed response to comment #44:
Y: 29
N: 4
A: 26
(pick one)

Cl **30** *SC* **30.30.9** *P* **38** *L* **3** # 45

Kim, Yong NIO

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R** *PLCA Management*

PLCA managed object class is put in the wrong part of the CL30. It should follow other CL30 additions and go after 30.15, So 30.16, unless other project ahead of this inserts one (unlikely)

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber and change the instructions to add this proposed 30.3.9 to be inserted after current 30.15

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cg D2.3 and D2.4 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Commenter may choose to resubmit this comment at Standards Association ballot.

I support the proposed response to comment 45:
Y:39
N:1
A:18

Cl **30** *SC* **30.3.9.2.7** *P* **39** *L* **47** # 46

Kim, Yong NIO

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *PLCA management*

aPLCABurstTimer measure bit times inside the internal process where the entire packet is transferred atomically. This is entirely (externally) invisible parameter, meaning any number of bit-times an implementation uses, it is indinguishbole from other MAC transmit schedulling; therefore meaningless. IPG is generated by PLS/RS. The default value of 128 *may be* relevant if this timer is measuring the gap at the PCS. But at RS, this timer is meaningless.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this timer.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3cg D2.3 and D2.4.
(while 30.3.9.2.7 has changes, the comment is unrelated to those changes, which were editorial to reformat how the default range was described)

Comment is a restatement of unsatisfied part 2 of comments #205 and #220 on draft 2.2.

Commenter is incorrect: the RS interfaces to the MAC layer via the PLS primitives and to the PHY via the MII interface.
The RS groups and aligns the bits conveyed by the MAC via the PLS_DATA.request primitive to the MII TX_CLK (See 22.2.1.1 and 22.2.1.1.3).

This mapping clarifies the specification of bit times within an RS. (see also 148.4.3.1)

I support the above proposed response to comment #46:
Y: 26
N:3
A:18