IEEE P802.3cx D2.2 ITSA Task Force 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

	P <b>0</b>	LO	# 435	C/ <b>45</b>	SC 45.2.1.	175	P <b>23</b>	L <b>40</b>	# 436
Hajduczenia, Marek	Charter Co	mmunications		Hajducze	enia, Marek		Charter Com	munications	
Comment Type E	Comment Status X			Commen	nt Type <b>T</b>	Comment	t Status X		
Update FM to revisi	ion 5.0 from https://www.ieee8	02.org/3/tools/fram	emaker/index.html						3, #389, #358, #360,
SuggestedRemedy Per change				Clau resol	se 45 registers t lution. The same	o use "in ns" ar naming chang	nd "in sub-ns" to le needs to be p	better differentia propagated into m	nore places in Clause
Proposed Response	Response Status O			oTab	specifically into c ble 45-139 for PM ble 45-230 for WI	IA/PMD	ers in the followi	ng tables and as	sociated text
C/ 30 SC 30.13.	.1 <i>P</i> 18	L <b>6</b>	# 465	oTab	ble 45-293 for PC ble 45-336 for PH	IY XS			
Tse, Richard	Microchip 7	Technology			ble 45-361 for DT ble 45-375 for TC				
Comment Type T	Comment Status X				edRemedy				
	should be updated so all the T prresponding management obj				ement the follow	ing changes in		a find&roplace	
SuggestedRemedy The draft text from t while trying to resolv	build also be updated for this. the team that was assembled live multiple comments on this <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b>			regis - cha [tran - cha [tran - cha	sters" to "the XXX ange "the fine res smit receive] pat ange "the ns-reso smit receive] pat ange "does not s	K [transmit]rece solution XXX [tr. h data delay re blution XXX [tra h data delay re upport the XXX	ive] path data d ansmit receive] gisters, in sub-r nsmit receive] p gisters, in ns re [transmit receiv	elay registers, in path data delay r is resolution" (7x path data delay re solution" (4x) re] path data dela	registers" to "the XXX
SuggestedRemedy The draft text from t	the team that was assembled ve multiple comments on this <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b>		should be used.	regis - cha [tran - cha [tran - cha not s	sters" to "the XXX ange "the fine res smit[receive] pal ange "the ns-reso smit[receive] pal ange "does not s support the XXX	K [transmit rece solution XXX [tr. h data delay re blution XXX [tra h data delay re upport the XXX [transmit receiv	ive] path data d ansmit receive] gisters, in sub-r nsmit receive] p gisters, in ns re [transmit receiv re] path data del	elay registers, in path data delay r is resolution" (7x path data delay re solution" (4x) re] path data dela	sub-ns resolution" (4x registers" to "the XXX gisters" to "the XXX ay registers" to "does as resolution" (12x)
SuggestedRemedy The draft text from t while trying to resolv Proposed Response	the team that was assembled ve multiple comments on this <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b>	subclause in D2.1,		regis - cha [tran - cha [tran - cha not s	sters" to "the XXX ange "the fine res smit[receive] pal ange "the ns-reso smit[receive] pal ange "does not s support the XXX	K [transmit rece solution XXX [tr. h data delay re blution XXX [tra h data delay re upport the XXX [transmit receiv	ive] path data d ansmit receive] gisters, in sub-r nsmit receive] p gisters, in ns re [transmit receiv re] path data del PCS, PHY XS,	elay registers, in path data delay r ns resolution" (7x path data delay re solution" (4x) re] path data dela lay registers, in n	sub-ns resolution" (4x registers" to "the XXX gisters" to "the XXX ay registers" to "does as resolution" (12x)
SuggestedRemedy The draft text from t while trying to resolv Proposed Response Cl 30 SC 30.13. Tse, Richard	the team that was assembled we multiple comments on this <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b> .1.7 <i>P</i> 20	subclause in D2.1,	should be used.	regis - cha [tran - cha [tran - cha not s	sters" to "the XXX ange "the fine res smit receive] pat ange "the ns-rese smit receive] pat ange "does not s support the XXX re XXX covers P	K [transmit rece solution XXX [tr. h data delay re olution XXX [tra h data delay re upport the XXX [transmit receiv MA/PMD, WIS,	ive] path data d ansmit receive] gisters, in sub-r nsmit receive] p gisters, in ns re [transmit receiv re] path data del PCS, PHY XS,	elay registers, in path data delay r ns resolution" (7x path data delay re solution" (4x) re] path data dela lay registers, in n	sub-ns resolution" (4x registers" to "the XXX gisters" to "the XXX ay registers" to "the XXX ay registers" to "does as resolution" (12x)
SuggestedRemedy The draft text from t while trying to resolv Proposed Response Cl 30 SC 30.13. Tse, Richard Comment Type <b>T</b>	the team that was assembled ve multiple comments on this <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b> .1.7 <i>P</i> 20 Microchip	subclause in D2.1, <i>L</i> 44 Technology	should be used.	regis - cha [tran - cha [tran - cha not s wher Proposed	sters" to "the XXX ange "the fine res smit receive] pat ange "the ns-reso smit receive] pat ange "does not s support the XXX re XXX covers P d Response	K [transmit rece solution XXX [tra h data delay re olution XXX [tra h data delay re upport the XXX [transmit receiv MA/PMD, WIS, <i>Response</i>	ive] path data d ansmit receive] gisters, in sub-r nsmit receive] p gisters, in ns re [transmit receiv e] path data del PCS, PHY XS, <i>Status</i> <b>O</b>	elay registers, in path data delay r is resolution" (7x path data delay re solution" (4x) re] path data dela lay registers, in n DTE XS, and TS	sub-ns resolution" (4x registers" to "the XXX egisters" to "the XXX ay registers" to "does as resolution" (12x)
