

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 00 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # 271  
Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
pdf metadata says:  
Title: IEEE P802.3xx name of Task Force  
Author: IEEE P802.3xx Task Force  
Subject: IEEE P802.3xx amendment  
Keywords: P802.3xx,  
SuggestedRemedy  
Correct the metadata  
Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 00 SC FM P 1 L 34 # 184  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
draft is for initial Working Group ballot - not Task Force review  
SuggestedRemedy  
Change "Task Force review" to "Recirculation Working Group Ballot" (which will be appropriate for 2.1)  
Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 00 SC FM P 1 L 37 # 185  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
change copyright variable & dates to 2025, editor should check globally  
SuggestedRemedy  
change copyright (variable and dates globally if hardcoded) to 2025.  
Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 00 SC 0 P 3 L 1 # 303  
Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
Comment Type E Comment Status X Front Matter  
The text reads: "This amendment to .... Specifies additions and appropriate modification to the 10BASE-T1S Physical Layer". However, the 10BASE-T1S Physical Layer is specified within 147 which is only touched in the overview section. Instead of modifications to 10BASE-T1S, a new 10BASE-T1M Physical Layer is created.  
SuggestedRemedy  
This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2022 specifies additions and appropriate modifications to enhance 10 Mb/s half duplex multidrop Physical Layer (PHY) specifications ...  
Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 00 SC FM P 3 L 3 # 186  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son  
Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial  
abstract doesn't change the 10BASE-T1S physical layer.  
SuggestedRemedy  
suggest change "modifications to the 10BASE-T1S Physical Layer (including reconciliation sublayers), management..." to "modifications to enhance the 10 Mb/s shared-medium (multidrop) mode of the 10BASE-T1S Physical Layer in a new, multidrop-only physical layer specification. This includes reconciliation sublayers, management..."  
Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 00 SC Keywords P 3 L 5 # 272  
Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial  
IEEE 802.3cg is not mentioned anywhere in the draft  
SuggestedRemedy  
Use it or delete it  
Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 00 SC FM P3 L5 # 187

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

There is no such thing as 10BASE-T1 - it shouldn't be a keyword

*SuggestedRemedy*

suggest delete 10BASE-T1 as a keyword.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 00 SC Keywords P3 L8 # 273

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

physical layer

*SuggestedRemedy*

Physical Layer

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 00 SC Photocopies P6 L23 # 274

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

A blue URL should be a link

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make it active. Get the template fixed if that is the issue.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 00 SC Updating P6 L39 # 275

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The link behind "IEEE Xplore" is <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/browse/standards/collection/ieee/> which is footnote 3.

The link behind "contact IEEE" is <https://standards.ieee.org/content/ieee-standards/en/about/contact/index.html> which is footnote 2.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move the pointer for footnote 3 to immediately follow "IEEE Xplore".

A pointer for footnote 2 could immediately follow "contact IEEE".

Get the template fixed.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 00 SC Patents P7 L9 # 276

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status X EZ

A blue URL should be a link

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make it active. Get the template fixed if that is the issue.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 00 SC 0 P8 L # 115

Lusted, Kent Independent

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

List of balloters is empty.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the list

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 00	SC Contents	P 14	L 1	# 277
-------	-------------	------	-----	-------

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Missing header

SuggestedRemedy

Include section header ("Contents")

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 00	SC Contents	P 14	L 17	# 279
-------	-------------	------	------	-------

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

5th level subclause numbers and titles are run together. Also 4th level in Clause 45

SuggestedRemedy

Set the tab stops to allow more space for the numbers

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 00	SC Contents	P 14	L 27	# 278
-------	-------------	------	------	-------

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Some subclause numbers and titles are run together

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the formatting

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 00	SC Contents	P 15	L 47	# 280
-------	-------------	------	------	-------

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Page numbers for some clauses are joined to clause title rather than being on the left

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the formatting

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 1	SC 1.4	P 22	L 4	# 266
------	--------	------	-----	-------

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The subclause numbers in 1.4 don't match the numbers in 8023-2022, which is the most recent published version that all changes should apply to.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct both instructions and subclause numbers per the following:

- change 1.4.63 to 1.4.59
- change 1.4.427 to 1.4.405
- change 1.4.433 to 1.4.411
- change 1.4.582 to 1.4.558

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 1	SC 1.4.63a	P 22	L 7	# 188
------	------------	------	-----	-------

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Naming

I have found that 10BASE-T1M gets confused in the industry as a totally new phy, with "10BASE-T1S" being short-reach, T1L being long reach, and T1M, instead of being "M" for "multidrop", MEDIUM reach... I suggest a better naming would be the relationship between 10BASE-T and 10BASE-Te, where the only real difference is the PMD/media spec. Therefore, I would suggest a global change to 10BASE-T1Sm or perhaps 10BASE-T1Se. indicating that it is the same PHY with some restriction.

Definition should parallel how 10BASE-Te relates to 10BASE-T and reference the 10BASE-T1S PHY. (SUBTYPE\_MASTER\_COMMENT)

SuggestedRemedy

Globally change references to 10BASE-T1M to 10BASE-T1Sm.

change references 10BASE-T1M / 10BASE-T1S to 10BASE-T1S / T1Sm

Change definition to read "IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a version of 10BASE-T1S supporting only the multidrop mode of operation (with an enhanced mixing segment specification) for a 10 Mb/s Ethernet local area network using a single balanced pair of conductors as a shared medium. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 188.)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 1 SC 1.4.206 P 22 L 10 # 147

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D Front Matter

Even before adding 10BASE-T1M to the 1.4.206 BASE-T1 definition and to the draft, we have a problem. The definition specifies "single twisted-pair copper cable". This is not true for 10BASE-T1L, 10BASE-T1S, and 10BASE-T1M which are defined to operate over a "balanced pair of conductors" which could be ribbon cable, twinax, or PCB differential traces in addition to single twisted-pair cable".

**SuggestedRemedy**

In 1.4.206, change "single twisted-pair copper cable" to "single pair of conductors".

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P 22 L 10 # 146

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D Front Matter

Definition 1.4.206 BASE-T1 definition to include 10BASE-T1M, clause 188.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Insert following text into draft. \*\*insert\*\* --delete--

/Change 1.4.206 as follows:/

1.4.206 BASE-T1: PHYs that belong to the set of specific Ethernet PCS/PMA/PMDs that operate on a single twisted-pair copper cable, including 10BASE-T1L, 10BASE-T1S, \*\*10BASE-T1M,\*\* 100BASE-T1, and 1000BASE-T1. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 96, Clause 97, Clause 146, --and-- Clause 147\*\*, and Clause 188\*\*.)

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 1 SC 1.4.127b P 22 L 18 # 189

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

A reference to clause 189, similar to those on the definition of MPD and MPSE would be useful here.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add "(see IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 189)." to the end of the definition for the MPI. (Clause 189 is a cross ref)

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 1 SC 1.4.427c P 22 L 21 # 47

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MPSE

"A device that provides power to a mixing segment which may also carry data"

The definition is ambiguous: is it the device that may also carry data or the mixing segment?

My guess is that it is the mixing segment - but why is it necessary to state in this definition that a mixing segment can carry data?

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete "which may also carry data".

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 1 SC 1.4.433 P 22 L 25 # 267

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The term being defined is supposed to be in bold print.

**SuggestedRemedy**

BOLD "network interface device (NID)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 1 SC 1.4.582a P 22 L 28 # 48

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MDI

The definition of TCI makes it an instance of MDI. From the definition, it is unclear why a new term is used instead of just MDI. But the description in 188.9 and Figure 188-18 suggests that it is quite different from an MDI.

Based on the text in 188.9 the definition would better be "The interface of the Clause 188 PHY to the mixing segment" or something similar.

A reference to clause 188 would be helpful (especially after this amendment is integrated into the next revision).

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change the definition to "An interface of a 10BASE-T1M PHY to a mixing segment (see Clause 188)" or something similar.

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 1 SC 1.4.582a P 22 L 30 # 190  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial  
 A reference to clause 188, similar to those on the definition of 10BASE-T1M, MPD, and MPSE would be useful here.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add "(see IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 188)." to the end of the definition for the TCI. (Clause 188 is a cross ref)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 22 SC 22 P 23 L 2 # 49  
 Ran, Adeee Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D MII  
 If Clause 22 is opened for editing it would be good to correct the title to include GMII and to differentiate it from other clauses that define Reconciliation Sublayer, such as clause 46, 81, etc.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the title to "Reconciliation Sublayer (RS) and Media Independent Interface for 10 and 100 Megabit (MII) and 1 Gigabit (GMII) ".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 22 SC 22.1 P 23 L 17 # 238  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial  
 white outline box around the text "RECONCILIATION" in the left had column (MII/PLS/AUI...)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 delete the box, basically copy the right hand RECONCILIATION box.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 22 SC 22.1 P 23 L 30 # 50  
 Ran, Adeee Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial  
 The new NOTE should be underlined  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 22 SC 22.1 P 23 L 31 # 281  
 Dawe, Piers Nvidia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial  
 If the NOTE is new  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 it should be underlined  
 Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 22 SC 22.1 P 23 L 34 # 51  
 Ran, Adeee Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D MII  
 The title of Figure 22-1 should include both MII and GMII.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "MII" to "MII and GMII".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.2.5 P 24 L 22 # 191  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Why are there double horizontal lines in the first column above the first 3 table rows (these rows are together)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change double horizontal lines in the first column to single lines ...  
 Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 30 SC 30.2.5 P 24 L 22 # 239

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Table 30-11, left margin has double lines the first three entries

**SuggestedRemedy**

make them single lines like the rest of the table.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.3.2 P 24 L 36 # 192

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Naming

If the construct for 10BASE-T1M to become 10BASE-T1Sm (a variant of 10BASE-T1S) is accepted, then, following the usage for 10BASE-T vs 10BASE-Te, there is no need for separate PhyType and MauType - you just use 10BASE-T1S. (SUBTYPE)

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete 30.3.2 and subclauses. (P24 L36-54)

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.6 P 25 L 14 # 193

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Management

No autonegotiation is defined for multidrop - hence addition of 10BASE-T1M to auto-negotiation management is inappropriate.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete 30.6 and subclauses (P25 L144-26)

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.6 P 25 L 20 # 52

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Management

188.1.1 says that Auto-negotiation is not available for 10GBASE-T1M. So why does this subclause need to be changed to add 10BASE-T1M?

