

Management Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

**Cl 00 SC 0**      **P**      **L**      # **[r03-7]**

Berger, Catherine

Comment Type **G**      Comment Status **D**

This draft meets all editorial requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response      Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 00 SC 0**      **P 12**      **L 52**      # **[r03-6]**

Zimmerman, George      ADI, APL Group, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco, Commscop

Comment Type **E**      Comment Status **D**      **EZ**

"adds 50 Gb/s 200 Gb/s, and 400 Gb/s" is missing a comma between 50 Gb/s and 200 Gb/s

SuggestedRemedy

Change "50 Gb/s 200 Gb/s" to "50 Gb/s, 200 Gb/s"

Proposed Response      Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 98 SC 98.2.1.1.2**      **P 79**      **L 16**      # **[r03-8]**

Graber, Steffen      Pepperl+Fuchs AG

Comment Type **T**      Comment Status **D**      **AutoNeg**

LSM Autoneg in the Start Delimiter has more transitions than HSM Autoneg. Thus Column T4a in Table 98-1 and text in IEEE 802.3-2018, Section 7, Page 208 (after the figure) needs to be corrected.

SuggestedRemedy

On P79, L16, Table 98-1, item T4a, low\_speed, change the "Min" column value from 79 to 84 and the "Max" column value from 143 to 148.

Bring subclause 98.2.1.1 into the draft with editing instruction: "Change second paragraph of 98.2.1.1 as follows:

The first 26 transition positions contain the Start Delimiter, which marks the beginning of the page. The Start Delimiter contains a transition from quiet to active at position 1.

<UL>For HSM Auto-Negotiation, </UL>this is followed by transitions at positions 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26 and no transitions at the remaining positions.<\UL> For LSM Auto-Negotiation this is followed by transitions at positions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26 and no transitions at the remaining positions.</UL>"

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COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected      RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn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 104 SC 104.4.1a**      **P 96**      **L 30**      # **[r03-1]**

Anslow, Peter      Ciena

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

In the editing instruction: "Insert new subclause 104.4.1a including Table 104-4b after 104.4.1 as follows:"  
"Table 104-4b" should be "Table 104-1b"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Table 104-4b" to "Table 104-1b"

Proposed Response      Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 104 SC 104.9.4.2**      **P 117**      **L 5**      # **[r03-2]**

Anslow, Peter      Ciena

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

In item PSEa "See 104-1b" should be "See Table 104-1b"

SuggestedRemedy

Change the cross-reference format to "TableName"

Proposed Response      Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 104 SC 104.9.4.2**      **P 117**      **L 8**      # **[r03-3]**

Anslow, Peter      Ciena

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

In item PSE37 the entry under Support is "SCCP:O CRM:M"

This means that if SCCP is true the function is optional, so "No [ ]" should be in the Support cell.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "No [ ]" to the Support cell.

Proposed Response      Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

anagement Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

C/ 146	SC 146.7.1	P 169	L 42	# r03-10
--------	------------	-------	------	----------

Hess, Dave

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Link Segment

To take into consideration, per the editor's note in cg d2.0 clause 146.7.1, that ISO/IEC JTC1 SC25/WG3 has approved ISO/IEC TR 11801-9906 for publication, in support of 10BASE-T1L over application specific balanced single-pair cabling.

To make an informative reference to ISO/IEC TR 11801-9906, at the location of the editor's note.

To inform the user that TR 11801-9906 provides guidance on the selection of cabling in support of 10GBASE-T1L, such as choosing cable size per the desired reach.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a sentence at the end of the paragraph; to include the proposed text:

"It is recommended that the informative cabling specifications in ISO/IEC TR 11801-9906 be considered for guidance on the selection of cabling in support of 10BASE-T1L, such as choosing cable size per the desired reach."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The comment is out of scope and would insert new text to an unchanged portion of the draft.

Further, the CRG disagrees with the commenter. The editor's note referenced was removed several drafts ago. Including a recommendation to consult the draft ISO/IEC informative reference does not improve the clarity of this draft.

C/ 146	SC 146.8	P 175	L 1	# r03-15
--------	----------	-------	-----	----------

Lewis, Jon Dell EMC

Comment Type T Comment Status D MDI

Changes from D3.2 to D3.3 included connector information that is not a requirement and is thus a type of marketing information. As I believe that a defined MDI is in the best interest of the standard I believe that changes are required to both Clause 146 and 147 to create a requirement for the MDI with a single connector per ISO/IEC and TIA recommendations. IEEE 802.3 should be following the recommendations of the connector standards organization which have both identified the same recommendation: See [http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/sep18/incoming/SC25\\_WG3\\_to\\_IEEE\\_802d3\\_1\\_pair\\_Aug\\_2018.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/sep18/incoming/SC25_WG3_to_IEEE_802d3_1_pair_Aug_2018.pdf) and [http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/nov18/incoming/TR42-2018-10-152a\\_to\\_IEEE\\_802d3.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/nov18/incoming/TR42-2018-10-152a_to_IEEE_802d3.pdf) for the recommendations sent to IEEE 802.3 from both organizations.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change Clause 147 to specify IEC 63171-1 CD for M1I1C1E1 environments (e.g. commercial enterprise buildings) and IEC 63171-6 (formally IEC 61076-3-125) for M2I2C2E2/M3I3C3E3 and other non M1I1C1E1 environments (e.g. industrial) using the following modifications to the draft.

