

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

Cl 1 SC 1.4.46a P 31 L 32 # 81

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Rewording of definitions is overly verbose and doesn't quite make sense (e.g., a "Physical Layer specification" for a "Physical Layer"?). Suggested improvement applies to 1.4.46a through 1.4.46f, 1.4.95a & b, and 1.4.178 a & b.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for an asymmetric full duplex Ethernet Physical Layer for point-to-point transmission" to "IEEE 802.3 specification for an asymmetric full duplex Ethernet Physical Layer for point-to-point transmission" in 1.4.46a through 1.4.46f, 1.4.95 a&b, and 1.4.178a&b.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.405f P 33 L 12 # 82

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ-R

MultiGBASE-A definition does not align with MultiGBASE-AT1 and MultiGBASE-AV1 on the speeds and presumes a 1000 Mb/s rate in the opposite direction, which is not in the specification.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "less than or equal to 1000 Mb/s" to "100 Mb/s" to align with 104.405g and 104.405h.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.3.2.1.2 P 34 L 15 # 83

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R

Looking at the PHY type change for MultiGBASE-A highlights an error in all the phy type definitions in 30.3.2.1.2.

These are attributes of aPHYtype. The Behavior states "A read-only value that identifies the PHY type. The value of this attribute maps to the value of aMAUType." Therefore, we should have one per PHY type. That means we shouldn't be defining the family here (combining T1/V1) - these are enumerated management objects and need to enumerate each phy type separately. Note that aMAUType (30.5.1.1.2) is done correctly, with separate entries per type and inconsistently with 30.3.2.1.2 and 30.3.2.1.3. The error effects both 30.3.2.1.2 (PhyType) and 30.3.2.1.3 (PhyType list) which are somewhat redundant. Suggested remedy also includes improved wording for the clause 192 PHY, where the multiple PAM types leads to confusion.

SuggestedRemedy

At P34 Lines 16,17, 24,25, 32, and 33: Replace each T1/V1 entry with an entry for T1 and an entry for V1 adding, "for balanced pair media" to T1 and "for coaxial media" to V1.

At P34 Line 39, Replace MultiGBASE-A with Two entries, one for MultiGBASE-AT1 and one for MultiGBASE-AV1, with definitions:

"MultiGBASE-AT1 Clause 192 Asymmetric rate 2.5Gb/s to 10 Gb/s PAM HS_PATH, 100 Mb/s PAM2 LS_PATH for balanced pair media." and

"MultiGBASE-AV1 Clause 192 Asymmetric rate 2.5Gb/s to 10 Gb/s PAM HS_PATH, 100 Mb/s PAM2 LS_PATH for coaxial media."

Make the corresponding same changes in 30.2.1.3 entries, at P34 L49, 50; P35 L5,6; P35 L12,13; and P35 L19.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

Cl 30 **SC 30.3.2.1.2** **P 34** **L 24** # **157**

Regev, Alon Keysight

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

The 2.5G table row reads "2.5 Gb/s PAM2 transmit, 100 Mb/s DME receive", but the parallel 5G and 10G rows omit the word "transmit": "5 Gb/s PAM2, 100 Mb/s DME receive" and "10 Gb/s PAM4, 100 Mb/s DME receive". Occurs in both the aPhyType and aPhyTypeList tables.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "transmit" after "PAM2"/"PAM4" in the 5G and 10G rows of both tables.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make this change after the change defined by #83 to ensure the word "transmit" is added correctly, where appropriate.

Cl 31B **SC 31B** **P 315** **L 36** # **122**

Muma, Scott Microchip

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

Typo 10.5 should be 10

SuggestedRemedy

Change 10.5 to 10

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Acommodated by Comment #36.

Cl 31B **SC 31B.4.3** **P 315** **L 18** # **36**

Gorshe, Steve Microchip

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

The feature descriptions contain editorial errors. It appears from the table structure that Mllga should pertain to 5 Gb/s transmit (to mirror Mllgb for the receive) and Mllgc should pertain to 7.5 Gb/s transmit (to mirror Mllgd for the receive).

SuggestedRemedy

In Mllga, change "2/5 Gb/s" to "5 Gb/s". In Mllgc, change "5 Gb/s" to "7.5 Gb/s". In Mllib, change "10.5 Gb/s" to "10 Gb/s".

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1** **P 37** **L 18** # **294**

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type T **Comment Status D** **late - EZ**

We changed the name of register 1.18, but don't show the updated name in Table 45-3

SuggestedRemedy

Bring in the row for register 1.18 and show the name change as shown in 45.2.1.16.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1** **P 37** **L 24** # **295**

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type T **Comment Status D** **late - EZ**

We changed the name of register 1.2100, but don't show the updated name in Table 45-3

SuggestedRemedy

Bring in the row for register 1.2100 and show the name change as shown in 45.2.1.214.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.10** **P 39** **L 25** # **158**

Regev, Alon Keysight

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

The editing instruction reads "Change the row for 1.11.11 in Table 45-19 as follows", but the table shown and actually being edited is Table 45-14.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct "Table 45-19" to "Table 45-14" in the instruction sentence.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comm

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.16.aaab P 40 L 27 # 57

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The editing instruction reads "Insert 45.2.1.16.aaaa and 45.1.16.aaab before 45.2.1.16.aaa". There is no subclause 45.1.16.aaab; the subclause that is inserted and that carries the heading later in the draft is 45.2.1.16.aaab. An editing instruction that names a subclause which does not exist cannot be executed unambiguously by the editor.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "45.1.16.aaab" to "45.2.1.16.aaab".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.60f P 40 L 45 # 86

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Improper editing instruction. Saying 45.2.1.60f.x makes it look like the inserted number is .x. Since the major subclause is inserted (45.2.1.60f), the hierarchy below it is already part of the insert command. (for example, if you were inserting a whole new clause, you wouldn't list all the subclauses...)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete ", 45.2.1.60f.x,"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.250b P 48 L 51 # 159

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The introductory sentence calls register 1.2319 the "MultiGBASE-A PMA supported rates register", but the register and table title (and subclause heading) is "MultiGBASE-A PMA rate negotiation register".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "supported rates register" to "rate negotiation register" to match the register/table title.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.250b.1 P 49 L 25 # 160

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Bit references use a colon instead of a period (e.g. "1.2319:5:4" instead of "1.2319.5:4"). More significantly, subclause 45.2.1.250b.2 ("Negotiated PHY_S Transmit rate") states "When bits 1.2319:5:4 are not 000..." but 1.2319.5:4 is the PHY_D transmit-rate field described in the previous subclause (250b.1) whereas this subclause is about the PHY_S field, 1.2319.3:1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "1.2319:5:4" to "1.2319.3:1" in 45.2.1.250b.2, and correct the colon-vs-period typos elsewhere in this bit-field block.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The colons that should be periods are:

P49L25 - 2x
1.2319:5:4 - > 1.2319.5:4

P49L32
1.2319:3:1 - > 1.2319.3:1
1.2319:5:4 - > 1.2319.3:1

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.250c.2 P 51 L 1 # 161

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

subclauses 45.2.1.250c.2 / .3 / .4 each state "bit 1.2318.14/.13/.12 indicates that the link partner supports...". these subclauses should cite 1.2320.14/.13/.12.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "1.2318" with "1.2320" in 45.2.1.250c.2, .250c.3, and .250c.4.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.250c.2 P 51 L 3 # 56

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

45.2.1.250c defines register 1.2320, MultiGBASE-A PMA link partner rate negotiation. The titles of 45.2.1.250c.2, 45.2.1.250c.3 and 45.2.1.250c.4 name bits 1.2320.14, 1.2320.13 and 1.2320.12, and the register table on page 50 lists the same bits in 1.2320, but the body text of all three subclauses describes bits of register 1.2318, which is the local MultiGBASE-A PMA rate ability register of 45.2.1.250a. Six sentences are affected: page 51 lines 3, 4, 9, 10, 15 and 16. The neighbouring subclauses 45.2.1.250c.1 and 45.2.1.250c.5 through 45.2.1.250c.10 cite 1.2320 correctly. As written, the same register bits are given two different meanings, local ability and link partner ability, which makes the rate negotiation ambiguous.

SuggestedRemedy

In 45.2.1.250c.2 replace both occurrences of "1.2318.14" with "1.2320.14". In 45.2.1.250c.3 replace both occurrences of "1.2318.13" with "1.2320.13". In 45.2.1.250c.4 replace both occurrences of "1.2318.12" with "1.2320.12".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 98 SC 98 P 58 L 1 # 60

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The running header of pages 58 to 64 and 312 to 317 names the draft "IEEE Draft P802.3/D2.1", while the running header of the remaining pages names it "IEEE Draft P802.3dm/D2.1". The draft designation should be the same on every page.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the running header of pages 58 to 64 and 312 to 317 to read "IEEE Draft P802.3dm/D2.1".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Val to update header in 31B.

Cl 98 SC 98.3 P 61 L 51 # 7

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The title of Table 98-7 should have been updated when the title of Clause 98 was updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: State diagram variable to Single_-lane_*twisted-pair* media Auto-Negotiation MDIO register mapping
To: State diagram variable to *Single twisted-pair media*_Clause 98_ Auto-Negotiation MDIO register mapping
Where text between *x* is in strikethrough and text between _x_ is in underline.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 98 SC 98.5.1 P 62 L 11 # 162

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Extra "T1" in "2.5GigT1+100MT1/V1", "5GigT1+100MT1/V1", and "10GigT1+100MT1/V1"

SuggestedRemedy

change "2.5GigT1+100MT1/V1" to "2.5Gig+100MT1/V1"
change "5GigT1+100MT1/V1" to "5Gig+100MT1/V1"
change "10GigT1+100MT1/V1" to "10Gig+100MT1/V1"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 98 SC 98.6.4 P 63 L 41 # 163

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

A stray lowercase "l" appears immediately after "...as follows (unchanged rows not shown):" before the footnote rule.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the stray "l" character.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.1 P 65 L 19 # 8

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

There are 20 instances of "shielded balanced" and 2 instances of "shielded, balanced".
Make these consistent

SuggestedRemedy
Change: shielded, balanced
To: shielded balanced
Also on P67L30

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.1 P 65 L 42 # 71

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

"Baud" is a unit, not the quantity. Per the style guide and precedent clauses (with very few exceptions) we should not use "Baud rate". The common term is "signaling rate" or alternatively "symbol rate".

SuggestedRemedy
Change "Baud rate" to "signaling rate" across the draft.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

P65L42
Change: baud rates
To: signaling rates

P193L20 (Val)
Change: baud rate
To: symbol rate

P194L4 (Val)
Change: baud rate
To: symbol rate

P269L44 (Val)
Change: baud rate
To: symbol rate

CI 191 SC 191.1 P 65 L 42 # 92

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The description of the spectral overlap and how the MultiGBASE-T1 PHYs is somewhat misleading (they aren't 'fully overlapped', and could use some improvement.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "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 of the remote signal from the echo signal." to
"Unlike frequency division techniques, the PHYs use overlapped spectra in the two transmit directions, but utilize the relatively narrow bandwidth of the Low Data Rate (LDR) signal compared to the High Data Rate (HDR) signal to enable recovery of the remote signal in the presence of the local transmitter's echo."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.1 P 65 L 43 # 107

Jonsson, Ragnar Infineon

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The wording "full spectral overlap" is inaccurate and misleading, because the LS spectra only partially overlaps the HS spectra.

SuggestedRemedy
Drop the word "full" from "full spectral overlap"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

AIP - accommodated by #92

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comm

CI 191 SC 191.1 P 65 L 47 # 93

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The sentence describing the construction of the PHY names belongs in the 191.1.1 Nomenclature section, not in the 191.1 Overview.

SuggestedRemedy

Move "This clause defines multiple PHY types named according to <maximum transmit data rate>+<maximum receive data rate>BASE-T1/V1, where -T1 is for single differential balanced-pair media, and V1 is for single-ended unbalanced media." to be the first sentence in 191.1.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.1 P 65 L 47 # 108

Jonsson, Ragnar Infineon

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The wording "maximum transmit data rate" and "maximum receive data rate" inaccurately describes the naming convention, especially considering the use of the term "MultiG" in this context, throughout the document.

SuggestedRemedy

Drop the word "maximum" from "maximum transmit data rate" and "maximum receive data rate".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.1 P 65 L 65 # 72

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"The Clause 4 MAC parameters for the appropriate rate (multigigabit or 100 Mb/s) are used in conjunction with the PHYs described in this clause in conjunction with either the multigigabit (HS) path or the 100 Mb s (LS) path."

With two "in conjunction" in the same sentence, I can't understand what it means.

SuggestedRemedy

Simplify and clarify the sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

P65L52

Change: The Clause 4 MAC parameters for the appropriate rate (multigigabit or 100 Mb/s) are used in conjunction with the PHYs described in this clause in conjunction with either the multigigabit (HS) path or the 100 Mb/s (LS) path.