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete 30.6 and its subclauses.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.6.1.1.5 P 25 L 26 # 42

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Management

Since T1M doesn't do autoneg, I don't understand why we should add a aAutoNegLocalTechnologyAbility for it.

**SuggestedRemedy**

remove 30.6.1.1.5 aAutoNegLocalTechnologyAbility

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.16.1.1.3 P 25 L 40 # 318

Law, David HPE

Comment Type T Comment Status D Management

Since subclause 30.16.1.1.3 defines the aPLCANodeCount attribute, it seems it should map to the plca\_node\_count variable rather than the local\_nodeID variable as stated. In addition, this is an attribute, not a parameter.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Suggest that the text 'This parameter maps to the local\_nodeID variable in 148.4.4.2.' is changed to read 'This attribute maps to the plca\_node\_count variable in 148.4.4.2.'

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 30 SC 30.16.1.1.4 P 25 L 47 # 319

Law, David

HPE

Comment Type T Comment Status D Management

Since subclause 30.16.1.1.4 defines the aPLCALocalNodeIDattribute, it seems it should map to the local\_nodeID variable rather than the plca\_node\_count variable as stated. In addition, this is an attribute, not a parameter.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest the text 'This parameter maps to the plca\_node\_count variable in 148.4.4.2.' is changed to read 'This attribute maps to the local\_nodeID variable in 148.4.4.2.'

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 30 SC 30.16.1.1.13 P 27 L 16 # 124

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Since the enumerated values are TRUE and FALSE, why not make the syntax BOOLEAN?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change Appropriate Syntax to BOOLEAN

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 30 SC 30.16.1.1.14 P 27 L 27 # 125

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Since the enumerated values are TRUE and FALSE, why not make the syntax BOOLEAN?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change Appropriate Syntax to BOOLEAN

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 30 SC 30.17.1.1.1 P 28 L 21 # 43

Jones, Peter

Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D Management

The attribute is named aMPSEAdminState but is described as " operational state". It's either operational or administrative.

*SuggestedRemedy*

replace

"A read-only value that identifies the operational state of the MPSE function"

with

"A read-only value that identifies the administrative state of the MPSE function."

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 30 SC 30.17.1.1.2 P 28 L 41 # 44

Jones, Peter

Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Management

In aMPSEPowerState, the mappings from the states to the enums are not obvious, e.g., what does HIGH\_MARK map to. We need to define the mappings, here is probably the best place.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Create a mapping table either here or in 189.4.4.5 that defines how these values are mapped.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 30 SC 30.17.1.1.3 P 28 L 50 # 194

Zimmerman, George

CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type T Comment Status D Management

the aMPSETypeDiscovery enumerated values miss the case where type "mixed" MPDs are discovered... they just have the case where Both type 0 and type 1 MPDs have been discovered. This case should also include type "mixed" discovered, as listed in 30.17.2.1.1 (as well as in clause 189)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change description of "mixed" to read "Type Mixed, or a mixture of MPD Types"

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 30 SC 30.17.1.1.3 P 28 L 52 # 53  
Ran, Adeel Cisco  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
Missing space "in189.4.6"  
SuggestedRemedy  
Insert space  
Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 30 SC 30.17.1.1.3 P 28 L 53 # 45  
Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ  
The reference for aMPSETypeDiscovery is wrong.  
SuggestedRemedy  
replace  
"MPD(s) as specified in189.4.6.;"  
with  
"MPD(s) as specified in 189.3.;"  
Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 30 SC 30.17.1.1.3 P 28 L 53 # 195  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
189.4.6 is the wrong cross reference for MPD types. 189.5.1 lists MPD types  
SuggestedRemedy  
Change cross-reference to 189.5.1 and put space prior to cross-reference.  
Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 30 SC 30.17.1.1.4 P 29 L 8 # 3  
Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
aMPSEPoweringCounter is described as  
"This counter is incremented when the MPSE transitions to the POWER\_ON state in from the MPI as specified in Figure 189-4.;"  
"transitions to the POWER\_ON state in from the MPI" doesn't make sense.  
SuggestedRemedy  
Fix description.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 30 SC 30.17.1.1.4 P 29 L 8 # 240  
Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
"...to the POWER\_ON state in from the MPI..." extra word "in" in the sentence.  
SuggestedRemedy  
Delete "in", making it "...to the POWER\_ON state from the MPI..."  
Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 30 SC 30.17.1.1.4 P 29 L 8 # 46  
Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
Comment Type TR Comment Status X Management  
aMPSEPoweringCounter is described as  
"This counter is incremented when the MPSE transitions to the POWER\_ON state in from the MPI as specified in Figure 189-4.;"  
I think the counter variable and it's update should be part of the state machine.  
SuggestedRemedy  
For this and similar counters, e.g. aMPSEShortCircuitCounter, define a counter variable and show the increment in the state machine.  
Proposed Response Response Status O



## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 30 SC 30.17.1.1.5 P 29 L 18 # 196  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son  
Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
189.4.9 is short circuit current, 189.4.8 is overload....  
SuggestedRemedy  
Change 189.4.9 cross-ref to point to 189.4.8  
Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.17.1.1.6 P 29 L 28 # 197  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son  
Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
189.4.10 is the power removal section, 189.4.9 is short circuit  
SuggestedRemedy  
Change 189.4.10 cross-ref to point to 189.4.9  
Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.17.1.1.7 P 29 L 39 # 4  
Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
Comment Type TR Comment Status D Management  
the description for aMPSEActualPower says:  
"The sampling frequency and averaging is vendor-defined."  
If this is relevant to the consumer of clause 30, we need to report what it is. If they don't care,  
then we should remove this.  
SuggestedRemedy  
Remove "The sampling frequency and averaging is vendor-defined." from the description.  
Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.17.1.1.7 P 29 L 39 # 257  
Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC  
Comment Type E Comment Status D Management  
subject/verb agreement  
SuggestedRemedy  
change: frequency and averaging is vendor-defined  
to: frequency and averaging are vendor-defined  
Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.17.1.1.8 P 29 L 48 # 241  
Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
"...aMPSEActualPower in  $\pm$  milliwatts.;" extraneous character in the text.  
SuggestedRemedy  
delete " $\pm$ "  
Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.17.1.1.8 P 29 L 48 # 5  
Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
Comment Type T Comment Status X Management  
The description for aMPSEPowerAccuracy includes  
"indicating the accuracy associated with aMPSEActualPower"  
I'm wondering if we need to say anything about how this is determined?  
SuggestedRemedy  
Consider adding text described how power accuracy can be assessed.  
Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.17.1.1.8**    **P 29**    **L 48**    # **54**

Ran, Adee    Cisco

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

"the accuracy associated with aMPSEActualPower in  $\pm$  milliwatts" - it is unclear what "in  $\pm$  milliwatts" means.

The suggested remedy is my interpretation.

Also applies in 30.17.2.1.9.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change "in  $\pm$  milliwatts" to "in milliwatts (e.g., a value of 1 means  $\pm$  1 mW).

Apply similar changes in 30.17.2.1.9.

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

---

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.17.1.1.9**    **P 30**    **L 8**    # **6**

Jones, Peter    Cisco Systems

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

aMPSECumulativeEnergy is described as

"A count of the cumulative energy supplied by the MPSE as measured at the MDI in kilojoules."

Do we need to say anything about how this is measured?

**SuggestedRemedy**

Consider adding text described how power measurement can be done..

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status O**

---

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.17.1.2.1**    **P 30**    **L 18**    # **198**

Zimmerman, George    CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

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

"This action provides a means to alter 189.4.4.2 mpse\_enable;" seems like this got editorially jumbled...

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change to read: "This action provides a means to alter mpse\_enable as specified in 189.4.4.2.;"

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

---

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.17.1.2.1**    **P 30**    **L 19**    # **7**

Jones, Peter    Cisco Systems

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

acMPSEAdminControl is described as

"This action provides a means to alter 189.4.4.2 mpse\_enable.;"

A little more description would be useful.

**SuggestedRemedy**

replace

"This action provides a means to alter 189.4.4.2 mpse\_enable.;"

with

"This action provides a means to alter 189.4.4.2 mpse\_enable and the change is reflected in aMPSEAdminState".;

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

---

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.17.2.1.2**    **P 30**    **L 47**    # **8**

Jones, Peter    Cisco Systems

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

the aMPDAdminState description includes the following:

"A read-only value that identifies the operational state of the MPD functions"

"The operational state of the MPD function"

It's either operational or administrative.

**SuggestedRemedy**

replace both instances of

"operational state "

with

"administrative state."

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

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 30 SC 30.17.2.1.2 P 30 L 48 # 55

Ran, Adeel Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X Management

"An interface which can provide the MPD functions specified in Clause 189 will be enabled to do so when this attribute has the enumeration "enabled"."

The word "will" is deprecated and its usage here suggests (incorrectly) that the enumeration controls the enablement.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change the quoted sentence and the one that follows (which is about "disabled") to:  
"An interface that supports the MPD functions specified in Clause 189 indicates that these functions are available when this attribute has the enumeration "enabled" and that these functions are not available when this attribute has the enumeration "disabled". "

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 30 SC 30.17.2.1.3 P 31 L # 201

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type T Comment Status D Management

The states listed for the MPD power state are not consistent with the state diagram, more explanation is needed - identifying state names with the descriptions .

#### SuggestedRemedy

change idle description to "MPD idle (PON\_NO\_POWER state)"  
change discovery description to "MPD discovery (DO\_MARKn, DO\_DISCOVERYn, and DISCOVERY\_LOW\_TYPE\_x, states)"

and change powered description to "MPD powered (PON\_EVAL, INRUSH, or PON\_LOAD\_ON states)".