Clause 146 Changes:

Page 175/Line1: Change:

"Connectors meeting the mechanical requirements of IEC 63171-1 or IEC 63171-6 may be used as the mechanical interface to the balanced cabling. The plug connector is used on the balanced cabling and the MDI jack connector on the PHY. The IEC 63171-1 plug and jack are depicted (for informational use only) in Figure 146-29 and Figure 146-30 respectively, and the mating interface is depicted in Figure 146-31. The IEC 63171-6 plug and jack are depicted (for informational use only) in Figure 146-32 and Figure 146-33 respectively, and the mating interface is depicted in Figure 146-34. These connectors should support link segment DCR characteristics for 1.02 mm (18 AWG) to 0.40 mm (26 AWG) in Table 146B-1."

To:

"Connectors meeting the mechanical requirements of IEC 63171-6 shall be used as the mechanical interface to the balanced cabling. The plug connector is used on the balanced cabling and the MDI jack connector on the PHY. The IEC 63171-6 plug and jack are depicted (for informational use only) in Figure 146-29 and Figure 146-30 respectively, and the mating interface is depicted in Figure 146-31. This connector should support link segment DCR characteristics for 1.02 mm (18 AWG) to 0.40 mm (26 AWG) in Table 146B-1."

Remove Figures 146-29, 146-30, and 146-31. Renumber subsequent figures accordingly.

Clause 147 Changes:

Page 225/Line 53: Change:

"Connectors meeting the mechanical requirements of IEC 63171-1 or IEC 63171-6 may be used as the mechanical interface to the balanced cabling. The plug connector is used on the balanced cabling and the MDI jack connector on the PHY. The IEC 63171-1 plug and jack are depicted (for informational use only) in Figure 147-21 and Figure 147-22 respectively, and the mating interface is depicted in Figure 147-23. The IEC 63171-6 plug and jack are depicted (for informational use only) in Figure 147-24 and Figure 147-25 respectively, and the mating interface is depicted in Figure 147-26. These connectors

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

C/ 146  
SC 146.8

Page 2 of 13  
9/5/2019 3:44:40 PM

## Management Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

should support link segment DCR characteristics for 1.02 mm (18 AWG) to 0.40 mm (26 AWG) in Table 146B-1."

To:

"Connectors meeting the mechanical requirements of IEC 63171-1 shall be used as the mechanical interface to the balanced cabling. The plug connector is used on the balanced cabling and the MDI jack connector on the PHY. The IEC 63171-1 plug and jack are depicted (for informational use only) in Figure 147-21 and Figure 147-22 respectively, and the mating interface is depicted in Figure 147-23. This connector should support link segment DCR characteristics for 1.02 mm (18 AWG) to 0.40 mm (26 AWG) in Table 146B-1."

Remove Figures 147-24, 147-25, and 147-26. Renumber subsequent figures accordingly

*Proposed Response      Response Status      W*

PROPOSED REJECT.

The CRG cannot come to a consensus to make changes necessary to address the comment.

Significant discussion and contributions have been dedicated to this issue in prior meetings, and many statements are matters of opinion. Consensus does not satisfy all, but the group has discussed the issue repeatedly in an attempt to build a broad consensus.

Specifically, alignment with the recommendations from ISO/IEC SC25 WG3 and TIA TR42 has been cited as reasons for the recommendation of these connectors, as communicated by liaison to the 802.3 working group.

However, other commenters on previous drafts, supported by technical data, have shown that the restrictions to specific electromagnetic environments in the liaised ISO/IEC specifications for the link segment are not desirable for the equipment.

C/ 146	SC 146.8.1	P 174	L 40	# r03-25
Yseboodt, Lennart	Signify			
Comment Type      TR	Comment Status      D			MDI
	Comment r01-88 provided a rationale to remove the descriptive language used in 146.8.1 that points to connectors based on IEC 63171-1 and IEC 63171-6.			
	This comment, after substantial discussion, was accepted in principle and the CRG chose to remove the connector descriptions.			
	This change was reverted at the next meeting.			
	This group has chosen NOT to mandate a specific connector in order to comply with 802.3cg. This allows system vendors to make the appropriate choice for their applications. It also allows other SDO's to create interoperability standards around 802.3cg where choices are made for specific application (eg. connectors chosen.)			
	There is no justification for an 802.3 standard to choose NOT to mandate a connector, but at the same time make a soft recommendation for TWO connectors.			
	Either the group chooses to define MDI interoperability, and mandate a connector, or we leave that choice to vendors/other SDO's and only specify connector requirements.			
	802.3 is no place for advertisements.			
	The new SPMD group is going to define a powering system for use with an (enhanced) part of 802.3cg. Because power is involved, the issue of connectors will also play there. It complicates the work of that group if there is market confusion around connectors. Recommendations for connectors create that confusion.			
	The group needs time to figure out how to enable interoperability and co-existence between all of the different 802.3cg data modes and the two powering schemes.			
	It is key that 802.3cg makes no mention of connectors and leaves a green field for SPMD to figure this out.			

