

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI FM SC FM P1 L 10 # 473
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Missing amendment number
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert amendment number or a placeholder; here, p 10 L 4, p 26 L 3
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P1 L 32 # 474
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 IEEE Std 802.3yy-20xx
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the known amendments, as listed in pages 11 to 13, keeping this placeholder or not as appropriate
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P1 L 32 # 475
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "The purpose of the amendment is to add" is not the usual language
 SuggestedRemedy
 Follow precedent where appropriate.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P1 L 34 # 265
 Chini, Ahmad Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Add a 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY option for use with Clause 192
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add 7.5 Gb/s support according to changes proposed in
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf, with editorial license.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P1 L 34 # 267
 Lou, Wei Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Add a 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY option in 802.3 Clause 192.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY support according to changes proposed in
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI FM SC FM P1 L 34 # 255
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Add a 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY option
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add 7.5 Gb/s support according to changes proposed in
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf (also attached), with editorial license.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI **FM** SC **FM** P1 L 34 # 270
 Tu, Mike Broadcom
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 The 7.5 Gb/s speed should be added to Clause 192 as a high speed option.
SuggestedRemedy
 Adopt the proposed changes as shown in
 "https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-
 comments.pdf".
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P1 L 34 # 273
 Pan, Chunpo Broadcom
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 In Clause 192, add a 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY option
SuggestedRemedy
 Add 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY support according to changes proposed in
 https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-
 comments.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P2 L 1 # 476
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 This material should appear on the first page.
SuggestedRemedy
 Reduce the font size, line spacing and/or space after the title on the first page as needed
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P3 L 1 # 477
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Abstract and keywords should appear on the page with the special footer beginning "The
 Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc."
SuggestedRemedy
 Move the abstract and keywords to the right place
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P3 L 2 # 256
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Add support for a 1 Gb/s LS PHY option for use with 5 and 7.5 Gb/s HS
SuggestedRemedy
 Add 1 Gb/s support according to the changes proposed in
 chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_comments-preview.pdf in the June 2 ad hoc meeting folder
 https://ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P3 L 2 # 274
 Pan, Chunpo Broadcom
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 In Clause 192, add 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY and 1000 Mb/s LS PHY options
SuggestedRemedy
 Add 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY and 1000 Mb/s LS PHY support according to changes proposed in
 https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-
 preview.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI **FM** SC **FM** P3 L2 # 272
 Tu, Mike Broadcom
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 The 5 Gb/s high speed and 1000 Mb/s low speed option should be added to Clause 192.
SuggestedRemedy
 Adopt the proposed changes as shown in
 "https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf".
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P3 L2 # 268
 Lou, Wei Broadcom
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Add a 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY and 1000 Mb/s LS PHY option in 802.3 Clause 192.
SuggestedRemedy
 Add 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY and 1000 Mb/s LS PHY support according to changes proposed in
 https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P3 L2 # 271
 Tu, Mike Broadcom
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 The 7.5 Gb/s high speed and 1000 Mb/s low speed option should be added to Clause 192.
SuggestedRemedy
 Adopt the proposed changes as shown in
 "https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf".
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P3 L2 # 266
 Chini, Ahmad Broadcom
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Add a 7.5 Gb/s HS with 1Gb/s LS option to the Clause 192
 Add a 5.0 Gb/s HS with 1Gb/s LS option to the Clause 192
SuggestedRemedy
 Add 7.5 Gb/s HS with 1Gb/s LS and 5Gs/s HS with 1Gb/s LS support according to changes
 proposed in chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf, with editorial license.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P3 L2 # 269
 Lou, Wei Broadcom
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Add a 5 Gb/s HS and 1000 Mb/s LS PHY option in 802.3 Clause 192.
SuggestedRemedy
 Add 5 Gb/s HS PHY and 1000 Mb/s LS PHY support according to changes proposed in
 https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P3 L2 # 275
 Pan, Chunpo Broadcom
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 In Clause 192, add 5 Gb/s HS and 1000 Mb/s LS PHY options
SuggestedRemedy
 Add 5 Gb/s HS PHY and 1000 Mb/s LS PHY support according to changes proposed in
 https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **3** L **4** # **257**
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Add MultiG PHYs to the list
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add 100M+MultiGBASE-T1, 100M+MultiGBASE-V1, MultiG+100MBASE-T1 and MultiG+100MBASE-V1 to the list
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **13** L **16** # **21**
 Ran, Adee Cisco Systems
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 The amendments list does not include 802.3dj and 802.3dr, which are both expected to complete before 802.3dm.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the missing amendments 802.3dr-2026 and 802.3dj-202x, with abstracts based on the latest drafts respectively.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **3** L **7** # **138**
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 -AT1 and -AV1 PHY types need to be added to the list of Keywords.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add to the list of Keywords: MultiGBASE-AT1 and MultiGBASE-AV1
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **13** L **24** # **237**
 Muma, Scott Microchip Technology Inc.
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Clause 200 is mentioned but not part of the draft amendment.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change Clause 200 to appropriate close number(s) with editorial license.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **13** L **10** # **20**
 Ran, Adee Cisco Systems
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 802.3dk-2026 was approved in March 2026
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 202x to 2026
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **13** L **24** # **480**
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Clause 200 - not
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clause 191, Clause 192 and Annex 191A
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **13** L **10** # **479**
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 802.3dk is published now
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 202x to 2026
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **13** L **24** # **139**
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 The Clause numbers weren't updated.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: Clause 200
 To: Clauses 191 and 192 and Annex 191A.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **13** L **25** # **236**
 Muma, Scott Microchip Technology Inc.
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Add support to Clause 192 for a 1 Gb/s LS PHY option for use with 5 and 7.5 Gb/s HS
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add 1 Gb/s support according to the changes proposed in
 chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_comments-preview.pdf in the June 2 ad hoc meeting folder
<https://ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226>, with editorial license.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **13** L **25** # **235**
 Muma, Scott Microchip Technology Inc.
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Add a 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY option for use with Clause 192
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add 7.5 Gb/s support according to changes proposed in gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-
 comments.pdf in the June 2 ad hoc meeting folder
<https://ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226>, with editorial license.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **FM** SC **FM** P **26** L **48** # **481**
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 Reviewers and the publication editor need to know which other IEEE 802.3 amendment
 projects running in parallel that modified the same text and tables the editors have taken
 into account.
 SuggestedRemedy
 List them here. Preferably, list all the amendment projects running in parallel, in two
 groups: those that affect this amendment, and those that don't. Also, it is worth providing
 summary information specifically for, and at the start of, clauses such as Clause 45 where
 this is most important.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **00** SC **0** P **3** L **4** # **478**
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**
 Don't use + within a word, because search engines and similar, and humans, interpret it as
 plus meaning and, not a letter within a word. This isn't 100BASE-T1 and 2.5GBASE-T1 (for
 example), nor a thing with two symmetrical rate options, but a distinct PHY. We discovered
 the problem with SFP+, too late to change that, but there is no need to repeat the same
 mistake.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change + to something else e.g. underscore
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **00** SC **0** P **3** L **8** # **385**
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 MultiGBASE-AT1 and MultiGBASE-AV1 should be added to keywords. Consider order of
 keywords.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert, ", MultiGBASE-AT1, MultiGBASE-AV1" after IEEE 802.3dm™
 Move, "automotive Ethernet" to before IEEE 802.3dm™
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P 8 L # 31
 Lusted, Kent Synopsys
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Add the ballot committee members
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the ballot committee members
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.1.3.2 P 170 L 3 # 484
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 If 1.4.88 10 Gigabit Media Independent Interface (XGMII) is changing...
 SuggestedRemedy
 1.1.3.2 f) needs revision to match. Page 170 is in the base standard.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1 P 28 L 42 # 386
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Update MultiGBASE-A, MultiGBASE-AT1 and MultiGBASE-AV1 definitions to better align with objectives. Correct missing "that transmit" and clarify that speed is less than or equal to 1000 Mb/s in the MultiGBASE-A definition.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace definitions of MultiGBASE-A, MultiGBASE-AT1 and MultiGBASE-AV1 with:
 1.4.405b MultiGBASE-A: PHYs that belong to the set of specific asymmetric PHYs that transmit at speeds in excess of 1000 Mb/s in one direction and less than or equal to 1000 Mb/s in the other direction, with the direction of asymmetry and high-speed rate determined at link startup for at least one transmission rate, including MultiGBASE-AT1 and MultiGBASE-AV1. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 191.)
 1.4.405c MultiGBASE-AT1: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for an asymmetric rate Ethernet full duplex point-to-point link operating at 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, or 10 Gb/s in one direction and 100 Mb/s in the other direction, with the direction of asymmetry and high-speed rate determined at link startup for at least one transmission rate, over a single shielded balanced pair of conductors. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 192.)
 1.4.405d MultiGBASE-AV1: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for an asymmetric rate Ethernet full duplex point-to-point link operating at 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, or 10 Gb/s in one direction and 100 Mb/s in the other direction, with the direction of asymmetry and high-speed rate determined at link startup for at least one transmission rate, over a single coaxial conductor. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 192.)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P 27 L 9 # 326
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 use of british/canadian spelling for 'analogue' is inconsistent with other instances in the document
 SuggestedRemedy
 change analogue to analog
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.4.2.249 P 28 L 36 # 259
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The title and text of 1.4.249a are inconsistent
 SuggestedRemedy
 The title is "MultiG+100MBASE," which pertains to Clause 192. However, the text contains the enumeration used in Clause 191 along with a reference to that clause. It appears that this clause should be re-written to reflect Clause 192.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 1 SC 1.4.26 P 27 L 15 # 87
 Kim, Yong General Motors
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Definitions for 802.3 100M+2.5G/5G/10G and 100M+MultiGigBASE are the same whether it is T1 or V1. One may conclude that if the definitions are the same, they are the same. Obviously, intention is to be different. Please correct the definition.
 SuggestedRemedy
 At least, refer to the clauses that differentiate the T1 and V1. Or other suitable changes to make the definition text different.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.4.26 P 27 L 46 # 88
 Kim, Yong General Motors
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Definitions for 802.3 2.5G/5G/10G+100M and MultiGigBASE+100M are the same whether it is T1 or V1. One may conclude that if the definitions are the same, they are the same. Obviously, intention is to be different. Please correct the definition.
 SuggestedRemedy
 At least, refer to the clauses that differentiate the T1 and V1. Or other suitable changes to make the definition text different.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.4.26 P 28 L 5 # 89
 Kim, Yong General Motors
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 "including asymmetric PHYs with 100 Mb/s in the reverse direction" is vague. What is reverse direction.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to read "The interface between the Reconciliation Sublayer (RS) and the Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) for 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s operation in both direction, or one of the direction operating at 100 Mbps in asymmetric PHYs. BTW, Pg 47 line 11 in CL46 is clear, as is this remedy.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.4.26 P 28 L 29 # 90
 Kim, Yong General Motors
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 "The electrical and mechanical interface to the shared coaxial cable medium", where "shared" is stricken is problematic for 10BASE5, 10BASE2, and 10Broad36, MAU ("PHY").
 SuggestedRemedy
 Reverse the change and define coax cable P2P or appropriate definition for asymmetric phy over coax.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.4.27 P 28 L 45 # 91
 Kim, Yong General Motors
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 "1.4.405c MultiGBASE-AT1" and "1.4.405d MultiGBASE-AV1" definitions have exactly the same text definition. One may conclude that if the definitions are the same, they are the same.
 SuggestedRemedy
 At least, refer to the clauses that differentiate the T1 and V1. Or other suitable changes to make the definition text different.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.4.46 P 27 L 40 # 258
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The title of 1.4.46g is inconsistent with the text
 SuggestedRemedy
 The title is "100M+MultiGBASE," which pertains to Clause 192. However, the text contains the enumeration used in Clause 191 along with a reference to that clause. It appears that this clause should be re-written to reflect Clause 192.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 1 SC 1.4.46a P 27 L 15 # 482

Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X

"link supporting transmission at X b/s and reception at Y b/s over a single ..." has problems. The link is bidirectional; it does not have a "transmission" and "reception" direction, but the PHYs and Physical Layers on the ends do. The PHYs do not "support" transmission and reception, they do these things, i.e. they transmit and receive. Clause 45 uses better language such as "operate" or "perform".
 According to 1.1.2.2 Full duplex is always point-to-point.
 Compare the language in 1.4.46g 100M+MultiGBASE.

SuggestedRemedy

IEEE 802.3 specification for an asymmetric full duplex Ethernet Physical Layer for point-to-point transmission at 100 Mb/s and reception at 10 Gb/s over a single shielded balanced pair of conductors. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 191.)
 or
 IEEE 802.3 specification for an asymmetric full duplex Ethernet Physical Layer transmitting at 100 Mb/s and receiving at 10 Gb/s over a single shielded balanced pair of conductors. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 191.)
 And similarly.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.4.46g P 27 L 39 # 483

Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X

I notice that most of these definitions are for "Physical Layer specification"s while this one and the later MultiG ones are for PHYs. I don't see a definition of e.g. 100M+10GBASE-T1 PHY in this section.

SuggestedRemedy

Please review and clarify.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.4.46g P 27 L 40 # 327

Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

1000 Mb/s used is inconsistent with 1 Gb/s language used on same page.

SuggestedRemedy

change 1000 Mb/s to 1 Gb/s

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.4.249 P 28 L 37 # 328

Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

1000 Mb/s used is inconsistent with 1 Gb/s language used on same page.

SuggestedRemedy

change 1000 Mb/s to 1 Gb/s

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.4.405 P 28 L 43 # 260

Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

Incorrect clause reference in 1.4.405b

SuggestedRemedy

The reference should be to Clause 192 rather than 191

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.4.405 P 28 L 43 # 329

Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

1000 Mb/s used is inconsistent with 1 Gb/s language used on same page.

SuggestedRemedy

change 1000 Mb/s to 1 Gb/s

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 1 SC 1.4.405b P 28 L 41 # 82
 Lusted, Kent Synopsys
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The definition for MultiGBASE-A references Clause 191 in the (). However, the PCS PMD and medium description of MultiGBASE-A is in Clause 192.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "(See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 191.)" to "(See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 192.)"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P 29 L 1 # 144
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 ACT and TDD were added as abbreviations when these were included in the Clause names. These have been removed from the Clause names.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete 1.5 and its contents.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P 29 L 6 # 92
 Kim, Yong General Motors
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 "TDD". Time Division Duplex is unclear. I heard and referred to "TDD" so long that I did not question it until reviewing the draft. "Duplex" is misnomer and sounds more marketing. Time Division Multiplex, or Time Division Simplex would be more correct and be more aligned with common reference to this type of technique. Why create confusion by creating a new term when perfectly well-understood term is available.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider TDM, which is more well-understood term for this operation.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 30 SC 30.3.2.1.3a P 31 L 20 # 382
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Missing indent.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert hanging indent so that LS-PATH wraps correctly
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1 P 33 L 8 # 22
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Typo: throug
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to through
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1 P 33 L 9 # 332
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 typo
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "throug" to "through"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 33 L 22 # 187
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Add note to registers to indicate they are also used for -V1 type PHYs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following, existing, registers in Table 45-3 (1.2309, 1.2310, 1.2314, 1.2315, 1.2316, 1.2317). Add a "b" superscript to the name.
 Add note "b" at the end of the table: This register also applies to all MultitG type -V1 PHYs.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.7.4 P 34 L 22 # 51
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Add row to table 45-9 for MultiGBASE-AT1, MultiGBASE-AV1 transmit fault description location 202.4.2.2
 SuggestedRemedy
 As per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.7.4 P 34 L 22 # 189
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Add transmit fault reference to Clause 192
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change Editor's note to to add: and insert a new row at the end of the table.
 Add new row at the end of the table: MultiGBASE-AT1, MultiGBASE-AV1 | 192.4.2.2.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.7.5 P 34 L 30 # 333
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 insert a space between "table" and "("
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "table(unchanged" to "table (unchanged"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.10 P 35 L 1 # 334
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 remove period
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "shown.)" to "shown)"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.10 P 35 L 9 # 95
 Huber, Thomas Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 In table 45-14, V1 is being added to the name, but this is not shown as a change
 SuggestedRemedy
 Underline the "/V1" in "Base-T1/V1 extended abilities"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.16 P 36 L 5 # 140
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 update Editor's instructions
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: and insert new row 3
 To: and insert new rows 3 and 4
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.16 P 36 L 14 # 96

Huber, Thomas Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

The editing instruction notes that the text of row 2 is to be changed relative to the base standard, as modified by 802.3cy, 802.3da, and 802.3dg. In 802.3dg, the reserved bits are 15:10 rather than 15:7. While the final text is correct, it may be confusing to readers to see bit 7 replcaed with bit 12 in the second row, but only bits 10 and 11 being added in the new rows.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the Bit(s) column in the second row to show a 10 in strikethrough rather than a 7, or include the rows defining bits 7-9 in the table as unchanged rows (in which case the rows being added for bits 10 and 11 should be underlined)

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.16 P 36 L 27 # 141

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 update Editor's instructions

SuggestedRemedy

Change: 45.2.1.16.aaaa
 To: 45.2.1.16.aaaa and 45.2.1.16.aaab

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.16 P 36 L 44 # 142

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 update Editor's instructions

SuggestedRemedy

Change: 45.2.1.60f
 To: 45.2.1.60f and subclauses and table 45-58f.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.60f P 36 L 44 # 97

Huber, Thomas Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

In the editing instruction, subclause 45.2.1.60e was added by 802.3dj rather than 802.3df.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 802.3df to 802.3dj

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.214 P 40 L 5 # 297

Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The instruction is to replace rows for bits 1.2100.13:4 and 1.2100.3:0 but the table is 1.2100.13:5 and 1.2100.4:0

SuggestedRemedy

Need to correct either the instruction or the table to reconcile the change

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.214 P 40 L 19 # 298

Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

visually, it looks like there is a space between the T and the 1 in MultiGBASE-AT1. I don't see a space when I select the text but visually it seems to be there.