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 30 SC 30.17.2.1.3 P 31 L 13 # 9

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Management

In aMPDPowerState, the mappings from the states to the enums are not obvious, e.g., what does PON\_EVAL map to. We need to define the mappings, here is probably the best place.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Create a mapping table either here or in 189.5.3.5 that defines how these values are mapped.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 30 SC 30.17.2.1.4 P 31 L 22 # 10

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Management

aMPDDiscoveryCounter is described as  
"This counter is incremented when the MPD enters the DO\_MARK1 state in Figure 189-8.;"  
I think the counter variable and it's update should be part of the state machine.

#### SuggestedRemedy

For this and similar counters, e.g. aMPDMismatchCounter , define a counter variable and show the increment in the state machine.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 30 SC 30.17.2.1.4 P 31 L 22 # 199

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

DO\_MARK1 is in Figure 189-6, not 189-8. (189-6 is part a of the state diagram and 189-8 is part c...)

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change cross-referenece to Figure 189-6

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

Cl 30 SC 30.17.2.1.5 P 31 L 31 # 200

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial

There is no longer any PON\_MISMATCHED\_TYPE state. It has been replaced by present\_mismatch\_indicator being set to true.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "enters the PON\_MISMATCHED\_TYPE state" with "present\_mismatch\_indication is set to true"

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 30 SC 30.17.2.1.8 P 32 L 1 # 242

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Management

aMPDActualPower - this requires a PD to measure its power, this is a big requirement to place on some of the PDs targeted by this standard. I see we say the PD reports 0 if the MPI is not powered. What does an MPD report if it doesn't support power measurement?

SuggestedRemedy

Add a value that designates that the MPD doesn't support this feature.  
"An MPD that does not support measuring MPI power reports 1 mW."

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 30 SC 30.17.2.1.8 P 32 L 9 # 11

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Management

the description for aMPDActualPower says:

"The sampling frequency and averaging is vendor-defined."

If this is relevant to the consumer of clause 30, we need to report what it is. If they don't care, then we should remove this.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "The sampling frequency and averaging is vendor-defined." from the description.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 30 SC 30.17.2.1.8 P 32 L 10 # 258

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC

Comment Type E Comment Status D Management

subject/verb agreement

SuggestedRemedy

change: frequency and averaging is vendor-defined  
to: frequency and averaging are vendor-defined

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 30 SC 30.17.2.1.9 P 32 L 19 # 243

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"...aMPDActualPower in  $\pm$  milliwatts.;" extraneous character in the text.

SuggestedRemedy

delete " $\pm$ "

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 30 SC 30.17.2.1.9 P 32 L 19 # 12

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status X Management

The description for aMPDPowerAccuracy includes

"indicating the accuracy associated with aMPDActualPower"

I'm wondering if we need to say anything about how this is determined?

SuggestedRemedy

Consider adding text described how power accuracy can be assessed.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

Cl 30 SC 30.17.2.2.1 P 32 L 35 # 244

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

"APPROPRIATE SYNTAX: Same as aMPDAdminState" - why make a reader page back to see what this is? Make it easy, cut and paste it here, we aren't trying to optimize the number of bits required to display the standard.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Here's the text from aMPDAdminState that should be copied in:  
An ENUMERATED VALUE that has one of the following entries:  
enabled MPD functions enabled  
disabled MPD functions disabled

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 30 SC 30.17.2.2.1 P 32 L 38 # 13

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X Management

the acMPDAdminControl description includes  
"This action provides a means to alter 189.5.3.3 mpd\_reset and dte\_power\_required. A  
"disabled" to "enabled" transition ...."  
to "disabled"  
A little more description would be useful, as would breaking up the paragraph

*SuggestedRemedy*

replace  
"This action provides a means to alter 189.5.3.3 mpd\_reset and dte\_power\_required. A  
"disabled" ....."  
with  
"This action provides a means to alter 189.5.3.3 mpd\_reset and dte\_power\_required, and the  
change is reflected in aMPDAdminState.  
A "disabled" ....."

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.16 P 33 L 32 # 202

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type T Comment Status D Naming

If the construct for 10BASE-T1M to become 10BASE-T1Sm (a variant of 10BASE-T1S) is accepted, then, following the usage for 10BASE-T vs 10BASE-Te, there is no need for new identification of 10BASE-T1M in the extended ability register, or the PMA/PMD control register. (SUBTYPE)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete 44.2.1.16 and 45.2.1.214 from the draft (P33 L21-54)

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.234 P 35 L 5 # 179

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

This clause is an example where center justifying the paragraph causes non-uniform spacing for the phrase "10BASE-T1M / 10BASE-T1S"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Globally insert non-breaking spaces between "10BASE-T1M" and the "/" and between the "/" and "10BASE-T1S".

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.234.3 P 35 L 42 # 14

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Management

I think its odd to have low-power mode defined only in clause 145.  
I think it should be mentioned in clause 188, and there probably should be a PICS.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Specify low-power mode in clause 188 or remove T1M from 45.2.1.234.3/45.2.1.235.2

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.235.4 P 37 L 4 # 15

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Management

In the description of 45.2.1.235.4 Receive fault ability it says  
When read as a one, bit 1.2298.9 indicates that the 10BASE-T1M / 10BASE-T1S PMA has  
the ability to detect a fault condition on the receive path.  
I don't see anything in 188.5 that describes how to detect a fault condition.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Either add text to 188.5 describing how to detect a fault condition, or remove T1M from  
45.2.1.235.4/5.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.236 P 37 L 22 # 56

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Missing dash in "10BASET1S"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert a dash

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.236 P 37 L 24 # 16

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Editorial

The bit descriptions for "10BASE-T1M / 10BASET1S test mode control register" just identify  
a "Test mode 4", but don't say what it does.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add text from "188.6.2 Test modes" saying what the tests do, or add a cross reference to  
188.6.2.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.236 P 37 L 29 # 57

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Missing 10 in "BASE-T1S"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert "10"

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 45 SC 45.2.3 P 37 L 44 # 126

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

In all the changed register names, 10BASE=T1S should be 10BASE-T1S, and there should  
be a space after the /

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a space after the / and change = to - (in all 4 rows)

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 45 SC 45.2.3 P 37 L 48 # 58

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"=" should be "-", multiple instances in Table 45-233

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.72.3 P 39 L 5 # 127

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Stray space in 10BASE- T1M

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the space after the hyphen

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 45 SC 45.3.72.3 P 39 L 5 # 259

Wienckowski, Natalie

IVN Solutions LLC

Comment Type E

Comment Status D

EZ

extra space

SuggestedRemedy

change: 10BASE- T1M PCS  
to: 10BASE-T1M PCS

Proposed Response

Response Status W

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.73.1 P 39 L 28 # 17

Jones, Peter

Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR

Comment Status X

Management

The text for "45.2.3.73.1 Fault" includes  
"the 10BASE-T1M / 10BASE-T1S PCS has detected a fault condition on either the transmit  
or receive path."

I don't see anything in clause 188 that defines what a fault condition is and how to detect it.

SuggestedRemedy

Either add text to 188.5 describing how to detect a fault condition, or remove T1M from  
45.2.3.73.1.

Proposed Response

Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.73.2 P 39 L 40 # 59

Ran, Adeel

Cisco

Comment Type T

Comment Status D

Full Duplex

"10BASE-T1M PHYs do not have full duplex capability." = but this subclause is about the  
register, not about the capability; it is not stated what the register reads in this case..

SuggestedRemedy

Change the quoted sentence to "For 10BASE-T1M PHYs this bit always reads as a zero"..

Proposed Response

Response Status W

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.74 P 40 L 10 # 18

Jones, Peter

Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR

Comment Status X

Editorial

The register bit definitions say  
"16-bit field counting the number of remote jabber errors received since last read of this  
register".  
I think this needs a cross reference to where remote jabber errors are specified in clause 188  
for T1M, and clause 147 to T1S

SuggestedRemedy

Add cross references in table or in text above.

Proposed Response

Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.75 P 40 L 27 # 19

Jones, Peter

Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR

Comment Status X

Management

The table of bit definitions for "10BASE-T1M / 10BASE-T1S PCS diagnostic 2 " contains  
'CorruptedTxCnt', but I don't see any text defining what this is and how it's counted.

SuggestedRemedy

Either add text to 188 to specify How to count it, or remove T1M from 45.2.3.75

Proposed Response

Response Status O

Cl 79 SC 79.3.9.3 P 41 L 6 # 284

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type E

Comment Status D

EZ

Uneven font size

SuggestedRemedy

Remove formatting overrides

Proposed Response

Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 78 SC 78.3 P 41 L 17 # 122

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D New Feature

It's been assumed the MPoE will provide the equivalent function to the "Power via MDI Measurements TLV" defined for 4 pair PoE, but we have not specified this in the draft.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Implement proposal to be submitted at least one week before January interim

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 78 SC 78.3 P 41 L 17 # 121

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D New Feature

It's always been assumed the MPoE will use LLDP to exchange status and negotiate power for MPoE, but we have not specified this in the draft.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Implement proposal to be submitted at least one week before January interim

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 79 SC 79.3.9.3 P 41 L 48 # 60

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D LLDP

This subclause is titled "PLCA TLV usage rules" but it does not contain any rules - only recommendations.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the title to "PLCA TLV usage".

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

---

CI 79 SC 79.3.9.3 P 41 L 52 # 283

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status X PLCA

"If PLCA is not enabled, this field reports 255": it is not clear what "not enabled" means here. Presumably not supported is not enabled, and according to 148.4.6.1, INACTIVE or FAIL would be disabled. Also, if PLCA is not enabled, it seems strange that a PLCA TLV would be sent at all.

*SuggestedRemedy*

If a station without PLCA or with it not enabled would not send a PLCA TLV, delete the sentence. If it would, explain, and tie the language to that in Clause 148.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 79 SC 79.3.9.3 P 41 L 52 # 282

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status X LLDP

"this field reports 255", but this subclause is about a TLV not a field.