To: The PHYs described in this clause use the Clause 4 MAC parameters for the appropriate rate multigigabit (HS path) or 100 Mb/s (LS path).

CI 191 SC 191.1.1 P 67 L 30 # 9

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

P67L30-39 is redundant with P65L17-21

SuggestedRemedy

Delete P67L30-39

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

If this is pulled, #73 also has to be pulled.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.1.1 P 67 L 67 # 73

Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Comment 5 against D2.0 suggested changes to the text to make it explain the nomenclature to the reader, rather than instruct them how to use it.
The comment was resolved with AIP, stating that the text in question is being deleted. But it has not been deleted and the issue in the comment persists. Thus, I am resubmitting the comment.

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"P67L30
This text is deleted by #9"

CI 191 SC 191.1.3.2 P 73 L 39 # 61

Pandey, Sujana Velinktech

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

add a sentence after "The LS_RX PCS reverses the above process"

SuggestedRemedy

The LS_RX PCS reverses the above process as defined below

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 191 SC 191.1.3.2 P 73 L 41 # 62

Pandey, Sujana Velinktech

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

add an variable assignment for receiver

SuggestedRemedy

rx_group4x65B<65xi+j> = rx_codedi<j>

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 191 SC 191.1.4 P 74 L 26 # 94

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Missing articles. The text change in the first sentence of 191.1.4 and 191.1.4 to reference the HS_TX(and LS_TX) PCS, rather than the signaling requires an article.

SuggestedRemedy

at P74 L26 (191.1.4): Change "HS_TX PCS" to "The HS_TX PCS" at the start of 191.1.4
at P74 L52 (191.1.5): Change "LS_TX PCS" to "The LS_TX PCS" at the start of 191.1.5

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.1.4 P 74 L 35 # 63

Pandey, Sujana Velinktech

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

No correlation between the HS_PATH and LS_PATH symbol stream

SuggestedRemedy

No correlation between the HS_PATH and LS_PATH symbol stream through two different scrambler polynomials at both transmitters

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The Suggested Remedy provided by the commenter is not clear.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.1.4 P74 L40 # 10

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Polarity swap is not limited to the balanced pair. Comment #152 corrected this in 191.5.2.3, but this issue is in the draft in another place.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete: in the connection for the single balanced pair of conductors (-T1)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.2.2 P77 L16 # 95

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

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The parameter passed from the PCS to the PMA to isn't rfer_cnt - it is hi_rfer (see the PHY Control state diagram). All of the block diagrams incorrectly show this as rfer_cnt. The count is used within the RFER monitor state diagram to produce hi_rfer. The definition of the parameter in 191.2.2.1 is right, just the name is wrong nearly everywhere. Note - this parameter was missing from the diagrams in clause 149, and we added it to fix the omission. It appears to be correct in Clause 192.

SuggestedRemedy

Change rfer_cnt to hi_rfer at:
P71L11 Figure 191-3 and P72L11 Figure 191-4
P77 L16 (191.2.2), P84L24, L26, L34,and L44 (191.2.2.10.1)
P86L15 Figure 191-7, and L49 Figure 191-8
P100L10 (191.3.5.1.2)
P120 L3 Figure 191-28

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.2.2.1.1 P80 L9 # 64

Pandey, Sujan Velinktech

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Z Symbols term is used for the first time but lack reference for its defination

SuggestedRemedy

This value is continuously asserted when transmission of Z symbol (see 191.7.2.7) is required

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.2.2.5.3 P82 L35 # 58

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The sentence reads "The effect of receipt of this primitive is specified in 191.5.2.3 for HS_RX and in 191.5.2.3 for LS_RX". The same subclause is cited for both receive paths. Either one subclause applies and the sentence should cite it once, or one of the two references has been lost in editing. The draft has a single PMA Receive function subclause, 191.5.2.3, but two PHY Control subclauses, 191.5.2.4 for HS_PATH and 191.5.2.5 for LS_PATH, so the reader cannot determine which was intended.

SuggestedRemedy

If a single subclause applies, change the sentence to "The effect of receipt of this primitive is specified in 191.5.2.3." If separate subclauses were intended, cite them explicitly, for example "The effect of receipt of this primitive is specified in 191.5.2.4 for HS_RX and in 191.5.2.5 for LS_RX."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change: The effect of receipt of this primitive is specified in 191.5.2.3 for HS_RX and in 191.5.2.3 for LS_RX.

To: The effect of receipt of this primitive is specified in 191.5.2.3.

CI 191 SC 191.2.2.6 P82 L35 # 11

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

PMA_PCSSTATUS.request refers to 149.2.2.6. 149.2.2.6.3 refers to 149.4.4.1 but it should refer to 191.5.2.6.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Bring 149.2.2.6 into 191.2.2.6 and update the reference. (Preferred as all other service primitives are included in the text in this section.)

OR

Change 191.2.2.6 to read: PMA_PCSSTATUS.request is as described in 149.2.2.6, with the exception that the refence to 149.4.4.1 in 149.2.2.6.3 is replaced with 191.5.2.6.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make the change according to the first option.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 87 L 23 # 164
 Regev, Alon Keysight
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 "2.5GBASE-T1/V1" should be "2.5G+100MBASE-T1/V1"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "2.5GBASE-T1/V1" to "2.5G+100MBASE-T1/V1".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 87 L 32 # 12
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 subject/verb agreement
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: the subsequent functions of the PCS Transmit process takes L groups
 To: the subsequent functions of the PCS Transmit process take L groups
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 88 L 14 # 165
 Regev, Alon Keysight
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 "2.5G and 5" should be "2.5G and 5G"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "2.5G and 5" to "2.5G and 5G".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 88 L 15 # 74
 Ran, Adeo Cisco Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 "and 5"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "and 5G"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2 P 88 L 15 # 13
 Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 5 should be 5G
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 2.5G and 5
 To: 2.5G and 5G
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.2.5 P 90 L 54 # 2
 Lasry, Ariel Qualcomm Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ-R
 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."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.3.2.3 P 97 L 3 # 96
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,Cisco,Eliyan,Infineon,OnSemi,
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 The name of the state diagram isn't the 'monitor state diagram' it is the RFER monitor state diagram.
 SuggestedRemedy
 P97L3 (191.3.2.3) In the second sentence of the second-to-last paragraph of 191.3.2.3, change "monitor state diagram" to "RFER monitor state diagram"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.3.3 P 98 L 3 # 97

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Parallel grammar/structure: The first sentence of the first paragraph in 191.3.3 has "the" for transmitter & channel, but lacks it for remote receiver

SuggestedRemedy

At P98 L3: change "and remote receiver" to "and the remote receiver"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.3.5.1.2 P 100 L 24 # 39

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

A statement for when it is set FALSE is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

At the end of the pcs_reset definition add the sentence: Otherwise it is set FALSE.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.3.5.1.3 P 101 L 40 # 257

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

formatting: apply "Justify", not "Align Left".

