Cl **01** *SC* **1** *P* **24** *L* **1** # 450

Jones, Peter — Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Missing anything about PAUSE. At least needs update of Annex 31B. See 802.3bz as an example

SuggestedRemedy

At least Annex 31B needs to be updated. See 802.3bz as an example

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Consider with comments 500 and 487.

PHYs at 100 Mb/s or less are already covered in Annex 31B:
"At operating speeds of 100 Mb/s or less, a station that implements an exposed MII, shall not begin to transmit a (new) frame (assertion of TX_EN at the MII, see 22.2.2.3) more than one pause_quantum after
the reception of a valid PAUSE frame (deassertion of RX_DV at the MII, see 22.2.2.7) that contains a nonzero value of pause_time. Stations that do not implement an exposed MII, shall measure this time at the
MDI, with the timing specification increased to one pause_quantum + 64 BT."

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **24** *L* **15** # 265

KIM, YONG — NIO

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X** *Editorial*

says ..up to at least 1000 m reach while the line 18 (T1S) does not say ..up to at least 25 m reach. Make them consistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Most MAUs do not state reach (due to all other relevant media spec dependancies), but some do. Do what make sense and defend it.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Master comment 265. Resolve with 666.

Resolution to comment 368 adds reach information to the definition of 10BASE-T1S. If reach is not addressed then the defintions for 10BASE-T1S and 10BASE-T1L are identical and, therefore, not meaningful.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **24** *L* **16** # 666

Donahue, Curtis — UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

"1.4.13b 10BASE-T1S" definition does not include any mention of reach, while "1.4.13a 10BASE-T1L" does. Suggest consistent language in both definitions. After reviewing other BASE-T definitions in 802.3-2015 it would appear that the common practice is to not include reach in the PHY type definion.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "up to at least 1000 m reach"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Master comment 265. Resolve with 265.

Resolution to comment 368 adds reach information to the definition of 10BASE-T1S. If reach is not addressed then the defintions for 10BASE-T1S and 10BASE-T1L are identical and, therefore, not meaningful.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **24** *L* **18** # 607

Bains, Amrik — Cisco

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X** *Editorial*

"single balanced twisted-pair cabling"

SuggestedRemedy

"singlebalanced pair of conductors"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Master comment 368. Resolve with 368, 701, 144, and 428.

Change from, "over short reach single balanced twisted-pair cabling"

to, "over a single balanced pair of conductors up to at least 15m reach"

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4.13b** *P* **24** *L* **18** # 368

Matheus, Kirsten — BMW AG

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

"short reach" is not defined. It MIPI it is 30cm, in industrial it is 100m.

SuggestedRemedy

over single balanced twisted-pair cabling up to at least 15m reach.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Master comment 368. Resolve with 701, 144, 607, and 428.

Change from, "over short reach single balanced twisted-pair cabling"

to, "over a single balanced pair of conductors up to at least 15m reach"

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4.13b** *P* **24** *L* **18** # 701

Kabra, Lokesh — Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Correct "balanced twisted-pair cabling"

SuggestedRemedy

balanced pair cabling,

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Master comment 368. Resolve with 368, 144, 607, and 428.

Change from, "over short reach single balanced twisted-pair cabling"

to, "over a single balanced pair of conductors up to at least 15m reach"

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4.13b** *P* **24** *L* **18** # 144

Lewis, Jon — Dell EMC

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X** *Editorial*

Twisted-pair is still included

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 10 Mb/s Ethernet local area network over a short reach single balanced pair of conductors.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Master comment 368. Resolve with 368, 701, 607, and 428.

Change from, "over short reach single balanced twisted-pair cabling"

to, "over a single balanced pair of conductors up to at least 15m reach"

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4.13b** *P* **24** *L* **19** # 428

Wienckowski, Natalie — General Motors

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

still have twisted-pair

SuggestedRemedy

Change "single balanced twisted-pair cabling" to "single balanced pair of conductors".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Master comment 368. Resolve with 368, 701, 144, and 607.

Change from, "over short reach single balanced twisted-pair cabling"

to, "over a single balanced pair of conductors up to at least 15m reach"

Resolve with 368, 701, 144, and 607.

Cl **22** *SC* **22.2.2.4** *P* **25** *L* **13** # 292

KIM, YONG NIO

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

The strike outs "Other. shall have no effect upon the PHY". This proposed change could potentially make existing systems non-compliant. So this potentially violates CRD (compatibility) and may cause other issues.

SuggestedRemedy

please fix it.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This text has not been deleted - it has been moved to later in clause 22.2.2.4. See page 25, line 21 of draft 2.0.