*SuggestedRemedy*

If you mean the PLCA nodelfield, say so, and move the sentence to the relevant subclause, 79.3.9.2.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 79 SC 79.3.9.3 P 41 L 52 # 61

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D LLDP

"If PLCA is not enabled, this field reports 255"

Which field? The subclauses title is "PLCA TLV usage rules" and it does not mention any specific field.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Clarify or delete this sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---



## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 79 SC 79.3.9.3 P 41 L 52 # 128

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D LLDP

The last sentence of the paragraph seems out of place. It is unclear what "this field" is. The subclause is about TLV usage rules, not a field within the TLV.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Name the field that has the value 255, or move the sentence to the appropriate subclause if it belongs somewhere else.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 79 SC 79.3.9.3 P 42 L 6 # 285

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status X Management

This is normative behaviour, so the references should go to normative material, not auxiliary material such as Management.

#### SuggestedRemedy

In the Notes column, add or change the references to refer to the relevant places in 148.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 0 P 42 L 6 # 203

Zimmerman, George

CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Font size is larger in the Length and Format columns than others. This is not consistent with other clause 79 tables.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change font size of the contents of the Length and Format Columns to be consistent with the rest of the table.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 79 SC 79.3.9.3 P 42 L 8 # 286

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status D LLDP

TRUE or FALSE doesn't make sense for a status. 30.16.1.1.2 (too arcane) says that aPLCAstatus indicates whether PLCA Control state diagram is receiving BEACON indication or transmitting BEACON request, but then it refers to 148.4.6.2 where the values are OK or FAIL, which is more understandable.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Refer to 148.4.6.2 and change TRUE and FALSE to OK and FAIL.  
30.16.1.1.2 could be improved sometime, but that's maintenance.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 79 SC 79.5.13 P 43 L 30 # 129

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The comment for PLC3 should be talking about the LLDPDU rather than the PLCA TLV.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change the comment to "LLDPDU should contain no more than one PLCA TLV":

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 79 SC 79.5.13 P 43 L 30 # 20

Jones, Peter

Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

The "Value/Comment" item for PLC3 in the PLCA TLV table (below) doesn't match many similar descriptions and doesn't make sense.

"PLCA support/status TLV should contain no more than one PLCA TLV"

#### SuggestedRemedy

replace  
"PLCA support/status TLV should contain no more than one PLCA TLV"  
with  
"LLDPDU contains no more than one"

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 79 SC 79.5.13 P 43 L 30 # 62

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D LLDP

"PLCA support/status TLV should contain no more than one PLCA TLV" is a recommendation, not an option. Recommendations typically don't have PICS items. It is unclear why this is not a mandatory requirement (what usage model has more than one TLV) and assuming it's optional, is it important that an implementation reports whether it sends more than one?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete PICS item PLC3, unless the "rule" is made mandatory.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 79 SC 79.5.1 P 43 L 30 # 287

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status X LLDP

79.3.9.3 says should not shall, so it's not a requirement, and a PICS is not appropriate

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete PICS PLC3 or change should to shall in 79.3.9.3

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 147 SC 147.1 P 45 L 10 # 63

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Naming

The new paragraph inserted makes a statement about a PHY in another clause, which is unclear (what does "refined" mean?).

This statement is not required in clause 147 and is out of scope (the project is not intended to change the 10BASE-T1S PHYs). It is also repeated in 188.1, where it seems to belong.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete this statement (and the whole of clause 147).

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 147 SC 147.1 P 45 L 10 # 288

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type T Comment Status X Naming

Specifications for one PHY are "refined" in the clause for another PHY. That's weird, and leaves the reader at a loss to know what to obey. Same problem in 188.1. It seems that 188 is complete, in that it does not rely on 147.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "refined" to "given", each time.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 148 SC 148.2 P 46 L 13 # 289

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status X Editorial

unique to

*SuggestedRemedy*

unique in

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 148 SC 148.2 P 46 L 15 # 204

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type E Comment Status D D-PLCA

This is the first instance of "Dynamic PLCA" it seems appropriate to introduce the acronym D-PLCA here.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Dynamic PLCA (see 148.4.7)" to "Dynamic PLCA (D-PLCA, see 148.4.7)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4 P 46 L 21 # 320

Law, David

HPE

Comment Type T Comment Status X D-PLCA

It appears that the description in IEEE Std 802.3-2022 subclause 148.4.4.1 'PLCA Control state diagram' needs to be updated based on the addition of DPLCA to the PLCA Control state diagram. As an example, it appears that the second paragraph of subclause 148.4.4.1 reads, 'To achieve error free operation the PLCA node should be configured ...' and then says that 'Each local\_nodeID is unique to the local collision domain.' needs to be updated to reflect that this is only the case for a node that does not support DPLCA or does, but does not have it enabled. As another example, it appears that the antepenultimate paragraph of subclause 148.4.4.1 starts 'When condition (2) occurs ...' should perhaps be updated to reflect that COMMIT is appended to transmissions if DPLCA is enabled.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add IEEE Std 802.3-2022 subclause 148.4.4.1 'PLCA Control state diagram' to the draft and modify as required to account for the addition of DPLCA.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.2 P 46 L 29 # 205

Zimmerman, George

CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"Values:TRUE" lacks a space after the colon. This lack of space between the value and the description appears for every variable in 148.4.4.2, except dplca\_txop\_claim.

*SuggestedRemedy*

insert space after colon at P46 L29, L33, L48, L52, and P47 L3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.2 P 46 L 33 # 321

Law, David

HPE

Comment Type TR Comment Status X D-PLCA

The definition of the dplca\_en variable in subclause 148.4.4.2 says, 'This signal maps to TRUE when aDPLCAAdminState is enabled and to FALSE when aDPLCAAdminState is disabled.'. Since IEEE Std 802.3 subclause 30.1 'Overview' says, 'Implementation of part or all of Layer Management is not a requirement for conformance to any other clause of this standard.', the D-PLCA state diagram has to be able to operate in the absence of this attribute.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest that the text 'This signal maps to TRUE when aDPLCAAdminState is enabled and to FALSE when aDPLCAAdminState is disabled.' be deleted.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 148 SC 148.4.4.2 P47 L3 # 150

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status X D-PLCA

The description for node count seems wrong in PLCA/DPLCA. The variable `plca_node_count` and attribute `aPLCANodeCount` in 30.16.1.1.3 describe it as "number of nodes getting a transmit opportunity before a new BEACON is generated". It essentially sets the number of transmit opportunities between BEACONS in the PLCA bus cycle.

`dplca_txop_node_count` is a copy of `plca_node_count` so it takes the same range.

A value of 0 currently is permitted, but according to the description this would allow for no transmit opportunities makes no sense. Instead a value of 0 yields one transmit opportunity between BEACONS. See exit from NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY to RESYNC via B in Figure 148-4.

Recommend to disallow the value of zero in these variables/attributes.

#### SuggestedRemedy

P47 L3 (`dplca_txop_node_count`)  
Change: "Values: integer from 0 to 255"  
To: "Values: integer from 1 to 255"

In Clause 148.4.4.2, change the valid values for `plca_node_count` from "0 to 255" to "1 to 255"

P25 L40 (30.16.1.1.3 `aPLCANodeCount`)  
Change: "Valid range is 0 to 255, inclusive."

To: "Valid range is 1 to 255, inclusive."

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 148 SC 148.4.4.6 P48 L46 # 117

Huszk, Gergely Kone

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Non-elementary expressions shall be embraced in a pair of parentheses

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change "!CRS" to "(!CRS)" at exit from SYNCING, RECEIVE, and ABORT states (across 2 pages)

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 148 SC 148.4.4.6 P49 L30 # 206

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type E Comment Status D State Diagrams

Transition from BURST back to TRANSMIT crosses over transition line from WAIT\_TO to NEXT\_TX\_Opportunity and Transition from TRANSMIT to BURST, making it hard to follow.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change transition out of Burst to TRANSMIT to go to a tag (I believe it would be E) , and have that tag be the entry to TRANSMIT.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 148 SC 148.4.4.6 P49 L33 # 322

Law, David HPE

Comment Type TR Comment Status X D-PLCA

The `bc` variable is defined as an integer from 0 to 255 (see subclause 148.4.4.2). The first action on entry to the BURST state in Figure 148-4 'PLCA Control state diagram' is to set `bc` to equal `bc + 1`. There is then an IF-THEN-ELSE statement that tests if `bc > 0`. If it is, the `burst_timer` is started (the THEN condition). If it isn't, the `append_commit_timer` is started (the ELSE condition).

The intent seems to be to append COMMIT after a packet transmission when bursting is not enabled. Since, however, `bc` is set to 0 in the COMMIT state and incremented on entry to the BURST state, the `bc` variable will always be `> 0` when the IF-THEN-ELSE statement is reached. As a result, the THEN condition will always execute (start `burst_timer`), and the ELSE condition (start `append_commit_timer`) will never be reached.

What will happen is then `deb=pendant` on the setting of `burst_timer` when bursting isn't enabled. If it is set to zero, it appears that COMMIT will not be appended after a packet transmission. If it is set to the default of 128 bit times (see subclause 30.16.1.1.7), the appended COMMIT will be longer than the `append_commit_timer` duration of 22 bit times.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 148 SC 148.4.4.6 P 51 L 49 # 323

Law, David

HPE

Comment Type TR Comment Status X D-PLCA

When Figure 148–4 'PLCA Control state diagram' enters the NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY state, it will set `dplca_txop_claim` to TRUE. Since the exit conditions from the NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY state are an equation and an ELSE, one of the two will be true. As a result, the state diagram will exit the NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY state immediately, either transitioning to the RESYNC or WAIT\_TO state. If the `nodeID` is non-zero, the PLCA Control state diagram will immediately transition to the WAIT\_TO state, where it sets `dplca_txop_claim` to NONE.