SuggestedRemedy The draft text from t while trying to resolv Proposed Response C/ 30 SC 30.13. Tse, Richard Comment Type T Start of SFD should	the team that was assembled ve multiple comments on this <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b> .1.7 <i>P</i> 20 Microchip T <i>Comment Status</i> <b>X</b>	subclause in D2.1, <i>L</i> 44 Technology	should be used.	regis - cha [tran - cha [tran - cha not s wher Proposed	sters" to "the XX ange "the fine res smit receive] pat ange "the ns-res smit receive] pat ange "does not s support the XXX re XXX covers P d Response SC 45.2.1.	K [transmit rece solution XXX [tra h data delay re olution XXX [tra h data delay re upport the XXX [transmit receiv MA/PMD, WIS, <i>Response</i>	ive] path data d ansmit receive] gisters, in sub-r nsmit receive] p gisters, in ns re [transmit receiv re] path data del PCS, PHY XS, <i>Status</i> <b>0</b>	elay registers, in path data delay r is resolution" (7x iath data delay re solution" (4x) ve] path data dela lay registers, in n DTE XS, and TS	sub-ns resolution" (4) registers" to "the XXX gisters" to "the XXX ay registers" to "the XXX ay registers" to "does as resolution" (12x)
SuggestedRemedy The draft text from t while trying to resolv Proposed Response Cl 30 SC 30.13. Tse, Richard Comment Type T Start of SFD should SuggestedRemedy Change "Uses SFD as DDM	the team that was assembled ve multiple comments on this <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b> .1.7 <i>P</i> 20 Microchip T <i>Comment Status</i> <b>X</b> d be specified as the DDMP ins	subclause in D2.1, <i>L</i> 44 Technology	should be used.	regis - cha [tran - cha [tran - cha not s wher Proposed CI 45 Hajducze Commen	sters" to "the XXX ange "the fine res smit receive] pat ange "the ns-rest smit receive] pat ange "does not s support the XXX re XXX covers P d Response SC 45.2.1. enia, Marek at Type E	K [transmit rece solution XXX [tra h data delay re olution XXX [tra h data delay re upport the XXX [transmit receiv MA/PMD, WIS, <i>Response</i> 175	ive] path data d ansmit receive] gisters, in sub-r nsmit receive] p gisters, in ns re [transmit receiv e] path data del PCS, PHY XS, <i>Status</i> <b>O</b> <i>P</i> 23 Charter Comut <i>t Status</i> <b>X</b>	elay registers, in path data delay r is resolution" (7x iath data delay re solution" (4x) ve] path data dela lay registers, in n DTE XS, and TS	sub-ns resolution" (4) registers" to "the XXX egisters" to "the XXX ay registers" to "does as resolution" (12x)
SuggestedRemedy The draft text from t while trying to resolv Proposed Response C/ 30 SC 30.13. Tse, Richard Comment Type T Start of SFD should SuggestedRemedy Change	the team that was assembled ve multiple comments on this <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b> .1.7 <i>P</i> 20 Microchip T <i>Comment Status</i> <b>X</b> d be specified as the DDMP ins	subclause in D2.1, <i>L</i> 44 Technology	should be used.	regis - cha [tran - cha [tran - cha not s wher Proposed C/ 45 Hajducze Commen "sub	sters" to "the XXX ange "the fine res smit receive] pat ange "the ns-ress smit receive] pat ange "does not s support the XXX re XXX covers P d Response SC 45.2.1. enia, Marek at Type E -ns-resolution" in	K [transmit rece solution XXX [tra h data delay re olution XXX [tra h data delay re upport the XXX [transmit receiv MA/PMD, WIS, <i>Response</i> 175	ive] path data d ansmit receive] gisters, in sub-r nsmit receive] p gisters, in ns re [transmit receiv e] path data del PCS, PHY XS, <i>Status</i> <b>O</b> <i>P</i> 23 Charter Comut <i>t Status</i> <b>X</b>	elay registers, in path data delay r is resolution" (7x iath data delay re solution" (4x) ve] path data dela lay registers, in n DTE XS, and TS	sub-ns resolution" (4: registers" to "the XXX egisters" to "the XXX ay registers" to "does as resolution" (12x)
SuggestedRemedy The draft text from t while trying to resolv Proposed Response Cl 30 SC 30.13. Tse, Richard Comment Type T Start of SFD should SuggestedRemedy Change "Uses SFD as DDM to	the team that was assembled ve multiple comments on this <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b> <b>.1.7 P20</b> Microchip T <i>Comment Status</i> <b>X</b> d be specified as the DDMP ins	subclause in D2.1, <i>L</i> 44 Technology	should be used.	regis - cha [tran - cha [tran - cha not s wher Proposed C/ 45 Hajducze Commen "sub Suggeste	sters" to "the XXX ange "the fine res smit receive] pat ange "the ns-rest smit receive] pat ange "does not s support the XXX re XXX covers P d Response SC 45.2.1. enia, Marek at Type E	<pre>&lt; [transmit rece solution XXX [tra h data delay re blution XXX [tra h data delay re upport the XXX [transmit receiv MA/PMD, WIS, <i>Response</i> 175 Comment istances are still </pre>	ive] path data d ansmit receive] gisters, in sub-r nsmit receive] p gisters, in ns re [transmit receiv re] path data del PCS, PHY XS, <i>Status</i> <b>0</b> P23 Charter Com t <i>Status</i> <b>X</b> III present	elay registers, in path data delay r is resolution" (7x iath data delay re solution" (4x) re] path data dela lay registers, in n DTE XS, and TS <i>L</i> 48 munications	sub-ns resolution" (4: registers" to "the XXX egisters" to "the XXX ay registers" to "does as resolution" (12x)