SuggestedRemedy

For T_BLOCK_TYPE, apply "Justify" to lines 40 ~ 51.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Justify is not used when defining the parameter values.

CI 191 SC 191.3.5.2 P 104 L 16 # 291

Lo, William Axonne Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D late - EZ

ENCODE(tx_raw), EBLOCK_T are underlined and not in same font as other text in Figure 191-19. The C and D labels also need changing.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the fonts

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.3.5.2 P 104 L 53 # 166

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

text states "...except for the transition from RX_WE to RX_E, which occurs immediately after the RX_WE processes are complete." RX_WE is an EEE/LPI-only state from base Clause 149 (Figure 149-19). Clause 191 explicitly excludes LPI/EEE, and Figure 191-20 has no RX_WE state.

SuggestedRemedy

change

"It makes exactly one transition for each receive block processed except for the transition from RX_WE to RX_E, which occurs immediately after the RX_WE processes are complete."

to

"It makes exactly one transition for each receive block processed."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.3.5.2 P 105 L 6 # 293

Lo, William Axonne Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D late - EZ

The arrow into RX_INIT is misaligned and pokes into the box. Also all the arrow heads do not all look like the same size.

SuggestedRemedy

Realign the arrow. Fix arrow head size

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.3.5.2 P 105 L 18 # 292

Lo, William

Axonne Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D late - EZ

DECODE(rx_coded), EBLOCK_R are underlined and not in same font as other text in Figure 191-20. The C, D and E labels also need changing.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the fonts

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.2 P 109 L 19 # 28

Gorshe, Steve

Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Since "RS-FEC(50,46,6) has already been introduced (pp. 79) and since the TF agreed to omit the symbol size from the in this form, it is better to use consistent RS-FEC language

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "(50,46,6) RS-FEC" with "RS-FEC(50,46)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.2.3 P 111 L 23 # 29

Gorshe, Steve

Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

For consistency with the other 802.3 clauses, the TF agreed to omit the symbol size from the in this FEC form.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the "6" from RS(50,46,6) in Figure 191-23 and other places in Clause 191.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.4.2.3.3 P 117 L 32 # 109

Jonsson, Ragnar

Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The list is missing the case of bad CRC-6

SuggestedRemedy

Add one more item to the list: e) Detection of CRC-6 error (see 191.4.2.2.1.5).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.4.4 P 118 L 12 # 14

Wienckowski, Natalie

IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernova, Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Should use "six" not "6" due to the style manual and consistency.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: The 6 CRC bits

To: The six CRC bits

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.2 P 121 L 34 # 98

Zimmerman, George

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The mention of "Z" just comes completely out of the blue, and reads as though Z is just one of the possibilities that the PMA might have in SEND_Z (as opposed to the only one).

SuggestedRemedy

At P121 L34, Change "When tx_mode is SEND_Z, see 191.7.2.7 for the encoding of "Z"." to "When tx_mode is SEND_Z, the PMA is receiving "Z" symbols from the PCS, muting the transmitter. See 191.7.2.7 for the PMA's encoding of "Z"."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.6.1 P 130 L 10 # 101

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

There are two ways of referencing a variable definition elsewhere: "See x.x.x" or "This variable is defined in x.x.x". Here we do See 98.5.1 - but just adjacent, two are "This variable is defined...". Be consistent in style - pick one.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "see 98.5.1" at P130 L10 to "This variable is defined in 98.5.1." at: P130L10 (191.5.2.6.1), P136 L31, 33, & 37, and P137 L13 (191.5.2.8.1), Change "see 98.5.2" to "This timer is defined in 98.5.2." at P137L20 (191.5.2.8.2).
At P231L42 (192.3.5.1.2 pcs_data_mode) change "See 192.2.1.8.1." to "This variable is defined in 192.2.1.8.1."
At P261L33 & P262L2, 33, 44, P263L36 (192.4.4.1 block_lock, hi_rfer, loc_rcvr_status, pcs_data_mode, and tx_mode) change "See " to "This variable is defined in "
Editorial license to similarly clean up any other ones in clauses 191 or 192 that I missed.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.6.1 P 130 L 39 # 102

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

duplicate shall - the state diagram is called with a shall - variable descriptions shouldn't contain shall's. If the requirement needs to be tested as a PICS, the shall should be in text - however, this looks like it isn't needed, and "is" would be parallel with the rest of the text. - further, the "parameter" isn't set - it is a variable, and it has a value taken from a message.

SuggestedRemedy

change "shall be set to" to "is"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.8 P 135 L 21 # 68

Pandey, Sujan Velinktech

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

1001 is binary number but reads like decimal

SuggestedRemedy

1001'b

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change: 1001

To: 0b1001

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.8 P 135 L 44 # 288

Lo, William Axonne Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D late - EZ

LEADER TX case incorrect

SuggestedRemedy

Change to Leader TX

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.8 P 138 L 35 # 289

Lo, William Axonne Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D late - EZ

Block of text above SYNC_DISABLE wrong font

SuggestedRemedy

Fix font and remove underline.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.8.1 P 136 L 31 # 17

Wienckowski, Natalie

IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernet, Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
grammar

SuggestedRemedy

Capitalize "see" as it is the start of a sentence. Also on P136L34, P136L37, P137L20, and P130L10.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.8.2 P 137 L 24 # 59

Zherebtsov, Aleksei

Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The definition of follower_delay_timer refers to Figure 191-36, which is the Link Synchronization signaling structure. The offset that this timer controls is shown in Figure 191-37, the Link Synchronization timing figure, and that is the figure the body of 191.5.2.8 cites for the Follower reply timing ("with timing as shown in Figure 191-37", page 135, line 29). The figures were renumbered in D2.1 and this reference appears to have been shifted by one figure.

SuggestedRemedy

In the definition of follower_delay_timer in 191.5.2.8.2, change "as shown in Figure 191-36" to "as shown in Figure 191-37".

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.8.4 P 138 L 3 # 18

Wienckowski, Natalie

IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernet, Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
duplicate period

SuggestedRemedy

Remove duplicate period at end of sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.5.2.8.4 P 138 L 3 # 167

Regev, Alon

Keysight

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
Double period typo: "The PHY Link Synchronization state diagram is shown in Figure 191-38.."