When `dplca_aging` is ON, the operation of the Figure 148–9 'D-PLCA Aging State Diagram' is controlled by the `dplca_txop_end` variable from the PLCA Control state diagram. When `dplca_txop_end` is set TRUE by the PLCA Control state diagram, the D-PLCA Aging State Diagram will immediately transition from the WAIT\_TXOP\_END state to the TXOP\_END state. The actions in the TXOP\_END state will execute instantaneously, and then the D-PLCA Aging State Diagram will transition immediately to the UPDATE\_SOFT, NOTIFY or UPDATE\_HARD state depending on the value of `dplca_txop_claim`.

As a result, there is a form of race condition between the variables set in the PLCA Control state diagram and their use in the D-PLCA Aging State Diagram. The PLCA Control state diagram sets the variable `dplca_txop_claim` to TRUE in the NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY state immediately followed by setting the `dplca_txop_claim` variable to NONE in the WAIT\_TO state (in the cases where the `nodeID` is non-zero). The D-PLCA Aging State Diagram state diagram exits the WAIT\_TXOP\_END state due to `dplca_txop_end` being TRUE, executes the actions in the WAIT\_TXOP\_END state, and then transitions either to the UPDATE\_SOFT, NOTIFY or UPDATE\_HARD state depending on the value of `dplca_txop_claim`.

Since actions inside a state block execute instantaneously (IEEE Std 802.3-2022, subclause 21.5.1), and the PLCA Control state diagram will exit the NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY state immediately, it is not clear if the value of `dplca_txop_claim` will be tested by the D-PLCA Aging State Diagram before or after it is set to NONE by the PLCA Control state diagram. If it is after it is set to NONE by the PLCA Control state diagram, the D-PLCA Aging State Diagram will not operate correctly as it will never reach the UPDATE\_SOFT or UPDATE\_HARD states.

Suggest that the PLCA Control state diagram should not transition out of the NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY state until the D-PLCA Aging State Diagram has tested the value of `dplca_txop_claim`. This can be achieved by waiting in the NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY state until the `dplca_txop_table_upd` is set to TRUE in the NOTIFY state of the D-PLCA Aging State Diagram. This condition should be ignored when `dplca_aging` is OFF.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that:

[1] The transition condition for the transition from the NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY state to the RESYNC state in Figure 148–4 'PLCA Control state diagram, part b' is changed to:

$((\text{local\_nodeID} = 0) * (\text{curlID} \geq \text{plca\_node\_count})) + (\text{curlID} = 255) * (\text{dplca\_txop\_table\_upd} + \text{dplca\_aging} = \text{OFF})$

[2] The transition condition for the transition from the NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY state to the WAIT\_TO state in Figure 148–4 'PLCA Control state diagram, part b' is changed to:

$((\text{local\_nodeID} \neq 0) + (\text{curlID} < \text{plca\_node\_count})) * (\text{curlID} \neq 255) * (\text{dplca\_txop\_table\_upd} + \text{dplca\_aging} = \text{OFF})$

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 148 SC 148.4.5.7 P 51 L 51 # 118

Huszk, Gergely

Kone

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Non-elementary expressions shall be embraced in a pair of parentheses

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change "`!plca_txen`" to "`!(plca_txen)`" at exit from ABORT and COLLIDE states (across 2 pages)

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 148 SC 148.4.7 P 53 L 3 # 290

Dawe, Piers

Nvidia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Dynamic (D-PLCA) - ungrammatical

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change to: Dynamic PLCA (D-PLCA)

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

**Cl 148**      **SC 148.4.7.1**      **P 53**      **L 5**      # **324**

Law, David

HPE

**Comment Type**    **T**      **Comment Status**    **X**      **D-PLCA**

While subclause 148.4.7.1 'D-PLCA state diagram overview' provides a high-level overview of the operation of DPLCA, it does not provide the level of detail offered by subclause 148.4.4.1 'PLCA Control state diagram', subclause 148.4.5.1 'PLCA Data state diagram' and subclause 148.4.6.1 'PLCA Status state diagram' regarding the operation of the respective state diagrams. While strictly speaking, only the normative requirements (in this case, the state diagram) is required, it is difficult to review the operation of the state diagram without the additional description.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Suggest that subclause 148.4.7.1 'D-PLCA state diagram overview' be updated to provide a high-level description of the operation of the state diagram.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

---

**Cl 148**      **SC 148.4.7.1**      **P 53**      **L 12**      # **325**

Law, David

HPE

**Comment Type**    **TR**      **Comment Status**    **D**      **Editorial**

Subclause 148.4.7.1 'D-PLCA state diagram overview' says that 'D-PLCA adjusts aPLCANodeCount and aPLCALocalNodeID based on transmit opportunity claims ...'. aPLCANodeCount and aPLCALocalNodeID are, however, management attributes that reflect the values of the plca\_node\_count and local\_nodeID variables, respectively. Since IEEE Std 802.3 subclause 30.1 'Overview' says, 'Implementation of part or all of Layer Management is not a requirement for conformance to any other clause of this standard.', the D-PLCA state diagram has to be able to operate in the absence of these attributes.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Suggest that the text 'D-PLCA adjusts aPLCANodeCount and aPLCALocalNodeID based on transmit opportunity claims ...' is changed to read 'D-PLCA adjusts plca\_node\_count and local\_nodeID based on transmit opportunity claims ...'.

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

---

**Cl 148**      **SC 148.4.7.2**      **P 54**      **L 9**      # **207**

Zimmerman, George

CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

**Comment Type**    **T**      **Comment Status**    **D**      **D-PLCA**

shouldn't hard\_aging\_cycles ( and the associated soft\_aging and counters) have a range?  
Not sure what it would be right now...

**SuggestedRemedy**

Consider ranges for aging cycles variables.

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

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.2 P 54 L 39 # 148

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status X D-PLCA

There are only 255 usable transmit opportunities, 0->254. The local\_nodeID value of 255 is reserved for PLCA disabled. This can be seen by the global transition into the DISABLE state of Figure 148-3 - PLCA Control state diagram. This global transition condition includes the term (local\_nodeID=255). Also, the transition from NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY to RESYNC (via B) to transmit begin a new PLCA cycle occurs when curID=255, after curID was incremented in NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY. There is no Transmit Opportunity 255.

A number of variables and functions need to be updated to reflect this.

#### SuggestedRemedy

P54 L39 (txop\_claim\_table)

Change: "...claim state of the 256 transmit opportunities IDs."

To: "...claim state of the 255 transmit opportunity IDs."

P54 L51 (txop\_claim\_table)

Change: "Array of 256 elements..."

To: "Array of 255 elements..."

P55 L14 (CLEAR\_TXOP\_TABLE)

Change: "...all of the 256 elements..."

To: "...all of the 255 elements..."

P55 L19 (HARD\_CLAIMING)

Change: "...range of 0 to 255..."

To: "...range of 0 to 254..."

P55 L40 (SOFT\_CLAIMING)

Change: "...range of 0 to 255..."

To: "...range of 0 to 254..."

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.4 P 55 L 47 # 326

Law, David

HPE

Comment Type TR Comment Status X D-PLCA

Subclause 148.4.7.4 'Timers' says that wait\_beacon\_timer '... is defined by the aDPLCAWaitBeaconTimer configuration Parameter.'. aDPLCAWaitBeaconTimer, however, is not a configuration parameter but a management attribute, one of four types of elements found in a managed object (see the third paragraph of subclause 30.1.4 'Management model'). Further, IEEE Std 802.3 subclause 30.1 'Overview' says, 'Implementation of part or all of Layer Management is not a requirement for conformance to any other clause of this standard.'. This timer, therefore, must be defined to operate in the absence of this attribute.

#### SuggestedRemedy

[1] Suggest that 30.16.1.1.12 'aDPLCAWaitBeaconTimer' is changed to read:

30.16.1.1.12 aDPLCAWaitBeaconTimer

ATTRIBUTE

APPROPRIATE SYNTAX:

INTEGER

BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS:

A GET operation returns the current wait\_beacon\_timer value in bit times (see 148.4.7.4).

A SET operation changes the wait\_beacon\_timer value. The value of this attribute is preserved across reset, including loss of power.;

[2] Suggest that wait\_beacon\_timer in subclause 148.4.7.4 'Timers' is changed to read:

wait\_beacon\_timer

Represents the time the D-PLCA state diagram waits for a BEACON indication.

Duration: 40 bit times.

Tolerance: +/- 1 bit time.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 148 SC 148.4.7.5 P 56 L 12 # 151

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status X D-PLCA

DPLCA is intended to work with nodes statically assigned node IDs. If a node is statically assigned to a node ID greater than 7 then it is possible that the DPLCA coordinator will never expand the node count and therefore the number of transmit opportunities enough to allow for the statically assigned node to gain a transmit opportunity. This occurs because the plca\_node\_count is initialized to 8, allowing for TOs 0-7. If no node ever claims TO 7, then the DPLCA coordinator will never increase the plca\_node\_count upwards.

A proposed solution is to change the assigned initialization value of plca\_node\_count from 8 to 255 in the WAIT\_BEACON state. This will start the DPLCA coordinator with the longest possible PLCA cycle with all possible transmit opportunities available and giving the statically assigned nodes a chance to hard commit. The DPLCA coordinator will then shrink the plca\_node\_count downwards. The disadvantage is that this may increase the convergence time.

#### SuggestedRemedy

In the WAIT\_BEACON state of Figure 148-8, change the initialization value of plca\_node\_count from 8 to 255.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 148 SC 148.7.5 P 56 L 18 # 299

McClellan, Brett Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D D-PLCA

In Figure 148-8 D-PLCA Control State Diagram, in the COORDINATOR state, a coordinator lockup happens when two nodes send the BEACON at the same time. The PLCA is not able to register activity from other nodes while transmitting BEACON.