SuggestedRemedy

check if there is a spece present between the T and the 1

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.244.1 P 40 L 51 # 184
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 missing register that needs to be updated for 191
 SuggestedRemedy
 Bring in this section from 802.3, as modified by 802.3cy and add references to 191.3.2.2.14, 191.5.2.4.5 and 191.5.2.5.4, with editorial license.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250 P 40 L 13 # 485
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 In most of 802.3, except for old 8B/10B style sections, we use Rx for receiver and Tx for transmitter. TX, as well as being part of 100BASE-TX, means Texas.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change RX to Rx and TX to Tx throughout the document except in names where ALL CAPs are used, such as RX_CLK.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.245.1 P 40 L 51 # 185
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 missing register that needs to be updated for 191
 SuggestedRemedy
 Bring in this section from 802.3, as modified by 802.3cy and add references to 191.3.2.2.14, 191.5.2.4.5 and 191.5.2.5.4, with editorial license.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250 P 44 L 43 # 261
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Typo error in the text associated with each of the 45.2.1.250c sub-clauses on pages 44-45.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In the text for each 45.2.1.1.250c.x sub-clause, change the register bit reference to be the same as in the sub-clause title rather than a reference back to Table 45-212a.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.246 P 40 L 51 # 186
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 missing register that needs to be updated for 191
 SuggestedRemedy
 Bring in this section from 802.3, as modified by 802.3cy and add appropriate references, with editorial license.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250 P 45 L 7 # 242
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Sub-clause 45.2.1.250c.4 title and text point to an incorrect register value
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 1.2318.8 to 1.2320.8
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250a P 41 L 6 # 98
 Huber, Thomas Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 802.3dj is already inserting table 45-212a in subclause 45.2.1.250
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change Table 45-212a to Table 45-212aa. Make the same change in the title of the table.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250a P 41 L 35 # 299
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 missing space in description column between 5 and Gb/s. Inconsistent with rest of table
 SuggestedRemedy
 add space between 5 Gb/s
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250a P 41 L 37 # 300
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 missing space in description column between 2.5 and Gb/s. Inconsistent with rest of table
 SuggestedRemedy
 add space between 2.5 Gb/s
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250b P 42 L 43 # 301
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 There's a mismatch somewhere here. The Table 45-212a is rate ability register definitions and 45-212b is rate negotiation definitions. I suspect either the title is wrong or the pointer is to the wrong table
 SuggestedRemedy
 refer to table 45-212b instead?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250b P 42 L 45 # 99
 Huber, Thomas Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The table for the PMA assignments should be 45-212ab rather than 45-212a
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change Table 45-212a to Table 45-212ab. Change the title of the table itself (on the following page) from 45-212b to 45-212ab.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250b.1 P 42 L 50 # 389
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Missing commas.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change, "When bits 1.2319:5:4 are 00 negotiation of the PHY_D transmit rate is in progress."
 to: "When bits 1.2319:5:4 are 00, negotiation of the PHY_D transmit rate is in progress."
 Grant Editorial license to review and correct this is all clause 45 bit clauses.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250b.2 P 43 L 25 # 302
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 incorrect bits and bit amount called out "When bits 1.2319:5:4" 000 when only 2-bits called out. Likely a typo carried forward from prior register text
 SuggestedRemedy
 should be "When bits 1.2319:3:1"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250c P 43 L 39 # 100
 Huber, Thomas Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The table should be 45-212ac
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change Table 45-212c to Table 45-212ac. Make the same change in the title of the table.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250b.2 P 43 L 43 # 390
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Numbers less than ten should be spelled out. Insert comma per another Maguire comment.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change, "When bit 1.2319.0 is 1 the LEADER..."
 to: "When bit 1.2319.0 is one, the LEADER...."
 Change, "When bit 1.2319.0 is 0 the LEADER..."
 to: "When bit 1.2319.zero, the LEADER...."
 Grant Editorial license to review and correct this is all clause 45 bit clauses.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250c.0 P 45 L 33 # 312
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 mismatch in title bit called out versus text
 SuggestedRemedy
 change bit 1.2318.0 to 1.2320.0, two instances
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250c.1 P 44 L 40 # 306
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 mismatch in title bit called out versus text
 SuggestedRemedy
 change bit 1.2318.15 to 1.2320.15, two instances
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250b.3 P 43 L 34 # 303
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 no period at end of sentence
 SuggestedRemedy
 PHY_S mode.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250c.1 P 44 L 42 # 101
 Huber, Thomas Nokia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 In this clause and all the other 45.2.1.250c.* clauses, the bit numbers should be 1.2320.x rather than 1.2318.x.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 1.2318 to 1.2320 in all 45.2.1.250c.x subclauses
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250c.2 P 44 L 48 # 307
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 mismatch in title bit called out versus text
 SuggestedRemedy
 change bit 1.2318.13 to 1.2320.13, two instances
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250c.6 P 45 L 21 # 310
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 mismatch in title bit called out versus text
 SuggestedRemedy
 change bit 1.2318.5 to 1.2320.5, two instances
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250c.3 P 45 L 3 # 308
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 mismatch in title bit called out versus text
 SuggestedRemedy
 change bit 1.2318.12 to 1.2320.12, two instances
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250c.7 P 45 L 27 # 311
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 mismatch in title bit called out versus text
 SuggestedRemedy
 change bit 1.2318.4 to 1.2320.4, two instances
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250c.4 P 45 L 7 # 313
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 wrong bits in title and body altogether
 SuggestedRemedy
 change bit 1.2318.8 to 1.2320.8, three instances
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3 P 45 L 38 # 188
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Add note to registers to indicate they are also used for -V1 type PHYs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Bring in Table 45-233.
 Add the following, existing, registers in Table 45-233 (3.2318 through 3.2319, 3.2320 through 3.2321, 3.2322, 3.2323, 3.2324). Add a "a" superscript to the name.
 Add note "a" at the end of the table: This register also applies to all MutltiG type -V1 PHYs.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250c.5 P 45 L 15 # 309
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 mismatch in title bit called out versus text
 SuggestedRemedy
 change bit 1.2318.7 to 1.2320.7, two instances
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.87.6 P 46 L 18 # 314
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Hyphenation: "six bit counter" → IEEE style usually prefers "six-bit counter"
 SuggestedRemedy
 make six-bit counter
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.5 P 46 L 26 # 448
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 PICS are missing for clause 45, 46, 98, 191, 192 (annex 98B doesn't have PICS)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add draft PICS for all clauses to IEEE 802.3dm from zimmerman_PICS_3dm_061326.pdf
 with editorial license, including license to add / change per comment resolution.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC table 45-212c P 44 L 24 # 304
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 missing space in description column between 5 and Gb/s. Inconsistent with rest of table
 SuggestedRemedy
 add space between 5 Gb/s
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC table 45-212c P 44 L 28 # 305
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 missing space in description column between 2.5 and Gb/s. Inconsistent with rest of table
 SuggestedRemedy
 add space between 2.5 Gb/s
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC Table 45-58f P 37 L 9 # 296
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Table 45–58f lists both MultiGBASE-AV1 and MultiGBASE-AT1 under bit 1.77.13, but the
 prose on pages 36–38 correctly puts AV1 at 1.77.13 and AT1 at 1.77.12.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change line 9 table entry for AT1 to Bit 1.77.12 and then maybe flip the order of the bits 13
 and 12.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.1 P 47 L 7 # 227
 Torres, Luisma KD
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The inclusion of asymmetric PHYs in the Overview is not clear. The first suggested addition
 at line 10 refers to the concept "Asymmetric PHYs" and the second one at line 11 refers to
 the inclusion (and not limiting to) asymmetric PHYs with one of these rates in one direction
 and 100 Mb/s in the reverse direction". A more clear rewording is needed, specially for the
 undefined "reverse" direction (is the "reverse direction" relative (and inverse) to the "one
 direction" or an absolute direction equivalent to the "parallel decoding" direction?). I suggest
 to use the "transmit and receive paths" concepts specified in 46.1.6.

SuggestedRemedy
 Reword the third paragraph of 46.1 as follows: "The RS adapts the bit serial protocol of the
 MAC to the parallel encodings of 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s symmetrical PHYs or to the
 parallel encodings of 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s asymmetrical PHYs in the transmit or
 receive path and 100 Mb/s in the other one. Though the XGMII is an optional interface, it is
 used extensively in this
 standard as a basis for specification. The 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s Physical Coding
 Sublayers (PCS), or the 100 Mb/s PCS in case of asymmetric PHYs, are specified to the
 XGMII, so if not implemented, a conforming implementation shall behave functionally as if
 the RS and XGMII were implemented."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 46 SC 46.1 P 47 L 10 # 23

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"The 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s (including asymmetric PHYs with one of these rates in one direction and 100 Mb/s in the reverse direction) Physical Coding Sublayers (PCS) are specified to the XGMII"

This amended sentence does not make sense. The original sentence was about the various PCSs and the XGMII being their interface. The added parenthetical text talks about asymmetric PHYs, not PCSs.

The original sentence is still correct for many existing PCSs and should not be made more complicated by the addition of the new PCSs defined in this project.

The suggested remedy points to the specific PCSs using their clause numbers, which would be an improvement.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the quoted sentence to read
 "The Physical Coding Sublayers (PCS) in Clause 127 (2.5BASE-X), Clause 179 (5GBASE-R), Clause 49 (10GBASE-R), Clause 191 (MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1), and Clause 192 (MultiGBASE-A) are specified to the XGMII".

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.1 P 47 L 16 # 24

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"It is capable of supporting at least one of the following rates of operation: 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, or 10 Gb/s (including asymmetric PHYs with one of these rates in one direction and 100 Mb/s in the reverse direction)."

This sentence is in the "characteristics" list in the introduction subclause 46.1 and as such is essentially informative. The addition of the parenthesized text is not necessary. The original sentence is correct as it stands - the XGMII is indeed capable of supporting one of these rates - at least in one direction. The change does not create a normative requirement so it can be removed.

Similarly for 46.1.1 item i.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the parenthesized text in item a and in item i of 46.1.1 (This would result in no change to these lists so the editing instructions can be removed).

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.1 P 47 L 19 # 228

Torres, Luisma KD

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

"Reverse direction" is not clear

SuggestedRemedy

Change "(including asymmetric PHYs with one of these rates in one direction and 100 Mb/s in the reverse direction)" to "(including asymmetric PHYs with one of these rates in the transmit or receive path and 100 Mb/s in the other path)."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.1.1 P 47 L 26 # 229

Torres, Luisma KD

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

"Reverse direction" is not clear

SuggestedRemedy

Change "(including asymmetric PHYs with one of these rates in one direction and 100 Mb/s in the reverse direction)" to "(including asymmetric PHYs with one of these rates in the transmit or receive path and 100 Mb/s in the other one)."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.1.3 P 47 L 42 # 486

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

"Symmetric operation at 10 Mb/s and 100 Mb/s is supported by the MII defined in Clause 22 and operation at 1000 Mb/s by the GMII defined in Clause 35": so what, this amendment is not about symmetric operation. Language.

SuggestedRemedy

Maybe something like this is meant: Asymmetric operation at 10 Mb/s and 100 Mb/s is defined for that direction by the MII of Clause 22 and similarly, operation at 1000 Mb/s is defined by the GMII of Clause 35." Add additional detail explaining how this works as necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 46 SC 46.1.3 P 47 L 43 # 230
 Torres, Luisma KD
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 "Direction" is not specifically defined, but derived from transmit and receive path.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "in at least one direction" to "in the transmit or received path"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 46 SC 46.1.3 P 47 L 43 # 93
 Kim, Yong General Motors
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 "A compliant device may implement any subset of these rates in at least one direction" with "in at least one direction" inserted as new text. The new text allows for new capability of having XGMII operating at two separate high-speed, which is not intended nor correct.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Just delete the new text. I think it works.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 46 SC 46.1.3 P 47 L 45 # 102
 Huber, Thomas Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 As written, the text talks about symmetric operation at 10/100M, and asymmetric operation at 2.5/5/10G, but never mentions symmetric operation at 2.5/5/10G (this is of course implied). It would be more clear to explicitly state that symmetric operation at 2.5G, 5G, and 10G is supported by the XGMII.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the last sentence of the paragraph with this:
 The XGMII supports symmetric operation with a MAC data rate of 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, or 10 Gb/s. The XGMII supports asymmetric operation with a MAC data rate of 100 MB/s in one direction and at least one of the specified multigigabit rates in the other direction.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 46 SC 46.1.3 P 47 L 45 # 487
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The XGMII supports a MAC data rate of 100 Mb/s in one direction, for asymmetric operation, when at least one of the specified multigigabit rates is used in the other direction.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The XGMII operates at a MAC rate of 100 Mb/s in one direction, for asymmetric operation, when at least one of the specified multigigabit rates is used in the other direction.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 46 SC 46.1.3 P 47 L 45 # 94
 Kim, Yong General Motors
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 "The XGMII supports a MAC data rate of 100 Mb/s in one direction, for asymmetric operation, when at least one of the specified multigigabit rates is used in the other direction." This new text does not flow well with previous sentences.
 SuggestedRemedy
 How about
 "Asymmetric operation at one of the specified multigigabit rates in one direction, XGMII supports a MAC data rate of 100 Mbps in the other direction."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 46 SC 46.1.3 P 47 L 45 # 231
 Torres, Luisma KD
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 "Direction" is not specifically defined, but derived from transmit and receive path. Asymmetry should appear before in the sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "The XGMII supports a MAC data rate of 100 Mb/s in one direction, for asymmetric operation, when at least one of the specified multigigabit rates is used in the other direction." to "The XGMII supports for asymmetric operation a MAC data rate of 100 Mb/s in the transmit or receive path and 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, or 10 Gb/s in the other path."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 46 SC 46.3.1.1 P 48 L 10 # 25

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"corresponding to the MAC's nominal transmit bit rate"

The MAC does not have a nominal transmit bit rate, nor a nominal receiver bit rate.

The MAC is formally defined as an bit-oriented entity that uses service interface primitives, without an associated data rate (there is no frequency parameter for the MAC); it is the choice of RS (and PHY below it) that governs the bit rate. (This is also an issue in the existing text - and it's a good time to fix it)

This project is modifying the specification of the RS such that it will have different bit rates in each direction (essentially creating new types of RS, asymmetric). The MAC is not modified and still does not have bit rates. So it's the RS bit rate in each direction that should be mentioned.

Similarly for RX_CLK in 46.3.2.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from

"f_MAC is the frequency (in Hz) corresponding to the MAC's nominal transmit bit rate"

to

"f_MAC is the frequency (in Hz) corresponding to the nominal MAC bit rate that the RS provides in the transmit direction (2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, 10 Gb/s, or 100 Mb/s)"

Make a similar change in 46.3.2.1 for the receive direction.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.3.1.1 P 48 L 10 # 409

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type T Comment Status X

If a 7.5 Gbps high-speed rate is added, the text regarding the RS TX_CLK and RX_CLK need to be specified without specifying a new MAC rate, and the use of a 10 Gbps MAC parameterization should be identified.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following new sentences (to shown in underline):

46.3.1.1 (at P48 L10, after the "transmit bit rate.") "When interfacing to a PHY with a 7.5 Gbps transmit bit rate, the TX_CLK frequency calculation shall use a 7.5 GHz in place of f_MAC, even though interfacing is to a MAC parameterized for 10 Gb/s as described in Table 4-2."

and, add to 46.3.2.1 (pat P48 L21, after "receive bit rate.")

"When interfacing to a PHY with a 7.5 Gbps receive bit rate, the RX_CLK frequency calculation shall use a 7.5 GHz in place of f_MAC, even though interfacing is to a MAC parameterized for 10 Gb/s as described in Table 4-2."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.3.1.1 P 48 L 10 # 232

Torres, Luisma KD

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

Use the "transmit path" definition as specified in 46.1.6

SuggestedRemedy

Change "MAC's nominal transmit bit rate" to "MAC's nominal transmit path bit rate".

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.3.1.1 P 48 L 11 # 115

Kim, Yong General Motors

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

The addition of the word "transmit" does not add to clarity. It's already clear. TXCLK is by definitoin transmit direction. There is, however, technical concern on how asymmetric MAC rates are defined. It's missing (see my comment on CL4.4.2 reference).

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the added word "transmit"

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 46 SC 46.3.1.1 P 48 L 21 # 233
 Torres, Luisma KD
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Use the "transmit path" definition as specified in 46.1.6
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "MAC's nominal receive bit rate" to "MAC's nominal receive path bit rate".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.3.2.1 P 48 L 16 # 315
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Reference to 46.3.1.1 should be 46.3.2.1
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to 46.3.2.1
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.3.2.1 P 48 L 18 # 116
 Kim, Yong General Motors
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 "it may be that of a nominal clock" of which "it may be that of a" is deleted as a change. I recall the original text to be permissible behavior, whereas with this deletion, it is not -- for other PHYs that use XGMII.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Unless the work was done to ensure all implementations prior to this project is not affected by this change, revert back this change. If the intended change is just for 802.3dm PHYs, text should be revised just for the CL191/2 PHY types.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.3.2.1 P 48 L 18 # 401
 Nicholl, Shawn AMD
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The revised text "the nominal clock (e.g., TX_CLK)" is more restrictive than the existing 802.3-2022 text. The revised text suggests (i.e. implies) that there is only one nominal clock. The existing 802.3-2022 text "a nominal clock (e.g., TX_CLK)" permits RX_CLK to use a nominal clock frequency that differs from the nominal frequency of TX_CLK.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Propose returning to the text ("a nominal clock") that exists in 802.3-2022. In other words, restore this text: "... received data or it may be that of a nominal clock (e.g., TX_CLK)."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.3.2.1 P 48 L 18 # 234
 Torres, Luisma KD
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 The suggested deletion implies losing the option to do not use the nominal clock
 SuggestedRemedy
 Revert the deletion to preserve flexibility
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 46 SC 46.6.3.1 P 49 L 7 # 26
 Ran, Adee Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The optional items in the PICS are intended to identify the feature set of a product. In the original PICS it was clear what G1, G2, and G3 mean. The proposed changes make it ambiguous: PHYs that use 100M in the Tx direction and PHYs that use 100M in the Rx direction will have the same set of PICs responses. There is a better way to define the features.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the new item G3a with three separate items:
 G3a - PHY uses 100 Mb/s in the transmit direction
 G3b - PHY uses 100 Mb/s in the receive direction
 G3c - PHY does not use 100 Mb/s in either direction
 Ther 3 should have status "PHY:O/1" so that one and only one of them has to be supported.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 98 SC 98 P 50 L 4 # 488
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 There is 73, Auto-Negotiation for backplane and copper cable assembly, which includes single-lane media. 73 precedes 98, so 98 cannot broaden its scope to "Auto-Negotiation for single-lane media"
 SuggestedRemedy
 If the distinction is that 98 is bidirectional and 73 is not, use that to choose a suitable title.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98 SC 98.1.1 P 50 L 15 # 1
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The original text included the words "single twisted pair", but it is amended to "single-lane media". This is an inappropriate name since there is another auto-negotiation function in clause 73 that also works on single-lane media, and there are other single-lane media (such as optical fibers) that do not use any form of auto-negotiation.
 Clause 98 was indeed written specifically for single twisted pair applications. The new name is too broad and will cause confusion for readers who are not familiar with all of the 802.3 PHYs.
 This change is pervasive in clause 98.
 SuggestedRemedy
 If the scope of this clause is to be extended to other media such as shielded balanced cables or unbalanced coaxial cables, the name can be changed to include these specific media. Alternatively, change the text such that it refers to the specific PHY types that use this clause, regardless of the media type.
 In the remainder of the clause, change "Single twisted pair Auto-negotiation" to "Auto-negotiation defined in this clause" or just delete it if appropriate. Do not use "single-lane".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98 SC 98.2.1.1.4 P 52 L 47 # 316
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 missing Ohm symbol
 SuggestedRemedy
 replace 100 / with 100 Ohm
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98 SC 98.2.1.1.4 P 52 L 48 # 317
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 typo 'within range'
 SuggestedRemedy
 replace 'within range' with 'within the range'
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98 SC 98.2.1.2.4 P 53 L 8 # 318
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Body is clearly Technology Ability Field (A[26:0])... — belongs in 98.2.1.2.4, not 98.2.1.1.4 (transmitter peak output).
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to 98.2.1.2.4
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 98 SC 98.2.4.2 P 53 L 0 # 209

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The base standard definition for Priority Resolution in Clause 98 appears to need some updating as well. I believe the resolution for Asymmertric is for not a single matching bit, but a pair of corresponding abilities where for example one side is 10G/100M (A16) and the other is 100M/10G (A15). If you hooked two devices that only advertised 10G/100M to each other they should fail to select a 10G/100M operation (which is a matching set of ability bits with both set A16).

SuggestedRemedy

In 98.2.4.2 change:
 "The single PHY enabled to connect to the MDI by Auto-Negotiation shall be the technology corresponding to the bit in the Technology Ability Field common to the local device and link partner that has the highest priority as defined in 98B.4 (listed from highest priority to lowest priority)."
 To:
 "The PHY enabled to connect to the MDI by Auto-Negotiation shall be the technology corresponding to the bit in the Technology Ability Field that has the highest priority as defined in 98B.4."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98 SC 98.5.1 P 53 L 46 # 41

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status X

This section contains a Note that redefines how priority resolution HCD is to work. This should be updated in 98.2.4.2 instead since that is where priority resolution is defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the text in 98.2.4.2 with changes shown in muma_d2d0_asymmetric_98_4_2_4.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98 SC 98.6.2.2 P 54 L 21 # 103

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status X

In the right-hand column of the table, Single Differential-Pair should be removed

SuggestedRemedy

Change Single Differential Pair to strike-through font

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98B SC 98B P 250 L 0 # 324

Simms, William NVIDIA

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The header is different than rest of document

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98B SC 98B P 251 L 0 # 325

Simms, William NVIDIA

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The header is different than rest of document

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98B SC 98B.3 P 250 L 14 # 18

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

There is an editorial instruction to change rows in the table, and then to replace the table.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the instruction "Replace Table 98B-1 as follows".

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98B SC 98B.3 P 250 L 17 # 110

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The table being modified is Table 98B-1 rather than 1b

SuggestedRemedy

in the title of the table, change Table 98B-1b to Table 98B-1

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 98B SC 98B.4 P 250 L 43 # 19

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

"Table 98B-2 shall indicate the relative priorities" - The table is a definition, not a normative requirement. The requirement it is to implement the resolution according to the table. But this is already stated in 98.2.4.2 and should not be repeated here.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Table 98B-2 indicates the relative priorities".

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98B SC 98B.4 P 251 L 38 # 211

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Table 93B-2 doesn't appear to be sustainable. Make the table be 3 columns which lists the Leader & Follower ability bits and what the Technology that maps to, using the order in the table as the priority.

SuggestedRemedy

Update 98B.4 to be as follows:

Since a local device and a link partner may have multiple abilities in common, a prioritization scheme exists to ensure that the highest common denominator ability is chosen. When the Leader PHY and Follower PHY both indicate the Technology Ability present in a given row of Table 98B-2, that is considered a common ability. Table 98B-2 specifies the relative priorities of the technologies supported by the IEEE 802.3 Selector Field value, the priorities are listed from highest to lowest.

Table 98B-2

| Leader | Follower | Technology |
|--------|----------|--|
| A6 | A6 | 25GBASE-T1, highest priority |
| A5 | A5 | 10GBASE-T1 |
| A15 | A16 | 100M+10GBASE-T1/V1 (L), 10G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (F) |
| A16 | A15 | 10G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (L), 100M+10GBASE-T1/V1 (F) |
| A4 | A4 | 5GBASE-T1 |
| A13 | A14 | 100M+5GBASE-T1/V1 (L), 5G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (F) |
| A14 | A13 | 5G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (L), 100M+5GBASE-T1/V1 (F) |
| A3 | A3 | 2.5GBASE-T1 |
| A13 | A14 | 100M+2.5GBASE-T1/V1 (L), 2.5G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (F) |
| A14 | A13 | 2.5G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (L), 100M+2.5GBASE-T1/V1 (F) |
| A2 | A2 | 1000BASE-T1 |
| A21 | A21 | 100BASE-T1L increased tx/rx |
| A10 | A10 | 100BASE-T1L standard tx/rx |
| A0 | A0 | 100BASE-T1 |
| A1 | A1 | 10BASE-T1S full duplex |
| A22 | A22 | 10BASE-T1S half duplex |
| A9 | A9 | 10BASE-T1L, lowest priority |

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 98B SC 98B.4 P 251 L 38 # 210

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Table 93B-2 doesn't appear to be sustainable. I think you can retain it as a dashed list.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 98B.4 with the following:
 Since a local device and a link partner may have multiple abilities in common, a prioritization scheme exists to ensure that the highest common denominator ability is chosen. For PHYs with asymmetric transmit and receive rates the proper combination of abilities is required to negotiate to that operating mode. The following list shall represent the relative priorities of the technologies supported by the IEEE 802.3 Selector Field value, where priorities are listed from highest to lowest and "(L)" stands for "Leader" and "(F)" for "Follower":

- 25GBASE-T1
- 10GBASE-T1
- 100M+10GBASE-T1/V1 (L) with 10G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (F)
- 10G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (L) with 100M+10GBASE-T1/V1 (F)
- 5GBASE-T1
- 100M+5GBASE-T1/V1 (L) with 5G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (F)
- 5G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (L) with 100M+5GBASE-T1/V1 (F)
- 2.5GBASE-T1
- 100M+2.5GBASE-T1/V1 (L) with 2.5G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (F)
- 2.5G+100MBASE-T1/V1 (L) with 100M+2.5GBASE-T1/V1 (F)
- 100BASE-T1
- 100BASE-T1L increased tx/rx
- 100BASE-T1L standard tx/rx
- 100BASE-T1
- 10BASE-T1S full duplex
- 10BASE-T1S half duplex
- 10BASE-T1L

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 98B SC 98B.4 P 251 L 41 # 218

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The NOTE indicates that "F" and "L" are be interpreted as Follower and Leader but the table uses them as "(F)" and "(L)". There are other L present in the definitions like T1L.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "L" to "(L)" and "F" to "(F)" in the NOTE.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191 P 56 L # 118

Kim, Yong General Motors

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Asymmetric PHYs operate with XGMII down to 100 Mbps MAC rate (for the low-speed path). There is no reference to 100 Mbps MAC rates (explicit or implicit reference to CL 4.4.2 MAC parameters).