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/ 45 SC 45.2.1.175 Page 1 of 10 2/21/2022 3:52:09 PM

IEEE P802.3cx D2.2 ITSA Task Force 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Dawe, Piers       Nvidia         Dawe, Piers       Nvidia         Comment Type       E       Comment Status X         Please provide cross-references       Omegasted Remedy         Suggested Remedy       As is usual for MDIO registers - provide cross-reference(s) to the appropriate places(s) in Clause 90. Similarly for the other similar MDIO registers.       Dawe, Piers       Nvidia         Proposed Response       Response Status       O       Dawe, Piers       Nvidia         Dawe, Piers       Nvidia       Nvidia       Number of bits of dynamic transmit path data delay".         MAC bits?       Bits at single-lane rate?       Aggregate bits on the line, all lanes? ns? or 2e-16 ns         Suggested Remedy       Please clarify what units the number represents.       Proposed Response       Response Status       O						-	-			
comment Type E Comment Status X       Please provide cross-references         tiggested/Remedy       As is usual for MDIO registers - provide cross-reference(s) to the appropriate places(s) in Clause 90. Similarly for the other similar MDIO registers.       This says "a value indicating the number of bits of dynamic transmit path data delay". MAC bits? Bits at single-lane rate? Aggregate bits on the line, all lanes? ns? or 2e-16 m. Suggested/Remedy         Please 10x1       Please Clarify what units the number represents.         Proposed Response       Response Status O         Vi 45       SC 452.3.67       P30       L50       # 473         Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.111 Multilane is labelled as "a "bility", as the other entries in this table are. Suggested/Remedy       Clause not support". It should be labelled as an "ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.8       P32       L47       # 438         Vide 5       SC 452.3.67       P31       L5       # 474       Halduczenia, Marek       Charter Communications         Comment Type T       Comment Status X       Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are. Suggested/Remedy       Class C 452.3.67.8       P32       L47       # 438         Vide 5       SC 452.3.67       P31       L5       # 474       Halduczenia, Marek       Charter Communications         Comment Type T       Comment Statu	C/ <b>45</b>	SC 45.2.3.67	P <b>30</b>	L <b>31</b>	# 432	C/ 45	SC 45.2.3.6	7 P <b>52</b>	L <b>21</b>	# 433
Please provide cross-references       This says *a value indicating the number of bits of dynamic transmit path data delay!.         Was is usual for MDIO registers - provide cross-reference(s) to the appropriate places(s) in Clause 90. Similarly for the other similar MDIO registers.       This says *a value indicating the number of bits of dynamic transmit path data delay!.         Was is usual for MDIO registers - provide cross-reference(s) to the appropriate places(s) in Clause 90. Similarly for the other similar MDIO registers.       This says *a value indicating the number of bits of dynamic transmit path data delay!.         Was is usual for MDIO registers - provide cross-reference(s) to the appropriate places(s) in Clause 90. Similarly for the other similar MDIO registers.       This says *a value indicating the number of bits of dynamic transmit path data delay!.         Was Sc 45.2.3.67.       P30       L50       # 473         Cl 45       SC 45.2.3.67.1       P31       L36       # 439         SenderdRemedy       Change name of register from "Multilane Support" to "Multilane ability" in Table 45-293, 452.3.67.3       P31       L5       # 474         Yas Sc 45.2.3.67       P31       L5       # 474       Table 45-293, 452.3.67.8       P32       L47       # 388         Yas Sc 45.2.3.67.7       P31       L5       # 474       Table 45-293, 452.3.67.8       P32       L47       # 388         Yas Sc 45.2.3.67.8       P32       L47       # 388	Dawe, Pie	rs	Nvidia			Dawe, Pie	ers	Nvidia		
MagestedRemedy         As is usual for MDIO registers - provide cross-reference(s) to the appropriate places(s) in         Clause 90. Similarly for the other similar MDIO registers.         proposed Response         Response Status         V145       SC 45.2.3.67       P 30       1 473         Clause 90. Similarly for the other similar MDIO registers.       O         V145       SC 45.2.3.67       P 30       1 473         Clause 90. Similar MDIO registers - provide cross-reference(s) to the appropriate places(s) in       Clause 90. Similar MDIO registers.       O         V145       SC 45.2.3.67       P 30       1 473         Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.01 MUltilane ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.3, 90A.2, and 90A.3.       Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.01 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.       Nace Charge Toom Filt Status X         V145       SC 45.2.3.67.       P 31       L5       # 474         V26       Sc 45.2.3.67.       P 31       L5       # 474         V145       SC 45.2.3.67       P 31       L5       # 474         V145       SC 45.2.3.67       P 31       L5       # 474         V145       SC 45.2.3.67       P 31       L5       # 474         V26	Comment	Туре Е	Comment Status X			Comment	Туре Е	Comment Status X		
uggestedRemedy       SuggestedRemedy         As is usual for MDIC registers - provide cross-reference(s) to the appropriate places(s) in Clause 90. Similarly for the other similar MDIO registers.       SuggestedRemedy         As is usual for MDIC registers - provide cross-reference(s) to the appropriate places(s) in Clause 90. Similarly for the other similar MDIO registers.       SuggestedRemedy         As is usual for MDIC registers - provide cross-reference(s) to the appropriate places(s) in Clause 90. Similarly for the other similar MDIO registers.       O         As is usual for MDIC registers - provide cross-reference(s) to the appropriate places(s) in Clause 90. Similarly for the other entries in this table as in 'support'. It should be labelled as an 'ability', as the other entries in this table are.       SuggestedRemedy         Change name of register from 'Multilane Support' to 'MUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelef 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but registers 1.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelef 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but registers 1.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelef 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but registers 1.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelef.       SuggestedRemedy         Change name of register from 'NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support' to 'NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is ability' in Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but registers 1.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is ability' in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.       SuggestedRemedy         Change name of register from 'NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support' to 'NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelef as an 'ability', as the other entries in this table as a reno, bit 3.1800.01 indicates that the PCS does not support the fine resolution 'Support''. It should be labelef as an 'ability', as the other entri	Please	e provide cross-re	ferences							
As is dual for MD/D registers - provide class full mADD registers - pro	Suggested	lRemedy						gle-lane rate? Aggregate bits	s on the line, all la	anes? ns? or 2e-16 ns
21       45       SC 45.2.3.67       P 30       L 50       # 473         See, Richard       Microchip Technology         comment Type       T       Comment Status X         Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.11 Multilane is labelled as       "addes not supports"         "support". It should be labelled as an "ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.3, 90.A.2, and 90A.3.       P 31       L 5       # 474         "does not supports"       In addition to this subclause, this appears in 45.2.3.67.2, 45.2.5.28.1, and 45.2.5.28.2.       SuggestedRemedy         Change name of register from "Multilane Support" to "Multilane ability" in Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.       Cl 45       SC 45.2.3.67.8       P 32       L 47       # 438         Vides 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labeled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.       Cl 45       SC 45.2.3.67.8       P 32       L 47       # 438         Viduezenia, Marek       Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.       SC 45.2.3.67.8       P 32       L 47       # 438         Hajduczenia, Marek       Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90					propriate places(s) in	00		its the number represents.		
ise, Richard       Microchip Technology       Ran, Adee       Cisco         comment Type       T       Comment Status X       Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.11 Multilane is labelled as "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.       Comment Type       E       Comment Status X         VagestedRemedy       Change name of register from "Multilane Support" to "Multilane ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.3, 90A.2, and 90A.3.       Response Status O       Change to "does not support", 4 instances         Proposed Response       Response Status O       C/       45       SC 45.2.3.67       P 31       L5       # 474         YableIde as "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.       Comment Type       T       Comment Status X       Charter Communications         Comment Type       T       Comment Status X       Bit 3.1800.0 does not indicate fine resolution support: "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0       Scomment Type       T       Comment Status X         Bit 3.1800.0 does not indicate fine resolution Support:       It here C scoes not support the fine resolution support: "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0       SuggestedRemedy         Charge to "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.       SuggestedRemedy       Charge to "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0 indicates that the PCS does not support: "When read as a zero, bit 3	Proposed I	Response	Response Status O			Proposed	Response	Response Status O		
