Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D  D-PLCA

Clause 30 Attribute for D-PLCA management "SOFT_AGING_CYCLES" is needed.

Suggested Remedy:

Append the following to Table 30-11:
"aDPLCASoftAgingCycles | ATTRIBUTE | GET-SET"

Add new sub-clause of 30.16.1.1 "aDPLCASoftAgingCycles" with content: "
ATTRIBUTE
APPROPRIATE SYNTAX: INTEGER
BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS:
Controls the aging time in BEACON cycles of D-PLCA SOFT claims as defined by the SOFT_AGING_CYCLES variable in Clause 148.4.7.2.;"

At page 32, in the SOFT_AGING_CYCLES description, substitute "This variable maps on the TBD attribute in Clause 30.x" with:
"This variable maps on the aDPLCASoftAgingCycles attribute in Clause [#ref to new subclause in 30.16.1.1]"

Proposed Response:  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D  D-PLCA

Clause 30 Attribute for D-PLCA management "HARD_AGING_CYCLES" is needed.

Suggested Remedy:

Append the following to Table 30-11:
"aDPLCAHardAgingCycles | ATTRIBUTE | GET-SET"

Add new sub-clause of 30.16.1.1 "aDPLCAHardAgingCycles" with content: "
ATTRIBUTE
APPROPRIATE SYNTAX: INTEGER
BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS:
Controls the aging time in BEACON cycles of D-PLCA HARD claims as defined by the HARD_AGING_CYCLES variable in Clause 148.4.7.2.;"

At page 32, in the HARD_AGING_CYCLES description, substitute "This variable maps on the TBD attribute in Clause 30.x" with:
"This variable maps on the aDPLCAHardAgingCycles attribute in Clause [#ref to new subclause in 30.16.1.1]"

Proposed Response:  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Clause 30 Attribute for D-PLCA management "coordinator_role_allowed" is needed.

Suggested Remedy

Append the following to Table 30-11:
"aDPLCACoordinatorRoleAllowed | ATTRIBUTE | GET-SET"

Add new sub-clause of 30.16.1.1 "aDPLCACoordinatorRoleAllowed" with content: "

APPROPRIATE SYNTAX:
An ENUMERATED VALUE that has the following entries:
disabled
enabled

BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS:
Controls whether the D-PLCA enabled node is allowed to take the coordinator role,
mapping to the coordinator_role_allowed variable defined in Clause 148.4.7.2.;"

At page 31, in the coordinator_role_allowed description, substitute "This variable maps on the TBD attribute in Clause 30.x" with:

"This variable maps on the aDPLCACoordinatorRoleAllowed attribute in Clause [#ref to new subclause in 30.16.1.1]"

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Clause 30 Attribute for D-PLCA management "dplca_en" is needed.

Suggested Remedy

Append the following to Table 30-11:
"aDPLCAAdminState | ATTRIBUTE | GET"
"acDPLCAAdminControl | ACTION |

Add sub-clause of 30.16.1.1 "aDPLCAAdminState" with content: "

ATTRIBUTE
APPROPRIATE SYNTAX:
An ENUMERATED VALUE that has the following entries:
disabled
enabled

BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS:
A read-only value that indicates whether the dynamic node ID allocation method for the PLCA Reconciliation Sublayer (D-PLCA) is enabled. When D-PLCA is enabled, plca node IDs are dynamically assigned as defined in Clause 148.4.7.;"

Add new sub-clause of 30.16.1.1 "acDPLCAAdminControl" with content:
"ACTION
APPROPRIATE SYNTAX:
An ENUMERATED VALUE that has the following entries:
disabled
enabled

BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS:
This action provides a means to alter aDPLCAAdminState. Setting acDPLCAAdminControl to the disabled state sets the variable dplca_en to FALSE and disables the PLCA functionality specified in Clause 148.4.7. Setting acDPLCAAdminControl to the enabled state sets the variable dplca_en to TRUE in Figure 148–5, and Figure 148–6.;"

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Comment Type  E  Comment Status  D  D-PLCA

We should specify that when D-PLCA is used, the uniqueness of PLCA node ID is not an issue.

