Cl **30**   *SC* **30.3.9.2.5**   *P* **39**   *L* **28**   # 1
Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom

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

Sections 30.3.9.2.5 and 30.3.9.2.3 use one style to list the valid range, while 30.3.9.2.6 and 30.3.9.2.7 use a different format. Both of which differ from how the base standard has bounded the valid ranges for objects (ie. 30.14.1.6).

SuggestedRemedy

Change the APPROPRIATE SYNTAX entry to be "INTEGER" for 30.3.9.2.3, 30.3.9.2.5, 30.3.9.2.6, and 30.3.9.2.7

In 30.3.9.2.3 add this sentence to the Description of the object "Valid range is 0 to 255 inclusive."

In 30.3.9.2.5 add this sentence to the Description of the object "Valid range is 1 to 255 inclusive."

In 30.3.9.2.6 add this sentence to the Description of the object "Valid range is 0 to 255 inclusive."

In 30.3.9.2.7 add this sentence to the Description of the object "Valid range is 0 to 255 inclusive."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the APPROPRIATE SYNTAX entry to be "INTEGER" for 30.3.9.2.3, 30.3.9.2.5, 30.3.9.2.6, and 30.3.9.2.7

Insert new second sentence in 30.3.9.2.3 (prior to "The default value..."), "Valid range is 0 to 255, inclusive."

Insert new third sentence in 30.3.9.2.5 (prior to "The default value..."), "Valid range is 1 to 255, inclusive."

Insert new second sentence in 30.3.9.2.6 (prior to "By default..."), "Valid range is 0 to 255, inclusive."

Insert new third sentence in 30.3.9.2.7 (prior to "By default..."), "Valid range is 0 to 255, inclusive."

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.3.9.2.6**   *P* **39**   *L* **44**   # 123
Kim, Yong   NIO

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

"By default, this attribute is 0.;" should follow other default value statement format.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace it with "The default value is 0.;"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.3.9.2.7**   *P* **39**   *L* **44**   # 124
Kim, Yong   NIO

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

"By default, this attribute is 128.;" should follow other default value statement format.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace it with "The default value is 128.;"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.7.26**   *P* **61**   *L* **21**   # 107
Kim, Yong   NIO

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

Not an issue with the D2.3 text, but companion CMP version has this table unmodified -- whereas clean version has 7.527.5 and 7.527.4 turned to reserved. Provide machine generated CMP version or some other means to ensure all changes are noted in CMP file going forward. And somehow this table is there twice, once w/o changes, and once post-changes, but none with revision marks.

SuggestedRemedy

I know it is a lot of work to edit drafts, but would you machine-genrate the dff on CMP PDF going forward?

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Commenter provides insufficient remedy. No change to clean draft requested. CMP file was machine-generated, what the commenter describes is how frame handles changes. CMP is for information only - comments should be against the clean draft. Editorial efforts will be and are made to provide all substantive changes in the CMP document.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **45**
SC **45.2.7.26**

Page 1 of 6
2/13/2019 3:26:56 PM

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.5.3.7**   *P* **72**   *L* **46**   # **40**
Graber, Steffen   Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

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

The 10BASE-T1L PCS fault bit is implemented with latching high behavior.

SuggestedRemedy

Bit 3.2279.7 is implemented with latching high behavior. (Align the text with RM170, RM171, and RM172, to keep a decreasing bit ordering, it would also make sense to move RM173 one row up).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Page 72, line 48: Replace, "The 10BASE-T1L PCS fault bit is implemented with latching high behavior" with "Bit 3.2279.7 is implemented with latching high behavior"

Swap the entries for RM172 and RM173 so that RM172 is for subclause 45.2.3.68b.5 and RM173 is for subclause 45.2.3.68b.6

Cl **146**   *SC* **146.8.1**   *P* **159**   *L* **14**   # **46**
Graber, Steffen   Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

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

In Figures 146-26 to 146-31 first the IEC63171-1 Plug and Jack, then the IEC61076-3-125 Plug and Jack and then the mating faces for both connectors are shown. It seems to be more suitable to first show the three IEC63171-1 figures (plug, jacket and mating face) and then the three IEC61076-3-125 figures (plug jack and mating face).