Comment Type T       Comment Status X         Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.11 Multilane is labelled as         "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.         SuggestedRemedy         Change name of register from "Multilane Support" to "Multilane ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.3, 90A.2, and 90A.3.         Toposed Response       Response Status O         C/ 45       SC 45.2.3.67         P31       L5         # 474         "se, Richard       Microchip Technology         Comment Type T       Comment Status X         Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.         UggestedRemedy       Comment Type T         Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.	C/ <b>45</b>	SC 45.2.3.67	P30	L <b>50</b>	# 473	CI 45	SC 45.2.3.6	7.1 <i>P</i> 31	L <b>36</b>	# 439
Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.11 Multilane is labelled as "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are. Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.11 Multilane ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.2, 45.2.3.67.2, 45.2.3.67.2, 45.2.5.28.1, and 45.2.5.28.2. SuggestedRemedy Change name of register from "Multilane Support" to "Multilane ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.2, 93.2.2.5.28.1, and 45.2.5.28.2. SuggestedRemedy Change name of register from "Multilane Support" to "Multilane ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.2, 93.2.2.5.28.1, and 45.2.5.28.2. SuggestedRemedy Change name of register from "Nulmilane Support" to "Multilane ability" in Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are. SuggestedRemedy Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.	Tse, Richa	ard	Microchip Teo	chnology		Ran, Ade	е	Cisco		
<ul> <li>"support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.</li> <li><i>buggestedRemedy</i></li> <li>Change name of register from "Multilane Support" to "Multilane ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.3, 90A.2, and 90A.3.</li> <li><i>Change name of register from "Multilane Support" to "Multilane ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.3, 90A.2, and 90A.3.</i></li> <li><i>Change name of register from "Multilane Support" to "Multilane ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.7, 9231 L5 # 474</i></li> <li><i>Change name of register from Topic To Comment Status X</i></li> <li>Table 45-293 is a table of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.</li> <li><i>ClaggestedRemedy</i></li> <li><i>Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE S</i></li></ul>	Comment	Туре Т	Comment Status X			Comment	Type E	Comment Status X		
Change name of register from "Multilane Support" to "Multilane ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.3, 90A.2, and 90A.3. Proposed Response Response Status O Change to "does not support", 4 instances Proposed Response Response Status O Change to "does not support", 4 instances Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.67.8 P32 L47 # 438 Change to "does not support", 4 instances Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.67.8 P32 L47 # 438 Change to "does not support", 4 instances Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.67.8 P32 L47 # 438 Change to "does not support", 4 instances Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.67.8 P32 L47 # 438 Change to "does not indicate fine resolution support". "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0 indicates that the PCS does not support the fine resolution PCS receive path data delay registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." is just wrong making reference to "fine resolution" SuggestedRemedy Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3. Change to "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0 indicates that the PCS does not support the PCS receive path data delay registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." The same problem exists in 45.2.5.28.6								clause, this appears in 45.2.3	8.67.2, 45.2.5.28. <sup>-</sup>	1, and 45.2.5.28.2.
45.2.3.67.3, 90A.2, and 90A.3. Proposed Response Response Status O 27 45 SC 45.2.3.67 P31 L5 # 474 See, Richard Microchip Technology Comment Type T Comment Status X Table 45-293 is a talbe of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are. SuggestedRemedy Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3. Proposed Response Response Response Status O Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.67.8 P32 L47 # 438 Comment Type T Comment Status X Bit 3.1800.0 does not indicate fine resolution support: "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0 indicates that the PCS does not support the fine resolution PCS receive path data delay registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." is just wrong making reference to "fine resolution" SuggestedRemedy Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.	Suggested	lRemedy				Suggestee	dRemedy			
Proposed Response       Response Status       O         Cl 45       SC 45.2.3.67       P31       L5       # 474         Se, Richard       Microchip Technology       Comment Type       T       Comment Status X         Table 45-293 is a talbe of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.       Bit 3.1800.0 does not indicate fine resolution PCS receive path data delay registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." is just wrong making reference to "fine resolution"         SuggestedRemedy       Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.       SuggestedRemedy				o "Multilane abilit	y" in Table 45-293,	Chang	ge to "does not s	upport", 4 instances		
C/ 45       SC 45.2.3.67       P31       L5       # 474         Tese, Richard       Microchip Technology         Comment Type       T       Comment Status X         Table 45-293 is a talbe of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.       Bit 3.1800.0 does not indicate fine resolution support: "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0 indicates that the PCS does not support the fine resolution PCS receive path data delay registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." is just wrong making reference to "fine resolution"         SuggestedRemedy       Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.       Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE			d 90A.3.			Proposed	Response	Response Status 0		
Cl 45       SC 45.2.3.67       P31       L5       # 474         "se, Richard       Microchip Technology       Microchip Technology       Toble 45-293 is a talbe of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.       Bit 3.1800.0 does not indicate fine resolution support: "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0 indicates that the PCS does not support the fine resolution PCS receive path data delay registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." is just wrong making reference to "fine resolution"         SuggestedRemedy       Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.       # UMM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "Support Support" to "Support Support Support" to "Support Support Support Support Support Support Su	Proposed I	Response	Response Status O							
Time       Microchip Technology         Comment Type       T       Comment Status X         Table 45-293 is a talbe of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are.       Bit 3.1800.0 does not indicate fine resolution support: "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0 indicates that the PCS does not support the fine resolution PCS receive path data delay registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." is just wrong making reference to "fine resolution" <i>SuggestedRemedy</i> Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.       SuggestedRemedy         Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE       Change name of registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." is just wrong making reference to "fine resolution" the PCS receive path data delay registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." The same problem exists in 45.2.5.28.6	CI 45	SC 45 2 2 67	D24		# [ <b>47</b> 4	C/ <b>45</b>	SC 45.2.3.6	7.8 P32	L <b>47</b>	# 438
Comment Type T Comment Status X Table 45-293 is a talbe of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are. SuggestedRemedy Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3. Comment Type T Comment Status X Bit 3.1800.0 does not indicate fine resolution support: "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0 indicates that the PCS does not support the fine resolution PCS receive path data delay registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." is just wrong making reference to "fine resolution" SuggestedRemedy Change to "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0 indicates that the PCS does not support the PCS receive path data delay registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." The same problem exists in 45.2.5.28.6			_		# 474	Hajduczei	nia, Marek	Charter Corr	nmunications	
Table 45-293 is a talbe of capabilities, but register 3.1800.10 NUM_UNIT_CHANGE is labelled as "support". It should be labelled as an "ability", as the other entries in this table are. SuggestedRemedy Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.	rse, Richa	ard	•	chnology		Comment	Туре Т	Comment Status X		
SuggestedRemedy Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3. SuggestedRemedy Change to "When read as a zero, bit 3.1800.0 indicates that the PCS does not support the PCS receive path data delay registers (3.1805 through 3.1808)." The same problem exists in 45.2.5.28.6	Table 4 labelle	45-293 is a talbe	of capabilities, but register 3			indica	tes that the PCS	does not support the fine re	solution PCS rec	eive path data delay
Change name of register from "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE Support" to "NUM_UNIT_CHANGE ability" in Table 45-293, 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90A.3.						Suggestee	dRemedy			
	Chang	e name of registe	er from "NUM_UNIT_CHANG 45.2.3.67.4, 90A.2, and 90/	GE Support" to "I A.3.	NUM_UNIT_CHANGE	PCS r	eceive path data	delay registers (3.1805 thro		S does not support the
							•			

