



IEEE 802.3cg Unbalanced PLCA Issue September 2018



### Unbalanced PLCA Issue (comment 613)

**Contributors** Michael Rentschler, Microchip Venkat Iyer, Microchip Dixon Chen, Microchip

Supporters Piergiorgio Beruto, Canova Tech



### • PLCA test environment:

- 2 Nodes (A and B) with PLCA enabled
- MACs A and B keep sending back to back
- The issue we see:
  - Sometimes, the pattern is ABB instead AB
  - Results in a 1:2 bandwidth ratio instead 1:1

 $\rightarrow$  unbalanced bandwidth distribution w/ PLCA



# **Unbalanced Bandwidth**

#### • The pattern we expect to see:

Bus cycle	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	
ТО	Α	В	Α	В	Α	В	Α	В	Α	В	Α	В	Α	В	Α	В
Node A	TX	COL	ТХ	COL	ΤХ	COL	ΤХ	COL	ΤХ	COL	ТΧ	COL	ΤХ	COL	ΤХ	COL
Node B	COL	ТΧ	COL	ТХ	COL	ΤХ	COL	ТХ	COL	ТΧ	COL	ТХ	COL	ΤХ	COL	ТХ

#### • What we see instead, is:

Bus cycle	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	
ТО	Α	В	A	В	Α	В	A	В	Α	В	A	В	Α	В	A	В
Node A	ΤХ	-	-	COL	ТХ	-	-	COL	ТΧ	-	-	COL	ΤХ	-	-	COL
Node B	COL	ТХ	-	TX	COL	ΤХ	-	TX	COL	ТХ	-	TX	COL	ТΧ	-	TX

→ An unevenly balanced bandwidth distribution like this would render PLCA hardly predictable!



## **Root Cause**

- According to the current spec, PLCA RS will de-assert CRS only for a short time, smaller than the required minimal IPG time
- MAC of node A will not be capable to start transmission of its next pending packet during this period, and may lose its next TO





## Proposal

- Always de-assert CRS between two adjacent packets for at least the min. IPG time
- We can achieve this by keeping CRS de-asserted also during the PLCA SYNC period



# MICROCHIP Picture w/o cable delay



# **Picture with cable delays**





# **Resulting Spec Change**





- We were able to validate that the proposed solution will fix the unbalanced behavior of PLCA
- This issue was also seen by Canova Tech and they agreed on the proposed spec change



## **Thank You!**