Suggested Remedy

Change "Proper operation of the Clause 148 functionality assumes that the assigned node ID is unique in the local collision domain."

To:

"When not using D-PLCA, proper operation of the Clause 148 functionality assumes that the assigned node ID is unique in the local collision domain."

Proposed Response  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  D  D-PLCA

"Node ID may be allocated by optional D-PLCA control state diagram in 148.4.7.6." missing a 'the' in the sentence but need to reform the sentence to keep it unambiguous.

Suggested Remedy

change "Node ID may be allocated by optional D-PLCA control state diagram in 148.4.7.6." to "Node ID may be optionally allocated by the D-PLCA control state diagram in 148.4.7.6."

Proposed Response  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Commenter's suggested remedy altered to also fix the hyphenation of the variable name)

Change dplca_txop_id to be non-breaking
change "Node ID may be allocated by optional D-PLCA control state diagram in 148.4.7.6." to "Node ID may be optionally allocated by the D-PLCA control state diagram in 148.4.7.6."

Proposed Response  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  D  D-PLCA

"Notifies the D-PLCA state diagrams that the transmit opportunity indicated by the dplca_txo- p_id variable is over." this took me more than one read to parse. "is over" is the problem, has expired better?

Suggested Remedy

change "Notifies the D-PLCA state diagrams that the transmit opportunity indicated by the dplca txo- p_id variable is over." to "Notifies the D-PLCA state diagrams that the transmit opportunity indicated by the dplca txo- p_id variable has expired."

Proposed Response  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Commenter's suggested remedy altered to also fix the hyphenation of the variable name)

Change dplca_txop_id to be non-breaking
change "Notifies the D-PLCA state diagrams that the transmit opportunity indicated by the dplca txop_id variable is over." to "Notifies the D-PLCA state diagrams that the transmit opportunity indicated by the dplca txop_id variable has expired."

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  D  D-PLCA

Overview text for D-PLCA is needed

Suggested Remedy

Replace the only Editor's note with the content of the attached file "802d3_TFR_WGB_beruto_dplca_overview.pdf"

Proposed Response  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl/ 148</th>
<th>SC 148.5.3.7</th>
<th>P37</th>
<th>L 16</th>
<th># 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman, George</td>
<td>CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type** T

**Comment on behalf of Gergely Huszak, Kone:** "148.5.3.7 D-PLCA" includes sentences D1 and D2 that say "Conforms to Figure 148-8" and "Conforms to Figure 148-9" (respectively) but these figures do not seem to be part of the draft. Is this intentional (= the yellow highlight is there for this?) or just a simple oversight/export problem?

**Detail** - (editor)

First, the figures that are intended to be referenced ARE in the draft (D-PLCA Control and D-PLCA Aging) – these are misnumbered where they occur (148-5 and 148-6 should be 148-8 and 148-9). Second, the actual requirement ("conforms to") is missing from the text (should be in 148.4.7 – which has yet to be filled in – but at least the requirement should be there…) third, the editing instruction for 148.4.7 (top of page 31) mentions Figure 148-7 (the incorrect number as well, should be 148-8), but not the second figure, and finally, the PICS should be a cross-ref.

**Suggested Remedy**

Number D-PLCA Control State Diagram as Figure 148-8 (page 34), and D-PLCA Aging State Diagram as Figure 148-9 (page 35)

On page 31, add sentence to 148.4.7.1 "If the D-PLCA option is implemented, it shall comply with the state diagrams in Figure 148-5 (D-PLCA Control State Diagram) and Figure 148-6 (D-PLCA Aging State Diagram)."

On page 29, Change Editing instruction at top of page from "Insert 148.4.7 following 148.4.6.5 (and Figure 148-7) as follows:" to "Insert 148.4.7 following 148.4.6.5 (and Figures 148-8 and 148-9) as follows:"

On page 37, In 148.5.3.7, Change text in PICS DP1 and DP2 for Figure 148-8 and Figure 148-9 to cross-references and remove highlighting.