### SuggestedRemedy

Re-adopt the resolution of r01-88.

*Proposed Response      Response Status      W*

PROPOSED REJECT.

The CRG cannot come to a consensus to make changes necessary to address the comment.

Significant discussion and contributions have been dedicated to this issue in prior meetings, and many statements are matters of opinion. Consensus does not satisfy all, but the group has discussed the issue repeatedly in an attempt to build a broad consensus.

Additionally, the CRG disagrees with the commenter's statement that "There is no justification for an 802.3 standard to choose NOT to mandate (sic) a connector, but at the same time make a soft recommendation for TWO connectors."

## Management Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

Alignment with the recommendations from ISO/IEC SC25 WG3 and TIA TR42 has been cited as reason for the recommendation of these connectors, as communicated by liaison to the 802.3 working group.

Additionally, the commenter argues that the CRG should make the content of the draft based on possible future actions of other groups, including as-yet unapproved IEEE 802.3 standards projects. The existing text allows other projects to specify connectors, and the CRG declines to base the draft on promised future actions.

C1 146	SC 146.8.1	P 174	L 44
# r03-28			

Kim, Yongbum

NIO

Comment Type	TR	Comment Status	X
			MDI

While heading is editorial, this comment is on the use of the terminology MDI - a mandatory conformance test point and interoperability interface -- inappropriately to refer to a connector reference that "may be" used as "MDI connectors". There may be only one MDI connector, unless there is no connector at all at the MDI (as is the case with Backplane Ethernet, automotive Ethernet PHYs, chip to module interfaces, all to do with undefinable or undesirable (for the served application) connector at the MDI). This project clearly has a need for a medium attachment unit (MAU), Medium, and means of connecting type two (THE MDI connector). Either pick one of the two illustrated referenced connector as the MDI (only one), or do not refer to either one as MDI connectors. Doing so would only serve marketing purposes without serving any normative conformance purposes.

Reminder -- we do standard to achieve industry-wide multi-vendor interoperability. We don't do standards for standards sake. MDI, including a single chosen connector, serves a way to ensure interoperability while also serving as the exposed test point. Unless there is no selectable connector system to reference, there should be one and only one MDI connector.

### *SuggestedRemedy*

Change the clause title to "Reference Connectors";  
 Change "MDI jack connector" line 3, pg 175 to "jack connector";  
 Change Table 146-8 "MDI contacts" to "contacts"

Proposed Response	Response Status
	W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The CRG disagrees with the commenter.

IEEE Std 802.3-2018 contains other clauses which specify more than one MDI connector (see, e.g., 39.5.1, 85.11, 92.12, 96.8.1, or Annex 136C in IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018). Significant discussion in the CRG has referenced that which connector is used may depend on environmental, equipment design, or other factors which require variation. Referencing connectors which may be used in a number of environments, particularly connectors which ISO/IEC SC25 WG3 and TIA TR42 have liaised that they are recommending for use in single pair installations, provides assistance to the user of the standard by aligning with other standards.

C1 146	SC 146.8.1	P 174	L 44
# r03-26			

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type	TR	Comment Status	D
			MDI

The standard offers two options for a connector - and optional options. While some think this is a service to the reader, I view this as a disservice. It is my opinion that a connector should be mandatory or not included. Since this standard attempts to cover a great many use cases, many that do not need a connector, I feel the connector references should be deleted.

802.3 is not Craigslist. It should not be a place for advertisements.

### *SuggestedRemedy*

revert to the resolution of r01-88

Proposed Response	Response Status
	W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The CRG cannot come to a consensus to make changes necessary to address the comment.

Significant discussion and contributions have been dedicated to this issue in prior meetings, and many statements are matters of opinion. Consensus does not satisfy all, but the group has discussed the issue repeatedly in an attempt to build a broad consensus.

## Management Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

C/ 146	SC 146.8.1	P 174	L 45	# r03-13
--------	------------	-------	------	----------

Hormeyer, Bernd

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

MDI

IEEE 802.3 standards exist with and without definitions of connectors. Therefore, there is obviously no technical necessity to define certain connectors.

The focus here is on connecting IoT devices which usually have no connection with the generic cabling but follow their own installation rules depending on the area of application and expectations of the user groups. Within these application areas, manufacturer-independent interoperability and thus the basis for market success is always given.

Therefore, the example with the RJ45 for generic cabling in office buildings is not suitable for advertising a uniform connector.

It must also be questioned to what extent the plugs in question can be regarded as uniform MDI plugs at all. There is no interoperability between the connectors of standards 63171-1 and 63171-6. The goal of a uniform MDI connector is therefore missed anyway. In addition, 63171-6 describes several connectors that are incompatible with each other. Here the goal of a uniform MDI connector is violated within just one standard.

The question also arises as to whether the connectors are technically suitable at all.

Standards 63171-1 and 63171-6 only require a dielectric strength of 1000V, although IEEE 802.3 requires a dielectric strength of 2250V.