#### SuggestedRemedy

I will submit a presentation on proposed changes to the D-PLCA Control State Diagram.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 148 SC 148.4.7.5 P 56 L 31 # 119

Huszak, Gergely Kone

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Non-elementary expressions shall be embraced in a pair of parentheses

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change "!dplca\_new\_age" to "(!dplca\_new\_age)" at exit from INCREASE\_NODE\_COUNT

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 148 SC 148.4.7.5 P 56 L 35 # 149

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status X D-PLCA

There are only 255 usable transmit opportunities, 0->254. The local\_nodeID value of 255 is reserved for PLCA disabled. This can be seen by the global transition into the DISABLE state of Figure 148-3 - PLCA Control state diagram. This global transition condition includes the term (local\_nodeID=255). Also, the transition from NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY to RESYNC (via B) to transmit begin a new PLCA cycle occurs when curlID=255, after curlID was incremented in NEXT\_TX\_OPPORTUNITY. There is no Transmit Opportunity 255.

Figure 148-8 DPLCA Control State Diagram incorrectly allows for the PLCA bus cycle to expand to allow Transmit Opportunity ID 255 to exist.

#### SuggestedRemedy

In the Figure 148-8 state transition from COORDINATOR to INCREASE\_NODE\_COUNT,  
Change: "(plca\_node\_count < 255) \*\*"  
To: "(plca\_node\_count < 254) \*\*"

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 148 SC 148.4.7.6 P 57 L 2 # 120

Huszak, Gergely Kone

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Non-elementary expressions shall be embraced in a pair of parentheses

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change "dplca\_aging = OFF" to "(dplca\_aging = OFF)" at entry to DISABLED,  
"dplca\_txop\_claim = SOFT" to "(dplca\_txop\_claim = SOFT)" at entry to UPDATE\_SOFT,  
"dplca\_txop\_claim = NONE" to "(dplca\_txop\_claim = NONE)" at entry to NOTIFY,  
"dplca\_txop\_claim = HARD" to "(dplca\_txop\_claim = HARD)" at entry to UPDATE\_HARD,  
and "!dplca\_txop\_end" to "(!dplca\_txop\_end)" to exit from NOTIFY

Proposed Response Response Status W



## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.6 P 57 L 19 # 328

Law, David HPE  
Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial  
Typo.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
In the TXOP\_END state, '... = SOFT\_AGAIN\_CYCLES ...' should read '... = SOFT\_AGING\_CYCLES ...'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.6 P 57 L 19 # 327

Law, David HPE  
Comment Type E Comment Status D State Diagrams  
Both soft\_aging\_cycles and hard\_aging\_cycles are defined as variables in subclause 148.4.7.1. As a result, their use in Figure 148–9 'D-PLCA Aging State Diagram' should be in lowercase.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Suggest that in the TXOP\_END state:

[1] 'IF short\_cnt = SOFT\_AGAIN\_CYCLES THEN' should be changed to read 'IF short\_cnt = soft\_aging\_cycles THEN'.  
[2] 'IF long\_cnt = HARD\_AGING\_CYCLES THEN' should be changed to read 'IF long\_cnt = hard\_aging\_cycles THEN'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.6 P 57 L 26 # 329

Law, David HPE  
Comment Type E Comment Status D State Diagrams  
The CLEAR\_TXOP\_TABLE() function is defined in subclause 148.4.7.3. As a result, its use in Figure 148–9 'D-PLCA Aging State Diagram' should be in uppercase. This is the case in the DISABLED state but not the TXOP\_END state.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Suggest that in the TXOP\_END state 'clear\_txop\_table(txop\_claim\_table\_new)' should read 'CLEAR\_TXOP\_TABLE(txop\_claim\_table\_new)'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188 P 60 L 1 # 177

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
and' seems like a better word choice than 'to' here.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Replace "Insert Clause 188 to Clause 189 in numeric order:" with "Insert Clause 188 and Clause 189 in numeric order:"

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188 P 60 L 1 # 155

Baggett, Tim Microchip  
Comment Type T Comment Status D 10BASE-T1S  
Clause 147 specifies a PHY with three fundamentally different analog drivers/receivers: Multidrop, point-to-point half duplex and point-to-point full duplex. The analog impedances are different, and full-duplex requires an echo canceller / hybrid. Because of this multidrop has primarily been implemented in the market. Where point-to-point is needed, 10BASE-T1L or 100BASE-T1 seems to be a better choice.

To aid in market acceptance of 10BASE-T1M as the same technology as 10BASE-T1S (multidrop), recommend deprecating/deleting point-to-point full and half duplex from Clause 147. Then merging Clause 188 into Clause 147 by adding 10BASE-T1M TCI and segment.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Delete point-to-point full and half duplex from Clause 147.  
Merge Clause 188 into Clause 147 \*adding\* specifications for TCI and enhanced mixing segment specifications. We do not delete existing Clause 147 multidrop MDI and mixing segment specifications.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188 P 60 L 4 # 123

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
Comment Type T Comment Status D New Feature  
We have discussed physical topology discovery many times, but we have not specified it in the draft.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Implement proposal to be submitted at least one week before January interim

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.1 P 60 L 14 # 208

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type T Comment Status D 10BASE-T1S

if the clause 188 specification is a refinement and subtype of clause 147, then this needs to be stated in the overview (SUBTYPE)

#### SuggestedRemedy

Insert at the end of the first paragraph of 188.1 "The 10BASE-T1Sm PCS and PMA specifications in this clause are refinements of the specifications in Clause 147 when the multidrop mode of operation is the only mode used. In some cases they are tightened for improved interoperability, or restated for clarity. Mixing segment specifications and the specifications for the interface from the PHY to the medium are restated and altered to improve usability and increase plug-and-play functionality.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.1 P 61 L 13 # 145

D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D MII

Fig 188-1 indicates that the MII is optional via Note 1. However, other parts of Clause 188 are written in such a way that assumes the MII is present. Therefore, it is assumed that Note 1 is really discussing a physical implementation of the MII.

Other BASE-T clauses address this by inclusion of a subclause that addresses interfaces and notes that implementations of the xMII interface are optional. Reference 165.1.5

#### SuggestedRemedy

- Following changes are proposed -
1. Modify Note 1 of Figure 188-1 to read "Physical implementation of MII is optional."
  2. Add new subclause -

Interfaces

All 10BASE-T1M PHY implementations are compatible at the MDI and at the MII, if implemented. Physical implementation of the MII is optional. Designers are free to implement circuitry within the PCS and

PMA in an application-dependent manner provided that the MDI and MII (if the MII is implemented) specifications are met. System operation from the perspective of signals at the MDI and management objects are identical whether the MII is physically implemented or not.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.1.2.2 P 61 L 46 # 64

Ran, Adeed Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X State Diagrams

"All timers operate in the manner described in 40.4.5.2"

This statement appears in 188.1.2.2 and in 189.1.3.2.

The referenced subclause, 40.4.5.2, points to 14.2.3.2, where timer conventions are described; it also makes an additional convention (regarding "stop timer") that is not used in clause 188 (in this amendment it is only used in Figure 148-4).

Also, 189.4.4.3 and 189.5.3.4 repeat the timers convention with the same text as in 40.4.5.2.

The result is a bit messy: apparent contradictory cross-references, which are in fact duplicate, and unnecessary indirect cross references due to a convention that is not used.

#### SuggestedRemedy

In 188.1.2.2 and 189.1.3.2, change the cross-reference to 14.2.3.2.

In 189.4.4.3 and 189.5.3.4, delete the "conventions" statements (they are duplicates and covered by the general conventions in the subclauses above).

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.2 P 62 L 11 # 209

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"two level Differential Manchester Encoding" should have "two level" hyphenated, as it is a compound adjective.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change two level to two-level

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.3 P 63 L 18 # 158

CI 188 SC 188.3 P 63 L 49 # 21

CI 188 SC 188.3 P 63 L 49 # 157

CI 188 SC 188.3 P63 L49 # 260

CI 188 SC 188.3 P 63 L 49 # 247

<i>Cl</i> 188	SC 188.3	<i>P</i> 63	<i>L</i> 51	# 248
---------------	----------	-------------	-------------	-------

Page 27 of 63  
12/24/2024 9:30:11 AM

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.3.2.3 P 64 L 48 # 159

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D Primitives

Text refers reader to DME encoding rules in 188.5. The DME rules are, however, in 188.5.2.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change:

"DME following rules in 188.5"

To:

"DME following rules in 188.5.2"

Note: If this change is accepted, I would like to make the same correction in 147.2.2.3 either in 3.da or maintenance.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4 P 65 L 21 # 130

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D PCS

The two sentences in this paragraph are not self-consistent. The first says the PCS consists of 3 functions that are shown in figure 188-3, the second describes 4 functions within the PCS.

**SuggestedRemedy**

add "and the PCS Loopback function" to the end of the first sentence. Or delete the clause in the second sentence that points to the loopback function.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4 P 65 L 23 # 210

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type T Comment Status D PCS

PCS loopback isn't a "function" as in a functional block. It is an operation. In 188.4.4 it is called a mode.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change "and the PCS Loopback function is explained in 188.4.4" to "and operation in PCS Loopback mode is explained in 188.4.4".

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.1 P 66 L 1 # 22

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PCS

In "Figure 188–3—PCS reference diagram", the "Technology Dependent Interface" should not be here. It's only used by AutoNeg which is not supported by T1M.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Remove "Technology Dependent Interface" and associated signals.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.1 P 66 L 2 # 160

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X PCS

Link control is not needed since AutoNeg is not supported and therefore needs to be fully removed.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Make the following changes:

P66 L2 - Delete from Figure 188-3 the Technology Dependent Interface and link\_control lines to PCS TRANSMIT and PCS RECEIVE boxes.