SuggestedRemedy

If TF addressed this concern but not obvious to the reviewer, please help identify where it is addressed. And if it is addressed, whether CL4 or Annex 4A MAC is referenced.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191 P 56 L 4 # 452

RAJAGOPAL, KARTHIK TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INC

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The draft as looked at an IEEE standard to facilitate interoperability fails to offer a clear implementation guide with more than 1 type of implementation/standard to choose from. Sections 191 and 192 with their widely different PCS & PMA layers fails to fulfil the primary goal which is to be a standard. This would not qualify as standard if users are free to choose from multiple implementations which tries to achieve the same function.

SuggestedRemedy

Rather than letting users guess or arbitrarily choose 1 of the 2 types of PCS & PMA implementation, a technically superior implementation needs to be selected and made as a standard with clear guideline on the PCS and PMA layers. This way facilitates maximum interoperability, which is the only path for this draft to be considered as an IEEE standard

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191 P 56 L 4 # 2

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The title of clause 191 includes the list of PHYs covered, which is long. The same list repeats in the text of the clause as well as in other places in this draft. This is very disruptive to readers and does not add much value.

Since these PHYs have some common features and are distinct from others, it is adequate to give them a common nomenclature as a family of PHYs, following the example of MultiGBASE-A in this project, and other precedence, such as "BASE-R" and "BASE-T1" in the existing definitions.

I suspect that the new definition of 100M+MultiGBASE (1.4.46g) is suitable for some of these PHYs and MultiG+100MBASE (1.4.249a) covers the rest. The term "MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1" is mentioned in 191.1.1 as covering both, but has no definition in 1.4.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the family names 100M+MultiGBASE and MultiG+100MBASE to refer to all the PHYs in the respective family instead of listing all PHYs.

Add a definition of MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1 in 1.4. and use this family name in the title of clause 191 and to replace the long lists in clause 191 and elsewhere in the document (e.g. in 46.1.2).

Use the family names in 191.1 and refer to the definitions in 191.1.1.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191 P 56 L 5 # 281

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The repeated usage of "100M+2.5GBASE-T1, 2.5G+100MBASE-T1, 100M+5GBASE-T1, 5G+100MBASE-T1, 100M+10GBASE-T1, 10G+100MBASE-T1, 100M+2.5GBASE-V1, 2.5G+100MBASE-V1, 100M+5GBASE-V1, 5G+100MBASE-V1, 100M+10GBASE-V1, 10G+100MBASE-V" makes this hard to read.

Moving the definitions of MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1, MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-V1 and MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1 to the front of the introduction and using them in the clause heading and in the rest of "191.1 Overview", as well as in PICs sub-clauses will significantly improve readability

SuggestedRemedy

Please see changes in P8023dm_D2p0_pjones_introduction.docx attached to ballot submission.

Make the equivalent changes in:

- 191.15 title
- 191.15.1 first paragraph
- 191.15.2.2 - Identification of protocol standard text
- 191.15.4 title

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.1 P 56 L 15 # 117

Kim, Yong General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The list of PHY types is really long, and reader must follow carefully to understand slight differences. Normally we do not use PHY types in a table in the overview section. But this overview could use a table to help readers to make sense quickly.

SuggestedRemedy

Was going to suggest adding a table, by speed (HS and LS) and media type, but then found the Table 191-2. Consider moving and referencing Table 191-2 to the overview section and remove a long list of PHY types in the text. It may be clearer to split the Table 191-2 into two tables, one for balanced and one for single ended (easier to refernce from the overview clause).

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.1 P 56 L 31 # 3

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"The conductors supporting the operation of the 100M+2.5GBASE-T1, <...> are defined <...> allowing implementers to provide their own conductors <...> as long as the normative requirements included in 191.9 are met"

191.9 discusses link segments that are not just conductors but specifically "shielded balanced pair of conductors". The term "link segment" is also used in 191.1.

Similarly in the next paragraph which discusses -V1 PHYs.

Also possibly in clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

In the quoted sentence, change "conductors" to "link segments".

Make the same change in the paragraph about -V1.

Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.1 P 56 L 34 # 282

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The text "implementers to provide their own conductors" sounds wrong. Implementers always provide conductors; the standard does not.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "implementers to provide their own conductors" to "implementers to specify their own conductors".

Make the same change on page/line: 56/44.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.1 P 56 L 48 # 4

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

I assume that the PHY types defined in this clause interoperate only asymmetrically, e.g. 100M+2.5GBASE-T1 and 2.5G+100MBASE-T1 can be used to form a link, but not two PHYs of the same type.

This is a non-trivial property of these PHYs and should be mentioned in the overview. In fact I do not see it mentioned anywhere, except implicitly in 98B.4, which is unclear and not referenced from clause 191; and auto-negotiation is defined as optional.

Also possibly in clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

Add text in 191.1 and possibly elsewhere to describe the possible configurations of links using these PHYs.

Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.1 P 56 L 49 # 143

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status X

add new paragraph to define the type of transmission.

SuggestedRemedy

These PHYs continuously transmit in both directions concurrently, but at different baud rates. Unlike frequency division techniques, the PHYs have full spectral overlap in the two transmit directions, but utilize the relatively narrow bandwidth of the Low Data Rate (LDR) signal to enable separation without echo cancellation.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.1.1 P 57 L 42 # 5

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The nomenclature subclause is supposed to explain to the reader what the terms mean. The text here looks like instructions to the editors or contributors.

Also possibly in clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from
 "For all PHYs communicating on a shielded, balanced, pair of conductors, regardless of transmit bit rate, use: MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1"
 to
 "The term MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1 is used to refer to the PHYs in this clause that communicate on a shielded, balanced, pair of conductors, regardless of transmit bit rate".

Make similar changes to the text describing the other terms.

Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.1.1 P 57 L 43 # 104

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The wording for the aggregate terminology below the figure is a bit awkward: "For all PHYs communicating on a shielded, balanced, pair of conductors, regardless of transmit bit rate, use:", etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the definitions below the figure. Add these to the list of nomenclature that is above the figure:
 MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1 Refers to all PHYs communicating on a shielded, balanced, pair of conductors, regardless of bit rate
 MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-V1 Refers to all PHYs communicating on a coaxial cable, regardless of bit rate
 MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1 Refers to all PHYs regardless of cable type or bit rate

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.1.1 P 58 L 1 # 105

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status X

"PHY's transmit bit rate" is unnecessarily personifying the PHY

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "transmit bit rate of the PHY"

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.1.2 P 59 L 14 # 77

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Both stacks in figure 191-2 include a "PMD" box. But these PHYs do not have a PMD sublayer (based on the clause title and lack of a PMD subclause). The -T1 and -V1 are PHYs for different media, and the differences are in the MDI (191.5.2.10 and 191.5.2.11).

There are other mentions of "PMD" in 191.1.3.3 and 191.11.2.1, and in the PICS.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the PMD boxes and legend item from the figure.
 Delete other mentions of PMD from the clause.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.1.2 P 59 L 15 # 78

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The right side of Figure 191-2 shows the -V1 stack with an AN block, referred to as optional, and the text above the figure points to clause 98 for the whole family (including -V1). Also in 191.1.3 AN is mentioned for both T1 and V1, and there are numerous other mentions of AN in the clause.

However, in 191.8.1 it is stated that -V1 PHYs do not support AN.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the AN block from the right-hand stack and delete the -V1 family from references to AN.
 Consider how to clarify that AN is not supported (even as an option) in -V1, in the other mentions of AN.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.1.3 P 59 L 33 # 145
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 improve wording
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: receives at a 100 Mb/s bit rate
 To: receives at a bit rate of 100 Mb/s
 Also P59L35.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.2.2 P 146 L 47 # 161
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The frequency range for PSAACRF should be modified to match the rest of this subclause.
 SuggestedRemedy
 At the end of the sentence add the following:
 where f is the frquency in MHz; $3 \leq f \leq 4000$
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.1.3 P 61 L 24 # 454
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Subclause 191.5.2.8.1 'State diagram variables' says sync_link_control is a variable that indicates the data source for the PMA Transmit function. Further, subclause 191.5.2.2 'PMA Transmit function' says, 'During Link Synchronization, when sync_link_control = DISABLE and Auto-Negotiation is either not enabled or is not implemented, the sync_tx_symb output by the PHY Link Synchronization function shall be used in place of tx_symb as the data source for PMA Transmit.'
 Based on this, the output of the PMA TRANSMIT block is controlled by sync_link_control, yet Figures 191-3 'PHY_S functional block diagram', 191-4 'PHY_D functional block diagram', and 191-25 'PMA reference diagram' do not show sync_link_control connected to the PMA TRANSMIT block.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add sync_link_control as a connection to the PMA TRANSMIT block in Figures 191-3, 191-4 and 191-25.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.2.2.1.1 P 70 L 8 # 380
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 It's unclear what "in case" means here... Do we mean "if transmission of..."? Or, "when transmission of..."?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "...in case transmission of..." with "...when transmission of..." in the following six locations:
 P70, L8
 P70, L10
 P119, L15
 P125, L11
 P167, L11
 P167, L14
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.2.1 P 146 L 43 # 160
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The frequency range for PSANEXT should be modified to match the rest of this subclause.
 SuggestedRemedy
 At the end of the sentence add the following:
 where f is the frquency in MHz; $3 \leq f \leq 4000$
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.2.2.2 P 70 L 25 # 79
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "Clause 98" is formatted as external reference but exists in the draft.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make it an active xref.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.2.2.4.2 P 72 L 5 # 320
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 should we be using MHz or MBd?
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to MBd if desired
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.2.2.5.3 P 72 L 37 # 319
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 should LS_RX point to 191.5.2.5?
 SuggestedRemedy
 change LS_RX point to 191.5.2.3
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.2.2.9.1 P 74 L 4 # 321
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Other sections titled 'Semantics of the primitive' go on to name features or further define things. This one seems to be missing. Is it intentional?
 SuggestedRemedy
 add definitions of primitive if desired
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.2.2.9.1 P 74 L 4 # 455
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The semantics of the PMA_PCSDATAMODE.indication primitive are missing a definition of the pcs_data_mode parameter.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the text:
 The pcs_data_mode parameter can take on one of two values of the form:
 TRUE The PCS is transmitting and receiving data from the XGMII.
 FALSE The PCS is in a training or test mode.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2 P 74 L 26 # 146
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 improve wording and add OAM
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: The PCS comprises one PCS Reset function and two simultaneous and asynchronous operating functions, one of which is the HS_PATH and the other is the LS_PATH. This subclause discusses the HS_PATH. The HS_PATH PCS operating functions are the HS_TX PCS Transmit in the PHY_S device, and the HS_RX PCS Receive in the PHY_D device.
 To: The HS_PATH PCS comprises the following functions: PCS Reset, HS_TX PCS Transmit in the PHY_S device, HS_RX PCS Receive in the PHY_D device, and an optional PCS OAM. The PCS Transmit and PCS Receive functions execute simultaneously and asynchronously.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.1 P76 L5 # 422
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 There is only one PCS reset - there isn't a 'low speed reset' and a 'high speed reset'. The text should reflect this.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert the following after "PCS Reset initializes all PCS functions." (P76 L4) "This means that there is only one PCS Reset, resetting both the low speed and high speed paths."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P76 L20 # 402
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The 65B/65B state diagram is not Figure 191-9 or 191-10 - those are the block diagrams and are not required. Figure 191-18 is the 64B/65B state diagram and should be required at this point in the text.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the first paragraph of 191.3.2.2 to read:
 The PCS Transmit function shall conform to the PCS 64B/65B Transmit state diagram in Figure 191-18.
 The PCS Transmit bit ordering shall conform to Figure 191-11 for a 10G+100MBASE-T1/V1 PHY. For a 5G+100MBASE-T1/V1 or a 2.5GBASE-T1/V1 PHY, the PCS Transmit bit ordering shall conform to Figure 191-12.
 Adjust PICS appropriately if added by another comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P76 L34 # 6
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "L-interleaved RS-FEC which adds $L \times 340$ parity bits."
 L is used here before it is defined (although it can be inferred). The reader has to read into the next page to find the definition "L is called the interleaving depth, and the possible choices of L are 1, 2, and 4" (P77 L19). And prior to that there is another usage of this parameter "L-interleaved (L = 1, 2, or 4)" (P77 L8).
 Also possibly in clause 192.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Edit to define the parameter L first and then use it.
 Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P76 L35 # 42
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 L35-37 and L39-41 are saying nearly the same thing in 2 slightly different ways. Combine to remove repetition.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Combine L35-41 as: These bits are then mapped, two at a time, into a PAM4 symbol for 10G and one at a time into a PAM2 symbol for 2.5G and 5G. In each symbol period transmit data-units are sent to the PMA service interface via the PMA_UNITDATA.request primitive. The symbol period, T, is $1000 / (5.625 \times S)$ ps. See Table 201-1 for the definition of S.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 77 L 17 # 289

van Dyck, Peter Infineon

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Missing distinction between 2.5/5G and 10G regarding PAM2/PAM4 usage during data mode.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:
The bits of the RS-FEC superframe are then scrambled by the PCS using an additive PCS scrambler, encoded in PAM4 symbols, and transferred to the PMA.

With:
The bits of the RS-FEC superframe are then scrambled by the PCS using an additive PCS scrambler, encoded in PAM4 symbols in 10G and PAM2 symbols in 2.5G/5G, and transferred to the PMA.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 77 L 19 # 7

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

"The interleaver settings requested in each direction of transmission may be different"

But this subclause describes the HS_PATH which has only one direction. The LS_PATH seems to have no interleaving.

Also possibly in clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify or delete this sentence.

Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 77 L 30 # 493

Cheng, Xiaoyue Infineon

Comment Type E Comment Status X

HS_PATH 10G encoding is expected to be consistent with MGBT1, but Figure 191-9 shows DS_n[0] XOR with D_n[1] and DS_n[1] XOR with D_n[0]

SuggestedRemedy

swap D_n[1] and D_n[0] so that DS_n[0] XOR with D_n[0], and DS_n[1] XOR with D_n[1]

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 77 L 30 # 124

de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

In figure Figure 191-9, the bits D_n[0] and D_n[1] are reversed. D_n[0] should be XORed with DS_n[0] and D_n[1] should be XORed with DS_n[1], at least according to Clause 149.

SuggestedRemedy

Please correct figure 191-9.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 77 L 31 # 405

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Figure 191-9 incorrectly has D_n[1] xored with DS_n[0] and D_n[0] xored with DS_n[1]. According to 149.3.2.2.18, which is referenced in by 191.3.2.2.17, it should be the other way around (0 with 0 and 1 with 1). (note that DS_n[0] and DS_n[1] appear to be formed correctly)

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 191-9, change D_n[0] to D_n[1] and D_n[1] to D_n[0]

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 77 L 32 # 43
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Dn[0] and Dn[1] are reversed from the explanation in 149.3.2.2.18
 SuggestedRemedy
 In Figure 201-9 swap Dn[0] and Dn[1].
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 79 L 31 # 285
 van Dyck, Peter Infineon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Figure 191-11: For 10G, a RS-FEC superframe always has L x 1800 PAM4 symbols. A Training frame always has 7200 PAM2 symbols. The training frame symbols match the data path symbols for a case with L=4
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace:
 RS-FEC superframe (L x 1800 x u symbols)
 With:
 RS-FEC superframe (L x 1800 symbols) / Training Frame (u x 1800 symbols)
 Replace:
 For PAM2 path, V=2 and u=2
 With:
 For PAM2 path, V=2 and u=4
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 80 L 29 # 286
 van Dyck, Peter Infineon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Figure 191-12: For 2.5G and 5G, a RS-FEC superframe always has L x 3600 PAM2 symbols. A Training frame always has 7200 PAM2 symbols. The training frame symbols match the data path symbols for a case with L=2
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace:
 RS-FEC superframe (L x 1800 x u symbols)
 With:
 RS-FEC superframe (L x 3600 symbols) / Training Frame (7200 symbols)
 Replace:
 For PAM2 path, V=2 and u=2
 With:
 For RS-FEC Frame u=1. For Training Frame u=2.
 Replace:
 PAMVu x 1800-1
 With:
 PAM2u x 3600-1
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 81 L 43 # 287
 van Dyck, Peter Infineon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Figure 191-13: Same as comment for Figure 191-11
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace:
 For PAM2 path, V=2 and u=2
 With:
 For PAM2 path, V=2 and u=4
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 82 L 43 # 288

van Dyck, Peter Infineon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

Figure 191-14: Same as comment for Figure 191-12

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:
 For PAM2 path, V=2 and u=2. For PAM4 path, V=4 and u=1.
 With:
 For RS-FEC Frame u=1. For Training Frame u=2.

Replace:
 rx_PAMVn+(u x 1800-1)
 With:
 rx_PAM2n+(u x 3600-1)

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.1 P 78 L 22 # 424

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

Use of blocks, notation, structure, control codes and encodings of control characters is identical for low speed and high speed.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "The use of blocks, notation, block structure, control codes, and encoding of ordered sets, idle, start, terminate, and error characters is identical for the high speed path as for the low speed path." at P78 L29 as a new last paragraph to 191.3.2.2.1.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.3 P 78 L 43 # 363

Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X

It refers to 149.3.2.2.3. But 149.3.2.2.3 includes Figure 149-7 "PCS Receive bit Ordering" which is not applicable to Clause 191

SuggestedRemedy

Copy the text from 149.3.2.2.3 to this Sub-clause and replace Figure 149-7 with Figures 191-13 and 191-14

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.4 P 78 L 47 # 364

Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X

The referenced 149.3.2.2.4 includes the following text "The format of the blocks for MultiGBASE-T1 is as shown in Figure 149-8". However MultiGBASE-T1 is not defined for Clause 191 and it should also apply to V1

SuggestedRemedy

Add "With MultiGBASE-T1 replaced with MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1."
 Alternatively update Clause 149.3.2.2.4 to include "MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1".

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.5 P 78 L 50 # 410

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status X

149.3.2.2.5 has requirements in it - these need to be called out with a shall.

SuggestedRemedy

Either bring in the text of 149.3.2.2.5 or, change "See 149.3.2.2.5" to "Control codes shall be encoded as specified in 149.3.2.2.5." add PICS to PCT section, copying PICS PCT8 in Clause 149.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.5 P 78 L 51 # 365

Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X

The referenced 149.3.2.2.5 includes the following text "2.5G/5G/10GBASE-T1" which is not relevant for clause 191

SuggestedRemedy

Add "With 2.5G/5G/10GBASE-T1 replaced with MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1."
 Alternatively update Clause 149.3.2.2.5 to include "MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1".

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.5 P 79 L 1 # 123

de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status X

In figure 191-11, only L=1 is shown (just like in clause 149) . Rather than having to refer to the full explanation of the superframe and interleave depth in clause 149 (where it is still somewhat cryptic), an illustration of how the RS-FEC frames are interleaved into a superframe would be helpful, and would fit well into this diagram.

Same comment for figures 191-13, 192-6, and 192-13

SuggestedRemedy

In figure 191-11 (and similar HS PCS bit ordering diagrams), consider showing the figure with interleave depth L=2 or L=4.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.5 P 79 L 38 # 361

Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

Figure 191-11 is at the wrong Sub-Clause

SuggestedRemedy

Move to 191.3.2.2.2 line 40

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.7 P 79 L 47 # 411

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type E Comment Status X

149.3.2.2.7 has requirements in it - these need to be called out with a shall.

SuggestedRemedy

Either bring in the text of 149.3.2.2.7 or, change "See 149.3.2.2.7" to "Idles shall be encoded as specified in 149.3.2.2.7." add PICS to PCT section, copying PICS PCT9, 10 & 11 in Clause 149.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.8 P 80 L 35 # 45

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X

There is no PAM4 path shown in this figure.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace V with 2, and u with 2 and simplify math in Figure 201-14, remove Note 3.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.8 P 80 L 37 # 362

Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

Figure 191-12 is at the wrong Sub-clause

SuggestedRemedy

Move to 191.3.2.2.2 after Figure 191-11 from previous comment

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.11 P 80 L 46 # 412

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type E Comment Status X

149.3.2.2.11 has requirements in it - these need to be called out with a shall.