The selection of these connectors by the cabling committees TIA and ISO/IEC took place at an early stage when these aspects were only insufficiently known. Therefore, their recommendations can no longer be used as an argument for selecting an MDI connector. Moreover, these committees represent only the world of generic cabling and not the applications in which IEEE 802.3cg is likely to become most popular.

In summary, this means that the referencing of certain connectors is unnecessary, the proposed connectors are currently technically unsuitable and do not achieve interoperability, and the market does not benefit from referencing these connectors.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Complete IEEE 802.3cg without referencing certain connectors

Proposed Response	Response Status W
-------------------	-------------------

PROPOSED REJECT.

The CRG cannot come to a consensus to make changes necessary to address the comment.

Significant discussion and contributions have been dedicated to this issue in prior meetings, and many statements are matters of opinion. Consensus does not satisfy all, but the group has discussed the issue repeatedly in an attempt to build a broad consensus.

C/ 146	SC 146.8.1	P 175	L 1	# r03-4
--------	------------	-------	-----	---------

Anslow, Peter

Ciena

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

MDI

"Connectors meeting the mechanical requirements of IEC 63171-1 or IEC 63171-6 may be used..." implies that IEC 63171-1 or IEC 63171-6 will be found as references. However, these have been added to Annex A as bibliography entries. In 802.3 bibliography references are distinguished by having [Bxx] after them.  
Same issue in 147.9.1

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change: "IEC 63171-1 or IEC 63171-6" to: "IEC 63171-1 [B39a] or IEC 63171-6 [B39b]"  
Make the same change in 147.9.1

Proposed Response	Response Status W
-------------------	-------------------

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Note - the response to this comment depends on the resolution of the other "MDI" comments. If the other comments remove the cited references, the proposed response will be:

**PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE**

Accommodated by comment r03-xxx which removes the references.  
Response to comment r03-xxx is:

anagement Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

<b>C1 146</b>	<b>SC 146.8.2</b>	<b>P 176</b>	<b>L 3</b>	# <b>r03-29</b>
---------------	-------------------	--------------	------------	-----------------

Kim, Yongbum

NIO

**Comment Type TR Comment Status D**

MDI

"The electrical requirements specified in 146.5.4 and 146.5.5 shall be met when the PHY is connected to the MDI connector mated with the specified plug connector." This statement is in error. There is a "shall" statement but there is NO specified plug connector in the draft at present. Either specify one (and only one) specified connector (which would make this statement true), or revise the statement to eliminate the reference to the "specified connector".

**SuggestedRemedy**

If CRG selects one and only one MDI connector as the MDI, then this comment is withdrawn. Otherwise, change the text to read

"The electrical requirements specified in 146.5.4 and 146.5.5 shall be met when the PHY is connected to a connector mated with a plug connector, measured at the mated contacts as the measurement interface." or technically equivalent statement that recognizes that there is no specified MDI connector while preserving the normative statement. FYI - CL147 uses the "MDI attachment point" phase, which does not clearly specify where the test probe should be attached.

**Proposed Response Response Status W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The CRG disagrees with the commenter. The referenced sentence can only be interpreted as referring to the plug connector specified to be mated with MDI connector used on the port.

<b>C1 147</b>	<b>SC 147.4.3</b>	<b>P 217</b>	<b>L 1</b>	# <b>r03-17</b>
---------------	-------------------	--------------	------------	-----------------

Beruto, Piergiorgio

Canova Tech S.r.l.

**Comment Type E Comment Status D**

PCS

The note is not consistent with the PCS Receive state diagram WRT the required locking time. The maximum number of bits that the PHY is allowed to miss at the beginning of a packet is 8, not 12. Besides, the "should" expression is not appropriate to indicate unavoidable situations. If you don't achieve synchronization within the specified time, the system will not work. The use of "Must" is more appropriate. See IEEE Style guidelines Clause 10.2.2 "Must is only used to describe unavoidable situations"

**SuggestedRemedy**

- [1] Change "the PMA Receive function should achieve proper synchronization" to "the PMA Receive function must achieve proper synchronization"
- [2] Change "1.2 us" to "800 ns"

**Proposed Response Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

<b>C1 147</b>	<b>SC 147.7</b>	<b>P 223</b>	<b>L 8</b>	# <b>r03-11</b>
---------------	-----------------	--------------	------------	-----------------

Hess, Dave

**Comment Type T Comment Status X**

**Link Segment**

To take into consideration, per the editor's note in cg d2.0 clause 146.7.1, that ISO/IEC JTC1 SC25/WG3 has approved ISO/IEC TR 11801-9906 for publication, in support of 10BASE-T1S over application specific balanced single-pair cabling.

To make an informative reference to ISO/IEC TR 11801-9906, at the location of the editor's note.

To inform the user that TR 11801-9906 provides guidance on the selection of cabling in support of 10GBASE-T1S, such as choosing cable size per the desired reach.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add a sentence at the end of the paragraph; to include the proposed text:

"It is recommended that the informative cabling specifications in ISO/IEC TR 11801-9906 be considered for guidance on the selection of cabling in support of 10BASE-T1S, such as choosing cable size per the desired reach."

**Proposed Response Response Status W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The comment is out of scope and would insert new text to an unchanged portion of the draft.