C/ 45 SC 45.2.3.67.8 Page 2 of 10 2/21/2022 3:52:09 PM

IEEE P802.3cx D2.2 ITSA Task Force 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.69a.1 P35 L32 # 470	C/ 45 SC 45.2.5.31.1 P44 L5 # 472
rse, Richard Microchip Technology	Tse, Richard Microchip Technology
Comment Type E Comment Status X	Comment Type T Comment Status X
Fix sentence structure	Sentence refers to the wrong register and is not properly structured
SuggestedRemedy	SuggestedRemedy
Change	Change
"Writes to this bit are also be ignored if they attempt to set the bit to a value that the equivalent capability bits in register (3.1800) indicate is not supported."	"Writes to this bit are also be ignored if they attempt to set the bit to a value that the equivalent capability bits in register (3.1800) indicate is not supported."
to	to
"Writes to this bit are ignored if they attempt to set the bit to a value for which the corresponding capability bits in register (3.1800) indicate is not supported."	"Writes to this bit are ignored if they attempt to set the bit to a value for which the corresponding capability bits in register (5.1800) indicate is not supported."
Proposed Response Response Status <b>O</b>	Proposed Response Response Status O
C/ 45 SC 45.2.5.31.1 P44 L3 # [471	C/ 90 SC 90.3 P48 L41 # 440
Tse, Richard Microchip Technology	Ran, Adee Cisco
Comment Type T Comment Status X	Comment Type E Comment Status X
need to indicate DDMP is the beginning of the first symbol after the SFD	When mentioning IEEE Std 802.3 internally, it is common to call it "this standard" rather than using its full title. Compare with 90.4.1.
SuggestedRemedy Change	SuggestedRemedy
Change	Change "outside the scope of IEEE Std 802.3" to "outside the scope of this standard".
"When set to 1 the first symbol after the SFD is used as the data delay measurement point	Proposed Response Response Status <b>O</b>
to	
"When set to 1 the beginning of the first symbol after the SFD is used as the data delay	C/ 90 SC 90.4 P48 L43 # 441
measurement point"	Ran, Adee Cisco
Proposed Response Response Status <b>O</b>	Comment Type E Comment Status X
	There are no changes in the body of subclause 90.4.1, only in 90.4.1.1. Unchanged text (with no editorial instructions) should not be included.
	SuggestedRemedy
	Delete the body of 90.4.1 and the first sentence of 90.4.1.1.

C/ 90 SC 90.4

CI 90	SC 90.4.1.1	P <b>50</b>	L <b>46</b>	# 442	
Ran, Ade	е	Cisco			
Comment	Type E	Comment Status X			
There	seems to be no cl	hange in the text of either N	OTE 1 or NOTE	2.	
		the editorial instruction fror Response Status <b>O</b>	n the amendmen	t.	
Remo	ove both notes and		n the amendmen	t. # [443	
Remo Proposed	Notes both notes and Response SC 90.4.1.2	Response Status <b>O</b>			

ingress of packets provided by the TSSI, combined with knowledge of the time synchronization protocol frames, to capture the egress and ingress time of packets relevant to the protocol at the xMII. Which frames are of interest to any particular protocol is beyond the scope of this standard".

The words "packets" and "frames" are used apparently interchangeably in these two sentences. Other than here, clause 90 only refers to packets (15 times), and the word "frame" appears only in "start frame delimiter".

A "packet" is defined in 1.4.447 as "consists of a MAC frame (...) preceded by the Preamble and the SFD (...)".

To avoid confusion, it is suggested to use "packet" instead of "frame" throughout this amendment except in "start frame delimiter".

### SuggestedRemedy

Change "frame" to "packet" twice in the quoted sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status **O** 

Cl 90	SC 90.4.1.2	P <b>5</b> 1	L <b>12</b>	# 444
Ran, Adee		Cisco		
Comment T	vpe T	Comment Status X		

The words "ingress" and "egress" are used in this clause with specific meanings that are different from their dictionary meaning.

Ingress and Egress times are associated with specific events, but using the bare terms "ingress time" and "egress time" in the text does not make it clear.

To clarify the intent for readers who did not participate in the discussions of this amendment, some rephrasing would be beneficial.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Use the term "event" for ingress and egress and have the times associated with events.

### As an example, change the first sentence from

"When the TimeSync Client captures a relevant egress time, it can use that egress time at the xMII, along with the TimeSync PHY transmit path data delay, if available, and the PCS dynamic transmit path data delay, if supplied, to calculate the egress time at the MDI" to

"When the TimeSync Client captures a relevant packet egress event, it can use the time of that event at the xMII, along with the TimeSync PHY transmit path data delay, if available, and the PCS dynamic transmit path data delay, if supplied, to calculate the egress time of that packet at the MDI".

Make corresponding changes in the sentences about ingress, starting on line 16.

Response Status 0

C/ 90	SC 90.4.1.2	P <b>51</b>	L16	# 445	
Ran, Ade	e	Cisco			
Comment	Type E	Comment Status X			

The sentence starting with "When the TimeSync Client captures a relevant ingress time" is a change of topic - previous sentences were about packet egress. The two topics should be on separate paragraphs for clarity.

## SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response

Add a paragraph break before the quoted sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status **O** 

C/ 90 SC 90.4.1.2

IEEE P802.3cx D2.2 ITSA Task Force 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

C/ 90	SC 90.4.3.1	P <b>51</b>	L <b>42</b>	# 446
Ran, Adee		Cisco		

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X** 

The term "data delay measurement point (DDMP)" appears here before it is defined.

From its usage here it seems that a DDMP is an event that can be detected, and this meaning is consistent with its usage at least in most places. But in 90.4.3.1.1 it is defined as a parameter which has one of two possible values - not as an event that has a time associated with it.

It is suggested to have a definition of this term in the TSSI subclause, 90.4.2. The suggested remedy is a possible definition which hopefully captures the intent of using this term.

Alternatively, replace instances of "a valid data delay measurement point (DDMP) was detected" by "a valid time synchronization protocol frame was detected" and ensure that other usages of the term DDMP have a consistent meaning.

### SuggestedRemedy

Insert the following paragraph after the first paragraph of 90.4.2:

"The service interface primitives are defined with respect to a data delay measurement point (DDMP) event, which is the appearance of either the SFD or the first symbol of a time synchronization protocol frame. The choice of whether a DDMP is the SFD or the first symbol is implementation specific."

Rephrase other text as necessary.