SuggestedRemedy

Either bring in the text of 149.3.2.2.11 or, change "See 149.3.2.2.11" to "Idles shall be encoded as specified in 149.3.2.2.11." add PICS to PCT section, copying PICS PCT14 in Clause 149

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.11 P 80 L 51 # 366
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 The referenced Sub-clause 149.3.2.2.12 is referring to definitions of R_BLOCK_TYPE and T_BLOCK_TYPE in 149.3.7.2.4. It is better to use the definition in 191.3.5.1.4
 SuggestedRemedy
 Copy the text from 149.3.2.12 to line 51 and replace 149.3.7.2.4 with 191.3.5.1.4
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.12 P 82 L 1 # 122
 de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Placement of figure 191-13 and 191-14 - the receive bit ordering diagrams - is within the transmit function section. Very confusing.
 SuggestedRemedy
 please move figures 191-13 and 191-14 to the receive function section.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.12 P 82 L 43 # 44
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 There is no PAM4 path shown in this figure.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace V with 2, and u with 2 and simplify math in Figure 201-14, remove Note 3.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.14 P 83 L 24 # 413
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 149.3.2.2.15 has requirements in it - these need to be called out with a shall.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either bring in the text of 149.3.2.2.15 or, change "See 149.3.2.2.15" to "RS-FEC superframes shall be interleaved as specified in 149.3.2.2.15." add PICS to PCT section, copying PICS PCT16, 17, and 18 in Clause 149
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.14 P 83 L 24 # 367
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 The referenced Sub-clause 149.3.2.2.15 is referencing the InterleaverDepth from 149.4.2.4.5 where only 1 PHY Capability bits is specified. For Clause 191 there are 2 PHY capabilities one for the HS_PATH one for the LS_PATH. The Sub-clause also mentions specific PHYs for 802.3ch which are not relevant to Clause 191
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace line 24 with text from 149.3.2.2.15 and replace the reference 149.4.2.4.5 with 191.5.2.4.5. And replace the 3 listed .3ch PHYs with the corresponding Clause 191 PHYs.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.14 P 83 L 24 # 147
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Reference to 149.3.2.2.15 needs to be replaced with text to refer to specific Clause 191 requirements.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Copy in text from 149.3.2.2.15 replacing 149.4.2.4.5 with 191.5.2.4.5.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.17 P 83 L 35 # 406
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The text of 149.3.2.2.18 references the scrambler in clause 149 which is different from clause 191, creating an error. Either the text needs to be brought in, with the reference to 149.3.4 changed to 191.3.2.2.19, or the text needs to note the change of scrambler.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either: bring in the text of 149.3.2.2.18, changing the reference to 149.3.4 to 191.3.2.2.19
 OR
 Change the text of 191.3.2.2.17 to "As specified in 149.3.2.2.18, with the exception that the scrambler defined in 191.3.2.2.19 is used in place of the scrambler in 149.3.4".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.18 P 83 L 44 # 322
 Simms, William NVIDIA
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 All incoming PAM2 path HS_RX'. Is this a typo? I thought we are in the HS_TX section
 SuggestedRemedy
 fix if typo confirmed
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.18 P 83 L 44 # 290
 van Dyck, Peter Infineon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Figure 191-10 shows Dn not Dn[0].
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace:
 All incoming PAM2 path HS_RX (5 Gb/s and 2.5 Gb/s) data bits are Dn, which are represented in Figure 191-10 as Dn[0].
 With:
 All incoming PAM2 path HS_RX (5 Gb/s and 2.5 Gb/s) data bits are Dn, as shown in Figure 191-10.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.19 P 84 L 3 # 377
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 PHY_S PCS Transmit includes both the HS and LS transmit paths. It could be misleading
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "PHY_S" with "PHY_S HS_TX" 2 times on line 3 and 1 time on line 4
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.2.19 P 84 L 9 # 80
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 "An implementation of side-stream scramblers by linear-feedback shift registers is shown in Figure 149-11"
 Figure 149-11 shows two scramblers and uses the labels MASTER and SLAVE to distinguish them. But these terms are not used in 802.3dm.
 If a reference to content in clause 149 is used, it should state which one is used. Based on equation 191-2, which has the same polynomial as equation 149-6, it is the "MASTER" one
 Also in 191.4.2.2.16, but there it is the MASTER polynomial.
 The suggested remedy is to point back to the respective polynomial equations in clause 149. Alternatively the equations can be retained, but the reference to figure 149-11 should be specific.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the first paragraph of 191.3.2.2.19, equation 191-2, and the quoted sentence by the following:
 "The PHY_S PCS Transmit function shall employ side-stream scrambling using the generator polynomial specified in Equation (149-6) for both LEADER and FOLLOWER PHY configurations. An implementation of the side-stream scrambler by a linear-feedback shift register is shown in the bottom part of Figure 149-11 (labeled SLAVE PHY)."
 Implement corresponding changes in 191.4.2.2.16 (using equation 149-5 and MASTER PHY).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2.19 P 84 L 10 # 378

Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The referenced Figure 149-11 depicts 2 scrambler and talks about MASTER and SLAVE PHY Transmit. In Clause 191 only the bottom figure would apply and is valid for both LEADER and FOLLOWER.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a new Figure with the content of the bottom of Figure 149-11 without the text

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2.20 P 84 L 21 # 414

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type E Comment Status X

149.3.2.2.19 has requirements in it - these need to be called out with a shall. The text also does not appropriately call out that PAM4 is only used for 10 Gb/s transmission.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "See 149.3.2.2.19" to "For 10 Gb/s transmit rate, bit pairs shall be gray-mapped for PAM4 encoding as specified in 149.3.2.2.19." add PICS to PCT section, copying PICS PCT19 in Clause 149, with status 10 Gb/s * PHY_S: M

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2.21 P 84 L 25 # 415

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type E Comment Status X

149.3.2.2.20 has requirements in it - these need to be called out with a shall. The text also does not appropriately call out that PAM4 is only used for 10 Gb/s transmission.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "See 149.3.2.2.20" to "For 10 Gb/s transmit rate, gray-coded PAM4 symbols shall be precoded as specified in 149.3.2.2.20" add PICS to PCT section, copying PICS PCT20 in Clause 149, with status 10 Gb/s * PHY_S: M

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2.21 P 84 L 26 # 379

Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

The referenced Sub-clause 149.3.2.2.20 refers to the Infocfield messages in 149.4.2.4.5 which should actually refer to 191.5.2.4.5. This is used to select the precoder in 45.2.1.246.3. But I'm not sure if this register is also applicable for Clause 191. And It talks about EEE which is not applicable.

SuggestedRemedy

Add: "EEE not supported by MutltiG+100MBASE-T1/V1 and 100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1 PHYs, The value of precoder_type shall be set to the value of PrecodeSel received from the link partner in the Infocfield messages (see 191.5.2.4.5."

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2.22 P 84 L 29 # 416

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type E Comment Status X

149.3.2.2.21 has requirements in it - these need to be called out with a shall. The text also does not appropriately call out that PAM4 is only used for 10 Gb/s transmission.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "See 149.3.2.2.21" to "For 10 Gb/s transmit rate, precoded PAM4 symbols shall be encoded as specified in 149.3.2.2.21" add PICS to PCT section, copying PICS PCT21 in Clause 149, with status 10 Gb/s * PHY_S: M

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.3 P 85 L 7 # 456

Law, David HPE

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Figure 191-17 'RFER monitor state diagram' uses the block_lock as an open arrow entry condition to the RFER_MT_INIT state, with subclause 191.3.5.1.2 'Variables' defining block_lock as a 'Boolean variable ...'. Further, subclause 191.3.6.1 'Status' says the block_lock bit 'Indicates the state of the block_lock variable.'. Subclause 191.4.2.3 and 191.3.2.3 'PCS Receive function', however, describe when the 'block_lock flag is de-asserted' and when the '... block_lock flag is re-asserted ...'.

SuggestedRemedy

Either change all instances of '... block_lock flag ...' to '... block_lock variable ...' or to just '... block_lock ...', as is used elsewhere in both subclauses 191.3.2.3 and 191.4.2.3.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.3 P 85 L 15 # 125

de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

How to synchronize the Rx descrambler state to that of the Tx (during training frames) is not spelled out.

"During PMA training mode, PCS Receive checks the received PAM2 framing and indicates the reliable acquisition of the PCS descrambler state by setting the scr_status parameter of the PMA_SCRSTATUS.request primitive to OK."

What does "reliable" mean?? how reliable is reliable enough? Needs a definition!

This is likely the same language and verbosity as similar clauses, but it would be beneficial for the standard to have a well-defined scrambler-state synchronization method.

Same comment for 192.3.2.3

SuggestedRemedy

consider adding an explicit method (state machine) for the scrambler state sync.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.3.1 P 85 L 40 # 407

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type E Comment Status X

the receiver concatenates indications, not requests. The same error is made on lines 40 and 46

SuggestedRemedy

replace "concatenating requests" with "concatenating indications" on P85 L40 and 46

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.3.1 P 85 L 46 # 323

Simms, William NVIDIA

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

incorrect figure reference 191-13

SuggestedRemedy

I think it should point to 191-14 for PAM2

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.3.1 P 85 L 46 # 294

van Dyck, Peter Infineon

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Reference to wrong Figure

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:
see Figure 191-13

With:
see Figure 191-14

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.2.3.3 P 86 L 16 # 276

Jonsson, Ragnar Infineon

Comment Type E Comment Status X

There should be a SHALL statement in "The R_BLOCK_TYPE of an invalid block is set to E."

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The R_BLOCK_TYPE of an invalid block shall be set to E."

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.3.3 P 86 L 21 # 417

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type T Comment Status X

149.3.3 Test pattern generators has requirements in it. Further, those requirements relate to the bit ordering figures in clause 149, which are only valid for 10 Gb/s and not for 2.5 Gb/s and 5 Gb/s. This section needs reworking to be simpler - better to bring it in.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "As specified in 149.3.3." with
 "The test-pattern generator mode is provided for enabling joint testing of the local transmitter, the channel, and remote receiver. When the transmit PCS is operating in test-pattern mode it shall transmit continuously according to the appropriate rate's transmit bit ordering diagram (Figure 191-11 or Figure 191-12), with the input to the RS-FEC encoder set to zero and the initial condition of the scrambler set to any non-zero value. This has the same effect as setting the input to the scrambler to zero.
 When the receiver PCS is operating in test-pattern mode it shall receive continuously according to the appropriate rate's receive bit ordering diagram (Figure 191-13 or Figure 191-14). The output of the received descrambled values should be zero. Any nonzero values correspond to receiver bit errors. The output of the RS-FEC decoder should also be zero; however, there is the possibility that the RS-FEC decoder corrected some errors. This mode is further described as test mode 7 in 191.1.6."
 Insert PICS duplicating PICS TPG1, with status PHY_S: M, and TPG2, with status PHY_D: M.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.5.1.2 P 88 L 33 # 457

Law, David HPE

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Since subclause 191.3.2.3 'PCS Receive function' says that 'The PCS Synchronization process sets the block_lock flag to indicate whether the PCS has obtained synchronization.', suggest that subclause 191.3.5.1.2 'Variables' description of the block_lock variable reference the PCS Synchronization process.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the text 'Boolean variable that is set TRUE when receiver acquires block delineation.' be updated to read 'Boolean variable that is set TRUE by the PCS Synchronization process when it acquires block delineation.'

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.5.1.3 P 88 L 25 # 214

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

rfer_timer_done is not used anywhere and automatically exists per 14.2.3.2

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "When the timer reaches its terminal count, rfer_timer_done = TRUE."

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.5.1.3 P 88 L 25 # 216

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

rfer_timer is not used within Clause 191, why is it here?

SuggestedRemedy

Move rfer_timer to Clause 192.3.5.x

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.5.1.3 P 88 L 25 # 215

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Timers have a duration, not a trigger. It appears you want to have a timer that continuously restarts over and over again.

SuggestedRemedy

Update the timer to be defined as "Timer with a duration of 125us/ 4*S + 1%, -25%. Upon completion of the timer duration the timer is immediately restarted. See Table 191-1 for the definition of S."

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.3.5.1.3 P 89 L 22 # 52
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 rfer_timer is the only timer defined and is never used, so the Timers section and subsections can be deleted.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete section 191.3.5.1.3 and rfer_timer definition.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.5.1.4 P 89 L 35 # 418
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Duplicate shall - the entire state diagram of figure 191-18 is required, having a shall only on the DECODE and ENCODE functions is duplicative.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "shall decode" to "decodes" at P89 L35 (DECODE description)
 Change "shall encode" to "encodes" at P89 L40 (ENCODE description)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.5.2 P 94 L 1 # 419
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Text should refer to the actual diagrams. Additionally, the 64B/65B state diagrams are required elsewhere in the text - Figure 191-19 is already there and Figure 191-18's requirement earlier is subject to an earlier comment of mine. These other two figures are described in the previous paragraphs so are unnecessary.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "The PCS shall perform the functions of RFER monitor, Transmit, and Receive as specified in these state diagrams."
 To "The PCS shall monitor for errors in the RS-FEC decoding as specified in Figure 191-17."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.5.2 P 94 L 31 # 458
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Move the transition condition 'R_TYPE(rx_coded) = T * R_TYPE_NEXT = (S + C)' to the right so it is clear that it is associated with the RX_D to RX_T transition in Figure 191-19 'PCS 64B/65B Receive state diagram'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.5.2 P 94 L 36 # 459
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Move the transition condition 'R_TYPE(rx_coded) = T * R_TYPE_NEXT = (S + C)' to the right so it is clear that it is associated with the RX_E to RX_T transition in Figure 191-19 'PCS 64B/65B Receive state diagram'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.3.6.1 P 95 L 8 # 212
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Appears the pcs_status is considered a boolean variable. That should be indicated.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert "Boolean variable that" as the first words of the definition for pcs_status
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.3.6.1 P 95 L 14 # 213

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Seems like this section is specifying what PCS variables are to definitively be made available to management entities. Along with their mapping to MDIO register bits. For block_lock and hi_rfer these are named the same as the state diagram variables and this text implies they're identical including the names. So aren't they really the state diagram variables?

SuggestedRemedy

Change the first sentence of block_lock definition to be: The state diagram variable block_lock (see 191.3.5.1.2).

Change the first sentence of hi_rfer definition to be: The state diagram variable hi_rfer (see 191.3.5.1.2).

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.7 P 95 L 38 # 148

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status X

improve wording

SuggestedRemedy

Change: exchanging PHY link health status and message exchange.

To: exchanging PHY link health status and messages.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.7 P 95 L 38 # 421

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The OAM behavior in 149.3.9 (including state diagrams Figure 149-24 and Figure 149-25) are not pulled in as requirements. They should be.

SuggestedRemedy

Change P95 L38 from "behavior is defined in 149.3.9" to "behavior shall be as defined in 149.3.9" add PICS as appropriate (see PICS comment)

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.3.7.2 P 96 L 1 # 420

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The OAM functions in 149.3.9.2 are not pulled in with requirement language. Further, the exceptions, are not only in 191.3.7.2.1, but are also in .2 (PHY Health) and .3 (PHY health indicator).

After requiring 191.3.7.2.1, there will be duplicate shalls...

SuggestedRemedy

Change 191.3.7.2 to from : "MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1 OAM functions are the same as those defined for a MultiGBASE-T1 PHY in 149.3.9.2 with the exception that the MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1 OAM frame structure, PHY health, and PHY health indicator are defined in 191.3.7.2.1."

to: "MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1 OAM functions shall be as defined for a MultiGBASE-T1 PHY in 149.3.9.2 with the exception that the MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1 OAM frame structure, PHY health, and PHY health indicator are defined in 191.3.7.2.1, 191.3.7.2.2, and 191.3.7.2.3, respectively."

Add pics reflecting sections of 149 and 191.3.7.2.2

Change "the first symbol (OAM<0>) shall be" to "the first symbol (OAM<0>) is" at P96 L21 (4th para 191.3.7.2.1)

Change "10-bit OAM field shall be set to all 0's" to "10-bit OAM field is set to all 0's." at P96 L31 (last para 191.3.7.2.1)

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.4.1 P 97 L 15 # 8

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"The XGMII is running at 1/100th the rate of 10 Gb/s, 1/50th the rate of 5 Gb/s, and 1/25th the rate of 2.5 Gb/s"

This is a convoluted way of stating a simple thing.

Also possibly in clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The XGMII runs at 100 Mb/s".

Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.4.2 P97 L 22 # 149

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type T Comment Status X

improve wording and add OAM

SuggestedRemedy

Change: The LS_PATH PCS operating functions are the LS_TX PCS Transmit in the PHY_D device, and the LS_RX PCS Receive in the PHY_S device.

To: The LS_PATH PCS comprises the following functions: PCS Reset, LS_TX PCS Transmit in the PHY_D device, the LS_RX PCS Receive in the PHY_S device, and an optional PCS OAM. The PCS Transmit and PCS Receive functions execute simultaneously and asynchronously.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.1 P97 L 33 # 423

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type T Comment Status X

There is only one PCS reset. This should just reference the earlier requirement

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the content of 191.4.2.1 with "See 191.3.2.1."

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.2.1 P99 L 1 # 55

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The 64B65B coding for LS_PATH seems identical to that of the HS_PATH in 192.3.2.2.1 and subsequent subclauses. If it's different, it would help the reader if the differences were stated instead of repeating everything.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace whatever is redundant with references to the parallel content in 191.3.2.2, listing exceptions if they exist.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.2.3 P99 L 28 # 150

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status X

missing article

SuggestedRemedy

Change: for ordered set

To: for an ordered set

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.2.4 P99 L 44 # 408

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The block structure is described in 149.3.2.2.4, but without a 'shall' and hence no requirement. 'shall be as specified' is therefore inappropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "The low data rate block structure shall be as specified in 149.3.2.2.4" with "See 149.3.2.2.4."

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.2.6 P100 L 42 # 403

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The text of 191.4.2.2.6 refers to 149.3.2.2.6 where there are no requirements, only description of ordered sets used. It should not have a 'shall' here, because it is unclear what requirement is referred to. Additionally, this is an introductory section and should reflect that LPI, used in the refernece, is not used in clause 191 PHYs.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The low data rate ordered sets shall be as specified in 149.3.2.2.6." to "The low data rate ordered set encoding is as in 149.3.2.2.6, except that the LPI ordered set is not used in Clause 191 PHYs."

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.2.7 P 100 L 48 # 404
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 This text refers to Idle encoding but says "ordered sets", similarly, 191.4.2.2.8 through 191.4.2.2.11 refer to Start, Terminate, Ordered set, and Error control characters.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "ordered sets" to "Idle control character", "Start control character", "Terminate control character", "Ordered set control character", and "Error control character" in 191.4.2.2.7 through .11
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.2.8 P 100 L 52 # 425
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 149.3.2.2.9, 149.3.2.2.10, and 149.3.2.2.12 have no requirments. There should not be a shall in the references in 191.4.2.2.8, 191.4.2.2.9 and 191.4.2.2.11 to them
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "shall be as specified" to "are as specified" in 191.4.2.2.8, 191.4.2.2.9, and 191.4.2.2.10
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.2.12 P 102 L 7 # 56
 Ran, Adee Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Missing space in "(seeFigure 191-18)"
 SuggestedRemedy
 insert space
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.2.14 P 102 L 25 # 151
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 numbers larger than 9 should be written as numbers, not as text per the IEEE Style manual
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: fifty
 To: 50
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.3 P 105 L 18 # 46
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The sentence "The PCS descrambler employs the generator polynomial per Equation (149-5)." seems to be redundant, out of place, and slightly incorrect at this point
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the sentence: The PCS descrambler employs the generator polynomial per Equation (149-5).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.4.4 P 106 L 1 # 57
 Ran, Adee Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Equation 191-9 has no indexing of Infocfield, OAM, "6bit v-s", Parity - are these constants or scalars that do not need indexing?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to Infocfield(n-195), OAM(n-260), v-s(n-270), Parity(n-276)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.4.4 P 106 L 27 # 277
 Jonsson, Ragnar Infineon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The description "The four training frame 65-bit blocks are then concatenated with the 10 OAM bits" is incorrect, as it implies that the 4x65-bits FOLLOW the 10 OAM bits.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "The four training frame 65-bit blocks are followed the 10 OAM bits"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.2 P 109 L 10 # 9
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 "The PMA Transmit function comprises a transmitter to generate a four-level modulated signal for PAM4, a two-level modulated signal for PAM2, both for HS_TX, and a DME modulated signal for LS_TX "
 This reads as if all components are required for a PMA transmit function. But implementations can have either an HS_TX or a LS_TX, not necessarily both, and in the case of HS_TX, it does not necessarily need PAM4.
 Also possibly in clause 192.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Rewrite this sentence to make the PMA transmit function dependent on the specific PHY type.
 Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.2 P 109 L 15 # 106
 Huber, Thomas Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 awkward phrase structure: "Auto-Negotiation is either not enabled or is not implemented". There shouldn't be an 'is' both before the either and after the or.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Multiple ways this could be fixed:
 1. Auto-Negotiation either is not enabled or is not implemented
 2. Auto-Negotiation is either not enabled or not implemented
 3. Auto-Negotiation is neither enabled nor implemented.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.2.1 P 109 L 34 # 426
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 DME Encoding is only used by the PHY_D in normal operation. PHY_S, I believe, only uses it in link synchronization. The text gets this all confused and says that the PMA always gets single bits An (which is the wrong variable name) and encodes them as DME (which is also wrong).
 The text for DME encoding also has a bunch of extraneous information about tx_mode, which properly belongs in the PMA Transmit section not in a discussion of DME encoding, such as a reference to SEND_Z.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert the following at the end of 191.5.2.2:
 "When tx_mode is SEND_Z, see 191.7.2.7 for the encoding of "Z".
 When tx_mode is not SEND_Z, the PHY_D PMA Transmit function, and the PHY_S PMA Transmit function in link synchronization, shall encode binary values using Differential Manchester Encoding (DME) according to the rules in 191.5.2.2.1.
 Delete the first 3 paragraphs of 191.5.2.2.1 (P109 L35 through 42), and change line 44 to read: "The following rules shall apply to when DME encoding is used:"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.2.1 P 109 L 36 # 10

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The definition of the DME encoder does not mention that it is only used for the LS_PATH (based on 191.1.5).