Further, the CRG disagrees with the commenter. The editor's note referenced was removed several drafts ago. Including a recommendation to consult the draft ISO/IEC informative reference does not improve the clarity of this draft.

## Management Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

CI 147	SC 147.9.1	P 225	L 43	# r03-27
--------	------------	-------	------	----------

Jones, Chad  
Cisco Systems, Inc.

**Comment Type** TR      **Comment Status** D      **MDI**

The standard offers two options for a connector - and optional options. While some think this is a service to the reader, I view this as a disservice. It is my opinion that a connector should be mandatory or not included. Since this standard attempts to cover a great many use cases, many that do not need a connector, I feel the connector references should be deleted.

802.3 is not Craigslist. It should not be a place for advertisements.

**SuggestedRemedy**

revert to the resolution of r01-88

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status** W

**PROPOSED REJECT.**

The CRG cannot come to a consensus to make changes necessary to address the comment.

Significant discussion and contributions have been dedicated to this issue in prior meetings, and many statements are matters of opinion. Consensus does not satisfy all, but the group has discussed the issue repeatedly in an attempt to build a broad consensus.

CI 147	SC 147.9.1	P 225	L 43	# r03-14
--------	------------	-------	------	----------

Hormeyer, Bernd  
**Comment Type** T      **Comment Status** D      **MDI**

IEEE 802.3 standards exist with and without definitions of connectors. Therefore, there is obviously no technical necessity to define certain connectors.

The focus here is on connecting IoT devices which usually have no connection with the generic cabling but follow their own installation rules depending on the area of application and expectations of the user groups. Within these application areas, manufacturer-independent interoperability and thus the basis for market success is always given.

Therefore, the example with the RJ45 for generic cabling in office buildings is not suitable for advertising a uniform connector.

It must also be questioned to what extent the plugs in question can be regarded as uniform MDI plugs at all. There is no interoperability between the connectors of standards 63171-1 and 63171-6. The goal of a uniform MDI connector is therefore missed anyway. In addition, 63171-6 describes several connectors that are incompatible with each other. Here the goal of a uniform MDI connector is violated within just one standard.

The question also arises as to whether the connectors are technically suitable at all. Standards 63171-1 and 63171-6 only require a dielectric strength of 1000V, although IEEE 802.3 requires a dielectric strength of 2250V.

The selection of these connectors by the cabling committees TIA and ISO/IEC took place at an early stage when these aspects were only insufficiently known. Therefore, their recommendations can no longer be used as an argument for selecting an MDI connector. Moreover, these committees represent only the world of generic cabling and not the applications in which IEEE 802.3cg is likely to become most popular.

In summary, this means that the referencing of certain connectors is unnecessary, the proposed connectors are currently technically unsuitable and do not achieve interoperability, and the market does not benefit from referencing these connectors.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Complete IEEE 802.3cg without referencing certain connectors

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status** W

**PROPOSED REJECT.**

The CRG cannot come to a consensus to make changes necessary to address the comment.

Significant discussion and contributions have been dedicated to this issue in prior meetings, and many statements are matters of opinion. Consensus does not satisfy all, but the group has discussed the issue repeatedly in an attempt to build a broad consensus.

## Management Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

C/ 147	SC 147.9.1	P 226	L 43	# r03-30
--------	------------	-------	------	----------

Kim, Yongbum

NIO

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

MDI

While heading is editorial, this comment is on the use of the terminology MDI - a mandatory conformance test point and interoperability interface -- inappropriately to refer to a connector reference that "may be" used as "MDI connectors". There may be only one MDI connector, unless there is no connector at all at the MDI (as is the case with Backplane Ethernet, automotive Ethernet PHYs, chip to module interfaces, all to do with undefinable or undesirable (for the served application) connector at the MDI). This project clearly has a need for a medium attachment unit (MAU), Medium, and means of connecting the two (THE MDI connector). Either pick one of the two illustrated referenced connector as the MDI (only one), or do not refer to either one as MDI connectors. Doing so would only serve marketing purposes without serving any normative conformance purposes. Recognizing that 10BASE-T1S serves automotive and backplane (non-exposed and undesirable-to-define connector systems) as well as industrial (exposed medium connection), it would be appropriate to specify the MDI as optional mandatory, i.e. use of the MDI connector is optional, but if one were to be used then it shall be the one..

### SuggestedRemedy

If CRG decides to select one and only one MDI connector as the optional mandatory (e.g. use is optional, but if used then it shall be the one) then this comment is withdrawn.

Otherwise,

Change the clause title to "Reference Connectors";

Change "MDI jack connector" line 3, pg 175 to "jack connector";

Change Table 147-3 "MDI contacts" to "contacts".

Proposed Response      Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The CRG disagrees with the commenter.

IEEE Std 802.3-2018 contains other clauses which specify more than one MDI connector (see, e.g., 39.5.1, 85.11, 92.12, or 96.8.1). Significant discussion in the CRG has referenced that which connector is used may depend on environmental, equipment design, or other factors which require variation. Referencing connectors which may be used in a number of environments, particularly connectors which ISO/IEC SC25 WG3 and TIA TR42 have liaised that they are recommending for use in single pair installations, provides assistance to the user of the standard by aligning with other standards.