Proposed Response Respon

Response Status 0

CI 90	SC 90.4.3.1.1	P <b>51</b>	L <b>49</b>	# 447
Ran, Adee		Cisco		
Comment Ty	pe T	Comment Status X		

The semantic of this primitive is being changed to TS\_TX.indication(MM, DDMP, PDDPD) but the order of the parameters in the subsequent paragraphs is DDMP, MM, and then PDDPD.

The order in the text makes more sense because conventionally (in most programming languages) mandatory arguments appear first. Also, the existing interface has "SFD" as a mandatory first parameter.

Also applies to the TS\_RX.indication primitive in 90.4.3.2.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the semantics line to TS\_TX.indication(DDMP, MM, PDDPD).

Change TS\_RX.indication accordingly.

Proposed Response Response Status **O** 

C/ 90	SC 90.4.3.1.1	P <b>52</b>	L19	# 448
Ran, Ade	e	Cisco		
<b>^</b>	<b>T</b>	0		

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"a value ranging from -32768 to +32767 in two's complement format"

The primitives are defined in an abstract manner and there is no need to specify a format (unlike register bit assignments or the TX\_NUM\_UNIT\_CHANGE interface). Compare to parameters with enumerated values for which the "formats" are never specified.

Also in 90.4.3.2.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "in two's complement format" in both places.

Proposed Response Response Status **O** 

C/ 90 SC 90.4.3.1.1 Page 5 of 10 2/21/2022 3:52:09 PM

IEEE P802.3cx D2.2 ITSA Task Force 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

C/ 90	SC 90.4.3.1.1	P <b>52</b>	L <b>20</b>	# 449	C/ 90	SC 90.4.3	.1.1	P <b>52</b>	L <b>26</b>	# 431
an, Adee		Cisco			Dawe, Pie	ers		Nvidia		
comment	Туре Е	Comment Status X			Comment	Туре Е	Comme	ent Status X		
SFD, c genera This is <i>uggested</i> Chang "indica	or the beginning on ated the primitive, a very long and o <i>Remedy</i> e the quoted sent ting the number of	f bits of dynamic transmit pa	FD (see 45.2.3.6 hin the PHY" ath data delay tha	9a), of the packet that	doesn RXC< conve TS_T Times Suggestee Chang	I't match the o 7:0>, RX_CLk sys the value o X.indication. I Sync PCS cap <i>dRemedy</i> ge the names	ther xMII signa ( and TX_CLK f PDDPD over n the context of ability, mention to ones that fit	al names such as The draft says to the xMII to the R of MDIO registers n "data delay", us with the other xM	TXD<63:0>, TXC hat TX_NUM_UN S, which sends it nearly all the re- ually in the bit na	gisters in Table 45-29 me - except this one.
		ket that generated the primi 3.69a), in the PCS within the		-D of the first symbol	Chang	ge RX_NUM_I	JNIT_CHANG	E to TX_DDEL; E to RX_DDEL;		
roposed l	Response	Response Status 0				-	CHANGE to			
					Proposed	Response	Respons	se Status O		
90	SC 90.4.3.1.1	P <b>52</b>	L <b>21</b>	# 450						
an, Adee		Cisco			C/ 90	SC 90.5		P <b>54</b>	L <b>6</b>	# 467
omment		Comment Status X			Tse, Rich	ard		Microchip Te	chnology	
"numb	er of bits of <> has units of time,	delay" so this should be "bit times"	' (bit time or BT h	as a definition		ction in gramm	ar	ent Status X		
	the descriptions	of TX_NUM_UNIT_CHANG GE (90.5.4).	E (90.5.3) and		Suggestee	,	e "provide"			
uggested	Remedy				Chan	ge				
	e "the number of ath delay in bit tim	bits of dynamic transmit pat nes (BT)".	h data delay" to "	the dynamic transmit						be forwarded to the path delay values."
Apply a	a similar change i	n 90.5.3 and 90.5.4.			to					
Proposed I	Response	Response Status <b>O</b>								e forwarded to the path delay values."

C/ 90 SC 90.5 Page 6 of 10 2/21/2022 3:52:09 PM

## IEEE P802.3cx D2.2 ITSA Task Force 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Ran, Adee Cisco Comment Type ER Comment Status X The editorial instruction "insert" does not require underlining the inserted text (unlike "change").	C/ 90	SC	90.5.3	P <b>56</b>	L1	# 451
The editorial instruction "insert" does not require underlining the inserted text (unlike	Ran, Ade	e		Cisco		
1 5	Comment	t Type	ER	Comment Status X		
			instructior	n "insert" does not require ur	nderlining the inse	erted text (unlike
	01		and a com		F.O. ("a shad" a sub-	

Clear the underline formatting from subclauses 90.5.3 (including the title) and 90.5.4.

Proposed Response	Response Status	ο
-------------------	-----------------	---

C/ 90	SC 90.5.3	P <b>56</b>	L11	# 452
Ran, Adee		Cisco		

### Comment Type E Comment Status X

"The value reports the number of bits of dynamic transmit path data delay the transmit data being transferred from the gRS to the PHY experiences, relative to the mean PCS transmit path data delay (see 45.2.3.68), due to actions such as alignment marker insertion, codeword marker insertion, and/or Idle rate adaptation insertion/removal"

This is a very long and complex sentence.

Similar sentence appears in 90.5.3 for TX\_NUM\_UNIT\_CHANGE.

### SuggestedRemedy

Change the quoted sentence to

"The value reports number of bits of dynamic transmit path data delay that are experienced by the data transferred from the gRS to the PHY, relative to the mean PCS transmit path data delay (see 45.2.3.68), due to actions such as insertion or removal of idles or insertion of alignment markers or codeword markers".

Change 90.5.3 TX\_NUM\_UNIT\_CHANGE accordingly.

Proposed Response

Response Status 0

C/ 90	SC 90.7	P <b>58</b>	L <b>14</b>	# 434
Dawe, Piers	3	Nvidia		

#### Comment Type E Comment Status X

Points are usually in space, instants are in time. So "data delay measurement point" sounds like the place where the data delay is measured (e.g. the MDI or xMII). The thing that is timed as it passes the MDI should have a different name. data delay measurement event? data delay measurement marker? data delay measurement instant (but that could be taken as the time when the thing passes the point)?

Also, I wondered if the phrase is being used with two meanings, the event and its time.

### SuggestedRemedy

If feasible, change "data delay measurement point" to "data delay measurement marker" and "data delay measurement instant" as appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

C/ 90 S	C 90.7	P <b>59</b>	L <b>7</b>	# 453
Ran, Adee		Cisco		
Comment Type	т	Comment Status X		

"The data delay measurement point shall be either the beginning of the start of frame delimiter (SFD) or the first symbol after the SFD (see 45.2.3.69a)"

It is not stated whether this choice is constant or can change dynamically. I would assume it is constant once the PCS is configured and enabled, but without stating it, implementations will need to handle dynamic changes, which may never occur.