SuggestedRemedy

If accepted, change ordering of the figures as described in the comments section and adapt the text references to fit the new ordering.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Move anchor for Figure 146-30 before Figure 146-28 and renumber.
(no change text required because cross-references will adjust the numbering.)

Cl **146**   *SC* **146.8.1**   *P* **161**   *L* **3**   # **47**
Graber, Steffen   Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

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

Table 146-8 defines "Contact", Figure 146-30 defines "Pin" and Figure 146-31 just shows 1 and 2.

SuggestedRemedy

Please unify the naming in table 146-8, Figure 146-30 and Figure 146-31.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change labels on Figure 146-30 from "PIN 1" and "PIN 2" to "1" and "2" respectively.
(leave table 146-8 as is - this is standard nomenclature)

Cl **147**   *SC* **147.1**   *P* **173**   *L* **7**   # **27**
Huszak, Gergely   Kone

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

Editor's note will have become stale

SuggestedRemedy

Remove editor's note that is at lines 6-10

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **147**   *SC* **147.1.2**   *P* **174**   *L* **2**   # **76**
Asmussen, Jes   Rockwell Automation

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

Would be nice to explain the purpose of 4B/5B encoding or provide a reference else where that explains the purpose

SuggestedRemedy

Change "4B/5B encoding is used" to "4B/5B encoding is used to support the transmisson of data as well as control symbols (see 147.3.2.4)".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **147**
SC **147.1.2**

Page 2 of 6
2/13/2019 3:26:56 PM

Cl **147**   *SC* **147.1.2**   *P* **174**   *L* **10**   # 28
Huszak, Gergely   Kone

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

In Figure 147-1, the dotted dividers on the left- and right-hand sides of "HIGHER LAYERS" do not match in style and are not located correctly in the Z-order, and those originated from the stack labeled "OSI REFERENCE MODEL LAYERS" do not align well

SuggestedRemedy

Fix all these

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Comment is out of scope (that part of the figure wasn't touched).
Comment does not clear up an ambiguity or other problem.

Cl **147**   *SC* **147.2**   *P* **175**   *L* **2**   # 29
Huszak, Gergely   Kone

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

In Figure 147-2, the syntax of the primitives is not harmonized: some are with, while others are without their arguments

SuggestedRemedy

Either remove the arguments from PMA_LINK.request and PMA_LINK.indication, or add those to PMA_UNITDATA.indication, PMA_UNITDATA.request, PMA_CARRIER.indication and PCS_STATUS.indication (let the editor propose the actual resolution)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
In Figure 147-2:
- Change label from "PMA_LINK.indication (link_status)" to "PMA_LINK.indication" going to the TDI
- Change label from "PMA_LINK.request (link_control)" to "PMA_LINK.request" coming from the TDI)

Cl **147**   *SC* **147.2**   *P* **175**   *L* **14**   # 59
Zimmerman, George   CMEC/ADI, APL Gp,

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

Figure 147-2 - delete parameters on PMA_LINK.indication/request going to the TDI. Interface diagrams do not usually show parameters of primitives. (functional block diagrams may)

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 147-2
Change label from "PMA_LINK.indication (link_status)" to "PMA_LINK.indication" going to the TDI
Change label from "PMA_LINK.request (link_control)" to "PMA_LINK.request" coming from the TDI

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Already resolved by #29.
Proposed resolution for #29 is as follows:
>>>>
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
In Figure 147-2:
- Change label from "PMA_LINK.indication (link_status)" to "PMA_LINK.indication" going to the TDI
- Change label from "PMA_LINK.request (link_control)" to "PMA_LINK.request" coming from the TDI)
<<<<

Cl **147**   *SC* **147.2**   *P* **175**   *L* **38**   # 30
Huszak, Gergely   Kone

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

In Figure 147-2, "PMA SERVICE INTERFACE" should be centered vertically to the labels to its left and right