Cl **22** *SC* **22.2.2.4** *P* **25** *L* **22** # 294

KIM, YONG NIO

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

The sentence "Other.shall.. upon the PHY"

SuggestedRemedy

Unneceesary text. But if you feel it is necessary, define what "shall have no effect" means, so that it could be added to the PICS and tested.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This is not new text. It is present in clause 22.2.2.4 of 802.3-2018. Removing this sentence may cause backward compatibility issues.

Cl **22** *SC* **22.2.2.5** *P* **25** *L* **46** # 369

Matheus, Kirsten BMW AG

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

OR clause at the end of the sentence makes it ambiguous. It should say what is meant in a clearer way (i.e. that when TX_EN is deasserted, the assertion of TX_ER does not affect the 10Mbps)

SuggestedRemedy

When TX_EC is deasserted, the assertion of TX_ER shall not affect .. (if this is what is meant)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace, "Assertion of the TX_ER signal shall not affect the transmission of data when a PHY is operating at 10 Mb/s
(with the exception of 10BASE-T1S and 10BASE-T1L), or when TX_EN is deasserted."

with, "When TX_EN is deasserted, the assertion of the TX_ER signal shall not affect the transmission of data when a PHY is operating at 10 Mb/s
(with the exception of 10BASE-T1S and 10BASE-T1L)." and show applicable strikeouts and underlines to note deletions and additions.

Cl **22** *SC* **22.2.2.11** *P* **26** *L* **34** # 699

Xu, Dayin Rockwell Automation

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

delete "possibly"

SuggestedRemedy

change " . data reception is possibly about ." to " . data reception is about ."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Master comment 703. Resolve with 703 and 297.

Delete all of clause 22.2.2.11 (lines 28 - 36).

Cl **22** *SC* **22.2.2.11** *P* **26** *L* **34** # 703

Kabra, Lokesh — Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Change "signal while both TX_EN and RX_DV are deasserted to"

Reason: CRS is defined as "CRS shall be asserted by the PHY when either the transmit or receive medium is nonidle"; It is not defined with respect to TX_EN or RX_DV

SuggestedRemedy

signal while both transmit and receive medium are idle to

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Master comment 703. Resolve with 699 and 297.

Delete all of clause 22.2.2.11 (lines 28 - 36).

Editor's note: The intention is to use the combination of CRS = TRUE and COL = TRUE to signal an early receive indication. From this perspective we don't need to specify anything for CRS because it is already behaving as required, i.e. rising when either the transmit or receive media are non-idle.

Cl **22** *SC* **22.2.2.12** *P* **26** *L* **42** # 704

Kabra, Lokesh — Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Change "signal while both TX_EN and RX_DV are deasserted to"

Reason: COLis defined as "COL shall be asserted by the PHY upon detection of a collision on the medium"; It is not defined with respect to TX_EN or RX_DV

SuggestedRemedy

signal while both transmit and receive medium are idle to

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace, "When PLCA capability is supported and enabled, the PHY may optionally assert COL along with the CRS signal while both TX_EN and RX_DV are deasserted to"

with, "When PLCA capability is supported and enabled, the PHY may assert COL signal when both TX_EN and RX_DV are deasserted to"

Editor's Note: The intention is to use the combination of CRS = TRUE and COL = TRUE to signal an early receive indication. Specifying that COL shall not be rised if TX_EN or RX_DV are asserted is required to disambiguate the signaling of an early receive condition from a collision and a reception. The new proposed text defines an additional case to rise COL (which is the intended change), without affecting already existing behavior.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.3.9.2.4** *P* **32** *L* **22** # 310

KIM, YONG — NIO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Local Node ID -- is there any other kind of node apart from the "local"? If not, how about just NodeID

SuggestedRemedy

Please do so.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No change to draft needed.

Editor's note: There are other types of ID. Hence "Local Node" modifies ID to distinguish it from cur_ID which is a counter in clause 148 state diagrams.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.5.1.1.2** *P* **33** *L* **12** # 145
Lewis, Jon Dell EMC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*
remove the word "cable"

SuggestedRemedy
Change to: Single balanced pair copper PHY as specified in Clause 147

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

Replace, "Single balanced pair copper cable PHY"

with, "Single balanced pair PHY"

in two locations (lines 11 and 12).

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.174d.1** *P* **41** *L* **14** # 462
Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*
Why does this say "may"?

SuggestedRemedy
Change to "Interruption to data communication is expected."

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

Consider with 169.

Replace, "This operation may interrupt data communication."

with, "This operation interrupts data communication."