If the task force thinks that the choice can be made static without loss of functionality, it would be good to specify it this way, here and in 45.2.3.69a.1.

### SuggestedRemedy

Add "The choice of the data delay measurement point is implementation dependent, and does not change when the PCS is not at reset or power down", or other language to that effect.

Additionally or alternatively, make a similar change in 45.2.3.69a.1.

Proposed Response Response Status O

C/ 90 SC 90.7 Page 7 of 10 2/21/2022 3:52:09 PM

Proposed Response

Response Status 0

IEEE P802.3cx D2.2 ITSA Task Force 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

) <b>90</b>	SC 90.7	P <b>59</b>	L <b>9</b>	# 454	C/ 90 SC 90.7		P <b>59</b>	L <b>48</b>	# 468
an, Adee	9	Cisco			Tse, Richard	Μ	icrochip Te	chnology	
omment	Type ER	Comment Status X			Comment Type T	Comment Sta	tus X		
		manual (18.1) "Within each su newly inserted NOTE is not n		should be numbered		nts from D2.1, we sho when refering to PHY la		otential controver	sy by avoiding use c
00	dRemedy				There is another	nstance of "multi-lane"	on line 52	of page 59.	
Chang	ge "NOTE" to "N	OTE 1" and renumber all subs	sequent notes ir	n 90.7 accordingly.	SuggestedRemedy				
Proposed	Response SC <b>90.7</b>	Response Status O	L31	# 455	between the lane to				
Ran, Adee	е	Cisco			"The receiver of F skew between the	'HY with multiple lanes	is expecte	d to include a buf	fer to compensate for
comment	Type ER	Comment Status X							
functio	ons, etc. but not	and for "transmit" is common in the text. "Transmit" is used another comment).			•	data delay for a multi- nt arrived at the MDI ir			
Simila	arly, "Rx" in the n	ext paragraph, line 40 should	be "receive".			data delay for a PHY nate of the molecular delay for a PHY nate of the molecular delayed at the			
Suggested Chang		nit" and "Rx" to "receive".			Proposed Response	Response Sta			and build doidy.

C/ 90 SC 90.7 Page 8 of 10 2/21/2022 3:52:09 PM

CI 90	SC 9	90.7	P <b>60</b>	L1	# 469	C/ 90	SC 90.8	P <b>62</b>	L1	# 457
Tse, Rich	ard		Microchip	Technology		Ran, Adee	)	Cisco		
Comment	Туре	т	Comment Status X			Comment	Туре Е	Comment Status X		
			n D2.1, we should avoid fering to PHY lanes.	potential controve	rsy by avoiding use of	The PI	CS subclause a	appears without any editorial	instruction.	
There	is anothe	er instance	e of "multi-lane" on line 6	6 of page 60.				ent that modifies the existing only the changes to the PIC		
Suggeste	dRemedy	V				be incl clause		rial instructions, as done in o	other amendment	s that modify existing
	skew ca		ent on a multilane transn their alignment markers		MD lanes have different	Suggested Remov	-	ed subclauses 90.8.1, 90.8.2	and 90.8.4	
to							0			-
			ent on a transmitter with ncies such that their align			Add ar Proposed I		ction in 90.8.3 to modify item Response Status <b>O</b>	is IS_IX and IS	_RX.
	transmit		ot zero, then it is recomi ed as if the data delay n			C/ 90A	SC 90A.2	P65	L <b>21</b>	# 458
to				icasurement point		Ran, Adee		Cisco		
			ot zero, then it is recomi be reported as if the data			Comment		Comment Status X		
			Response Status <b>O</b>	,			applications, an	lative term. The "old" clause d the "new" could be conside		
Proposed	Respons	se	Response Status 0	L53	# [456	some a applica This ar	applications, an ations. mendment now		ered not accurate cond" in its descri	enough for other
Proposed C/ <b>90</b> Ran, Adeo	Respons SC 9	se	Response Status O			some a applica This ar	applications, an ations. mendment now ite to use this te	d the "new" could be conside uses the term "'sub-nanosed	ered not accurate cond" in its descri	enough for other
Proposed Cl <b>90</b> Ran, Adeo Comment	Respons SC <b>9</b> e Type	90.7 E	Response Status 0 P60 Cisco	L53	# 456	some a applica This ar accura Suggested	applications, an ations. mendment now ite to use this te <i>IRemedy</i>	d the "new" could be conside uses the term "'sub-nanosed	ered not accurate cond" in its descri uracy".	enough for other ption. It would be mo
Proposed C/ <b>90</b> Ran, Ade Comment "it is r	Respons SC 9 E Type ecommer on/remov	90.7 E nded to, w	Response Status O P60 Cisco Comment Status X	L53	# 456	some a applica This ar accura Suggested	applications, an ations. mendment now ite to use this te <i>IRemedy</i> le "high accurac	d the "new" could be conside uses the term "'sub-nanosed rm here instead of "high acc	ered not accurate cond" in its descri uracy".	enough for other ption. It would be mo
Proposed C/ 90 Ran, Adea Comment "it is ru inserti xMII/A	Respons SC 9 Type ecommer on/remov UI" entence i	e 90.7 E nded to, w val, and/or	Response Status O P60 Cisco Comment Status X then possible, avoid Idle	L <b>53</b> insertion/removal, tion/removal in the	# 456 alignment marker sublayers below the	some a applica This ar accura <i>Suggested</i> Chang	applications, an ations. mendment now ite to use this te <i>IRemedy</i> le "high accurac	d the "new" could be conside uses the term "'sub-nanosed rm here instead of "high acc y" to "sub-nanosecond" acro	ered not accurate cond" in its descri uracy".	enough for other ption. It would be mo
Proposed C/ 90 Ran, Adea Comment "it is r inserti xMII/A This s possit	Respons SC 9 Type ecommer on/remov UI" entence i ole.	<b>E</b> nded to, w val, and/or is difficult	Response Status O P60 Cisco Comment Status X then possible, avoid Idle codeword marker inser	L <b>53</b> insertion/removal, tion/removal in the	# 456 alignment marker sublayers below the	some a applica This ar accura Suggested Chang Proposed I	applications, an ations. mendment now te to use this te <i>IRemedy</i> te "high accurac <i>Response</i> <i>SC</i> <b>90A.2</b>	d the "new" could be conside uses the term "'sub-nanosed rm here instead of "high acc y" to "sub-nanosecond" acro <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b>	ered not accurate cond" in its descri uracy". ss annex 90A, wi	enough for other ption. It would be mo th editorial license.
Proposed C/ 90 Ran, Adea Comment "it is r inserti xMII/A This s possit Suggested Chang	Respons SC 9 Type ecommer on/remov .UI" entence i ole. dRemedy ge to "it is	<b>60.7</b> <b>E</b> inded to, w val, and/or is difficult y s recomme	Response Status O P60 Cisco Comment Status X then possible, avoid Idle codeword marker inser	L53 insertion/removal, tion/removal in the slashes in text shou and removal of Idle	# 456 alignment marker sublayers below the uld be avoided when es, alignment markers,	some a applica This ar accura Suggested Chang Proposed I C/ 90A Ran, Adee Comment	applications, an ations. mendment now te to use this te <i>Remedy</i> le "high accurac <i>Response</i> SC <b>90A.2</b> Type <b>TR</b>	d the "new" could be conside uses the term "'sub-nanosed rm here instead of "high acc y" to "sub-nanosecond" acro <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b> <i>P</i> <b>65</b>	ered not accurate cond" in its descri uracy". ss annex 90A, wi	enough for other ption. It would be mo th editorial license. # 459
Proposed Cl 90 Ran, Adea Comment "it is r inserti xMII/A This s possit Suggested Chang and c	Respons SC 9 Type ecommer on/remov UI" entence i ole. dRemedy ge to "it is odeword i	<b>E</b> nded to, w val, and/or is difficult y s recomme markers in	Response Status <b>O</b> P60 Cisco Comment Status <b>X</b> then possible, avoid Idle codeword marker inser to parse. The usage of se	L53 insertion/removal, tion/removal in the slashes in text shou and removal of Idle	# 456 alignment marker sublayers below the uld be avoided when es, alignment markers,	some a applica This ar accura Suggested Chang Proposed I C/ 90A Ran, Adee Comment "physic Suggested	applications, an ations. mendment now the to use this te <i>IRemedy</i> te "high accurac <i>Response</i> <i>SC</i> 90A.2 <i>SC</i> 90A.2 <i>Type</i> <b>TR</b> cal layer device <i>IRemedy</i>	d the "new" could be conside uses the term "'sub-nanosed rm here instead of "high acc y" to "sub-nanosecond" acro <i>Response Status</i> <b>0</b> <i>P</i> <b>65</b> <i>Cisco</i> <i>Comment Status</i> <b>X</b> (PHY)" - "Physical Layer" is	ered not accurate cond" in its descri uracy". ss annex 90A, wi	enough for other ption. It would be mo th editorial license. # 459
Proposed Cl 90 Ran, Adea Comment "it is r inserti xMII/A This s possit Suggested Chang	Respons SC 9 Type ecommer on/remov UI" entence i ole. dRemedy ge to "it is odeword i	<b>E</b> nded to, w val, and/or is difficult y s recomme markers in	Response Status <b>O</b> P60 Cisco Comment Status <b>X</b> then possible, avoid Idle codeword marker inser to parse. The usage of se ended to avoid insertion in the sublayers below the	L53 insertion/removal, tion/removal in the slashes in text shou and removal of Idle	# 456 alignment marker sublayers below the uld be avoided when es, alignment markers,	some a applica This ar accura Suggested Chang Proposed I C/ 90A Ran, Adee Comment "physic Suggested	applications, an ations. mendment now the to use this te <i>IRemedy</i> te "high accurac <i>Response</i> <i>SC</i> 90A.2 <i>SC</i> 90A.2 <i>Type</i> <b>TR</b> cal layer device <i>IRemedy</i>	d the "new" could be conside uses the term "'sub-nanosed rm here instead of "high acc y" to "sub-nanosecond" acro <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b> <i>P</i> <b>65</b> Cisco <i>Comment Status</i> <b>X</b>	ered not accurate cond" in its descri uracy". ss annex 90A, wi	enough for other ption. It would be mo th editorial license. # 459