Also possibly in clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify that in the text.

Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.3 P 110 L 40 # 152

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Polarity swaps are not limited to the balanced pair, there is a desire to correct for the signal and ground to be swapped.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: correct for pair ploarity swaps.
To: correct for polarity swaps.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.4 P 110 L 50 # 427

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The 'shall' requirement for Figure 191-31 is repeated multiple times. We must really think someone is going to skip it! We only need to state the requirement once - in the section for both HS and LS path. It isn't like someone is going to start up one path and not the others.

SuggestedRemedy

change "shall comply with the state diagram in Figure 191-31" to "is shown in the state diagram in Figure 191-31 (see 191.5.2.6)." in 1st paragraph of 191.5.2.4 (P110 L50) and in the first paragraph of 191.5.2.5 (P114 L25).
(leave the requirement as is in the first sentence of 191.5.2.6 on P116 L15)

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.4 P 111 L 2 # 153

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status X

There is not always a PAM2 to PAM4 transition when completing training,

SuggestedRemedy

Change: PAM2 to PAM4 transition.
To: PCS_TEST to PCS_DATA transition.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.4.5 P 112 L 43 # 494

Cheng, Xiaoyue Infineon

Comment Type E Comment Status X

"The format of PHY capability bits is Oct10<2:1> = InterleaverDepth[1:0], Oct10<4:3> = PrecodeSel[1:0], Oct10<7> = OAMen, Oct8<7:0> = VendorSpecificData[7:0], and Oct9<7:0> = VendorSpecificData[15:8]. OAMen indicates MultiGBASE-T1 OAM capability is enabled. The optional MultiGBASE-T1 OAM capability..."

For HS_PATH, there is no Interleave or Precode. Also, better to change the speed description into consistent format with 191.5.2.5.4 in LS_PATH

SuggestedRemedy

change into:
"The format of PHY capability bits is Oct10<7> = OAMen, Oct8<7:0> = VendorSpecificData[7:0], and Oct9<7:0> = VendorSpecificData[15:8]. OAMen indicates MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1 OAM capability is enabled. The optional MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1 OAM capability..."

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.4.5 P 112 L 51 # 374

Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

Need to use appropriate PHY name

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "MultiGBASE-T1" with "MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1, 100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1"

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.4.5 P 112 L 53 # 375
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Need to use appropriate PHY name
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "MultiGBASE-T1" with "MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1, 100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.4.5 P 112 L 54 # 376
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Add a new sentence to this line. "InterleaverDepth indicates the requested data mode interleaving depth. PrecodeSel indicates the requested precoder, available for 10G only."
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.4.5 P 113 L 1 # 368
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Table 191-7 should show the fields described on lines 48, 49 of page 112.
 It seems that the content of this table should be swapped with the content of Table 191-10.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace Table-191-7 with the content of Table 191-10 and add ",HS_PATH" to the table title
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.4.5 P 113 L 12 # 112
 Lo, William Axonne Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Various capabilities are defined but not mapped to a register.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The OAMen is advertised in bit 1.2311.1.
 The advertised status is reported in bit 1.2312.1 of the link partner.
 The VendorSpecificData to send is set via bits 1.2316:15:0 and received on the link partner bits 1.2317:15:0.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.4.5 P 113 L 15 # 428
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The requirement here can be read to duplicate the requirement in 191.5.2.4.1 that requires reserved bits set to zero. It is rewritten to still require the bits be reserved, but reference 191.5.2.4.1. (also, 0 is changed to zero to comply with style)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "The remaining bits shall be reserved and set to 0." to "The remaining bits shall be reserved and are set to zero per 191.5.2.4.1."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.4.7 P 113 L 28 # 292
 van Dyck, Peter Infineon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "149.4.2.4.7 Reserved fields" section is missing in Clause 191.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move 191.5.2.4.8 to 191.5.2.4.9, move 191.5.2.4.7 to 191.5.2.4.8, add new section 191.5.2.4.7 with the text from 149.4.2.4.7
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.4.8 P 114 L 20 # 111
 Lo, William Axonne Inc.
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 link_status defined but not listed in table 191-9.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add to table 191-9
 Link Status , MultiGBASE-T1/V1 PMA status register, 1.2310.0, link_status
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.5.3 P 115 L 16 # 278
 Jonsson, Ragnar Infineon
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 The statement "Any other value shall not be transmitted and shall be ignored at the receiver" is ambiguous.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "Any value not listed in Table 191-5 for the LEADER and Table 191-6 for the FOLLOWER shall not be transmitted and shall be ignored at the receiver"
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.5 P 114 L 33 # 291
 van Dyck, Peter Infineon
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 The 65-bit Infocfield does not include the PMA MDIO function mapping
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace:
 191.5.2.5.2 through 191.5.2.5.6
 With:
 191.5.2.5.2 through 191.5.2.5.5
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.5.4 P 115 L 30 # 369
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Table 191-10 has fields for InterleaverDepth and PrecodeSel. However, there is no FEC interleaving and no PreCoder on the LS_PATH.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Table 191-10: bits 1,2,3 and 4 should be changed to Reserved.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.5.1 P 114 L # 429
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Since infocfield notation is the same for both, don't repeat it. It could get changed and be confusing....
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace content of 191.5.2.5.1 with "See 191.5.2.4.1."
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.5.4 P 115 L 44 # 370
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Delete "Oct8<2:1> = InterleaverDepth[1:0], Oct8<4:3> = PrecodeSel[1:0]," as there is no FEC interleaving and no precoder on the LS_PATH
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.5.4 P 115 L 47 # 371
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 this line applies also to MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add ", MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1" before "OAM"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.5.4 P 115 L 49 # 372
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 this line applies also to MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add ", MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1" before "OAM"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.5.4 P 115 L 50 # 373
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Remove the sentence "InterleaverDepth indicates the requested data mode interleaving depth. PrecodeSel indicates the requested precoder, available for 10G only." As there is no 10G on the LS_PATH
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.5.4 P 115 L 52 # 113
 Lo, William Axonne Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Various capabilities are defined but not mapped to a register.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The InterleaverDepth request is set in bits 1.2311.12:11.
 The received InterleaverDepth request is reported in bit 1.2312.12:11 of the link partner.
 When bit 1.2311.5 is set to 1, the PrecodeSel request is set in bits 1.2311.3:2, otherwise the PHY determines the precoder setting. The actual setting transmitted is reflected in bit 1.2310.4:3.
 The received PrecodeSel request is reported in bit 1.2312.3:2 of the link partner
 The OAMen is advertised in bit 1.2311.1.
 The advertised status is reported in bit 1.2312.1 of the link partner.
 The VendorSpecificData to send is set via bits 1.2316:15:0 and received on the link partner bits 1.2317:15:0.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.5.4 P 116 L 1 # 430
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The requirement here can be read to duplicate the requirement in 191.5.2.5.1 that requires reserved bits set to zero. It is rewritten to still require the bits be reserved, but reference 191.5.2.5.1. (also, 0 is changed to zero to comply with style)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "The remaining PHY capability bits shall be reserved and set to 0." with "The remaining PHY capability bits shall be reserved and are set to zero per 191.5.2.5.1."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.5.5 P 116 L 5 # 431
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The standard simply reserves - it is inappropriate to talk about future use. When a future use is standardized, the standard will be amended to unreserve the bits... these are just reserved bits.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "contains a reserved field and are reserved for future use." to "are reserved and are set to zero per 191.5.2.5.1."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.6 P 116 L 29 # 432
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 It appears that Table 191-11 is simply informational, and is a consequence of the PHY control state diagram. If so, it should not have a shall.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider wheter Tables 191-11 and 191-12 have requirements or are simply informational. If they have requirments,incorporate them into the PHY control state diagram. If not, change"shall comply with" to "is shown in" at P116 L29
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.5.5 P 116 L 5 # 293
 van Dyck, Peter Infineon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Clear definition of reserved fields missing.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Append after "for future use."
 "Reserved bits shall be set to 0."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.6 P 116 L 38 # 47
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The literal number would be more clear than an equation in this table
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 20 - 0.384 to 19.616
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.6 P 116 L 21 # 107
 Huber, Thomas Nokia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 awkward phrase structure: "Auto-Negotiation is either not enabled or is not implemented". There shouldn't be an 'is' both before the either and after the or.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Multiple ways this could be fixed:
 1. Auto-Negotiation either is not enabled or is not implemented
 2. Auto-Negotiation is either not enabled or not implemented
 3. Auto-Negotiation is neither enabled nor implemented.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.6 P 117 L 6 # 48
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The literal number would be more clear than an equation in this table
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 20 - 0.384 to 19.616
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.6.1 P 118 L 20 # 460

Law, David HPE

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Subclause 191.5.2.6.1 'State diagram variables' defines the pcs_data_mode variable as 'Generated by the PMA PHY Control function and indicates ... passed to the PCS via the PMA_PCSDATAMODE.indication primitive.' without defining the variable values.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following to the definition of the pcs_data_mode variable in subclause 191.5.2.6.1.

Values:

TRUE The PCS is transmitting and receiving data from the XGMII.

FALSE The PCS is in a training or test mode.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.6.1 P 118 L 48 # 279

Jonsson, Ragnar Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The PHY_D and PHY_S transition out of TRAINING at slightly different times due to the PHY_S mandatory countdown phase. When the PHY_D exits TRAINING and enters PCS_TEST (and subsequently PCS_DATA), it stops sending Infield messages. Because the PHY_S is still in TRAINING, it checks for rem_rcvr_status = OK from the partner. If the receiver status is not latched once received, the PHY_S will clear rem_rcvr_status and hang in training.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following after the text in line 49 on page 118: "The parameter rem_rcvr_status shall be set to the value received in the loc_rcvr_status bit in the Infield from the remote PHY. The rem_rcvr_status is set to NOT_OK if the PCS has not decoded a valid Infield from the remote PHY. The rem_rcvr_status is set to OK when remote PHY is transmitting SEND_N."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.6.1 P 119 L 6 # 154

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Add true and false definitions

SuggestedRemedy

TRUE: Training has not been successfully completed.

FALSE: Training has been successfully completed.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.6.2 P 119 L 19 # 202

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Removed redundant statement. This is already stated in 191.1.7.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete: All timers operate in the manner described in 14.2.3.2.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.6.2 P 119 L 24 # 433

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type E Comment Status X

duplicate shall. The timer's behavior is required by the shall on the state diagram.

SuggestedRemedy

change "shall expire" to "expires" at P119 L24

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.6.3 P 120 L 7 # 461

Law, David

HPE

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The mr_autoneg_enable variable is used as part of the open arrow entry condition to the DISABLE_TRANSMITTER state in Figure 191-31—PHY 'Control state diagram', as well as in the transition condition from the DISABLE_TRANSMITTER state to the SILENT state. The mr_autoneg_enable variable, however, is not defined in the associated subclause 191.5.2.6.1 'State diagram variables'.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following to subclause 191.5.2.6.1:

mr_autoneg_enable
see 98.5.1.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.6.3 P 120 L 47 # 462

Law, David

HPE

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Figure 191-31 'PHY Control state diagram' in the PMA uses the hi_rfer and block_lock variables, yet these variables are not defined in subclause 191.5.2.6.1 'State diagram variables'. The hi_rfer and block_lock variables are generated in the PCS, with the hi_rfer variable generated in Figure 191-17 'RFR monitor state diagram', and the block_lock generated in subclause 191.4.2.3 PCS 'Receive function'. As a result, these variables pass across the PMA Service interface, yet they are not parameters of any of the primitives defined in subclause 191.2.2 'PMA service interface'. Further, they are not illustrated in Figure 191-3 'PHY_S functional block diagram', Figure 191-4 'PHY_D functional block diagram', Figure 191-7 'PHY_S PCS reference diagram', Figure 191-8 'PHY_D PCS reference diagram', and Figure 191-25 'PMA reference diagram'.

SuggestedRemedy

[1] Add the following to the list of primitives in subclause 191.2.2 'PMA service interface':

PMA_PCSSYNC.request(block_lock, rfer_cnt)

[2] Add an arrow labelled 'PMA_PCSSYNC.request' from the PHY_S PCS to PHY_S PMA block in Figure 191-5 'PHY_S service interfaces' in Figure 191-5 'PHY_S service interfaces' and Figure 191-6 'PHY_D service interfaces'.

[3] Add the following new subclauses to subclause 191.2.2:

191.2.2.X PMA_PCSSYNC.request

191.2.2.X.1 Semantics of the primitive

PMA_PCSSYNC.request(block_lock, rfer_cnt)

The PMA_PCSSYNC.request primitive passes the block_lock and rfer_cnt parameters from the PCS to the PMA.

The parameter block_lock can take on one of the following two values of the form:

TRUE The PCS Synchronization process has acquired block delineation.
FALSE The PCS Synchronization process has not acquired block delineation.

The parameter rfer_cnt can take on one of the following two values of the form:

TRUE The PCS Synchronization has detected 16 errors in one RFRX_CNT_LIMIT interval.
FALSE The PCS Synchronization has not detected 16 errors in one RFRX_CNT_LIMIT interval.

191.2.2.X.2 When generated

The PCS generates PMA_PCSSYNC.request messages to indicate a change in block_lock

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

or rfer_cnt.

191.2.2.X.3 Effect of receipt

The effect of receipt of this primitive is specified in Figure 191–31.

[4] Add block_lock and rfer_cnt to figures 191–3, 191–4, 191–7, 191–8 and 191–25.

[5] Add the following variables to subclause 191.5.2.6.1 'State diagram variables':

block_lock

Boolean variable that is set TRUE by the PCS Synchronization process when it acquires block delineation. It is passed to the PMA via the block_lock parameter of the PMA_PCSSYNC.request primitive.

hi_rfer

Boolean variable that is set TRUE by the PCS Synchronization process when the rfer_cnt reaches 16 errors in one RFRX_CNT_LIMIT interval. It is passed to the PMA via the rfer_cnt parameter of the PMA_PCSSYNC.request primitive.

Proposed Response Response Status

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.8 P 122 L 3 # 58

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

"Clause 98" should be an active cross reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it an active xref.

Proposed Response Response Status

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.8 P 122 L 23 # 108

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Figure 191-33 is not entirely clear. The text at the bottom right "LEADER stops..." doesn't seem to align with the period of time that the brace to which the text relates indicates, since the Leader is still transmitting.. Maybe the "LEADER stops..." and "FOLLOWER mimics..." labels got transposed (and if so, maybe the line from "FOLLOWER mimics..." really should be pointing to the last block in the LEADER row)?

SuggestedRemedy

Revise the figure to better illustrate the intended behavior. As the comment notes, one option would be to switch the "LEADER stops..." and "FOLLOWER mimics..." labels, and change the line that would say "LEADER stops..." to point to the last block in the LEADER row rather than the last block in the FOLLOWER row.

Proposed Response Response Status

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.8.1 P 123 L 43 # 463

Law, David HPE

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Typo.

SuggestedRemedy

'mr_autoneg_enable:' should read 'mr_autoneg_enable' (remove colon).

Proposed Response Response Status

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.8.1 P 123 L 45 # 59

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

"98.5.1" is formatted as external reference but exists in the draft. Also in line 48.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it an active xref (twice).

Proposed Response Response Status

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.8.1 P 124 L 4 # 280
 Jonsson, Ragnar Infineon
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Incorrect condition for FALSE state
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "At least one SEND_S pulse" to "At least three SEND_S pulses".
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.8.2 P 124 L 44 # 381
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 "will be" seems to imply something in the future and I don't think this is what's intended.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "will be" to "is"
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.8.2 P 124 L 46 # 434
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 duplicate shall. The timer's behavior is required by the shall on the state diagram.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "shall expire" to "expires" for fail_inhibit_timer and sigdet_wait_timer (P124 L46 and L54)
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.8.4 P 126 L 12 # 241
 McCarthy, Frank Infineon
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 There are two SEND_REPLY states in Figure 191–35—PHY Link Synchronization state diagram. The SEND_REPLY state name is a little confusing especially for the LEADER. If the name were changed to SEND_PULSE, then the name would be more informative.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the name of the SEND_REPLY state to SEND_PULSE.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.8.4 P 126 L 12 # 464
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**
 Figure 191–35 'PHY Link Synchronization state diagram' has two states named 'SEND_REPLY'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 [1] Change the 'SEND_REPLY' state on the left-hand side to 'FOLLOWER_SEND_REPLY'.
 [2] Change the 'SEND_REPLY' state on the right-hand side to 'LEADER_SEND_REPLY'.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl 191 SC 191.5.2.8.4 P 126 L 42 # 465
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Figure 191–35 'PHY Link Synchronization state diagram' uses the training_failure variable in the transition from the LINK_GOOD_CHECK state to the TRANSMIT_DISABLE state. However, the training_failure variable is not defined in subclause 191.5.2.8.1 'State diagram variables'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following to subclause 191.5.2.8.1:
 training_failure
 A Boolean variable indicating whether PHY Control has resulted in a successful training.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.10 P 127 L 14 # 155
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove unnecessary text
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete sentence in 191.5.2.10
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.11 P 128 L 3 # 435
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The requirement in 191.5.2.10.1 needs to be inferred given the way this is written. It would be clearer to call it out since the text just says "as described", and just copy down the text from 191.5.2.10.1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert at the end of 191.5.2.11 (P128 L2) "The symbol response shall comply with the electrical specifications given in 191.6.2 for the HS_TX path and 191.7.2 for the LS_TX path."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.6.1 P 128 L 47 # 436
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The text says Test mode 2 transmits JP03A or JP03B, we need to know which one is transmitted. That doesn't appear until several pages later, and leads to confusion. (Table 191-15).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider whether a separate test mode is needed for each pattern or else add text indicating how the pattern is selected. If it is implementer's choice, add, "See Table 191-15 for control of jitter test modes." after "from its local clock source." (before discussion of PAM2 at P128 L48)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.5.6.1 P 128 L 51 # 437
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Test mode 3 is valid only for PAM4 (10 G operation). Otherwise, {0,3} (and the precoder) are invalid to the PMA
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the first sentence of the 5th paragraph of 191.6.1 (P128 L51) to read "Test mode 3 is specified for 10G+100MBASE-T1/V1 PHYs only, and is for testing precoder operation."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.6.1 P 128 L 29 # 387
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Per guidance from Pete Anslow provided during P802.3dg pre-publication review, "FOLLOWER" should be "Follower" and "LEADER" should be "Leader" when referring to the operating mode of the PHY.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Grant Editors license to change "FOLLOWER" to "Follower" and "LEADER" to "Leader" when referring to the operating mode of the PHY.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.6.1 P 128 L 51 # 114
 Lo, William Axonne Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Clarify that test mode 3 applies only to PAM4.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert to the end of the following sentence:
 "Test mode 3 is for testing the precoder operation" add:
 "in MultiG+100MBASE-T1/V1 only."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.6.2 P 131 L 50 # 438
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 No need for the repeated "shall" in the explanatory "i.e.," phrase for what AC-coupling means... it looks like 2 requirements
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "i.e., it shall present" to "i.e., it presents" at P131 L50
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.6.2 P 131 L 51 # 335
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 to align with 802.3ch
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "dc" to "DC"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.6.2.1 P 132 L 37 # 439
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 "jitter shall be measured" is a requirement on the user, not appropriate. This same text shows up in 191.6.2.2, 191.7.2.1, and 191.7.2.2 (I think 192 is clean). If changed it should be done everywhere.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "shall be measured" to "is defined when measured" in 191.6.2.1, 191.6.2.2, 191.7.2.1, and 191.7.2.2
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.6.2.1 P 132 L 38 # 440
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 "capturing device shall be at least 200 MHz" is a requirement on the user. This same text shows up in 191.6.2.2, 191.7.2.1, and 191.7.2.2 (I think 192 is clean). If changed it should be done everywhere.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "The band-pass bandwidth of the capturing device shall be at least 200 MHz" to "Conformance to this specification is defined when a capturing device with at least 200 MHz band-pass bandwidth is used."in 191.6.2.1, 191.6.2.2, 191.7.2.1, and 191.7.2.2
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.6.2.4 P 133 L 32 # 441
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 A rate of 5625xS MHz would only apply to PHY_S transmitting, and 5625/48 MHz for a PHY_D transmitting, yet this spec is divided on leader and follower...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the frequency for the follower PHY from 5625/48 MHz +/-20%" to "5625 x S MHz +/- 100 ppm. See Table 191-1 for definition of S."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.6.2.4 P 133 L 35 # 11

Ran, Adee Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The clock frequency is defined with dependence on LEADER/FOLLOWER, and FOLLOWER has a single frequency of 5625/48 MHz. but it seems that this frequency should only be used for LS_TX regardless of LEADER/FOLLOWER roles.

Note that in 191.7.2.4 (which is under the LS_PATH) the nominal symbol rate is also 5625/48 MHz.

Also possibly in clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to define the frequencies for HS_TX regardless of LEADER/FOLLOWER, and state that it is for the HS_TX. In 191.7.2.4 state that it is for the LS_TX.

Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.6.2.4 P 133 L 37 # 442

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The short term frequency variation should apply to both leader & follower, PHY_S and PHY_D, yet is written so it only applies to a PHY_D as follower. Frankly, a follower can't really control its short term variation....

SuggestedRemedy

Change the last sentence of the 2nd paragraph in 191.6.2.4 as follows:
delete "and the short-term... 1%/second" (ending the sentence after +1/-20%) at P133 L37
Create new 3rd paragraph: "For both PHY_S and PHY_D, leader and follower, the short-term rate of frequency variation shall be less than 1% / second."