SuggestedRemedy

Re-align the this label

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **147**
SC **147.2**

Page 3 of 6
2/13/2019 3:26:56 PM

Cl **147**	*SC* **147.3.1**	*P* **179**	*L* **16**	# **31**
Huszak, Gergely		Kone		

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

There is no reason for "PMA_UNITDATA.request (tx_sym)" to be broken into 2 lines

SuggestedRemedy

Level "(tx_sym)" with "PMA_UNITDATA.request". Moreover - if possible - do the same to "(pma_crs)" and "PMA_CARRIER.indication"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Comment is out of scope (that part of the figure wasn't touched).
Comment does not clear up an ambiguity or other problem.

Cl **147**	*SC* **147.3.2.4**	*P* **184**	*L* **29**	# **32**
Huszak, Gergely		Kone		

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

Table 147-1 is not consistent

SuggestedRemedy

Change all the "N/A" texts (in column 4B) to em-dash symbols

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Comment is out of scope. Text is unchanged an does not fix a problem. N/A in the column for 4B symbols indicates there is no 4 bit data is not applicable to the symbol, which is a different meaning than the em-dash in the Special function column which indicates no special function.

Cl **147**	*SC* **147.3.2.4**	*P* **185**	*L* **10**	# **65**
Baggett, Tim		Microchip		

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

COMMIT special function is missing from the 4B/5B table. Since HB, ESDBRS, and BEACON are also listed in this table, I believe COMMIT should be as well.

SuggestedRemedy

For the row containing the 5B "J" symbol,
Change: "SYNC"
To: "SYNC / COMMIT"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **147**	*SC* **147.3.8.1.3**	*P* **193**	*L* **28**	# **48**
Graber, Steffen		Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH		

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

The transition line between WAIT_HB and WAIT_RX state is too long.

SuggestedRemedy

Please remove overlapping part of the transition line within the WAIT_HB state.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **147**	*SC* **147.4.2**	*P* **197**	*L* **11**	# **25**
Huszak, Gergely		Kone		

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

In Figure 147-13:
- the arrow under "T2" may not be horizontal (right-end tilted up?)
- the waveform at the bottom looks off, both when zoomed out from and when zoomed in on.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the horizontal lines really horizontal and harmonize line width, as needed

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Comment is out of scope (that part of the figure wasn't touched).
Comment does not clear up an ambiguity or other problem.

Cl **147**	*SC* **147.5.2**	*P* **199**	*L* **26**	# **24**
Beruto, Piergiorgio		Canova Tech		

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

"another interface" is not in line with similar wording in this draft describing what to do when MDIO is not available.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:

"shall be provided by another
interface"

with:

"shall be provided by equivalent means"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **147**
SC **147.5.2**

Page 4 of 6
2/13/2019 3:26:56 PM

Cl **147** *SC* **147.5.5.2** *P* **203** *L* **9** *#* 26
Huszak, Gergely Kone

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

In figure 147-19:
- the dotted vertical lines under the 2 "MDI" labels do not align well (both vertically and horizontally)
- the horizontal line between the TP and the receiver does not align well on its left-hand side

SuggestedRemedy

Fix all these

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Comment is out of scope (that part of the figure wasn't touched).
Comment does not clear up an ambiguity or other problem.

Cl **147** *SC* **147.9.1** *P* **206** *L* **1** *#* 51
Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

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

In Figures 147-21 to 147-36 first the IEC63171-1 Plug and Jack, then the IEC61076-3-125 Plug, then the mating faces for both connectors and then finally the IEC61076-3-125 Jack are shown. It seems to be more suitable to first show the three IEC63171-1 figures (plug, jacket and mating face) and then the three IEC61076-3-125 figures (plug jack and mating face).