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.174d.4** *P* **41** *L* **41** # 344
Yseboodt, Lennart Signify

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*
"While in the low-power mode, the device shall, as a minimum, respond to management transactions necessary to exit the low-power mode."

The 'as a minimum' hints at desired behavior that isn't specified. Either the sentence should state what that is, or be simplified.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace by: "While in the low-power mode, the device shall respond to management transactions necessary to exit the low-power mode."

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

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.174d.4** *P* **41** *L* **44** # 169
Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*
[EASY] This operation interrupts data communication.

SuggestedRemedy
For 10BASE-T1L the equivalent text is: This operation may interrupt data communication. (Should be adapted to be the same for both PHY types.)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.

Consider with 462.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.58c** *P* **47** *L* **9** # 371
Matheus, Kirsten BMW AG

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*
the field should not indicate the maximum number of nodes, but the maximum number of Ids. This might not be the same if one node is assigned multiple Ids during one circle.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "nodes" with "nodeIDs"

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

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.58c 1** *P* **47** *L* **20** # 373

Matheus, Kirsten BMW AG

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Not max number of nodes but of Ids

SuggestedRemedy

Exchange "nodes" with "Node IDS"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **98** *SC* **98.2.1.1.2** *P* **59** *L* **15** # 463

Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X** *Editorial*

Where is the requirement for autonegotiation high speed mode stated?

SuggestedRemedy

Add explanatory text

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Master comment 2. Resolve with 2.

In 98.2.1.1,2, page 59, line 13 insert the following sentences after the first sentence (with underlining), "There exist two different auto negotiation speeds, from which at least one auto negotiation speed shall be supported. The two speeds are referred to as "high-speed mode" or HSM and "low-speed mode" or LSM, respectively. HSM serves all speeds above 10 Mb/s. For link segments with high insertion loss, and those requiring 10BASE-T1L, LSM is provided to enable the full reach capability."

Cl **98** *SC* **98.2.1.1.2** *P* **59** *L* **25** # 2

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

There is no definition of high-speed mode and low-speed mode anywhere in Clause 98 at this time.

SuggestedRemedy

Before (or at) the first use, explain (through referenece, for example) what the high speed and low speed modes are

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Master comment 2. Resolve with 463.

In 98.2.1.1,2, page 59, line 13 insert the following sentences after the first sentence (with underlining), "There exist two different auto negotiation speeds, from which at least one auto negotiation speed shall be supported. The two speeds are referred to as "high-speed mode" or HSM and "low-speed mode" or LSM, respectively. HSM serves all speeds above 10 Mb/s. For link segments with high insertion loss, and those requiring 10BASE-T1L, LSM is provided to enable the full reach capability."

Cl **98** *SC* **98.2.1.1.2** *P* **59** *L* **25** # 359

Yseboodt, Lennart Signify

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

"When operating in low speed mode, the period, T1, shall be 800.0 ns Â± 0.005 %."

Not English.

SuggestedRemedy

"The period T1 shall be 800.0 ns Â± 0.005 % when operating in low speed mode."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Wording is clear as is.

Cl **104** *SC* **104.1.3** *P* **73** *L* **10** # 466

Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

This text should be table, as text it's close to unreadable

SuggestedRemedy

Convert this to a table

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
This is a comment on legacy text, on a characteristic which hasn't been substantively changed. A maintenance request is needed to pursue such a change.

Cl **104** *SC* **104.5.6** *P* **76** *L* **36** # 76

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

In Table 104-7, the Additional information entry is shown against Item 1 Types A, B, C, E and Item 2 Types A, B, C but not Type E.

SuggestedRemedy

Assuming that 104.5.6.4 is appropriate for Input voltage dV/dt for Type E, merge the Type E Additional information cell in with the others.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.1** *P* **85** *L* **8** # 379

Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

superfluous comma. "Together, the PCS, and PMA sublayers comprise a 10BASE-T1L Physical Layer (PHY)."

SuggestedRemedy

delete the second comma.
CHANGE TO: "Together, the PCS and PMA sublayers comprise a 10BASE-T1L Physical Layer (PHY)."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.1** *P* **85** *L* **8** # 667

Donahue, Curtis UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Unnecessary comma.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from "Together, the PCS, and PMA sublayers" to "Together, the PCS and PMA sublayers"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implemented by comment i-379

Cl **146** *SC* **146.1.2** *P* **86** *L* **30** # 560

D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, Subsidiary

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Consider adding a table that maps the different functions in the stack to the respective clauses which then notes whether the respective clause is optional or mandatory. This greatly helps the reader.