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.6.2.5 P 133 L 41 # 443

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Requiring a test to be performed is a requirement on the user - we required the device to pass the test - those requirements are already there in the paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the first sentence of 191.6.2.5 from "With the transmitter in test mode 4, transmitting in MultiG mode, and using the transmitter test fixture 1 shown in Figure 191-36 for -T1 and Figure 191-37 for -V1, the test defined in 120D.3.1.2 shall be performed." to: "Transmitter linearity is specified with the transmitter in test mode 4, transmitting in MultiG mode, and using the transmitter test fixture 1 shown in Figure 191-36 for -T1 and Figure 191-37 for -V1, according to the test definition in 120D.3.1.2."

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.6.2.5 P 133 L 42 # 295

Sakunia, Saket Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

802.3dm PSD mask allows for a low-frequency high-pass filtering that produces baseline wander outside the usual impulse-response window. Without compensation, this baseline energy is counted as distortion/noise, depressing SNDR and degrading inter-lab correlation. The proposed subclause adds a narrowly scoped, LTI compensation step in Clause 201—without modifying 120D.3.1.2—restoring accuracy and repeatability while preserving test modes, fixtures, and limits.

SuggestedRemedy

With the transmitter in test mode 4, transmitting in MultiG mode, and using the transmitter test fixture 1 shown in Figure 191-36 for -T1 and Figure 191-37 for -V1, the test defined in 120D.3.1.2 shall be performed. "Annex191B describes additional High Pass Filter to be applied to the measured data when the DUT includes any low frequency high pass filtering (e.g. PoC/PoDL)"

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.6.3.1 P 136 L 27 # 156
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 subject/verb agreement
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: and have passed
 To: and has passed
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.6.3.2 P 136 L 39 # 444
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Somehow we wrote clause 149 without a shall in the broadband noise test section, and it propagated to here. There needs to be a requirement on noise rejection, otherwise receiver sensitivity is meaningless.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "The BER is expected to be less than" to "The BER shall be less than" and add PICS (the pics is shown in the PICS comment, but noted so it can be deleted if this comment is rejected)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.7.2.2 P 139 L 24 # 445
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 191.7.2.1 and 191.7.2.2 define jitter for the phy transmitting 100 Mb/s. However, the jitter spec on lines 23 and 24 reference the value of J in Table 191-14. (similarly on lines 44 and 45) There is no value of J in 191-14 for a 100M+xGBASE-T PHY. As a starting point consider whether a PHY_D as leader (which is what this spec is on) it should have the same jitter spec as the equivalent PHY_S.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add to the end of the 1st paragraph of 191.7.2.1 (after "for the definition of J."), "For an LS transmitter as Leader, use J for the equivalent HS transmitter on its partner PHY_S in Table 191-14."
 Add the same sentence after "for the definition of J." in 191.7.2.2 (middle of the paragraph, P139 L44)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.7.2.4 P 140 L 5 # 446
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 There is only a spec for the low speed transmitter as leader, there needs to be one as follower - there appears to be a specification for that in the high speed section.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following, base on the second paragraph of 191.6.2.4 to 191.7.2.4. Add PICS (TES_LS1 shown in the PICS comment) for this.
 New paragraph added to 191.7.2.4 is: "In test mode 2 and using test fixture 3 as shown in Figure 191-39 for -T1 and Figure 191-40 for -V1, the symbol transmission rate of the FOLLOWER PHY, when running off of a free-running clock, shall be within the range 5625/48 MHz +1/-20%.
 The short-term rate of frequency variation for both leader and follower shall be less than 1% / second."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.7.2.6 P 140 L 20 # 60
 Ran, Adee Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "The effective transmit baseband symbols, x(n), is derived" - number mismatch. Should be either "are derived" or refer to x(n) as a sequence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "The sequence of effective transmit baseband symbols, x(n), is derived"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.7.2.6 P 140 L 32 # 61
 Ran, Adee Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The text above table 191-20 refers to d_{out} but in the table headings there is only d_in. I assume the "Encoded bits" columns should be d_{out}.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct the headings per the comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.8.1 P 144 L 5 # 157
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 -V1 may support AN
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1
 To: MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-T1/V1
 Make the same change on P144L13
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.8.1 P 144 L 8 # 49
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 I understand that -V1 auto-negotiation is optional.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete sentence. Change previous sentence to -T1/V1.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.8.1 P 144 L 8 # 158
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 -V1 may support AN
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete: MultiG+100M/100M+MultiGBASE-V1 PHYs do not support Auto-Negotiation.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.8.1 P 144 L 13 # 50
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 I understand that -V1 auto-negotiation is optional.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change -T1 to -T1/V1
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.9 P 144 L 22 # 159
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Not all -T1 link segments support all speeds as the maximum frequency changes with the speed for many parameters.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s
 To: 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, or 10 Gb/s
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.9.1.5 P 146 L 30 # 28
 Bergner, Bert TE Connectivity
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Screening attenuation refers to SC 149.7.1.5. This subclause defines screening attenuation with 45dB from 30MHz up to Fmax. Fmax depends on speed grade in Clause 149. Thus, we inherit the speed grade dependency from Clause 149 which will differentiate between 2.5G, 5G and 10G. This conflicts with the idea of screening and coupling attenuation in 191 to be independent of speed grade.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the sentens to " The screening attenuation of each -T1 link shall be as specified in 149.7.5.1 with Fmax = 4000 MHz."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 191 SC 191.10 P 147 L 1 # 162
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Not all -V1 link segments support all speeds as the maximum frequency changes with the speed for many parameters.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s
 To: 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, or 10 Gb/s
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.10.1.5 P 147 L 36 # 163
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change the -V1 screening attenuation frequency range to match that of -T1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 10 to 30
 Also on P147L42, change 10 to 30 in the equation of f.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.10.1.5 P 147 L 33 # 31
 Bergner, Bert TE Connectivity
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Screening attenuation for -V1 coaxial unbalanced link segment: The sentence "Additional screening attenuation test methodologies are defined in Annex 149A." takes reference to clause 149A which defines screening attenuation measurement specifically for balanced link segments only. This may cause confusion.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the sentence to "The additional screening attenuation test methodologies defined in Annex 149A shall be applied with adaptation to unbalanced coaxial cabling."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.10.1.5 P 148 L 4 # 27
 Bergner, Bert TE Connectivity
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Figure 191-51 shows screening attenuation up to 5 GHz while equation (201-19) defines it to 4 GHz only. See also Boyer_Sharma_3dm_01_0526.pdf.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct Figure 191-51 and show limit line up to 4 GHz.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.10.1.5 P 147 L 33 # 137
 Long, Richard TE Connectivity
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Annex 149A is specified for differential pair, text needs to be added for coax.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following sentence after line 33 on page 147: These methodologies shall be applied with adaptation to unbalanced coaxial cabling and shall use a single 50 Ohm termination to ground.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 191 SC 191.10.2 P 148 L 34 # 32
 Bergner, Bert TE Connectivity
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Coupling parameters for -V1 coaxial link segments: The sentence "Test methodologies are specified in Annex 97B." refers to Annex 97B which specifically describes cross talk measurements for balanced cabling. Especially the description in 97A "Link segment ends not under test are terminated in 100 Ohm differential mode and 200 Ohm common mode." and Figure 97B-1 may cause confusion.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the sentence to "Test methodologies are specified in Annex 97B and shall be applied with adaptation to unbalanced coaxial cabling."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.10.2 P 148 L 38 # 33

Bergner, Bert TE Connectivity

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Coupling parameters between link segments: Reference to 149C.5: "For further information, see 149C.5." 149C is informative. 149C.5 specifically describes that "... care should be taken to avoid coupling between (MDI) ports." It recommends that PSANEXT between MDI ports is "... approximately the same level, but not greater, than ... specified in Equation (149-25)." This equation is the PSANEXT requirementd for balanced pair clause 149 link segments which is specified differently compared to (191-29). --> (149-25) PSANEXT>=min(75,80-5log10(f/100))

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the sentence "For further information, see 149C.5." by "The coupling between adjacent ports on a multiport MDI connector is recommended to be at the same level, but not greater, than specified for PSANEXT loss in Equation (191-20)."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.11.2.1 P 151 L 2 # 164

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status X

There is no reason to list out the Fmax frequencies again as they are already defined in Equation 191-17.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the 3 "For ..." sentences with:
Where Fmax is given by Equation (191-17).
Do the same on P152L(17-21).

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.12.1 P 151 L 44 # 12

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"Where coaxial cabling is used, the mechanical interface to the coaxial cabling is a single pin connector with a shield."
This subclause is under 191.12 which states that it addresses a single coaxnual cable. So the statement should not be conditional, and "cabling" should be simply "cable".

Also possibly in clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The mechanical interface to the coaxial cable is a single pin connector with a shield".

Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.12.3 P 153 L 1 # 447

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The requirement to withstand high-voltage transients "per application requirements" is ill-specified. It could be anything. Better to make it an advisory statement.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "shall also withstand" to "is expected to withstand"

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.12.3 P 153 L 33 # 393

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and

Comment Type T Comment Status X

I am concerned that "withstanding without damage high-voltage transient noises and ESD per application requirements" is a shall statement, which generates a PICS. But, how can this be validated? This sentence appears in both clause 191 and clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

In clause 191.12.3 and 192.10.3,

Change, "The single conductor of the MDI shall also withstand without damage high-voltage transient noises and ESD per application requirements."

to, "The single conductor of the MDI is capable of withstanding high-voltage transient noises and ESD per application requirements without damage."

Alternately, delete the sentence in both locations.

Grant Editor's license to adjust PICS in clause 191 and clause 192 accordingly.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.14 P 153 L 42 # 62

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

"Clause 31" and "Annex 31B" should be external references.

SuggestedRemedy

Format as external reference (forest green).

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.14 P 153 L 45 # 13

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The delay constraints are given in terms of HS_PATH delay and LS_PATH delay, but the way these are defined is a sum of delay in the transmitter and the receiver of the same rate - and these are in two different devices, which are different PHY types and possibly from different vendors. The "shall" statement addressing the delays cannot be fulfilled or verified by a single vendor. No vendor can claim compliance to such a "shared" requirement.

Other Base-T PHYs have either defined the requirement using the sum of the transmit and receive delays of a specific implementation (e.g. 55.11, 97.10, and 149.10) or specified separate delays for the transmit and receive path (e.g. 40.11 and 96.10).

In this case it seems that the latter option is preferable because loopback is not possible so the delays must be measured separately anyway. But specifying the sum on the delays of a specific implementation would still be acceptable.

Annex 191A provides recommendations but it is informative, and does not solve the problem that the specification is split between two vendors.

Also possibly in clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the delay constraints to either of the following:

- Separate transmit delay and receive delay maximum values for a specific implementations, splitting the budget e.g. according to the recommendations in Annex 191A (preferred)
- Sum of transmit delay and receive delay for a specific implementation.

Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191 SC 191.14 P 154 L 3 # 14

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Table 191-24 has numbers in bit times and pause quanta, and also in ns. The bit times and pause quanta depend on the the bit rate which is different in each direction (LS_PATH or HS_PATH), while the delay in ns does not.
There is no definition or reference for the bit time or pause quantum in each case.

I assume the first 6 rows use the high-speed bit times and the last row uses the low-speed bit times, but it takes time to figure out. It is not clear from the table that the last row has different units than the rest.

Also possibly in clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

Add footnotes to the bit times and pause quanta headings and indicate the value in each data rate.

Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.15 P 156 L 45 # 86

Lusted, Kent Synopsys

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

PICS entries for 192.15.3, 192.15.4.1, and 192.15.4.2 are incomplete

SuggestedRemedy

Complete PIC entries

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.15.3 P 156 L 45 # 283

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

PICS are missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Complete PICS

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.15.3 P 156 L 46 # 119

Kim, Yong General Motors

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

This sub-clause on, PICS Profoma is incomplete. Please complete.

SuggestedRemedy

Please complete.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191 SC 191.15.3 P 156 L 46 # 15

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

PICS tables are empty

Also possibly in clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

Populate them.

Implement in clause 192 if appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191A SC 191A P 252 L 1 # 489

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status X

There should be an editing instruction indicating whether this annex is new or being amended

SuggestedRemedy

Add the right editing instruction

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191A SC 191A P 252 L 20 # 129
 Turner, Max Ethernetvia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 explicitly state we measure XGMII to MDI
 SuggestedRemedy
 The HS_PATH delay of 201.14 is composed of the HS_TX delay in the PHY_S (XGMII to MDI) and the HS_RX delay in the PHY_D (MDI to XGMII) .
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191A SC 191A P 252 L 30 # 132
 Turner, Max Ethernetvia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 the "HS_RX RX_Delay" nomenclature seems excessive
 SuggestedRemedy
 b) The HS_RX delay is allocated 90% of the H S_PATH delay budget of Table 191-24.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191A SC 191A P 252 L 23 # 130
 Turner, Max Ethernetvia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 explicitly state we measure XGMII to MDI
 SuggestedRemedy
 The LS_PATH delay of 201.14 is composed of the LS_TX delay in the PHY_D (XGMII to MDI) and the LS_RX delay in the PHY_S (MDI to XGMII).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191A SC 191A P 252 L 31 # 133
 Turner, Max Ethernetvia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 the "LS_TX TX_Delay" nomenclature seems excessive
 SuggestedRemedy
 c) The LS_TX delay is allocated 25% of the LS_PATH delay budget of Table 191-24.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191A SC 191A P 252 L 29 # 131
 Turner, Max Ethernetvia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 the "HS_TX TX_Delay" nomenclature seems excessive
 SuggestedRemedy
 a) The HS_TX delay is allocated 10% of the HS_PATH delay budget of Table 191-24.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 191A SC 191A P 252 L 32 # 134
 Turner, Max Ethernetvia
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 the "LS_RX RX_Delay" nomenclature seems excessive
 SuggestedRemedy
 d) The LS_RX delay is allocated 75% of the LS_PATH delay budget of Table 191-24.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 191A SC 191A P 253 L 25 # 135

Turner, Max Ethernovia

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

get rid of the "frame or superframe" wording in the Figure, in lines 12, 15 and 17, as well as in the last paragraph
 As per page 162 of the draft
 "The RS-FEC output superframe consists of L × 3600 bits"
 I.e. for L=1 the superframe consists of a single frame – superframe is always correct, "frame or superframe" is ambiguous, as this will not work for the 3rd frame in an L=4 superframe.
 So we can always just use "superframe"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace last paragraph: Due to potential interleaving only the XGMII transfer X(n) encoded into the first 64B/65B block of an RS-FEC superframe (identical to the RS-FEC frame for L=1, per 202.3.2.2.14) can practically be used to define the delay between XGMII and MDI (or vice versa). As this is not accessible easily, it is recommended for the PHY implementers to specify TX delay and RX delay in the product's documentation and keep their variation low.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192 P 158 L 1 # 240

Ahuja, Ramanjit Onsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Support for a 1 Gbps Mode in Low Speed Direction to be used with 5 Gbps and 7.5 Gbps Modes in the HS direction for the TDD PHY must be included.

SuggestedRemedy

The 1 Gbps mode support should be added according to the proposal made in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192 P 158 L 1 # 330

Pal, Debajyoti ("Debu") Onsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Support for a 7.5 Gbps Mode for the High Speed Direction in TDD PHY must be included.

SuggestedRemedy

The 7.5Gbps mode support should be added according to the proposal made in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02a_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192 P 158 L 1 # 331

Pal, Debajyoti ("Debu") Onsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Support for a 1 Gbps Mode in Low Speed Direction to be used with 5 Gbps and 7.5 Gbps Modes in the HS direction for the TDD PHY must be included.

SuggestedRemedy

The 1 Gbps mode support should be added according to the proposal made in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192 P 158 L 1 # 239

Ahuja, Ramanjit Onsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Support for a 7.5 Gbps Mode for the High Speed Direction in TDD PHY must be included.

SuggestedRemedy

The 7.5Gbps mode support should be added according to the proposal made in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02a_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 192 SC 192 P 158 L 1 # 492
 Zerna, Conrad NXP
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Proposed speed of 1Gbps is not included in the draft
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add proposed green highlights from
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf
 Into the draft
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192 P 158 L 1 # 491
 Zerna, Conrad NXP
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Proposed speed of 7.5Gbps is not included in the draft
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add proposed highlights from
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02a_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf into the draft
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192 P 158 L 1 # 453
 RAJAGOPAL, KARTHIK TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INC
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The draft as looked at an IEEE standard to facilitate interoperability fails to offer a clear implementation guide with more than 1 type of implementation/standard to choose from. Sections 191 and 192 with their widely different PCS & PMA layers fails to fulfil the primary goal which is to be a standard. This would not qualify as standard if users are free to choose from multiple implementations which tries to achieve the same function.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Rather than letting users guess or arbitrarily choose 1 of the 2 types of PCS & PMA implementation, a technically superior implementation needs to be selected and made as a standard with clear guideline on the PCS and PMA layers. This way facilitates maximum interoperability, which is the only path for this draft to be considered as an IEEE standard
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1 P 158 L 11 # 16
 Ran, Adee Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "They also use the same TDD cycle for all data rates (see 192.3)"
 Cross-reference seems to be incorrect.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to 192.3.4.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1 P 158 L 16 # 243
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 PAM terminology correction
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "PAM 2" to "PAM2" (4 places) and "PAM 4" to "PAM4" (1place)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1 P 158 L 22 # 165
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 typo
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 64/65B To: 64B/65B
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.1 P 158 L 28 # 451
 Ganesan, Aravind Texas Instruments
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 In multi lane operation does the PHY_D synchronize all the TDD slots?
 SuggestedRemedy
 The recommendation for TDD slots synchronisation multi lane operation can be given.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.1 P 158 L 28 # 450
 Ganesan, Aravind Texas Instruments
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The paragraph talks about the timing operations at the follower. it is expected that the follower locks on to the leader clock. The accuracy requirement of the lock and holdover quality of the leader clock is not mentioned.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The accuracy requirement of the clock lock and holdover performance of the follower needs to be mentioned.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.1 P 158 L 28 # 36
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "The LEADER-FOLLOWER relationship is predetermined via management control during initialization or via default hardware setup." appears at L28 and L31, delete one
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete duplicate sentence L28-29, keep L31-32.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.1 P 158 L 30 # 238
 Chandrasekhar Sriram
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The draft suggests that the FOLLOWER phy recovers the clock from the received signal, but this clock is not available during time when LEADER's transmit is switched off (as part of time duplexing). Moreover since the time duration of the LEADER's transmit/FOLLOWER's receive is much less than FOLLOWER's transmit, I believe this implementation will lead to a very complicated CDR to deal with clock drifts.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest scraping this LEADER/FOLLOWER concept for TDD or give an option to the implementer to use an independent clock source for the FOLLOWER.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.1.1 P 158 L 46 # 63
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The symbols N_r, N_p, and N_z would be better written using subscript format for the r, n, and p, as is typically done for mathematical parameters, instead of using an underscore character. This would make their use in equations (e.g. 192-11) appear more readable. Similarly for N_{inf} and N_{TDD} on page 198 and possibly other symbols.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the symbols in 192.1.1.1 per the comment, and apply corresponding changes in the text throughout the document (43 instances of N_r, 42 of N_p, 21 of N_z).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 1 # 109

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The wording for the aggregate terminology below the figure is a bit awkward: "When talking about the asymmetric PHY communicating on a shielded, balanced, pair of conductors, regardless of transmit bit rate, use: ", etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the definitions below the figure. Add these to the list of nomenclature that is above the table:

MultiGBASE-AT1 Refers to the asymmetric PHY communicating on a shielded, balanced, pair of conductors

MultiGBASE-AV1 Refers to the asymmetric communicating on a coaxial cable

MultiGBASE-A Refers to all PHYs regardless of cable type or bit rate

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 224

Lee, Ching-Yen

Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

For the high-speed/low-speed options, add 7.5 Gbps/1 Gbps and 5 Gbps/1 Gbps to Clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

With editorial license, implement the changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 357

Wang, Frank

Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

In clause 192, add a 7.5 Gb/s PHY option for high-speed path.

SuggestedRemedy

With editorial license, implement the changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02a_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 222

Veloso, Gumersindo

BMW Group

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Add a 1 Gb/s LS PHY option for use with Clause 192

SuggestedRemedy

Add 1 Gb/s LS PHY support according to changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G-comment-preview.pdf and adapt any affected chapter/subchapter as can be seen under [chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G-comment-preview.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G-comment-preview.pdf).

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 220

Matheus, Kirsten

BMW Group

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Add a 1 Gb/s LS PHY option for use with Clause 192

SuggestedRemedy

Add 1 Gb/s LS PHY support in accordance with changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G-comment-preview.pdf

Note: for efficiency reasons (the referenced page, sub-clause and line # in this comment is reduced to a single sub-clause (192.1.1). All relevant pages, sub-clauses and lines that require updates can be seen in the referenced markup file ([chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G-comment-preview.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G-comment-preview.pdf)).

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 219

Matheus, Kirsten BMW Group

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Add a 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY option for use with Clause 192

SuggestedRemedy

Add 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY support in accordance with changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf.

Note: for efficiency reasons the referenced page, sub-clause and line # in this comment is reduced to a single sub-clause (192.1.1). All relevant pages, sub-clauses and lines that require update can be seen in the referenced markup file (gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf).