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/ 90A SC 90A.2 Page 9 of 10 2/21/2022 3:52:09 PM

CI 90A	SC 90A.3	P66	L1	# 460	C/ 90A	SC 9	0A.5.1	P <b>68</b>	L <b>4</b>	# 463
Ran, Adee		Cisco			Ran, Adee			Cisco		
Comment T	уре Т	Comment Status X			Comment 7	Гуре	TR	Comment Status X		
Here "b	ytes" but on line	e 46 "octet". "Octet" is used m	nore often in 802	2.3.	What d	loes "*(r	nanoseco	nds/unit)" mean?		
SuggestedF	Remedy				lt coom	o that D	א חמחחמ	as units of nanoseconds.	But this format is	uncommon in quah
Change	e "bytes" to "oct	ets".			express		וו טייטטיי	as units of hanoseconds.	But this format is	
Proposed R	esponse	Response Status <b>O</b>			A la a ia					
		•						e in 90A.5.2.		
	SC 004 0	Dec	1.20	# 404	Suggestedl	-		(nanaaaaada/unit)" ta "T		
C/ 90A	SC 90A.3	P66	L <b>39</b>	# 461	Change	9 11 +	PDDPD"	(nanoseconds/unit)" to "T1	+ PDDPD hs".	
Ran, Adee Comment T	ype <b>TR</b>	Cisco Comment Status X				tively, d sions in:		DDPD as a value in ns co	rresponding to P	DDPD and use it in the
		FEC for Ethernet rates 5G and the T1 PHYs have no PCS is			Implem	nent her	e and in i	tem vi and the two instand	ces in 90A.5.2.	
		nat do not include FEC at all ( elevant only for 2.5GBASE-T			Proposed F	Respons	se	Response Status O		
SuggestedF	Remedy									
Change	e "For these rate	es" to "For 2.5GBASE-T or 5G	BASE-T".		C/ 90A	SC 9	0A.5.3	P <b>69</b>	L	# 464
Conside	er adding "for of	ther PHYs at these speeds the	ere is no PCS la		Ran, Adee			Cisco		
	tion/merging".				Comment 7	Гуре	Е	Comment Status X		
Proposed R	esponse	Response Status 0			The us	age of s	lashes in	text should be avoided w	hen possible.	
					Suggestedl	Remedy	/			
C/ 90A	SC 90A.4	P67	L <b>5</b>	# 462	insertio	n/remov		not perform alignment ma a PHY does not perform i		
Ran, Adee		Cisco			Proposed F		,			
Comment T		Comment Status X			Fioposeu r	tespons	e e	Response Status <b>O</b>		
variable		shorthand for "transmit" "and tions, etc. but not in the text. ocument.								
		nand is spelled out in the begi s in this annex as well.	nning of 90A.4,	it is preferrable to avoid						
SuggestedF	Remedy									
		and "Rx" in the text to "transr se terms where they are used								
		on lines E G								
Delete t	the parentheses	s on lines 5-6.								

C/ 90A SC 90A.5.3 Page 10 of 10 2/21/2022 3:52:09 PM