SuggestedRemedy

Reference Table 116-3 as example

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Adding a table was considered, but there are only 2 phys here, and each have the PCS, PMA and PMD specified in a single clause as opposed to the optical PHYs which often have these tables. There are many older 10 Mbps PHYs, but they are out of scope of this project, a maintenance request might be an approach to that. Adding a table might be useful for the entire BASE-T1 family, but is beyond the scope of this project, as it would impact other speeds.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.3.3.2.5** *P* **104** *L* **31** # 258

Andre, Szczepanek HSZ Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

"The running disparity is reflecting this actual difference and depending on the running disparity the next symbol coding is chosen."

SuggestedRemedy

Change
"The running disparity is reflecting this actual difference and depending on the running disparity the next symbol coding is chosen."
to
"The running disparity reflects this difference and is used to choose the coding of the next symbol."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.3.4.1** *P* **106** *L* **13** # 259

Andre, Szczepanek HSZ Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

This paragraph though technically correct does not explain why a delay is necessary.
It is my understanding that the delay is required to allow packets with ESD_ERR4 to be indicated as in error on the MII.
So why not say this ?

SuggestedRemedy

Change
"ensuring correct packet reception at the MII"
to
"ensuring correct indication of error marked(ESD_ERR4) packets at the MII."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
After "As a result, the depth of the data flush-in delay line is the same as the flush-out delay line ensuring correct packet reception at the MII.",
Insert "These delay lines are necessary to decode the stream delimiters prior to forwarding the received data to the MII interface." (the delay is necessary to manage both the start and end of stream delimiter)"

Cl **146** *SC* **146.3.4.1.1** *P* **110** *L* **6** # 576

Fitzgerald, Niall Acuitas Silicon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

The RXD[3:0] signal is not described as being the corresponding signal of the MII, i.e. of Clause 22.2.2.8. This is in contrast to the preceding descriptions of RX_ER and RX_DV. This implies that RXD here is not the same as RXD of the MII, which I understand is not the case.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the desription of RXD[3:0] to be:
The RXD signal of the MII as specified in 22.2.2.8.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.3.5** *P* **112** *L* **32** # 474

Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Remove " PCS loopback mode is enabled"

SuggestedRemedy

Make suggested change

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.4.4.2** *P* **117** *L* **29** # 479

Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

This says "the PHYs may not immediately drop the link", Is the may supposed to trigger an optional PICS entry

SuggestedRemedy

rewrite or delete the note

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
replace "may" with "will"

Cl **146** *SC* **146.5.4.4** *P* **124** *L* **1** # 324

Yseboodt, Lennart — Signify

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Figure 146-19 is not drawn in Frame, and furthermore uses grayscale for the axis which is inconsistent with the rest of the document.

SuggestedRemedy

Redraw in Frame, with proper formatting.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Graphs are generally imported, not usually drawn in frame. Editor to investigate and fix 'gray scale'.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.5.4.5** *P* **124** *L* **29** # 486

Jones, Peter — Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Why is this in MBd instead of MHz

SuggestedRemedy

change to MHz

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change to MHz and review other occurances. A "rate" is measured in Hz, whereas "baud" implies rate. Where text says "rate", "MHz" is appropriate. Where the text simply says states the rate (without using the word rate), such as "symbols are transmitted at x MBd", "MBd" is appropriate. IEEE Std 802.3-2018 is mixed on this and recent style has been to start using MBd - incorrectly in some cases.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.7.1.1** *P* **129** *L* **9** # 325

Yseboodt, Lennart — Signify

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Figure 146-19 is not drawn in Frame.

SuggestedRemedy

Redraw in Frame.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Such figures as this, inserted graphs from Matlab, are ordinary and common in IEEE Std 802.3

Cl **146** *SC* **146.7.1.3** *P* **130** *L* **30** # 674

Donahue, Curtis — UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

The last sentence of the paragraph seems anecdotal and not necessary to include in the standard. At most this language might be part of a note, but since the conformance requirement is stated in the previous sentence then this sentence should be removed.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "The delay is derived from the point-to-point 14 AWG (1.63 mm) link segment length of 1589 m given in Table 146B-1 using Equation (80-1) with an NVP of 0.6."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Explanation of derivation of delay added to resolve comment requesting details.

Change sentence to indicate informational by adding "Note that" given below.

Note that the delay is derived from the
point-to-point 14 AWG (1.63 mm) link segment length
of 1589 m given in Table 146B-1 using Equation (80-1) with an NVP of 0.6.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.20** *P* **200** *L* **24** # 129

Anslow, Pete — Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

In the title of Figure 146A-1: "First possible implementation on intrinsically safe power feeding side" the word "side" is not needed.
Is this word also present in the title of Figure 146A-2 but wrapped out of sight?