P67 L10 - Delete the link\_control variable entry (lines 10-15)

P71 L4 - Figure 188-4 - Change the transition logic into the SILENT state from:

pcs\_reset + (link\_control = DISABLE)

to:

pcs\_reset

P73 L51 - Delete the link\_control variable entry (lines 51-53)

P76 L3 - Figure 188-7 - Change the transition logic into the WAIT\_SYNC state from:

pcs\_reset + (transmitting) + (link\_control = DISABLE)

to:

pcs\_reset + (transmitting)

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.1 P 66 L 38 # 211

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type E Comment Status D PCS

Figure 188-3 doesn't show PCS loopback (neither do the similar figures in 802.3)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add to Figure 188-3, "NOTE - PCS Loopback not shown for clarity."

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.2 P 67 L 11 # 23

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

link\_control is only used by AutoNeg which is not supported by T1M.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the definition of link\_control.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.2 P 67 L 11 # 65

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X PCS

link\_control definition says "This variable is generated by the Auto-Negotiation function" - but 188.1.1 says this function is not available for this PHY.

The definition makes it unclear whether this is a control variable or a status indicator. If it is programmable it should be mapped to some MDIO register?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the text about Auto-Negotiation, and clarify if this variable is a control or a status indicator. Add MDIO register mapping if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.3 P 68 L 2 # 249

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status X PCS

The constant BEACON is missing from the list of constants.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add BEACON "5B symbol defined as 'N' in the 4B/5B encoding" in alphabetical order in the list of constants in 188.4.2.3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.7 P 71 L 15 # 164

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type TR Comment Status D State Diagrams

Figure 188-4 - PCS Transmit state diagram, part a

The transition condition from SILENT to SILENT is different from Clause 147 Figure 147-4.

The last term was (tx\_cmd!=COMMIT) but is now (tx\_sym<=TXCMD\_ENCODE(tx\_cmd)).

The new term isn't equivalent and having an assignment in a state transition condition makes no sense.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In the transition condition from SILENT to SILENT, change the last term from:  
(tx\_sym <= TXCMD\_ENCODE(tx\_cmd))

to:  
(tx\_cmd != COMMIT)

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.7 P 71 L 15 # 250

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X State Diagrams

In Figure 188-4, the transition condition for the state SILENT to go back to itself contains an assignment which is not appropriate for a state transition condition. It also has an unbalanced parenthesis. The condition is "STD \* (!TX\_EN) \* (tx\_sym <= TXCMD\_ENCODE(tx\_cmd))".

*SuggestedRemedy*

This state transition should probably be "STD \* (!TX\_EN) \* (tx\_cmd != COMMIT)".

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.7 P71 L 15 # 131

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D State Diagrams

The last term in the transition from SILENT back to SILENT is "(tx\_sym <- TXCMD\_ENCODE(tx\_cmd))", which appears to be a copy-paste error. Presumably the intent is tx\_cmd != COMMIT, as that would cover all the cases that are not covered by the other two transitions.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "tx\_sym <- TXCMD\_ENCODE(tx\_cmd)" to "tx\_cmd != COMMIT"

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.7 P71 L 15 # 66

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D State Diagrams

In Figure 188-4, the condition for the transition arc from SILENT to itself contains the phrase "(tx\_sym <= TXCMD\_ENCODE(tx\_cmd))" - this is an assignment that cannot be a condition. It looks like a copy of the assignment within this state, rather than the intended condition; perhaps the intent was "tx\_cmd != COMMIT".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Correct the condition to whatever it should be, without an assignment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.7 P72 L 13 # 24

Jones, Peter

Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D New Feature

"188.4.2.9 Jabber functional requirements" describes how to detect jabber, and that's implemented in Figure 188-5, but there isn't a definition to a counter to record the error.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Define a "local jabber" counter in "188.4.2.2 Variables" and increment it in the "PCS Transmit state diagram".

Add a clause 45 object to expose this.

Base the new object on "45.2.3.74 10BASE-T1M / 10BASE-T1S PCS diagnostic 1"

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.8 P72 L 41 # 1

He, Xiang

Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The term "self-synchronizing scrambler" has been used all over this subclause and is the preferred term in 802.3. "multiplicative scrambling" is used in the first sentence.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "multiplicative" to "self-synchronizing".

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.8 P72 L 48 # 251

Opsasnick, Eugene

Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status X PCS

In the last paragraph on page 72, the scrambler reset description states:

"The scrambler is reset upon execution of the PCS Reset function. If the PCS Reset is executed, all bits of the 17-bit vector representing the self-synchronizing scrambler state are arbitrarily set. The initialization of the scrambler state is left to the implementer. In no case shall the scrambler state be initialized to all zeros."

The sentence "The initialization of the scrambler state is left to the implementor." is redundant with the previous sentence that states "... all bits of the ... scrambler are arbitrarily set." and can be removed. However, the next sentence that states the scrambler shall not be reset to all zeros which contradicts the statement that the initial state can be completely arbitrary.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest changing the quoted text to something like:

"The scrambler is reset upon execution of the PCS Reset function. When the PCS Reset is executed, the 17-bit vector representing the self-synchronizing scrambler state shall be set to a non-zero value."

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.8 P 72 L 49 # 67

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X PCS

"In no case shall the scrambler state be initialized to all zeros."

This is a valid requirement for an additive scrambler, but it is not necessary for a multiplicative (self-synchronizing) scrambler. Furthermore, it is impossible to detect whether this requirement is met; the scrambler state can occasionally be set to zero even during normal operation (assuming the incoming data in TXD is random, it will statistically happen once every  $2^{17}$  bits, many times per second). A temporary zero state is not a problem; the state will change whenever a nonzero bit appears in TXD, and the output is DME-encoded anyway so there is no clock recovery issue. Neither is it a problem if it is initialized to this value at PCS reset.

Compare to the self-synchronizing scrambler of 49.2.6 (which is used in multiple high-speed PCS sublayers); it has no requirements for initialization, and in fact its state is initialized to 0 in many implementations.

There is also a PICS item for this unnecessary requirement.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Delete the quoted sentence.  
Delete PICS item PCST5.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.9 P 73 L 16 # 261

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

There is a run-on sentence that needs a comma to make it readable.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Add comma between "receivers" and "then" in the following sentence.  
If the packet being transmitted continues longer than the specified time duration, the PCS Transmit sends an ESD, ESDJAB symbol sequence to notify the receivers then inhibits further transmissions for at least the duration of unjab\_timer.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.2.9 P 73 L 18 # 262

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

There is a run-on sentence that needs a comma to make it readable.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Add comma between "cleared" and "or" in the following sentence.  
The PCS Transmit may return to normal operation automatically after unjab\_timer elapsed and the error condition has been cleared or it may keep silent until reset.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.3.1 P 73 L 39 # 253

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status X PCS

The use of "either or" indicates a choice between two options or possibilities. In the 4th paragraph of 188.4.3.1, it is used awkwardly to present a choice between three options.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Suggest changing this sentence from:

"The DATA state, in which 5B symbols are decoded into MII data, is left when ESD or ESDBRS followed by either ESDOK, ESDERR, or ESDJAB symbol is encountered or when the PMA detects SILENCE on the media (e.g., the transmitter prematurely stops data transmission)."

to:

"The DATA state, in which 5B symbols are decoded to MII data, is left when an ESD or ESDBRS symbol is followed by an ESDOK, ESDERR, or ESDJAB symbol or when the PMA detects SILENCE on the media (e.g., the transmitter prematurely stops data transmission)."

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.4.3.3 P74 L 28 # 254

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status X PCS

BEACON should be defined in 188.4.2.3 since it is also used by the transmit function (as defined in the TXCMD\_ENCODE function on page 69). So the definition of BEACON should be moved to 188.4.2.3. But BEACON is not the only constant used in the RX state diagrams; other constants used include SYNC, SSD, and ESD, among others.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Move the definition of BEACON constant from 188.4.3.3 to 188.4.2.3. In addition, add text to 188.4.3.3 that all constants defined in 188.4.2.3 have the same meaning when used in the RX state diagrams. Something like:

"The constants BEACON, ESD, ESDERR, ESDJAB, ESDOK, ESDBRs, SILENCE, SSD, SYNC, and COMMIT have the same value as defined in 188.4.2.3."

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.3.4 P74 L 39 # 263

Wienckowski, Natalie IVN Solutions LLC

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

"value" is in the sentence twice, with just the variable between them.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Delete the second "value".

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.3.7 P76 L 4 # 255

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The condition to enter the WAIT\_SYNC state in Figure 188-7 has an extra space between "transmitting" and the end parenthesis.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Replace "(transmitting )" with "(transmitting)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.3.7 P76 L 9 # 161

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Judging from P74 L30 (188.4.3.2) we want to change the constant from fc\_supported (in CL147) to FC\_SUPPORTED. If so, this change needs to be made throughout the draft.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change fc\_supported to FC\_SUPPORTED in Figure 188-7 on page 76 in the following places:

L9 from SYNCING to WAIT\_SYNC  
L24 from SYNCING to BAD\_SSD  
L35 from COMMIT to WAIT\_SYNC  
L35 from WAIT\_SSD to WAIT\_SYNC  
L38 from WAIT\_SSD to BAD\_SSD  
L41 from COMMIT to BAD\_SSD

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.3.7 P76 L 9 # 133

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Inconsistent nomenclature between figure 188-7, where "fc\_supported" is used, and 188.4.3.3, where the constant FC\_SUPPORTED is defined.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Modify figure 188-7 to align with the name of the constant as specified in 188.4.3.3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.4.3.7 P76 L 10 # 252

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

In Figure 188-7 "fc\_supported" is a constant as defined in 184.3.3 and should be capitalized.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Replace "fc\_supported" with "FC\_SUPPORTED" in several places in Figure 188-7. Alternatively, define fc\_supported as a variable, and move its definition from 188.4.3.3 to 188.4.3.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W



## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 188 SC 188.4.3.7 P76 L 11 # 256

Opsasnick, Eugene Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D PCS

The variable rx\_cmd is assigned the constant value NONE in Figure 188-7 (and also COMMIT and BEACON in Figures 188-7 and 188-8. But the constants NONE, COMMIT and BEACON are not defined in the constants subclause 188.4.3.3. And the definition of rx\_cmd does not help.