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the extra period.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.6.3.1 P 148 L 25 # 139

Muma, Scott

Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The subclause title says "differential" but also covers single-ended.

SuggestedRemedy

Change subclause heading to "Receiver input signals"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.7.2.7 P 153 L 31 # 262

Wang, Frank

Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R
The value for f = 150 is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "3 < f < 150" to "3 < f <= 150".

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.9.1.3 P 157 L 40 # 264

Wang, Frank

Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R
The value for f = 4000 is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "3000 <= f < 4000" to "3000 <= f <= 4000".

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general

COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

CI 191

SC 191.9.1.3

Page 13 of 25

9/5/2026 11:11:05 AM

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.10.1.5 P 159 L 38 # 265
Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** EZ-R
The value for f = 4000 is missing.
SuggestedRemedy
Change "3000 <= f < 4000" to "3000 <= f <= 4000".
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.10.2.1 P 161 L 1 # 266
Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
formatting
SuggestedRemedy
The variable "f" in Equation (191-21) should be italic (including the second "f" in line 6).
Do the same for Equation (191-22).
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.11.2.1 P 162 L 47 # 267
Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** EZ-R
The value for f = Fmax is missing.
SuggestedRemedy
Change "400 <= f < Fmax" to "400 <= f <= Fmax".
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.12.2.1 P 164 L 6 # 268
Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.
Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** EZ-R
The value for f = Fmax is missing.
SuggestedRemedy
Change "400 <= f < Fmax" to "400 <= f <= Fmax".
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.1 P 169 L 16 # 124
Muma, Scott Microchip
Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
Subclause reference is incorrectly 149.1.3
SuggestedRemedy
Change to 191.1.3
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.2.5 P 174 L 21 # 168
Regev, Alon Keysight
Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** EZ
PCT_L4 states PCS Transmit "shall generate a sequence (Tn) defined in 191.3.4.1"; this is the HS_PATH training sequence. The LS_PATH body text (191.4.2.2) defines a different sequence, "(Sn) defined in 191.4.4".
SuggestedRemedy
Correct PCT_L4 to reference sequence (Sn) defined in 191.4.4.
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.2.6 P 175 L 40 # 131
Muma, Scott Microchip
Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** EZ
PCRL4 and PCRL5 have PHY_D in the status column, but should be PHY_S.
SuggestedRemedy
Change PHY_D to PHY_S in 2 places.
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.2.7 P 176 L 6 # 169

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

TPGL1 references Figure 191-11 (HS_PATH TX bit-ordering figure) instead of Figure 191-22 (LS_PATH TX bit ordering). The next item, which should be "TPGL2", is mislabeled "TPG2" and references Figure 191-14 (HS_PATH RX bit ordering) instead of Figure 191-23 (LS_PATH RX bit ordering, per the 191.4.3).

SuggestedRemedy

Correct both figure references to 191-22 and 191-23, and relabel the second item "TPGL2" for naming consistency.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.3.8 P 181 L 6 # 137

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The value comment makes it seem as if this is conditional on !AN, but the status makes it clear it's mandatory/unconditional.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Value/Comment for PLS1 to "Comply with Figure 191-38."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.1 P 182 L 36 # 55

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The Status column of PICS item TM9 begins "PPHY_S". PPHY_S is not a defined predicate; every other item of the proforma uses PHY_S or PHY_D.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "PPHY_S" to "PHY_S" in the Status column of TM9.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.2 P 182 L 23 # 173

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

On both pages 182 and 185, PICS entries TM4 and PML4 (test mode 1 clock access) specify clock "TX_CLK_175" (missing "T"); text throughout 191.6/191.7 consistently uses "TX_TCLK_175".

SuggestedRemedy

Correct "TX_CLK_175" to "TX_TCLK_175" in both PICS items.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.2 P 184 L 9 # 52

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

PICS item TES19, "Transmitter quiet signal level", is wrong in two ways. It references 191.6.2.7, but the requirement it states is in 191.6.2.6, page 146 line 14: "When tx_symb is Z the transmit signal at the MDI is nominally zero, and the transmit signal shall be less than -36dBm"; 191.6.2.7 is the peak output subclause and says nothing about the quiet level. It also states the limit as "Less than -36 dB", where the body states -36 dBm. dB is a ratio and dBm is an absolute power, so the proforma as printed does not state a testable limit. The Clause 192 counterpart, PMAT11 on page 309 line 16, correctly reads -36 dBm.

SuggestedRemedy

In 191.15.4.4.2, change the Subclause of TES19 from "191.6.2.7" to "191.6.2.6" and its Value/Comment from "Less than -36 dB" to "Less than -36 dBm".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.3 P 184 L 22 # 170

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Two different PICS items ("Receiver differential input signals" and "Broadband noise rejection") are both labeled "RES1".

SuggestedRemedy

Relabel the second item "RES2".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.3 P 184 L 23 # 138

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The feature name for the first RES1 is just the subclause title, the feature seems to be receiver BER.

SuggestedRemedy

Change feature to Receiver post-FEC BER

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.3 P 184 L 25 # 49

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Item number RES1 is used for two different features inside one table: "Receiver differential input signals" referencing 191.6.3.1 at page 184 line 22, and "Broadband noise rejection" referencing 191.6.3.2 at page 184 line 25. PICS item numbers have to be unique for a completed proforma to be interpretable. The same defect occurs elsewhere in 191.15: TPG2 is used at page 172 line 39 and again at page 176 line 12, and the seven items LSCT1 to LSCT7 are used both in the -T1 link segment table, page 187 lines 6 to 21, and in the -V1 link segment table, page 187 lines 30 to 45, where they denote different features. For example LSCT3 is "Coupling attenuation" in the first table and "Screening attenuation" in the second.

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber the 191.15 proforma so that every item number is unique. Suggested: renumber the second RES1 to RES2 and shift the following items of that table; give the LS_PATH test pattern item at page 176 line 12 an item number distinct from TPG2; and renumber the -V1 link segment items LSCT1 to LSCT7 as LSCV1 to LSCV7.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.3 P 184 L 25 # 140

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

This item should be RES2 as RES1 is already used.

SuggestedRemedy

Change RES1 to RES2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.5 P 185 L 33 # 171

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

TESL5 is titled "Follower peak-to-peak value of timing jitter at TX_TCLK" with value "Less than 10×J ps", but per the 191.7.2.1 body text this scaled value is the Leader's spec; the Follower's limits are fixed, non-scaled values (50 ps RMS, 500 ps p-p).