C/ 147	SC 147.11	P 230	L 48	# r03-19
--------	-----------	-------	------	----------

Beruto, Piergiorgio

Canova Tech S.r.l.

Comment Type T Comment Status D PCS

The "MDI input to RX\_DV/RX\_ER de-asserted" delay constraint is redundant as the assert delay (specified on the line above) implies a fixed de-assert time because of how the PCS Receive State Diagram works when receiving a packet. On the other hand, the RX\_ER assertion delay needs to be different from the RX\_DV time, again because of how the PCS Receive State diagram deals with COMMIT and BEACON indications.

### SuggestedRemedy

In Table 147-6 do the following:

[1] Change "MDI input to RX\_DV/RX\_ER asserted" to "MDI input to RX\_DV asserted" in the "Event" column.

[2] Change "Rising edge of RX\_DV/RX\_ER" to "Rising edge of RX\_DV" on the same row as [1].

[3] Change the last row "MDI input to RX\_DV/RX\_ER deasserted" to  
MDI input to RX\_ER asserted | 1.6 | 4 | us | Last DME encoded zero clock transition at the MDI | Rising edge of TX\_ER

Proposed Response      Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Commenter's proposed remedy with typo (transition) corrected:

In Table 147-6 do the following:

[1] Change "MDI input to RX\_DV/RX\_ER asserted" to "MDI input to RX\_DV asserted" in the "Event" column.

[2] Change "Rising edge of RX\_DV/RX\_ER" to "Rising edge of RX\_DV" on the same row as [1].

[3] Change the last row "MDI input to RX\_DV/RX\_ER deasserted" to  
MDI input to RX\_ER asserted | 1.6 | 4 | us | Last DME encoded zero clock transition at the MDI | Rising edge of TX\_ER

anagement Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

**C1 147 SC 147.12.3 P 232 L 11 # r03-31**

Kim, Yongbum NIO

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PICS

\*INS "Installation/Cabling" "Items marked with INS include installation practices and cabling specifications not applicable to a PHY manufacturer."

Comment 1: INS as used in 147.12.4.7 and 147.12.4.8 do not seem right. PICS statement test for the conditional \*INS. And if true, then :M (mandatory) kicks in. Two separate media, and they cannot be simultaneously true at the same time. At best, INS should be split for P2P and Mixing, such as INS-P2P and INS-MIX, or equivalent.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Define INS-P2P and INS-MIX and use them in 147.12.4.7 and 147.12.4.8 respectively.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**C1 147 SC 147.12.3 P 232 L 11 # r03-32**

Kim, Yongbum NIO

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PICS

\*INS "Installation/Cabling" "Items marked with INS include installation practices and cabling specifications not applicable to a PHY manufacturer."

Comment 2: 10BASE-T1S PHY operating in P2P has termination in the PHY, while 10BASE-T1S PHY operating in the Mixing Segment has termination on the medium (PHY being high-impedance tap connection), and 10BASE-T1S operating in half-duplex P2P has termination in TBD places. And in the cases where the high impedance tap is used, the internal trace length (from the connector) may/may not effect compliance to the conformance spec. So this part of the PICS seems to have dependency to PHY as well as installation.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "... installation practices and cabling specifications not applicable to a PHY manufacturer." to "... installation practices and cabling specifications and may be applicable to a PHY manufacturer."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The CRG disagrees with the commenter. While the media termination is dependent on the mixing segment, the PHY termination is dependent on whether the phy is in multidrop mode, and if the PHY meets the requirements, the mixing segment is not applicable to a PHY manufacturer.

**C1 148 SC 148.4.5.1 P 246 L 33 # r03-24**

Beruto, Piergiorgio Canova Tech S.r.l.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Missing "the"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "the" between "disrupt" and "current", to read "in order not to disrupt the current cycle of transmit opportunities"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**C1 148 SC 148.4.5.4 P 249 L 29 # r03-16**

Beruto, Piergiorgio Canova Tech S.r.l.

Comment Type T Comment Status D State diagrams

The to\_timer tolerance is too permissive. If two stations have a to\_timer difference of +/- 1/4 bit time, and the number of nodes is high enough, the transmit opportunity skew could lead to misaligned curID values, degrading the PLCA performance. Nevertheless, reasonable implementations would likely derive the to\_timer from the MII TX clock, which precision is 100 ppm. Therefore decreasing the tolerance does not result in any additional complexity.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change timer tolerance from "+/- 1/4 bit time" to "100 ppm"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Management Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

**C/ 148 SC 148.4.5.6 P 250 L 1 # r03-23**

Beruto, Piergiorgio

Canova Tech S.r.l.

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

State diagrams

After the latest clarification changes in the previous recirculation, some fixes were left over.  
The new proposed changes fix three issues simultaneously:

- [1] The node with local\_nodeID = 0 may not be able to send a BEACON in the unlikely situation that non-PLCA enabled nodes keep sending packets at a rate higher than the recv\_beacon\_timer expiration. In such case the PLCA Control State diagram would be stuck in the recover state.
- [2] The Control state diagram may loop from EARLY\_RECEIVE and RESYNC state because of CRS being continuously asserted. This may cause a false detection of the BEACON if the recv\_timer elapses when CRS=TRUE at the end of a packet where the length of the CRS is compatible with the length of a BEACON.
- [3] The BEACON may not be sent when PLCA is first enabled due to the Data state diagram being in normal state with plca\_status = FAIL, preventing this one to become OK.