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 223

Lee, Ching-Yen Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

For the high-speed/low-speed options, add 7.5 Gbps/100 Mbps to Clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

With editorial license, implement the changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02a_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 264

Tazebay, Mehmet Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Add a 5 Gb/s High Speed direction and 1000 Mb/s Low Speed direction PHY support in Clause 192

SuggestedRemedy

Add 5 Gb/s High Speed direction PHY and 1000 Mb/s Low Speed direction PHY support according to changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 358

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status X

In clause 192, add 1 Gb/s data rate for low-speed path when the data rates in high-speed path are 7.5 Gb/s or 5 Gb/s.

SuggestedRemedy

With editorial license, implement the changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 221

Veloso, Gumersindo BMW Group

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Add a 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY option for use with Clause 192

SuggestedRemedy

Add 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY support according to changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf and adapt any affected chapter/subchapter as can be seen under [gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf).

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 225

Schedl, Anton BMW Group

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Add a 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY option for use with Clause 192

SuggestedRemedy

Add 7.5 Gb/s HS PHY support according to changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf.

Note: for efficiency reasons (i.e., avoid a lot of duplicates in the comments) the referenced page, sub-clause and line # in this comment is reduced to a single sub-clause (192.1.1). All relevant pages, sub-clauses and lines that require update can be seen in the referenced markup file (gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf).

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 226

Schedl, Anton BMW Group

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Add a 1 Gb/s LS PHY option for use with Clause 192

SuggestedRemedy

Add 1 Gb/s LS PHY support according to changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G-comment-preview.pdf

Note: for efficiency reasons (i.e., avoid a lot of duplicates in the comments) the referenced page, sub-clause and line # in this comment is reduced to a single sub-clause (192.1.1). All relevant pages, sub-clauses and lines that require updates can be seen in the referenced markup file (chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G-comment-preview.pdf).

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 263

Tazebay, Mehmet Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Add 7.5 Gb/s High Speed direction PHY and 1000 Mb/s Low Speed direction PHY support in Clause 192

SuggestedRemedy

Add 7.5 Gb/s High Speed direction PHY and 1000 Mb/s Low Speed direction PHY support according to changes proposed in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/chini_3dm_02a_D2d0_1G_comments-preview.pdf, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1.1 P 159 L 17 # 262

Tazebay, Mehmet Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Add a 7.5 Gb/s High Speed direction PHY support in Clause 192

SuggestedRemedy

Add a 7.5 Gb/s High Speed direction PHY support https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/adhoc/060226/gorshe_3dm_02_D2d0_7d5G-comments.pdf, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1.2 P 160 L 21 # 37

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Text says PHY sublayers are shown shaded, but PMD is not shaded.

SuggestedRemedy

Shade PMD blocks in Figure 192-1.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1.2 P 160 L 35 # 64

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The stack in figure 192-2 includes "PMD" boxes. But these PHYs do not have a PMD sublayer (based on the clause title and lack of a PMD subclause). The AT1 and AV1 are PHYs for different media, and the differences are in the MDI (per 192.1.6).

There are other mentions of "PMD" in 192.9.2.1 and 192.10.2.1, and in the PICS.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the PMD boxes and legend item from the figure.
Delete other mentions of PMD from the clause.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1.2 P 167 L 33 # 166

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status X

atypical order

SuggestedRemedy

Change: FOLLOWER-LEADER
To: LEADER-FOLLOWER

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 192 SC 192.1.3.1 P 162 L 17 # 244
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 I thought we had agreed that for consistency with other IEEE 802.3 clauses, the symbol size should be omitted from within the parentheses.
 SuggestedRemedy
 RS-FEC(128,122,8) should be just RS-FEC(128,122)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.1.3.1 P 162 L 20 # 336
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 insert a space between "Duration" and "="
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "Duration=" to "Duration ="
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.2.1.1.1 P 167 L 6 # 65
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 "The parameter tx_mode can take on one of the following values of the form"
 These are just the values, not form.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete "of the form"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.2.1.3.1 P 168 L 20 # 337
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 the text for {-1, +1} is not clear to read
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "in data and training modes for all refresh header, 2.5 Gb/s mode, and 5 Gb/s mode data payloads."
 to "2.5 Gb/s or 5 Gb/s transmit payload in data mode and all refresh header in data and training modes."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.2.1.3.1 P 169 L 18 # 167
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 reword to make definitions parallel
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 10 Gb/s transmit payload in data mode
 To: in data mode for 10 Gb/s mode data payloads
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.2.1.9 P 171 L 8 # 168
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 There is a "from" but no "to".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: from their initialization states.
 To: from their initialization states to their data states.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.3.2 P 171 L 22 # 169
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 improve wording and add OAM
SuggestedRemedy
 Change: The PCS comprises one PCS Reset function and two simultaneous and synchronous operating functions. The PCS operating functions are PCS Transmit and PCS Receive..
 To: The PCS comprises the following functions: PCS Reset, PCS Transmit, PCS Receive, and an optional PCS OAM. The PCS Transmit and PCS Receive functions execute simultaneously and asynchronously.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2 P 172 L 51 # 394
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 A word seems to be missing...
SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "...to the PCS Transmit bit ordering (see Figure 192-5 and Figure 192-6)."
 with, "...to the PCS Transmit bit order mapping (see Figure 192-5 and Figure 192-6).
 Grant Editor's license to modify PICS to align if a change is made.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2 P 173 L 12 # 170
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 numberssmaller than 10 should be written out per the IEEE Style manual
SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 1, To: one
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2 P 173 L 14 # 245
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The wording "a PAM2 symbol" implies all of the 1040 bits are mapped to a single PAM2 symbol
SuggestedRemedy
 Consistent with the wording in the next paragraph, replace "a PAM2 symbol" with "PAM2 symbols"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2 P 173 L 29 # 171
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 add a reference to the figure that shows the TDD cycle.
SuggestedRemedy
 After: to complete the TDD cycle.
 Add (See Figure 192-17 and Figure 192-18.)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2 P 173 L 43 # 172
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The sequence is not generated to the PMA, it is generated and passed to the PMA.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change: shall generate a sequence (On) defined in 192.3.4 to the PMA
 To: shall generate a sequence (On) defined in 192.3.4, which is passed to the PMA
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 192 SC 192.3.2.2 P 173 L 47 # 173
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 missing article
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: makes request
 To: makes a request
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.3.2.2 P 174 L 4 # 247
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Since "RS-FEC(128,122) has already been introduced, it is better to use consistent RS-FEC language
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "(128,122) RS-FEC" with "RS-FEC(128,122)"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.3.2.2 P 173 L 52 # 174
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 use a non-breaking hyphen
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the hyphen in 17-bit to a non-breaking hyphen to keep 17-bit on the same line.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.3.2.2 P 174 L 11 # 175
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 break up sentence
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: complete a full TDD cycle of symbols, and then the process is repeated for each TDD cycle.
 To: complete a full TDD cycle of symbols. The process is repeated for each TDD cycle.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.3.2.2 P 173 L 54 # 246
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Since "RS-FEC(130,124) has already been introduced, it is better to use consistent RS-FEC language
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "(130,124) RS-FEC" with "RS-FEC(130,124)"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.3.2.2 P 174 L 43 # 17
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "PCS Transmit shall generate a sequence (On) defined in 192.3.4 "
 Cross-reference seems to be incorrect.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to 192.3.4.3
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 192 SC 192.3.2.2.1 P 174 L 16 # 338

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

PMA training frame uses PAM2 only.

SuggestedRemedy

change "PAM2/PAM4" to "PAM2"

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.3.2.2.4 P 177 L 23 # 66

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The 64B65B coding in this clause seems identical to the one used in previous PHYs (such as clause 149, which is referenced by Clause 191.

If it is the same, it should be referred back too, for consistency and ease of reading and reviewing.

If there are differences, it would help the reader if they are indicated.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the content of 192.3.2.2.4 through 192.3.2.2.11 with references to clause 149, as done in 191.3.2.2.2 through 191.3.2.2.11 and in 191.4.2.2.4 through 191.4.2.2.11.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.3.2.2.4 P 177 L 28 # 248

Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Suggestion to improve the flow and reduce redundancy of this and the following first paragraph of 193.2.2.5 (line 3 of pp. 179).

SuggestedRemedy

Suggested replacement for the paragraphs beginning in Line 28 and 33: "As illustrated in Figure 192-7, data blocks contain eight data characters and control blocks begin with an eight-bit block type field that indicates the format of the remainder of the block."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.3.2.2.4 P 177 L 33 # 249

Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status X

SuggestedRemedy

"The specific format of the blocks is shown in Figure 192-7. The column labeled Input Data shows, in abbreviated form, the eight characters used to create the 65-bit block. These characters are either data characters or control characters and, when transferred across the XGMII interface, the corresponding TXC or RXC bit is set accordingly. Within the input data column, D0 through D7 are data octets and are transferred with the corresponding TXC or RXC bit set to zero. All other characters are control octets and are transferred with the corresponding TXC or RXC bit set to one. Each control block contains eight characters. For control blocks containing a Start or Terminate character, as indicated by an S or T octet in the Figure 192-7 Input Data field, that character is implied by the block type field. Other control characters are encoded in a seven-bit control code or a four-bit O Code. The single bit fields in control blocks (thin rectangles with no label in the figure) are sent as zero and ignored upon receipt."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.3.2.2.5 P 179 L 29 # 67

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Table 192-3 contains two control codes defined as ordered sets, which are encoded by block type and O code; the O codes are provided. In addition, it contains six "reserved" control codes for which the O code is listed as "reserved" too. But these are not O codes (4 bit values).

The reason for having these reserved values is unclear. Valid and reserved XGMII control characters are listed in Table 46-3 and Table 46-4 (802.3-2022), and there are many reserved ones. What is special in the six values listed here?

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "reserved0" through "reserved5" from the "O code" column.

Consider deleting these rows entirely.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.5 P 179 L 41 # 68

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The designation of a special ordered set and control codes for "reserved for Fibre Channel" was made for the BASE-X PCS and then carried over to BASE-R PCS. It is unlikely that Fibre Channel will ever use the new PCS defined here or coexist on same networks, and T11 has not requested the 802.3dm task force to make these reservations. Therefore these reserved codes and ordered sets are just confusing the reader. Carrying this designation forward is not justified.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the "Signal ordered set" row and update the text in 192.3.2.2.6 accordingly. Also update R_BLOCK_TYPE 192.3.5.1.3 to remove the block type field 0x55.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.5 P 179 L 43 # 250

Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status X

There are other Signal ordered set values in addition to the one for Fibre Channel (i.e., FlexE and MTN). If we include Fibre Channel, they should also be included in the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Since there is no chance that any of those applications would appear in a P802.3dm network application, I recommend deleting this note rather than elaborating the list.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.6 P 179 L 48 # 38

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X

"remote fault and Local Fault" should have consistent capitalization

SuggestedRemedy

Change "remote fault" to "Remote Fault"

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.13 P 181 L 3 # 176

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Improve wording and follow IEEE Style manual for numbers.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: Fifteen of 65B blocks

To: 15 65B blocks

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.14 P 182 L 1 # 69

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The curved arrows in Figure 192-8 are confusing - they don't appear to include RS encoder #1. Supposedly they should denote "round-robin" but that is not the usual representation (more commonly a circular arc is used with terminals placed accordingly. The definition of the sequence under the "output encoded symbols" arrow is sufficient.

SuggestedRemedy

Either draw the curved arrows such that they span all the inputs and outputs (circular arcs), or just remove them.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.15 P 182 L 3 # 39

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The top right text in Figure 202-15 looks like it has 2 sets of characters overlaid.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete overlaid non-italicized text in top right of Figure 192-15 "m122 × L-1,m121 × L-1,...,mL-1,p1,5,...,p1,0"

Retain version of text with italicized "L"s: "m122 × L-1,m121 × L-1,...,mL-1,p1,5,...,p1,0"

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.15 P 182 L 3 # 126
 de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Though largely reused from Clause 149, the interleave diagram (Figure 192–8) is strange. Specifically, the input distribution and output recombine arrows don't look like they include the first FEC Encoder!
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider modifying Figure 192–8 to more effectively show the round robin.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.16 P 182 L 51 # 177
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 awkward wording
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: which is identified with the element of the finite field $m_{i,0}$ is the first bit transmitted.
 To: which is identified with the element of the finite field, where $m_{i,0}$ is the first bit transmitted.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.16 P 183 L 15 # 178
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 unnecessary word
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove "both".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.16 P 184 L 1 # 70
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 In Figure 192-9 the output of block $p_{₁}$ feeds the input of block $p_{_{n-k-1}}$. This seems incorrect.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add something in between (e.g. arrows and ellipsis).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.17 P 185 L 8 # 71
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Equations use a mixture of standard typography and markup-style text.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In equations 192-4 and 192-5, change "!=" to the "not equal" sign.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.17 P 185 L 16 # 179
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 subject/verb agreement, the subject is scrambled payload bits, not scrambled payload
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: for PAM2 is shown
 To: for PAM2 are shown
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.17 P 185 L 18 # 339
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 formatting: italics and subscript
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "Dn[0]" to "Dn[0]"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.17 P 185 L 28 # 180
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 This sentences is very confusing. Do you meand the second MSB, meaning bit 7 if there were 8 bits, or do you mean the 2nd bit is the MSB. I think it is the latter and my suggestion is based on this.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: The first least significant bit (LSB) is DS_n[0] equal to Sc_rn[0]. The second most significant (MSB) bit is DS_n[1] ...
 To: The first bit, which is the least significant bit (LSB) is DS_n[0] equal to Sc_rn[0]. The second bit, which is the most significant (MSB) bit is DS_n[1] ...
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.17 P 185 L 35 # 72
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Equations 192-6 and 192-7 defing A_n and B_n, which seem to apply only with tx_mode=SEND_N. Assuming that is the case, then there is no need to list tx_mode=SEND_N in their definitions (it raises the question what happens when the mode is different?)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete "tx_mode=SEND_N" and the opening brace in both equations
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.18 P 185 L 46 # 73
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The initial value of the PRBS11 generator is not specified. I assume it can be any value except all zeros, as in the PRBS33 scramblers.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Indicate the reset conditions and requirements for the PRBS11 generator, as done in 192.3.2.2.19.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.18 P 185 L 53 # 251
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Add clarification regarding when the PRBS11 runs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 While this is specified in 192.3.6.3, for consistency with 192.3.2.2.19, it would be good to add new text below Equation 192-8: "This scrambler, once started during PMA training, shall continue to run uninterrupted during the refresh headers of each frame and shall stop during the burst payload field and QUIET." Note that 192.3.6 also contains a statement similar to the one in 192.3.2.2.19.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.19 P 186 L 20 # 128
 de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Though we've abandoned master/slave terminology in favour of Leader/Follower, Equations (192-9) and (192-10) still use "M/S".
 Comment also applies to equation (191-8) in Section 191.4.2.2.16
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace gM(x) and gS(s) with gL(X) and gF(x), respectively.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.19 P 186 L 34 # 181
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 unnecessary comma
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the comma after "In no case".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.19 P 187 L 1 # 74
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Figure 192-11 shows two LFSR realizations which are conceptually similar to the PRBS11 generator in Figure 192-10, but the symbols used for the addition and the delay elements are different, the figure titles are different, and the scrambler in figure 192-11 has no explicit output (although in Figure 192-6 it is shown that it has three outputs, Scr_n indexes 0, 3, and 8).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change one of the figures (preferably figure 192-10) to be consistent with the other, especially the addition and delay elements.
 Preferably, show the outputs of the LFSRs in Figure 192-11.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.22 P 188 L 20 # 182
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 missing article
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: according to following
 To: according to the following
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.22 P 188 L 20 # 384
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Missing word
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change, "according to following mapping"
 to, "according to the following mapping"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.22 P 188 L 23 # 490
 Zerna, Conrad NXP
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 PAM2 encoding is inconsistent with PAM4 encoding, which is problematic for refresh header versus payload.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change line to:
 Input bit Sn is mapped to the transmit symbol Tn as follows: if Sn = 0, then Tn = -1, if Sn = 1, then Tn = +1.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.3 P 189 L 3 # 466
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Figure 192-19 'RFER monitor block state diagram' uses the block_lock as an open arrow entry condition to the RFER_MT_INIT state, with subclause 192.3.5.1.2 'Variables' defining block_lock as a 'Boolean variable ...'. Further, subclause 192.3.6.1 Status 'Status' says the block_lock bit 'Indicates the state of the block_lock variable.'. Subclause 192.3.2.3 'PCS Receive function', however, describes when the 'block_lock flag is de-asserted' and when the '... block_lock flag is re-asserted ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either change all instances of '... block_lock flag ...' to '... block_lock variable ...' or to just '... block_lock ...' as is used elsewhere in subclause 192.3.2.3.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.3 P 189 L 4 # 340
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 there is a space between "hi" and "_rfer"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "hi_rfer" to "hi_rfer"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.3.3 P 192 L 32 # 341
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 there is a space between "R_BLOCK_" and "TYPE"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "R_BLOCK_TYPE" to "R_BLOCK_TYPE"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.7 P 180 L 5 # 395
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Follow Style
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "4" with "four"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.3 P 192 L 38 # 396
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Should specifications for transmit and receive PCS test-pattern modes be written as "shall" statements, similar as to in clause 191.4.3?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "When the transmit PCS is operating in test-pattern mode, the input to the RS-FEC encoder (see Figure 192-5 or Figure 192-6) is set to zero and the initial condition of the PCS scrambler set to any non zero value."

with, "When the transmit PCS is operating in test-pattern mode, the input to the RS-FEC encoder (see Figure 192-5 or Figure 192-6) shall be set to zero and the initial condition of the PCS scrambler set to any non zero value."

Replace, "When the receiver PCS is operating in test-pattern mode, the received information is processed as shown in Figure 192-12 or Figure 192-13."

with, "When the receiver PCS is operating in test-pattern mode, the received information shall be processed as shown in Figure 192-12 or Figure 192-13."

Grant Editor's license to add PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.4 P 193 L 23 # 75
 Ran, Adee Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The symbol S_t is mixed typographic subscript and markup subscript. It is very unusual, and it makes it awkward to read and to refer to verbally (is it S-sub-t-sub-n?) I guess the "t" signifies that these are training symbols. But lowercase t usually stands for time. Surely a simpler notation is possible.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In Figure 192-5 this symbol appears as the output of the "training payload generator" so I'd suggest labeling it TP_n.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.3.4 P 196 L 3 # 252
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Add reference to new figure and table described in comment below.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add new sentence to the end of the paragraph: "See Figure 192-hh and Table 192-hh for an illustration of the data burst payload structure."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.4 P 196 L 26 # 253
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The data mode RS-FEC superframe only pertains to the HS, not the LS
 SuggestedRemedy
 As explained in 192.1, the HS TDD burst payload contains 25 RS-FEC superframes while the LS TDD burst payload contains a single RS-FEC superframe. Remove the 25-block structure from the data burst portion of the figure. A separate comment proposes a new figure and table to illustrate the data burst payload structure.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.4 P 196 L 33 # 254
 Steve, Gorshe Microchip Technology
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Add new figure and table to illustrate the data burst payload structure.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add new paragraph below Figure 192-18: "The burst payload structures are illustrated in Figure 192-hh, with the data burst payload information summarized in Table 192-h." Below this paragraph, insert the new figure and table from the attached file data_burst_format_fig_table.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.4.1 P 196 L 36 # 127
 de Koos, Andras Microchip Technology
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 It could be informative to note in this paragraph that the values in tables 192-7, 192-8, and 192-9 (symbols) are equivalent to the time values in Table 192-6
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the an explicative note to the paragraph:
 The durations (expressed in symbols) in the tables below match the durations (expressed in time) in Table 192-6.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.4.3 P 198 L 42 # 76
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The terms A_{n} and G_{n} are used in equation 192-13 without a definition in the equation. A_{n} is defined in equations 192-5 and 192-6, but I found only one other instance of G_{n} (in Figure 191-9, another clause). I suspect that G_{n} corresponds to $G(n)$ defined in 192.3.2.2.20.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add references to the definitions of these terms.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.1.2 P 199 L 52 # 183
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 missing definition of when to set FALSE
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add to the end of the definition: It is set FALSE otherwise.
 Also on P200L3, P200L11, and P200L15.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.1.2 P 200 L 2 # 217
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The definition of hi_rfer implies that it uses the rfer_timer, but Figure 192-19 appears to be controlling it.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Update the definition of hi_rfer to be "Boolean variable that is asserted TRUE when the rfer_cnt reaches 16 errors in one RFRX_CNT_LIMIT interval."
 Delete the rfer_timer as it is not used.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.1.2 P 200 L 2 # 53
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The definition of hi_rfer was copied from Clause 149 802.3-2022 but this was corrected in 802.3cy-2023 by changing 149.3.7.2.2. So update to match other corrections.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "rfer_timer" to "RFRX_CNT_LIMIT"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.1.2 P 200 L 6 # 467
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Subclause 192.3.5.1.2 'Variables' defines the pcs_data_mode variable with a cross-reference to 192.4.4.1, but then subclause 192.4.4.1 'State diagram variables' defines the pcs_data_mode variable with a cross-reference to 192.2.1.9.1. Suggest that the indirect cross-reference in subclause 192.3.5.1.2 be replaced with a direct cross-reference to 192.2.1.9.1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 'See 192.4.4.1.' to read 'See 192.2.1.9.1'.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.1.3 P 200 L 46 # 397
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Harmonize text for ENCODE (see P200,L52) and DECODE functions.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "The DECODE function shall decode the block based on code specified in 192.3.2.2.4."
 with, "The DECODE function shall decode the block as specified in 192.3.2.2.4."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.2 P 205 L 31 # 468
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Move the transition condition 'R_TYPE(rx_coded) = T * R_TYPE_NEXT = (S + C)' to the right so it is clear that it is associated with the RX_D to RX_T transition in Figure 191-19 'PCS 64B/65B Receive state diagram'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.2 P 205 L 36 # 469
 Law, David HPE
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Move the transition condition 'R_TYPE(rx_coded) = T * R_TYPE_NEXT = (S + C)' to the right so it is clear that it is associated with the RX_E to RX_T transition in Figure 191-19 'PCS 64B/65B Receive state diagram'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.4.1 P 207 L 21 # 470

Law, David

HPE

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

Figure 192–22 'PMA reference diagram' shows the config variable sourced from the PHY CONTROL block and passed from the PMA to the PCS across the PMA service interface. Subclause 192.4.2.4 'PHY Control function' says that 'PHY Control shall comply with the state diagram in Figure 192–26.'