SuggestedRemedy

in TESL5 change "Follower" to "Leader"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.5 P 185 L 33 # 47

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

PICS item TESL5 assigns the limit "Less than 10 x J ps" to the Follower, but 191.7.2.1 assigns the 10 x J ps peak-to-peak limit to the Leader, on page 151 lines 24 and 25, and gives the Follower a separate peak-to-peak limit which is listed as TESL7. As the table stands there are two Follower peak-to-peak jitter items and no item at all for the Leader peak-to-peak jitter at TX_TCLK, so that requirement of 191.7.2.1 has no PICS entry.

SuggestedRemedy

In 191.15.4.4.5 change the Feature of TESL5 from "Follower peak-to-peak value of timing jitter at TX_TCLK." to "Leader peak-to-peak value of timing jitter at TX_TCLK."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.5 P 185 L 38 # 172

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

TESL7 ("Follower peak-to-peak timing jitter at TX_TCLK") states the limit as "Less than 5000 ps". The 191.7.2.1 body text specifies this limit as 500 ps.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct "5000 ps" to "500 ps".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.5 P 185 L 38 # 46

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

PICS item TESL7 requires the Follower peak-to-peak timing jitter at TX_TCLK to be "Less than 5000 ps", but 191.7.2.1, the subclause it references, requires on page 151 line 30 that "The peak-to-peak value of the Follower TX_TCLK_175 jitter relative to anunjittered reference shall be less than 500 ps". The proforma value is ten times the value in the body. TESL6, the Follower RMS item, agrees with the body at 50 ps, which indicates a typing error in TESL7 rather than an intended difference.

SuggestedRemedy

In 191.15.4.4.5 change the Value/Comment of TESL7 from "Less than 5000 ps." to "Less than 500 ps."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.5 P 186 L 11 # 53

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

PICS item TESL17, "Transmitter quiet signal level", states the limit as "Less than -36 dB", while the requirement it references, 191.7.2.7, states -36 dBm. dB is a ratio and dBm is an absolute power, so the proforma as printed does not state a testable limit. This is the same defect as in TES19 on page 184.

SuggestedRemedy

In 191.15.4.4.5, change the Value/Comment of TESL17 from "Less than -36 dB" to "Less than -36 dBm".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191 SC 191.15.4.4.6 P 186 L 27 # 141

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Feature name is incorrect, the feature seems to be receiver BER.

SuggestedRemedy

Change feature to Receiver post-FEC BER

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 191A SC 191A P 320 L 1 # 3

Turner, Max Ethernovia

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R

It seems comment #135
Change: frame or superframe
To: superframe
was not implemented correctly
instead is was changed to frame

SuggestedRemedy

Change: frame
To: superframe

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.1 P 189 L 33 # 19

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"simultaneous" does not provide any value. There is no reason to include multiple PHYs in a single device if they can't be used simultaneously.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: A device that supports multiple simultaneous MultiGBASE-A PHYs
To: A device that supports multiple MultiGBASE-A PHYs

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.1.1 P 190 L 7 # 105

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R

The clause speaks repeatedly of "MAC data rate" -there isn't a "MAC data rate". There is a data rate supported by the physical layer to or from the MAC, or more particularly from the RS.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "MAC data rate" with "Data rate" globally in clause 192, wherever it is used generally (P190 L7,
Replace "Transmit MAC data rate" with "Transmit data rate", and Receive MAC data rate with "Receive data rate" globally in clause 192.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 192 SC 192.1.1 P 190 L 7 # 174

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Text states "The six modes of operation and MAC data rate combinations for each of the two PHY types are shown in Table 192-1", but Table 192-1 actually shows 8 mode/rate combinations per PHY type (16 rows total across both PHY types).

SuggestedRemedy

Change "six" to "eight", or remove the specific count from the sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace, "The six modes"

with, "The modes"

CI 192 SC 192.1.1 P 190 L 8 # 20

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

With the addition of 7.5 Gb/s there are 8 modes of operation.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: The six modes of operation
To: The eight modes of operation

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accommodated by Comment #174.

CI 192 SC 192.1.2 P 191 L 25 # 21

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The Figure is overlapping the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Add white space at the top of the figure so "OSI" doesn't overlap "Clause", or use some other method to fix the overlap.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add white space at the top of the figure so "OSI" doesn't overlap "Clause"

CI 192 SC 192.1.3 P 192 L 52 # 306

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D late -EZ

Correct E-Z typos and grammar issues

SuggestedRemedy

P192, L51 and P251, L42:

Replace, "back the PMA TRANSMIT" with "back to the PMA TRANSMIT"

P195, L42:

Replace, "The MDI for a" with "The MDIs for a"

P204, L35:

Replace, "are preceded" with "is preceded"

P208, L31:

Replace, "shown in shown in" with "shown in"

P245, L6:

Replace, "proceed to load in the next" with "proceed to load the next"

P246, L9 and P247, L21:

Replace, "whether MultiGBASE-A OAM message" with "whether the MultiGBASE-A OAM message"

P247, L4:

Replace, "whether valid MultiGBASE-A OAM" with "whether a valid MultiGBASE-A OAM"

P247, L21:

Replace, "in previous MultiGBASE-A OAM frame" with "in the previous MultiGBASE-A OAM frame"

P248, L5:

Replace, "begin transmitting them" with "begin transmitting it"

P254, L28:

Replace, "rollover to zero" with "roll over to zero"

P257, L2:

Replace, "either management configuration " with "either the management configuration "

P257, L2:

Replace, "or selecting the highest mutually" with "or selection of the highest mutually"

P263, L32:

Replace, "currently in either in a silent mode" with "currently in either a silent mode"

P299, L18:

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general

COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

CI 192
SC 192.1.3

Page 18 of 25
9/5/2026 11:11:06 AM

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

Replace, "one OAM symbols is" with "one OAM symbol is"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 **SC 192.3.2.2.4** **P 209** **L 35** # **31**

Gorshe, Steve Microchip

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

Insert the text from Clause 149.3.2.2.4 that appears to have been accidentally omitted or removed here.