The proposed changes also get rid of the recv\_timer and the recv\_beacon\_timer description achieving the very same functionality in a much simpler way, for the reader's benefit.

### SuggestedRemedy

Perform the following text changes:

[1] p245, L51 change "waits for all other nodes to be silent for at least recv\_beacon\_timer" to "waits one cycle of transmit opportunities"

[2] p246, L35 change "switch to RECOVER state if recv\_timer elapses and local\_nodeID = 0. In RECOVER state, since the curID variable might be out of synchronization, this node waits for all other nodes to be silent for at least recv\_beacon\_timer before sending a new BEACON" to "

switch to RECOVER state if local\_nodeID is 0 and CRS is de-asserted but no packet is being received. In RECOVER state, since the curID variable might be out of synchronization, this node waits for the end of the current cycle of transmit opportunities before sending a new BEACON"

[3] p246, L31 change "switch to RESYNC state also if recv\_timer elapses" to "switch to RESYNC state if CRS is not followed by the reception of a packet"

[4] p244, L20 remove the phrase beginning with "In any case" and ending with "possibility."

In Figure 148-4 do the following:

- [1] In the transition from HOLD to 'A' remove "recv\_timer\_done +" from the condition.
- [2] In the transition from HOLD to 'B' remove "recv\_timer\_not\_done \*" from the condition
- [3] In the condition of the recirculating arc on HOLD state, remove "recv\_timer\_not\_done \*\*"

In Figure 148-3 do the following:

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

[1] In the RECOVER state, remove the recirculating arc along with its condition.

[2] Add an unconditional jump from the RECOVER state to the 'A' connector (WAIT\_TO).

[3] Remove the transition between the RECOVER state to the SEND\_BEACON state.

[4] from the RECOVER state box, remove "start recv\_beacon\_timer"

[5] In the transition between RESYNC and SEND\_BEACON add "\* (!CRS)" to the condition.

[6] In the SEND\_BEACON state box, add "plca\_active <= TRUE".

[7] In the transition from WAIT\_TO to YIELD change the condition to read "  
(curID = local\_nodeID) \*  
((!packetPending) + (!plca\_active)) \*  
(!CRS)"

[8] In the transition from WAIT\_TO to COMMIT change the condition to read "  
plca\_active \*  
(curID = local\_nodeID) \*  
packetPending \*  
(!CRS)"

[9] from the EARLY\_RECEIVE state box, remove "start recv\_timer"

[10] In the transition from EARLY\_RECEIVE to "C" (RECOVER) change the condition to read "  
(!CRS) \* (local\_nodeID = 0)

[11] In the transition from EARLY\_RECEIVE to "B" (RESYNC) change the condition to read "  
(!CRS) \*  
(local\_nodeID != 0) \*  
(rx\_cmd != BEACON) \*  
beacon\_det\_timer\_done"

[12] In the transition from EARLY\_RECEIVE to RECEIVE, change the condition to read "receiving \* CRS"

[13] from RECEIVE state, remove "stop recv\_timer"

[14] from 148.4.5.4 delete the recv\_beacon\_timer and the recv\_timer along with their description. Remove also the reference to recv\_timer in 148.4.6.4.

*Proposed Response*      *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Management Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

**C1 148 SC 148.4.5.6 P 251 L 35 # r03-21**

Beruto, Piergiorgio Canova Tech S.r.l.

**Comment Type T Comment Status D**

In figure 148-3 in the TRANSMIT state, setting the "committed" variable to FALSE unconditionally may prevent the PLCA Data State Diagram from bursting.

**SuggestedRemedy**

```
In Figure 148-3, in the TRANSMIT state, change "committed <= FALSE" to "
IF bc >= max_bc" THEN
    committed <= FALSE
END"
```

**Proposed Response Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**C1 148 SC 148.4.6.2 P 253 L 42 # r03-20**

Beruto, Piergiorgio Canova Tech S.r.l.

**Comment Type T Comment Status D**

According to the "tx\_cmd\_sync" variable definition, its value is updated on the falling edge of MII TX\_CLK. This variable drives the MII signals in figure 148-4. According to Clause 22 the MII clock has setup/hold requirements defined which because of this may be violated (depending on the implementation).

**SuggestedRemedy**

[1] Change the definition of tx\_cmd\_sync variable from "The value of the tx\_cmd variable sampled on the falling edge of the MII TX\_CLK" to "The value of the tx\_cmd variable sampled on the rising edge of the MII TX\_CLK"

[2] In 148.4.5.3 replace existing text with "
PMCD
 Prescient mii\_clock\_done function. This function becomes done exactly 1 +/- 1/2 bit times earlier than mii\_clock\_done."