SuggestedRemedy

In the title of Figure 146A-1, delete "side".
Is this word also present in the title of Figure 146A-2 delete it there also.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.20** *P* **200** *L* **50** # 130

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Notes start with "NOTE-" i.e., an em-dash and no spaces before the first word of the note. Also, the wording of this note should be improved.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"Note: Likely the second version is easier to implement within a PHY IC as the hybrid within the PHY IC needs not to be adopted to different external resistor values." to:
"NOTE-The version shown in Figure 146A-2 is probably easier to implement within a PHY IC as the hybrid within the PHY IC does not need to adapt to different external resistor values."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change:
"Note: Likely the second version is easier to implement within a PHY IC as the hybrid within the PHY IC needs not to be adopted to different external resistor values." to:
"NOTE-The version shown in Figure 146A-2 may be easier to implement within a PHY IC as the hybrid within the PHY IC does not need to adapt to different external resistor values."

Cl **148** *SC* **148,.4.4.1.1** *P* **178** *L* **34** # 267

KIM, YONG NIO

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *EDITORIAL*

"PLCA Control state machine generates a BEACON request by way of the tx_cmd variable as specified
in 148.4.5.2". But tx_cmd in 148.4.5.2 does not specify such behavior. And refers back to 148.4.4.1.1.

SuggestedRemedy

please fix it.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Proposed resolution in Clause_148_r2p0_resolution.pdf. Changes are marked with #comment number in the right boxes.

Cl **148** *SC* **148.1** *P* **173** *L* **5** # 589

Healey, Adam Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *EDITORIAL*

The first sentence defines the expansion of "PLCA" to be "PHY Level Collision Avoidance". Elsewhere, it is expanded to "Physical Layer Collision Avoidance". I believe the latter is intended.

SuggestedRemedy

The first use of "PLCA" is this clause is in the Clause 148 heading and should be expanded there to be "Physical Layer Collision Avoidance". Update the first sentence of 148.1 to be consistent.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Proposed resolution in Clause_148_r2p0_resolution.pdf. Changes are marked with #comment number in the right boxes.

Cl **148** *SC* **148.3** *P* **173** *L* **29** # 506

Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *EDITORIAL*

Chamge "PLCA relies on CSMA/CD functions to have the MAC delay a transmission" to "PLCA relies on the COL signal to have the MAC delay transmission"

SuggestedRemedy

make suggested change

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
PLCA is an RS and interface with the MAC is done by the means of PLS primitives.

Proposed resolution in Clause_148_r2p0_resolution.pdf. Changes are marked with #comment number in the right boxes.

Cl **148** *SC* **148.4.4.1** *P* **178** *L* **29** # 507

Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *EDITORIAL*

I'd really like to see more high level description of what BEACON and COMMIT are used for, before diving into the details. Please add more descriptive text on the uses of these to 148.2.

SuggestedRemedy

make suggested change

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Proposed resolution in Clause_148_r2p0_resolution.pdf. Changes are marked with #comment number in the right boxes.

Cl **148** *SC* **148.4.4.1.1.** *P* **178** *L* **34** # 601

KIM, YONG NIO

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *EDITORIAL*

MII == Media Independent Interface.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace all "MII interface" with "MII" (preferred) or "MI Interface" (not preferred)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace all occurrences of "MII interface" with "MII"

Cl **148** *SC* **148.4.5.1** *P* **180** *L* **8** # 416

Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *EDITORIAL*

"The PLCA Control function shall conform to the PLCA Control state diagram in Figure 148-4 and Figure 148-5 and associated state variables, functions, timers and messages."
delete "and Figure 148-5"
combine Figures 148-4 and 148-5 into one figure.
Search for other instances of "Figure 148-5" and delete or correct as needed.

SuggestedRemedy

delete "and Figure 148-5" page 180 line 8
combine Figures 148-4 and 148-5 into one figure (page 181-183).
Rename "Figure 148-5" to "Figure 148-4 (continued)"
Search for other instances of "Figure 148-5" and delete or correct as needed.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
NOTE FOR EDITORS: resolve this comment after all others

Cl **148** *SC* **148.4.5.1** *P* **180** *L* **27** # 510

Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *EDITORIAL*

A lot of the rest of the text in this clause feels like a text version of the state machine. Remove, or make easily readable

SuggestedRemedy

make suggested change

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Proposed resolution in Clause_148_r2p0_resolution.pdf. Changes are marked with #comment number in the right boxes.

Additionally:
find and replace all occurrences of "MAX_ID" with "plca_max_id" in C148