Figure 192–26 'PHY Control state diagram', however, uses the config variable as an input, as part of the transition condition from the SILENT to TRAINING0 state. The config variable, therefore, is not sourced from the PHY CONTROL block as shown in Figure 192–22. Instead, both subclause 192.4.2.4.11 'Startup sequence' and subclause 192.2.1.2 'PMA_CONFIG.indication' say that the config variable is determined via management control or default hardware setup.

In addition, the PMA_CONFIG.indication primitive passes the config parameter from the PMA sublayer to the PCS; therefore, it seems odd to reference the PMA_CONFIG.indication config parameter in the PMA, since it is sourced there.

SuggestedRemedy

[1] Update figure 192–22 'PMA reference diagram' to [a] show a Configuration block that sources config and [b] show the config variable as an input to the PHY control block.

[2] Add a new PMA subclause as follows:

192.4.2.X PMA Configuration function

The PMA Configuration function sets the config variable to LEADER or FOLLOWER based on management control during initialisation or hardware setup.

[3] In subclause 192.4.4.1 'State diagram variables', change the definition of the config variable to read:

config
See 192.4.2.X.

[4] In subclause 192.4.2.4.11 'Startup sequence', delete the text 'PMA_CONFIG is predetermined to be the LEADER or FOLLOWER ...' since this is now addressed in the new 192.4.2.X 'PMA Configuration function' subclause.

[5] In subclause 192.4.2.2 'PMA Transmit function' change the text 'When the PMA_CONFIG.indication parameter config is LEADER, the ...' to read 'When the config variable (see 192.4.2.X) is set to LEADER, the ...' and change the text 'If the PMA_CONFIG.indication parameter config is FOLLOWER, the PMA Transmit function ...' to read 'When the config variable is set to FOLLOWER, the PMA Transmit function ...'.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.3 P 208 L 49 # 190

Wienckowski, Natalie

IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**

There is only one function listed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: include the functions of
To: include the function of

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.3 P 209 L 8 # 191

Wienckowski, Natalie

IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**

missing article

SuggestedRemedy

Add "the" between "receive" and "link".

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.3 P 210 L 28 # 192

Wienckowski, Natalie

IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**

Add non-breaking spaces between every three digits to make the number easier to read per IEEE Style Manual

SuggestedRemedy

Change: 16776959
To: 16 776 959

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.4 P 210 L 45 # 398
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 If values are not transmitted, then they are not available to be ignored.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "Any other values shall not be transmitted and shall be ignored at the receiver."
 with, "Any other values shall not be transmitted."
 Grant Editor's license to adjust PICS.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.4 P 210 L 47 # 193
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The rest of the paragraph uses "Message Field", but it is "Message Fields" in one spot for
 no apparent reason.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: Message Fields
 To: Message Field
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.4 P 210 L 48 # 399
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Typo
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "Message Fields setting"
 with, "Message Field setting"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.5 P 212 L 16 # 40
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The HS Rate fields could better align with the registers 1.2318 and 1.2320 in Clause 45 and
 the negotiated rate field by leaving a gap between 10G and 5G.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In Table 192-11 swap 10 Gb/s and Reserved between bit 5 and bit 4 in both Octet 9 and
 Octet 10.
 In Table 192-12 swap 10Gb/s and Reserved between row 000100 and 001000.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.5 P 212 L 33 # 194
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 It should be HS_RX, HS_TX, LS_RX, and LS_TX based on the Nomenclature in 192.1.1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add missing "_" in four places in this paragraph.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.5 P 212 L 44 # 54
 Muma, Scott Microchip
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Their can be multiple rates supported, so instead of 0's for the rows that have a 1 bit there
 should be x's.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In Table 192-12 in LS rate change 01 to x1, change 10 to 1x, delete the row with 11.
 In HS rate change:
 000001 to xxxxx1
 000010 to xxxx1x
 000100 to xxx1xx
 001000 to xx1xxx
 010000 to x1xxxx
 100000 to 1xxxxx
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 192 SC 192.4.2.4.6 P 213 L 40 # 195
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 missing article and comma
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: contains TDD delay counter sent LSB first.
 To: contains the TDD delay counter, sent LSB first.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.4.2.4.7 P 214 L 37 # 342
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 insert a comma after "Oct9<7:0>"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "[Oct8<7:0>, Oct9<7:0> Oct10<7:0>]" to "[Oct8<7:0>, Oct9<7:0>, Oct10<7:0>]"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.4.2.4.6 P 214 L 19 # 449
 Ganesan, Aravind Texas Instruments
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 It is not clear how the link segment delay maps to the delay count in the TDD delay counter. the link segment delay could also have some slow variation over time due to temperature drift.
 SuggestedRemedy
 A clarification in this section will help avoid ambiguity in implementation.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.4.2.4.7 P 214 L 39 # 197
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 capitalization
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: Data mode
 To: data mode
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.4.2.4.6 P 214 L 20 # 196
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The "should" should be "shall. Is it okay if the LEADER doesn't estimate the link segment delay? Can it just guess or pick a random value?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: it should estimate the link segment delay
 To: it shall estimate the link segment delay
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.4.2.4.7 P 214 L 214 # 388
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "will be" seems to imply something in the future and I don't think this is what's intended.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "will be" to "is"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.4.2.4.8 P 214 L 51 # 343
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 insert a comma after "Oct9<7:0>" and remove the right round bracket after "Oct10<7:0>"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "[Oct8<7:0>, Oct9<7:0> Oct10<7:0>]" to "[Oct8<7:0>, Oct9<7:0>, Oct10<7:0>]"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.9 P 215 L 5 # 400
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 There seems to be a comma missing and this sentence could be written more clearly.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "In Figure 192-25 the 16 delay elements S0,..., S15, shall be initialized to zero."
 with, "The 16 delay elements, S0,..., S15, shall be initialized to zero as shown in Figure
 192-25."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.11 P 216 L 3 # 198
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 verb tense
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: arrived at the FOLLOWER
 To: arrives at the FOLLOWER
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.11 P 216 L 13 # 199
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 How are you "at" a state? It should be during, e.g. while in the state.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: At any
 To: During any
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.11 P 216 L 17 # 344
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 change hyphen to en-dash
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "176 ns - delay_count" to "176 ns – delay_count"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.11 P 216 L 22 # 200
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 missing article
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: within maximum time
 To: within the maximum time
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.5 P 216 L 42 # 345
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 wording
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "pcs_data_mode=TRUE" to "pcs_data_mode = TRUE"
 and
 change "link_status" to "link_status"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.6 P 216 L 49 # 471

Law, David HPE

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Subclause 192.4.2.6 'Clock Recovery function' says, 'The received clock signal is supplied to the PMA Transmit function by received_clock for use when configured as the FOLLOWER. Figure 192-22 'PMA reference diagram', however, shows the recovered_clock supplied to the PMA transmit function with the note 'The recovered_clock arc is shown to indicate delivery of the received clock signal back the PMA TRANSMIT for loop timing.'. In addition, subclause 192.4.2.2 'PMA Transmit function' says 'If the ... config is FOLLOWER, the PMA Transmit function shall source TX_TCLK from the recovered clock of 192.4.2.6 ...'. In addition, suggest clarifying that the config variable determines when the function is configured as FOLLOWER.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the text 'The received clock signal is supplied to the PMA Transmit function by received_clock for use when configured as the FOLLOWER.' should be changed to read 'The received clock signal is supplied to the PMA Transmit function by recovered_clock for use when the config variable is set to FOLLOWER.'

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.4.1 P 219 L 28 # 201

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Change 01 value text to be parallel to 00 value text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: PHY Control is currently in asymmetric training.
To: PHY Control is currently in an asymmetric training phase.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.4.2 P 219 L 35 # 203

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Removed redundant statement. This is already stated in 191.2.7.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete: All timers operate in the manner described in 14.2.3.2.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.4.2 P 219 L 38 # 346

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

When training_active = TRUE, the time for "link_fail_inhibit_timer" stays in the SILENT state should also be considered. Therefore, the description of link_fail_inhibit_timer can be rewritten as proposed change for simplicity.

SuggestedRemedy

change:
"A timer used to determine the maximum amount of time the PHY Control stays in the TRAINING, COUNTDOWN, and PCS_TEST states."
to:
"A timer used to determine the maximum amount of time the PHY Control sets training_active = TRUE."

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.5 P 220 L 20 # 347

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

link_fail_inhibit_timer_done should only be valid when training_active = TRUE. Therefore, the condition for SILENT to DT needs update to avoid possible deadlock.

SuggestedRemedy

change one of the output conditions of SILENT state, "link_fail_inhibit_timer_done", to "link_fail_inhibit_timer_done * training_active".

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.4.5 P 220 L 24 # 348

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

rem_countdown_done has a similar definition as loc_countdown_done. As the description in 192.4.4.1, both are set to FALSE when entering to a TRAINING state. If "loc_countdown_done <= FALSE" is included in TRAINING0 and TRAINING1 of PHY Control state diagram, "rem_countdown_done <= FALSE" should also be included.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "rem_countdown_done <= FALSE" to TRAINING0 and TRAINING1 states.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.4.5 P 221 L 36 # 472

Law, David HPE
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Figure 192-27 'PHY Control state diagram' in the PMA uses the hi_rfer and block_lock variables, yet these variables are not defined in subclause 192.4.4.1 'State diagram variables'. The hi_rfer and block_lock variables are generated in the PCS, with the hi_rfer variable generated in Figure 192-19 'RFRX monitor state diagram', and the block_lock generated in subclause 192.3.2.3 PCS 'Receive function'. As a result, these variables pass across the PMA Service interface, yet they are not parameters of any of the primitives defined in subclause 192.2.1 'PMA service interface'. Further, they are not illustrated in Figure 192-3 'MultiGBASE-A service interface', Figure 192-4 'PCS reference diagram', or Figure 192-22 'PMA reference diagram'.

SuggestedRemedy

[1] Add the following to the list of primitives in subclause 192.2.1 'PMA service interface':

PMA_PCSSYNC.request(block_lock, rfer_cnt)

[2] Add an arrow labelled 'PMA_PCSSYNC.request' from the PHY_S PCS to PHY_S PMA block in Figure 191-5 'PHY_S service interfaces' in Figure 191-5 'PHY_S service interfaces' and Figure 191-6 'PHY_D service interfaces'.

[3] Add the following new subclauses to subclause 192.2.1:

192.2.1.X PMA_PCSSYNC.request

192.2.1.X.1 Semantics of the primitive

PMA_PCSSYNC.request(block_lock, rfer_cnt)

The PMA_PCSSYNC.request primitive passes the block_lock and rfer_cnt parameters from the PCS to the PMA.

The parameter block_lock can take on one of the following two values of the form:

TRUE The PCS Synchronization process has acquired block delineation.
 FALSE The PCS Synchronization process has not acquired block delineation.

The parameter rfer_cnt can take on one of the following two values of the form:

TRUE The PCS Synchronization has detected 16 errors in one RFRX_CNT_LIMIT interval.
 FALSE The PCS Synchronization has not detected 16 errors in one RFRX_CNT_LIMIT interval.

192.2.1.X.2 When generated

The PCS generates PMA_PCSSYNC.request messages to indicate a change in block_lock or rfer_cnt.

192.2.1.X.3 Effect of receipt

The effect of receipt of this primitive is specified in Figure 191-31.

[4] Add block_lock and rfer_cnt to figures 192-3, 192-4, and 192-22.

[5] Add the following variables to subclause 192.4.4.1 'State diagram variables':

block_lock

Boolean variable that is set TRUE by the PCS Synchronization process when it acquires block delineation. It is passed to the PMA via the block_lock parameter of the PMA_PCSSYNC.request primitive.

hi_rfer

Boolean variable that is set TRUE by the PCS Synchronization process when the rfer_cnt reaches 16 errors in one RFRX_CNT_LIMIT interval. It is passed to the PMA via the rfer_cnt parameter of the PMA_PCSSYNC.request primitive.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.5.1 P 223 L 23 # 349

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

10 Gb/s PHY transmits PAM4 for test mode 4, not PAM2.

SuggestedRemedy

change:

"PHYs that support 5 Gb/s and 10 Gb/s transmit rates shall support transmission of this signal at 6 GBd."

to:

"PHYs that support 5 Gb/s transmit rate shall support transmission of this signal at 6 GBd."

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 192 SC 192.5.1.1 P 224 L 17 # 350
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Test mode 4 in clause 192 is "transmitter distortion test", not "transmitter linearity test".
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "transmitter linearity" to "transmitter distortion".
 Do the same implementation for line 13 of page 225 (Figure 192-31).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.5.2.3 P 227 L 13 # 352
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 typo: remove"/"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "5 Gb/s/" to "5 Gb/s".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.5.2 P 225 L 20 # 351
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 to align with 802.3ch, change "ac" to "AC" and change "dc" to "DC".
 SuggestedRemedy
 line 21: change "ac-coupled" to "AC-coupled"; change "dc" to "DC".
 line 22: change "ac-coupling" to "AC-coupling".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.5.2.4 P 227 L 26 # 359
 Seth, Sumantra Texas Instruments
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Table 192-19 power levels are higher than Table 191-16 power level.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should have Same power level between Table 192-19 and Table 191-16
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.5.2.2 P 225 L 43 # 204
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernetvia & Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 improve wording
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: The captured block of signal shall be at least 4000 transmitted symbols long and be sampled with the minimum 10x oversampling. The transmit baud rate may be reduced to 1 Gs/s by repeating the symbols using the same clock edge as in data mode of operation.
 To: The captured block of signal shall be at least 4000 transmitted symbols long and be sampled with a minimum of 10x oversampling. The transmit baud rate may be reduced to 1 Gs/s by repeating the symbols using the same clock edge as in the data mode of operation.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.5.2.4 P 227 L 36 # 360
 Seth, Sumantra Texas Instruments
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 Differential (Balanced) and Single Ended (Unbalanced)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Differential (Balanced) and Single Ended (Unbalanced) should be replaced as T1-MDI and V1-MDI to be consistent across tables.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 192 SC 192.5.2.4 P 228 L 15 # 83
 Lusted, Kent Synopsys
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The abbreviation "UPSD" is not intuitively obvious to the average reader.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "UPSD" to "Upper PSD"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.5.2.4 P 228 L 24 # 84
 Lusted, Kent Synopsys
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 The abbreviation "LPSD" is not intuitively obvious to the average reader.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "LPSD" to "Lower PSD"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.5.2.6 P 230 L 25 # 392
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Typo - ")" not required
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "1 ppm/sec)."
 with, "1 ppm/sec."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.7.1.3 P 233 L 12 # 353
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 change angle brackets to round brackets.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "<" to "(" and change ">" to ")".
 Do the same for Equation (192-26).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.7.1.5 P 233 L 53 # 29
 Bergner, Bert TE Connectivity
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Screening attenuation refers to SC 149.7.1.5. This subclause defines screening attenuation with 45dB from 30MHz up to Fmax. Fmax depends on speed grade in Clause 149. Thus, we inherit the speed grade dependency from Clause 149 which will differentiate between 2.5G, 5G and 10G. This conflicts with the idea of screening and coupling attenuation in 192 to be independent of speed grade.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the sentens to " The screening attenuation of each -T1 link shall be as specified in 149.7.5.1 with Fmax = 5000 MHz."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.7.1.6 P 234 L 3 # 205
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Why is the frequency range for the maximum link delay different from the frequency range for IL and RL?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: between 3 MHz and 4 GHz.
 To: between 10 MHz and 5 GHz.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.7.2.1 P 234 L 22 # 354
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 formatting
 SuggestedRemedy
 The variables (f, j, and m) in (192-21) should be italic.
 Do the same for Equations (192-23), (192-28), and (192-30).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.7.2.2 P 235 L 40 # 355
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 formatting: the second "f" in line 40 should be italic.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "f" to "f".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.8.1.5 P 239 L 3 # 136
 Long, Richard TE Connectivity
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Screening attenuation limits need to be changed
 SuggestedRemedy
 The screening attenuation of a -V1 link segment shall meet the values determined using Equation (191-19). Screening attenuation is tested as specified in IEC 62153-4-7 using triaxial tube-in-tube method. Additional screening attenuation test methodologies are defined in Annex 149A. These methodologies shall be applied with adaptation to unbalanced coaxial cabling. (See Bergner contribution from June 16 Ad Hoc)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.8.1.5 P 239 L 4 # 34
 Bergner, Bert TE Connectivity
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Screening attenuation for -V1 coaxial unbalanced link segment: The sentence "Additional screening attenuation test methodologies are defined in Annex 149A." takes reference to clause 149A which defines screening attenuation measurement specifically for balanced link segments only. This may cause confusion.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the sentence to "The additional screening attenuation test methodologies defined in Annex 149A shall be applied with adaptation to unbalanced coaxial cabling."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.8.1.5 P 239 L 7 # 30
 Bergner, Bert TE Connectivity
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Screening attenuation for clause 192 -V1 link segments is defined by (192-27) with 64dB up to 3GHz and 54dB up to 5GHz. The link segment contains cable and connectors. The USCAR-49 defines screening attenuation for a single connector only with 62dB up to 2GHz which is less than the 192 -V1 link segment. USCAR-49 is considered as state of the art definition of automotive grade coaxial connectors. Thus, the 802.3dm objective "Define ... link segments suitable for use with ... automotive unbalanced coaxial cabling supporting use of up to 4 inline connectors ..." cannot be fulfilled.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change screening attenuation requirements for 192.8.1.5 in equation (192-27) to same value as in 191.10.1.5 (equation (191-19)).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.8.1.6 P 239 L 42 # 206
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Why is the frequency range for the maximum link delay different from the frequency range for IL and RL?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: between 3 MHz and 4 GHz.
 To: between 10 MHz and 5 GHz.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.8.2 P 239 L 50 # 35
 Bergner, Bert TE Connectivity
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Coupling parameters for -V1 coaxial link segments: The sentence "Test methodologies are specified in Annex 97B." refers to Annex 97B which specifically describes cross talk measurements for balanced cabling. Especially the description in 97A "Link segment ends not under test are terminated in 100 Ohm differential mode and 200 Ohm common mode." and Figure 97B-1 may cause confusion.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the sentence to "Test methodologies are specified in Annex 97B and shall be applied with adaptation to unbalanced coaxial cabling."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.8.2.2 P 241 L 17 # 356
 Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 formatting: the second "f" in line 17 should be italic.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "f" to "f".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.9.2.1 P 243 L 5 # 391
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Typo - "is" not required
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace, "a nominal differential characteristic is impedance of..."
 with, "a nominal differential characteristic impedance of..."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.9.2.1 P 243 L 21 # 207
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Why is the maximum MDI RL frequency less than the link segment RL frequency? I think
 is left from before the link segment requirements were finalized.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 4000
 To: 5000 for 5 Gb/s and 10 Gb/s
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.10.2.1 P 244 L 36 # 208
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia & Bosch
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Why is the maximum MDI RL frequency less than the link segment RL frequency? I think
 is left from before the link segment requirements were finalized.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 4000
 To: 5000 for 5 Gb/s and 10 Gb/s
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.12 P 246 L 40 # 121
 Kim, Yong General Motors
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Pause (CL31 and Annex 31B) operation seem irrelevant to camera and display application
 that these asymmetric PHYs are defined to be used. This said, 31.B.4.3, Pg 6383 on 802.3-
 2022 edition, refers to 31.B.3.7 that says "Stations that do not implement an exposed MII,
 shall measure this time at the MDI, with the timing specification increased to one
 pause_quantum + 64 BT." This project has 100 Mbps that does not have exposed MII, the
 timing is increased by 64 BT. this conflicts with "The sum of the transmit and receive data
 delays for an implementation of the PHY shall not exceed the
 limits shown in Table 192-24." in CL192.12, pg 247 line 1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Select which one is correct, i.e. pause quanta with or without +64 BT, and revise the text
 to match.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3dm D2.0 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 192 SC 192.12 P 247 L 10 # 383
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; affl w/ CME Consulting, Microchip, and
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Make adjustments to Table 192-24 and Table 191-24 to align with Table 81-1 and make minor editorial adjustments.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In Table 192-24 and Table 191-24,
 Change table title from "Delay Limits" to "Delay constraints"
 Change "Bit times" column header to "Maximum bit time (BT)"
 Change "Pause quanta" column header to "Maximum pause_quanta"
 Change "Delay (ns)" to "Maximum delay (ns)"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.13.3 P 249 L 6 # 120
 Kim, Yong General Motors
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 This sub-clause on, PICS Profoma is incomplete. Please complete.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please complete.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.13 P 249 L 4 # 85
 Lusted, Kent Synopsys
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 PICS entries for 192.13.3, 192.13.4.1, and 192.13.4.2 are incomplete
 SuggestedRemedy
 Complete PIC entries
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 192 SC 192.13.3 P 248 L 5 # 284
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 PICS are missing.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Complete PICS
 Proposed Response Response Status O