SuggestedRemedy

Below Figure 192-7, insert the two paragraphs below Figure 149-8: "Bits and field positions are shown . are reserved."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 **SC 192.3.2.2.16** **P 214** **L 10** # **175**

Regev, Alon Keysight

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

The LS_TX equation's range statement reads "for i = 0 to 123, and i = 0 to 7" - the second range variable should be j (which indexes bit position within the symbol), not a repeated i.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the second range variable to "j = 0 to 7".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 **SC 192.3.2.2.16** **P 214** **L 18** # **176**

Regev, Alon Keysight

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

The HS_TX equation reads "mi,j = tx_RSmessage<(121-i)×8 + i>, for i = 0 to 121, and i = 0 to 7". The formula should add "+ j", not "+ i", and the range statement also repeats i instead of stating j = 0 to 7.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the formula to "mi,j = tx_RSmessage<(121-i)×8 + j>, for i = 0 to 121, and j = 0 to 7".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 **SC 192.3.2.2.18** **P 217** **L 24** # **111**

Muma, Scott Microchip

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

The letter "T" in the boxes is understood to be a unit time delay, but the T symbol is used elsewhere in the clause and so should be defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a note to the figure "T represents 1 symbol period delay"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert note below figure,

"NOTE - T represents one symbol period delay.

CI 192 **SC 192.3.2.2.19** **P 217** **L 28** # **121**

Muma, Scott Microchip

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

The "management parameter config" would be more clear if it's specified and linked to the management registers responsible and this should be done throughout the text. The value of the managemenet parameter config comes from register bit 1.2100.14 and so it would be more clear if it's mr_config and used consistently through the clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "management parameter config" or "the management parameter config" with "mr_config":
P217L28, P217L35, P252L28, P252L30, P259L51, P260L50, P300L22, P300L32.

Change config to mr_config P261L36, P264L21-22.

On first use of mr_config P217L28 add (see 192.4.4.1 for definition of mr_config).

With editorial license.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 192 SC 192.3.2.2.19 P 218 L 23 # 112

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The letter "T" in the boxes is understood to be a unit time delay, but the T symbol is used elsewhere in the clause and so should be defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a note to the figure "T represents 1 symbol period delay"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert note below figure,

"NOTE - T represents one symbol period delay.

CI 192 SC 192.3.4 P 224 L 51 # 154

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

TFn is intended to be the training frame bit sequence (See paragraph starting at P229L24). So also call it training frame here when defining TFn for consistency.

SuggestedRemedy

P224L51 change "training data" to "training frame bit"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.3.4 P 227 L 35 # 33

Gorshe, Steve Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Update the FEC terminology in Figure 192-20

SuggestedRemedy

For both the HS and LS burst structures, replace "RS" with "RS-FEC"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.1.1 P 231 L 11 # 269

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R

IBLOCK_R and IBLOCK_T are not used due to no EEE mode

SuggestedRemedy

Remove lines 11 to 15.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: UBLOCK_R<71:0> is also not used.)

Delete lines 11 to 15 (IBLOCK_R<71:0> and IBLOCK_T<64:0>) and lines 27 to 29 (UBLOCK_R<71:0>) on page 231.

Delete lines 50 to 52 (UBLOCK_R<71:0>) on page 99.

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.1.3 P 232 L 37 # 270

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

To align with the description in the previous similar clauses, consider adding a sentence at the beginning.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a sentence before "Every case of the vector belongs to only one type.": This function classifies each 65-bit rx_coded vector as belonging to one of the five types {C, S, T, D, E} depending on its contents.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.1.3 P 232 L 39 # 272

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R

There are "eight" valid control characters, i.e., c0 ~ c7.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "seven" to "eight"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.1.3 P 233 L 9 # 274

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

To align with the description in the previous similar clauses, consider adding a sentence at the beginning.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a sentence before "Every case of the vector belongs to only one type.": This function classifies each 72-bit tx_raw vector as belonging to one of the five types {C, S, T, D, E} depending on its contents.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.1.3 P 233 L 10 # 275

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

formatting: apply "Justify", not "Align Left".

SuggestedRemedy

For T_BLOCK_TYPE, apply "Justify" to lines 10 ~ 21.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Justify is not used when defining the parameter values.

CI 192 SC 192.3.5.1.3 P 233 L 11 # 276

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"and" is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "/T/, /E/;" to "/T/, and /E/;".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.3.7 P 238 L 42 # 22

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change: such PHY link health status exchange

To: such as PHY link health status exchange

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.3.7.3 P 243 L 49 # 177

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Text reads "Assignments for PCS register/bit numbers 3.2308 to 3.231 are shown in Table 45-233"; the ending register number "3.231" is truncated (it should be 3.2324 per table 45-233).

SuggestedRemedy

change "3.231" to "3.2324"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Editor's note: 3.2321 addresses OAM registers.)

Replace, "...bit numbers 3.2308 to 3.231."

with, "...bit numbers 3.2308 to 3.2321 for OAM use."

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.3 P 254 L 25 # 178

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Text reads "The PHY burst count consists of 3 octets [Oct4<7:0>,Oct5<7:0>,Oct6,7:0>]" - missing the opening angle bracket for Oct6.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct "Oct6,7:0>" to "Oct6<7:0>".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.5 P 256 L 35 # 24

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

awkward wording

SuggestedRemedy

Change: A one in a field bit indicates

To: A one in a bit field indicates

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change: A one in a field bit indicates

To: A one in a capability bit indicates

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.5 P 256 L 38 # 25

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC; Ethernovia, Bosch

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Zero is used to represent one bit, not 6 bits.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: it would set Oct10<7:2> to zero.

To: it would set Oct10<7:2> to 000000.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change: it would set Oct10<7:2> to zero.

To: it would set Oct10<7:2> to all zeros

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.5 P 257 L 33 # 116

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Should specify the register bit location of the OAMen capability bits.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert: The advertised OAMen ability is in bit 1.2311.1. (See 45.2.1.244.5 for the definition of bit 1.2311.1.) The link partner's advertised OAMen is available in bit 1.2312.1. (See 45.2.1.245.4 for the definition of bit 1.2312.1.)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert: The advertised OAMen ability is in bit 1.2311.1 (see 45.2.1.244.5). The link partner's advertised OAMen is available in bit 1.2312.1 (see 45.2.1.245.4).