SuggestedRemedy

If accepted, change ordering of the figures as described in the comments section and adapt the text references to fit the new ordering.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
- Change the title of "Figure 147-24" from "IEC 63171-1 Pinout" to "IEC 63171-1 Mating Face"
- Move anchor of "Figure 147-24-IEC 63171-1 Mating Face" before "Figure 147-23-IEC 61076-3-125 Plug"
- Swap the order of "Figure 147-25-IEC 631076-3-125 Mating Face" and "Figure 147-26-IEC 61076-3-125 Jack"
Notes:
- Must be carried out after #52
- Also resolves #70
- Connected with #46 (in clause 146)

Cl **147** *SC* **147.9.1** *P* **206** *L* **8** *#* 70
Baggett, Tim Microchip

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

The ordering of the MDI connector and pin diagrams in Figures 147-21 through 147-26 is confusing. It would be more clear to visually group the connector types together.

SuggestedRemedy

Rearrange the figures as follows (or add editor's note to do this and renumber prior to D3.0):

Figure 147-21 - IEC 63171-1 Plug
Figure 147-22 - IEC 63171-1 Jack
Figure 147-23 - IEC 63171-1 Pinout

Figure 147-24 - IEC 61076-3-125 Plug
Figure 147-25 - IEC 61076-3-125 Jack
Figure 147-26 - IEC 631076-3-125 Mating Face

(Swap D2.3 figures 147-23 and 147-24; Swap D2.3 figures 147-25 and 147-26; update text P206 L2-6 to refer to moved figure numbers)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Already resolved by #51.
Proposed resolution for #51 is as follows:
>>>>
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
- Change the title of "Figure 147-24" from "IEC 63171-1 Pinout" to "IEC 63171-1 Mating Face"
- Move anchor of "Figure 147-24-IEC 63171-1 Mating Face" before "Figure 147-23-IEC 61076-3-125 Plug"
- Swap the order of "Figure 147-25-IEC 631076-3-125 Mating Face" and "Figure 147-26-IEC 61076-3-125 Jack"
Notes:
- Must be carried out after #52
- Also resolves #70
- Connected with #46 (in clause 146)
<<<<

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **147**
SC **147.9.1**

Page 5 of 6
2/13/2019 3:26:56 PM

Cl **147**　　*SC* **147.9.1**　　　　　*P* **207**　　*L* **49**　　# 52

Graber, Steffen　　　　　　　Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

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

Table 147-3 defines "Contact", Figure 147-24 defines "Pin" and Figure 147-25 just shows 1 and 2.

SuggestedRemedy

Please unify the naming in table 147-3, Figure 147-24 and Figure 147-25.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change labels in "Figure 147-24-IEC 63171-1 Pinout" from "PIN 1" and "PIN 2" to "1" and "2" respectively.
Notes:
- Must be carried out before #51
- Connected with #47 (in clause 146)

Cl **148**　　*SC* **148.4.4.1.1**　　　　*P* **224**　　*L* **34**　　# 56

Maguire, Valerie　　　　　　　The Siemon Company

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

"are free to" is not preferred standards terminology

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "are free to" with "may" on p 224, l 34 and p 224 46

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **148**　　*SC* **148.4.4.1.1**　　　　*P* **224**　　*L* **35**　　# 55

Maguire, Valerie　　　　　　　The Siemon Company

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

"herein" is not a suffciiently specific reference

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "herein" with "this subclause" on p 224, l 35 and p 224 47

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **148**　　*SC* **148.4.7.4**　　　　*P* **237**　　*L* **16**　　# 80

Asmussen, Jes　　　　　　　Rockwell Automation

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

Not exactly sure what "130 090" represents.

SuggestedRemedy

TBD

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
This is a question rather than a proposed change to the draft.

Commenter might be confused by the issue reported in comment #16.

Cl **148**　　*SC* **148.5.3**　　　　　*P* **239**　　*L* **9**　　# 62

Baggett, Tim　　　　　　　Microchip

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

Blank 3rd level heading (148.5.3).

SuggestedRemedy

Delete line for 148.5.3, or remove the heading tag and make it normal body text style.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete heading for 148.5.3.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general　　　　*Cl* **148**　　Page 6 of 6
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn　　*SC* **148.5.3**　　2/13/2019 3:26:56 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line