**Proposed Response** Response Status W

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl/ 148</th>
<th>SC 148.4.7.2</th>
<th>P32</th>
<th>L 2</th>
<th># 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Chad</td>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment on behalf of Gergely Huszak, Kone:** "148.5.3.7 D-PLCA" includes sentences D1 and D2 that say "Conforms to Figure 148-8" and "Conforms to Figure 148-9" (respectively) but these figures do not seem to be part of the draft. Is this intentional (= the yellow highlight is there for this?) or just a simple oversight/export problem?

**Detail** - (editor)

First, the figures that are intended to be referenced ARE in the draft (D-PLCA Control and D-PLCA Aging) – these are misnumbered where they occur (148-5 and 148-6 should be 148-8 and 148-9). Second, the actual requirement ("conforms to") is missing from the text (should be in 148.4.7 – which has yet to be filled in – but at least the requirement should be there…) third, the editing instruction for 148.4.7 (top of page 31) mentions Figure 148-7 (the incorrect number as well, should be 148-8), but not the second figure, and finally, the PICS should be a cross-ref.

**Suggested Remedy**

Number D-PLCA Control State Diagram as Figure 148-8 (page 34), and D-PLCA Aging State Diagram as Figure 148-9 (page 35)

On page 31, add sentence to 148.4.7.1 "If the D-PLCA option is implemented, it shall comply with the state diagrams in Figure 148-5 (D-PLCA Control State Diagram) and Figure 148-6 (D-PLCA Aging State Diagram)."

On page 29, Change Editing instruction at top of page from "Insert 148.4.7 following 148.4.6.5 (and Figure 148-7) as follows:" to "Insert 148.4.7 following 148.4.6.5 (and Figures 148-8 and 148-9) as follows:"

On page 37, In 148.5.3.7, Change text in PICS DP1 and DP2 for Figure 148-8 and Figure 148-9 to cross-references and remove highlighting.

**Proposed Response** Response Status W

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl/ 148</th>
<th>SC 148.2</th>
<th>P26</th>
<th>L 15</th>
<th># 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beruto, Piergiorgio</td>
<td>Canova Tech S.r.l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment on behalf of Gergely Huszak, Kone:** "148.5.3.7 D-PLCA" includes sentences D1 and D2 that say "Conforms to Figure 148-8" and "Conforms to Figure 148-9" (respectively) but these figures do not seem to be part of the draft. Is this intentional (= the yellow highlight is there for this?) or just a simple oversight/export problem?

**Detail** - (editor)

First, the figures that are intended to be referenced ARE in the draft (D-PLCA Control and D-PLCA Aging) – these are misnumbered where they occur (148-5 and 148-6 should be 148-8 and 148-9). Second, the actual requirement ("conforms to") is missing from the text (should be in 148.4.7 – which has yet to be filled in – but at least the requirement should be there…) third, the editing instruction for 148.4.7 (top of page 31) mentions Figure 148-7 (the incorrect number as well, should be 148-8), but not the second figure, and finally, the PICS should be a cross-ref.

**Suggested Remedy**

Number D-PLCA Control State Diagram as Figure 148-8 (page 34), and D-PLCA Aging State Diagram as Figure 148-9 (page 35)

On page 31, add sentence to 148.4.7.1 "If the D-PLCA option is implemented, it shall comply with the state diagrams in Figure 148-5 (D-PLCA Control State Diagram) and Figure 148-6 (D-PLCA Aging State Diagram)."

On page 29, Change Editing instruction at top of page from "Insert 148.4.7 following 148.4.6.5 (and Figure 148-7) as follows:" to "Insert 148.4.7 following 148.4.6.5 (and Figures 148-8 and 148-9) as follows:"

On page 37, In 148.5.3.7, Change text in PICS DP1 and DP2 for Figure 148-8 and Figure 148-9 to cross-references and remove highlighting.

**Proposed Response** Response Status W

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

We should define what the D-PLCA acronym stands for on its first occurrence

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace the first occurrence of "D-PLCA" with "Dynamic PLCA (D-PLCA)"

**Proposed Response** Response Status W

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**