

Cl 149 SC 149.4.2.4.5 P141 L50 # 285

Farjadrad, Ramin Aquantia

Comment Type T Comment Status X late

[PHY Capability Bits]: PHY Vendors need to communicate vendor specific information between the two link partners. Most previous BASE-T standards provided such capability, but currently 802.3ch does not provide it.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace paragraph on page 141, line 50 with the following:
 The format of PHY capability bits is Oct10<0> = OAMen, Oct10<2:1> = InterleaverDepth, Oct10<4:3> = PrecodeSel, Oct10<5> = SlowWakeRequest, Oct10<6> = EEEen and Oct10<7> = VendorSpecificMessage. EEEen and OAMen indicate EEE and MultiGBASE-T1 OAM capability enable, respectively. The PHY shall indicate the sup-port of these two optional capabilities by setting the corresponding capability bits. When the VendorSpecificMessage bit is set to 1 then the remaining 23 bits of the MSG24 field is vendor specific data. Otherwise when VendorSpecificMessage=0, the remaining bits shall be reserved and set to 0.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 149 SC 149.4.2.5 P142 L25 # 286

Farjadrad, Ramin Aquantia

Comment Type T Comment Status X late

[PHY Capability Bits]: Table 149-12 to be replaced by two tables (149-12a & 149-12b) to demonstrate the change proposed, meaning to include a field to identify the VendorSpecificMessage mode. Also, group all Reserved bits in Octer8 and Octer 9 for more efficient grouping

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 149-12a (when VendorSpecificMessage=0)
 Change Octer9<6> from SlowWakeReques to Reserved
 Change Octer9<6> from SlowWakeReques to Reserved
 Change Octer10<5> from Reserved to SlowWakeRequest
 Change Octer10<6> from Reserved to EEEen
 Change Octer10<7> from Reserved to VendorSpecificMessage=0

In Table 149-12b (when VendorSpecificMessage=1)
 Change Octer8<7:0>, Octer9<7:0>, Octer10<6:0> to Vendor Specific Data
 Change Octer10<7> VendorSpecificMessage=1

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 149 SC 149.3.2.2.15 P95 L28 # 287

Tu, Mike Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status X late

Figure 149-9 shows a multiplier associated with coefficient g_34. This is mathematically incorrect (although g_34=1 based on Equation 149-1). It can only cause confusions and mis-interpretations in the future when people look at this figure.

SuggestedRemedy

In figure 149-9, remove the multiplier next to g_34, and replace the arrowed line into that multiplier with a straight line connecting to the output of that multiplier. Also replace the text "g_34" with "g_34=1".

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 149 SC 149.3.9.2.13 P125 L6 # 288

Tu, Mike Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status X late

Figure 149-23 shows a multiplier associated with coefficient A_2. This is mathematically incorrect (although A_2=1 based on Equation 149-8). It can only cause confusions and mis-interpretations in the future when people look at this figure.

SuggestedRemedy

In figure 149-23, remove the multiplier next to A_2, and replace the arrowed line into that multiplier with a straight line connecting to the output of that multiplier. Also replace the text "A_2" with "A_2=1".

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 149 SC 149.5.1 P155 L44 # 289

Tu, Mike Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status X late

In test mode 3, the PCS generates continuous pattern of {0,3} symbols into the precoder. The precoder output is then mapped into PAM4. This paragraph should be rephrased to make it clear. The proposed change is based on discussions with George.

SuggestedRemedy

Change this paragraph to:
"Test mode 3 is for testing the precoder operation. When test mode 3 is enabled, the PCS shall generate a continuous pattern of {0, 3} symbols to be input to the transmit precoder specified in 149.3.2.2.19, to be precoded according to the Transmit precoder settings as determined by the value set in register 1.2309:10:9, or equivalent functionality if MDIO is not implemented, and transmitted by the PMA timed from its local clock source."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 149 SC 149.8.2.1 P168 L2 # 290

Tu, Mike Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status X late

The MDI return loss specification as shown in Equation 149-27 is unnecessarily restrictive.

SuggestedRemedy

See the proposal on the last page of "vakilian_3ch_01_0719.pdf".

Proposed Response Response Status O