[3] In figure 148-3 in the transition from RESYNC to SEND\_BEACON change "MCD" to "PMCD"

**Proposed Response Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(commenter's suggested remedy with some English language clean-up on [2])

[1] Change the definition of tx\_cmd\_sync variable from "The value of the tx\_cmd variable sampled on the falling edge of the MII TX\_CLK" to "The value of the tx\_cmd variable sampled on the rising edge of the MII TX\_CLK"

[2] In 148.4.5.3 replace existing text with "
PMCD
 Prescient mii\_clock\_done function. This function becomes true 1 +/- 1/2 bit times earlier than mii\_clock\_done."

[3] In figure 148-3 in the transition from RESYNC to SEND\_BEACON change "MCD" to "PMCD"

## Management Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

**C1 148 SC 148.4.6.7 P 256 L 19 # r03-22**

Beruto, Piergiorgio

Canova Tech S.r.l.

**Comment Type T Comment Status D**

**State diagrams**

According to Clause 147 PCS Receive State Diagram the COMMIT request is looped back into a COMMIT indication above the MII. If the implementation does not handle this correctly, the burst mode may not work (always trigger a collision). An additional state is required to clarify the behavior of the state diagram when bursting.

**SuggestedRemedy**

In Figure 148-4 do the following:

- [1] Add a state WAIT\_IDLE which content is the same as IDLE.
- [2] Add a transition from WAIT\_IDLE to IDLE on "MCD \* !CRS"
- [3] Have the "C" connector pointing towards WAIT\_IDLE instead of IDLE.
- [4] Add a transition from WAIT\_IDLE to TRANSMIT on "MCD \* CRS \* plca\_txen"
- [5] Add a recirculating arc on the WAIT\_IDLE state with an "ELSE" condition

**Proposed Response Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**C1 148 SC 148.4.6.7 P 257 L 13 # r03-18**

Beruto, Piergiorgio

Canova Tech S.r.l.

**Comment Type E Comment Status D**

**State diagrams**

The "start pending\_timer" statement is executed forever, resetting the timer, because of the recirculating "ELSE" arc. This is obviously not the intended behavior as it would result into an infinite loop. The intended behavior is that the timer is started once when entering the DELAY\_PENDING state. In fact, the expiration of such timer is the only way out DELAY\_PENDING.

Moving the "start pending\_timer" statement to COLLIDE solves the problem because the timer is restarted by the recirculating arc of the COLLIDE state until it's the time to enter DELAY\_PENDING. See also <http://www.ieee802.org/3/cg/email/msg01056.html>

The "start commit timer" statement in the WAIT\_MAC state is affected by the very same problem and can be fixed likewise.

**SuggestedRemedy**

- [1] Move the "start pending\_timer" statement from the DELAY\_PENDING state to the COLLIDE state
- [2] Move the "start commit\_timer" statement from the WAIT\_MAC state to the PENDING state

**Proposed Response Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**C1 A SC A P 195 L 1 # r03-12**

Hess, Dave

**Comment Type T Comment Status D**

**Link Segment**

Add a Bibliography entry for ISO/IEC TR 11801-9906

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add the Bibliography entry:

ISO/IEC TR 11801-9906 Ed.1:20xx, Information technology - Generic cabling for customer premises - Part 9906 - Balanced 1-pair cabling channels up to 600 MHz for single pair Ethernet (SPE)

**Proposed Response Response Status W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

PROPOSED REJECT.

The CRG disagrees with the commenter. The proposed draft reference is not referred to in the draft of IEEE P802.3cg.

---

Note - Response to this comment depends on the responses to r03-10 and r03-11. If they are rejected, as proposed, use the above. If either r03-10 and r03-11 are accepted or accepted in principle:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(P263 L31 - end of Annex A)

Add the following editing instruction, editor's note and inserted bibliographic entry:

Insert the following editor's note and reference after [B45]:

"Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): ISO/IEC TR11801-9906 has been approved for publication. The publication date for ISO/IEC TR11801-9906 will need to be inserted prior to publication of IEEE Std 802.3cg."

[B45a] ISO/IEC TR 11801-9906 Ed.1:20xx, Information technology - Generic cabling for customer premises - Part 9906 - Balanced 1-pair cabling channels up to 600 MHz for single pair Ethernet (SPE)."

**C1 A SC A P 263 L 1 # r03-9**

Graber, Steffen

Pepperl+Fuchs AG

**EZ**

**Comment Type E Comment Status D**

Page numbering is wrong in Annexes A, 98B, 146A, and 146B.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Correct page numbering

**Proposed Response Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

anagement Parameters for 10 Mb/s Operation and Associated Power Delivery over a Single Balanced Pair

C/ A      SC A      P 263      L 17      # r03-5 [REDACTED]

Anslow, Peter      Ciena

Comment Type E      Comment Status D      EZ

Reference and Bibliography entries to IEC documents in 802.3 do not include the edition number.

Also, comma missing in "[B39b] IEC 63171-6 Ed.1:20xx Connectors ..."

SuggestedRemedy

Change "[B39a] IEC 63171-1 Ed.1:20xx," to "[B39a] IEC 63171-1:20xx,"

Change "[B39b] IEC 63171-6 Ed.1:20xx" to "[B39b] IEC 63171-6:20xx,"

Proposed Response      Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.