CI 192 SC 192.4.2.4.5 P 257 L 35 # 117

Muma, Scott Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Should link the vendor specific data field in Table 192-14 to registers.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert: The vendor specific data the PHY sends to its link partner (see Table 192-14) may be controlled by bits 1.2316.15:0 (see 45.2.1.249). The vendor specific data received from the link partner may be observed in bits 1.2317.15:0 (see 45.2.1.250). The relationship between the field in Table 192-14 and the register bits is vendor specified.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.7.2.1 P 280 L 1 # 279

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R

typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Equation (192-29)" to "Equation (192-22)".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 192 SC 192.7.2.2 P 281 L 13 # 280

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R

typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Equation (192-31)" to "Equation (192-24)".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.8.1.5 P 284 L 8 # 281

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R

According to
https://www.ieee802.org/3/dm/public/0726/Long_Comment_Resolutions_30,31,34,136,137,163.pdf, the value for f = 3000 is 45.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "1000 <= f <= 3000" to "1000 <= f < 3000".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.9.2.1 P 288 L 13 # 282

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R

The value for f = Fmax is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "400 <= f < Fmax" to "400 <= f <= Fmax".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.10.2.1 P 289 L 28 # 283

Wang, Frank Realtek Semiconductor Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ-R

The value for f = Fmax is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "400 <= f < Fmax" to "400 <= f <= Fmax".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.2 P 297 L 30 # 180

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The PCS Receive table begins with "PCSR1" but the following four rows are labeled PCST2-PCST5, duplicating IDs already used for unrelated PCS Transmit requirements in the preceding table (192.13.4.1).

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber the PCS Receive rows PCSR2-PCSR5.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.2 P 297 L 40 # 54

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The Value/Comment entry of PICS item PCST4 reads "The Follower PHY shall uses". In addition the neighbouring item PCST3, which covers the Leader half of the same requirement, reads "The Leader PHY uses the", without "shall", so the two halves of one requirement are given different normative strength in the proforma.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The Follower PHY shall uses" to "The Follower PHY uses", and align the wording of PCST3 and PCST4 with the normative form used in 192.3.2.3.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "The Follower PHY shall uses" to "The Follower PHY uses".

Editorial license to align the wording of PCST3 and PCST4 with the normative form used in 192.3.2.3.2.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.5.1 P 299 L 39 # 181

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Item ID "PMAR1" is used twice for two different requirements: "PMA Reset function, 192.4.2.1" (p.299) and "PMA Receive, 192.4.2.3" (p.301).

SuggestedRemedy

reanme one set of items so PICS IDs are unique

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace "PMAR1" on P299, L39 with "RES1"

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.5.2 P 300 L 6 # 182

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

In subclauses 192.13.4.5.2 item IDs "PMAT1" through "PMAT7" (functional PMA Transmit requirements) are reused in 192.13.4.8.2, as "PMAT1" through "PMAT14"

SuggestedRemedy

Give the electrical-specifications table a different ID prefix to avoid duplicate PICS item IDs.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change item numbering in 192.13.4.8.2 from "PAMTx" to "XMTx" and change item numbering in 192.13.4.8.3 from "PMARx" to "RCVx"

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.5.2 P 300 L 25 # 34

Gorshe, Steve Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Terminology correction

SuggestedRemedy

Change "loops" to "loop"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change, "include loops timing"

to, "includes loop timing"

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.5.2 P 300 L 40 # 183

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

PMAT7 ("Launch power disable") cites subclause 192.3.2.2.1 ("Use of blocks", an unrelated PCS transmit-encoding subclause) as its normative reference. The actual requirement (PMA_transmit_disable causing average launch power per 192.5.2.4 when tx_symb = Z) is specified in 192.4.2.2.1 "Global PMA transmit disable".

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the Subclause reference to 192.4.2.2.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.5.6 P 302 L 40 # 184

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

MF4 states "The Message Field setting for the first transmitted PMA burst is the first row of Table 192-13 for the Leader, and the first or second row of Table 192-10 for the Follower." Table 192-10 is "Nr, Np, and Nz values for 2.5 Gb/s mode transmission", unrelated to Message Field settings; the correct table (used earlier in the same sentence, and in the parallel 192.4.2.4.4 body text) is Table 192-13.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Table 192-10" to "Table 192-13".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.5.11 P 305 L 25 # 179

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Body text (192.4.2.4.11) specifies the Follower's transmit-alignment offset as "176 ns - delay_count × 5.333 ns (± 5.333 ns)". PICS item ST4 (192.13.4.5.11) states the same requirement as "17 ns - delay_count × 5.333 ns (± 5.333 ns)"; missing a digit.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct ST4 to read "176 ns", matching the body text.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

P802.3dm D2.1 Asymmetrical Electrical Automotive Ethernet 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comn

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.9.2 P 310 L 37 # 188

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Items LSV1 and LSV2 are correctly prefixed for -V1, but the remaining five rows (Screening attenuation, Propagation delay, Coupling test methodologies, PSANEXT, PSAACRF) are labeled "LST3" through "LST7", duplicating IDs already used for different requirements in the preceding -T1 table (192.13.4.9.1).

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber the -V1 table's rows LSV3-LSV7.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.9.2 P 310 L 37 # 50

Zherebtsov, Aleksei Infineon

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The -V1 link segment table reuses item numbers that the -T1 table on the same page already uses for different features. For example LST3 is "Coupling attenuation, -T1" at page 310 line 13 and "Screening attenuation, -V1" at page 310 line 37. The same defect runs through the whole 192.13 proforma: PCST2 to PCST5 appear both in the PCS Transmit table on page 295 and in the PCS Receive table on page 297; PMAT1 to PMAT7 appear both in the PMA table on page 300 and in the transmitter electrical table on page 308; PMAR1 appears three times, on pages 299, 301 and 309; PMAR2, LST3 to LST7 and MDIT3 appear twice each. Nineteen item numbers in the proforma are not unique, so a completed proforma cannot be interpreted.

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber the 192.13 proforma so that every item number is unique, using a distinct prefix per table, for example PCSR for the PCS Receive items, TES for the transmitter electrical items, RES for the receiver electrical items, LSV for the -V1 link segment items and MDIV for the -V1 MDI items.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accommodated by Comment #181, Comment #182, Comment #188, and Comment #190.

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.10.1 P 311 L 16 # 189

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

MDIT2 ("Return loss, -T1") states the measurement is made "with a nominal impedance of 50 O". The -T1 MDI is differential/balanced with a 100 O nominal characteristic impedance per 192.7.1.2 and 192.9.2.1 body text; 50 O is the -V1 value (correctly used in the parallel item MDIV2).

SuggestedRemedy

Change MDIT2's nominal impedance value to 100 O.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change MDIT2's nominal impedance value to 100 O where O is the ohms symbol.

CI 192 SC 192.13.4.10.2 P 311 L 34 # 190

Regev, Alon Keysight

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The -V1 fault-tolerance PICS item is labeled "MDIT3", reusing the -T1 table's item ID (MDIT3, "Fault tolerance, -T1", 192.9.3) instead of a -V1-prefixed ID.

SuggestedRemedy

Relabel as "MDIV3".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.