#### SuggestedRemedy

For the definition of rx\_cmd in 188.4.3.2 on page 74 line 7, replace:

"PLCA signalling decoded by the PCS."

with:

"PLCA signalling decoded by the PCS, see 148.4.4.2."

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.4.3.7 P76 L 26 # 132

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

There is no off-page reference C in either figure 188-7 or 188-8, but there are references A, B, and D.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change reference D in both figures to C.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.4.3.7 P76 L 51 # 25

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D New Feature

"188.4.3.9 Jabber diagnostics" discusses how to detect "remote jabber" and how it is exposed via MDIO register 3.2293. but the "PCS Receive state diagram" does not show how/where this is done.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Define a "remote jabber" counter in "188.4.3.2 Variables" and increment it in the "PCS Receive state diagram".

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.4.5 P78 L # 152

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status X PCS

Relax the need to detect carrier sense during receive-mode collisions by applying change referenced on slide 16 of presentation 2023-05-30 "Beruto Carrier Sensing in Harsh Noise Environments" at [https://www.ieee802.org/3/da/public/0523/beruto\\_3da\\_20230515\\_carrier\\_sense\\_1p1.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/da/public/0523/beruto_3da_20230515_carrier_sense_1p1.pdf)

Carrier sense indication is defined in 188.3.3 as "a signal compatible with Differential Manchester Encoding (DME) encoding rules" being detected(P64 L52). Due to the corruption of signals during a collision, this may not always be possible to detect. If the need to detect carrier during a receive-mode collision is mandated then it will prevent signal processing techniques that can provide the immunity in harsh noise environments that is also needed. As shown in the above referenced presentation, this change has only minimal effect on CSMA/CD operation.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"The PHY shall assert CRS in the presence of a signal resulting from a collision between two or more other stations."

To:

"The PHY should assert CRS in the presence of a signal resulting from a collision between two or more other stations."

Apply same change to Clause 147.3.5

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 188 SC 188.4.3.8 P78 L 5 # 68

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Scrambler

The self-synchronizing descrambler cannot be a linear feedback shift register, because it needs to implement the inverse operation of the scrambler in 188.4.2.8. Since the scrambler is modeled by a linear feedback shift register, the descrambler has to be a linear feedforward shift register in order to be its inverse.

Figure 188-9 actually shows a linear feedforward (rather than feedback) shift register, except that an arrow to clarify the direction is missing.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change "feedback" to "feedforward".

In Figure 188-9, format the line above the "+" on the left side as an arrow (downward), to clarify the flow direction.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.5 P 79 L 38 # 162

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D Primitives

"The PMA couples messages from the PMA service interface specified in 188.4.1 ["\*\*PCS Reset function\*\*"] onto the 10BASE-T1M physical medium."

The sentence here refers to 188.4.1 "PCS Reset function" which makes no sense. The corresponding Clause 147.4 also refers to its "PCS Reset function" in 147.3.1, but neither make sense. What is the correct reference?

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference in L38 from "PCS Reset function":  
188.4.1  
to "service primitives and interfaces":  
188.3

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.5.2 P 80 L 43 # 163

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type T Comment Status D PMA

point-to-point is not supported, so we removed driving BI\_DA+ and BI\_DA- to 0V differential with a 100 Ohm impedance as was done in Clause 147. However, Figure 188-11 still shows this as being an option.

#### SuggestedRemedy

In the middle of the timing diagram between the first and second transmissions, identified as T1, change:  
high-Z or diff. 0V  
to:  
high-Z

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.5.2 P 81 L 7 # 69

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status X DMW

The minimum and maximum of a parameter are not a value in ppm - the ppm value is relative to the nominal value.

The columns are inconsistent between rows..

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change "-100 ppm" to "80 - 100 ppm" and "+100 ppm" to "80 + 100 ppm".

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 188 SC 188.5.3 P 81 L 22 # 70

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X PMA

"In order to meet the specifications of 188.6.5.1, the PMA Receive function must achieve proper synchronization on both the DME stream and the 5B boundary within 800 ns."

1. According to the style guide, the word "must" is deprecated and should not be used when stating mandatory requirements; must is used only to describe unavoidable situations. There is no unavoidable situation here.

2. the PMA receive function can synchronize on the DME stream, but from the information in the PMA specification alone it is unclear how it can find the 5B boundary; the output of the DME decoder is just a bit stream. Finding the 5B boundary requires some knowledge of the PCS transmit function behavior (e.g. Figure 188-4) which is not mentioned here

3. within 800 ns of what? I assume it is the appearance of a valid DME-encoded signal at the input following a SILENCE period?

#### SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite this sentence:

- As a normative requirement, using "shall" instead of "must", and clarifying where the 800 ns period starts.

- Add some reference to the expected initial 5B symbols and a reference to Figure 188-4.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.5.3 P 81 L 28 # 71

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X PMA

"When the PMA Receive function does not detect activity on the line, it shall convey the symbol 'I' "

It is not specified what the PMA receive function should do when there is "activity on the line" but it is not valid input; for example, if the signal is not proper DME.

It is also possible that after DME decoding the output contains 5B symbols other than the ones listed in Table 188-1. It is unclear if the detection of this condition is done by the PMA or by the PCS.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the quoted sentence to include cases where the input is not valid DME.

Consider whether invalid 5B codes should also be mentioned here or elsewhere.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 188 SC 188.6.1 P 81 L 38 # 72

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Editorial

"Direct Power Injection (DPI) and 150  $\Omega$  emission tests for noise immunity and emission as per 188.6.1.1 and 188.6.1.2 may be used to establish a baseline for PHY EMC performance"

"may" suggests this is optional (per the style manual, "may" equals "is permitted to"). It is not even a recommendation ("should"). Is this the intent?

As it stands, it means that the standards does not have normative EMC specifications or recommendations - there is a set of tests in 188.6.1.1 and 188.6.1.2 but it is optional, and other requirements that applications may have and are beyond the scope.

This style is appropriate for a white paper, not for a standard.

My assumption is that the standard sets some minimum requirements; applications can always have additional ones.

(after reading further I see that there is another subclause about EMC in 188.10.2.2. Should the text in 188.6.1 be merged into the latter?)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "may be used to establish a baseline" to "should be the baseline". Consider writing it more strongly with "shall" unless the intent is not to have normative requirements in this standard.

Alternatively, move the EMC test subclauses into 188.10.2.2.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 188 SC 188.6.1.1 P 81 L 48 # 73

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X** PMA Electrical

"In a real application, radio frequency (RF) common mode (CM) noise at the PHY is the result of electromagnetic interference coupling to the cabling system"

"In a real application" is redundant.

CM noise can result from multiple reasons; RF EM interference is one of them.

"Additional differential mode (DM) noise at the PHY is generated from the CM noise by mode conversion of all parts of the cabling system and the TCI"

If the cabling system and the TCI convert CM to DM then it is not "additional noise", it's just a different representation of the noise.

Note that with signaling frequency of 125 MHz (and receiver BW much below 1 GHz) it seems that mode conversion would not be a significant issue unless there is a very large intra-pair mismatch (in the order of ~1 m); it may not be a practical issue worth mentioning.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the quoted sentences to  
"Radio frequency (RF) electromagnetic interference coupled to the cabling system can result in both common mode (CM) and differential mode (DM) noise at the PHY input".

Consider dropping the DM part.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

---

CI 188 SC 188.6.1.1 P 81 L 51 # 74

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X** Test Modes

"may be tested" means it is optional.

Similarly in 188.6.1.2.

See reasoning in another comment.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Rephrase the sentences that include "may" to be recommendations ("should") or normative requirements ("shall").

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

---

CI 188 SC 188.6.2 P 82 L 22 # 75

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X** Test Modes

The positive and negative voltage levels are not specified; they are not even required to be driven by the same circuit as the DME generator (rather than for example a special "droop-compensated" driver).

It may be preferable to define the test pattern using logic levels corresponding to the DME levels.

*SuggestedRemedy*

State that the signal created shall also conform with the peak-to-peak voltage specified in 188.6.4.1.

Consider additional requirements to clarify that output is generated by the same circuit as the DME.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

---

CI 188 SC 188.6.2 P 82 L 25 # 114

Wu, Peter

Marvell

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Test Modes

Test Mode 3 does not include 4B/5B encoding, but it is not clearly stated in the text. It may bring in confusion for the implementors.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest to add in the clarification. Such as "When test mode 3 is enabled, the PHY shall transmit continually a pseudo-random sequence of positive and negative voltage levels generated by the scrambler defined in 188.4.2.8 and encoded using DME as in 188.5.2.. At the test mode, the scrambler generates the random data clocked at 12.5 MHz, and 5B-rate bit stream is sent to the DME encode, the data is not 4B5B encoded".

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 188 SC 188.6.2 P 82 L 26 # 156

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type ER Comment Status X Test Modes

The description of test mode 3 is not as clear as it could be, and, being the same as in the existing Clause 147, has caused some questions in the past.

**SuggestedRemedy**

\*\*inserted text\*\*

Change:

"When test mode 3 is enabled, the PHY shall transmit continually a pseudo-random sequence of positive and negative voltage levels generated by the scrambler defined in 188.4.2.8 and encoded using DME as in 188.5.2."

To:

"When test mode 3 is enabled, the PHY shall transmit continually a pseudo-random sequence of positive and negative voltage levels generated by the scrambler defined in 188.4.2.8 \*\*at 12.5MBd\*\* and encoded using DME as in 188.5.2. \*\*4B/5B encoding is not applied.\*\*"

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.6.2 P 82 L 29 # 76

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Test Modes

"the transmitter shall output the 'I' symbol" - this symbol is defined by the PCS as 5B "11111".

All other test modes define the signal at the PMA output (which is not necessarily generated by the normal PMA transmit function). If the PMA is to generate this pattern as a test mode, it would be a high-frequency toggling after DME encoding - this is probably not the intent.

To test the requirements of 188.5.2, the PCS should generate the 'I' symbol, and the PMA should behave normally.

Note that this requirement is also written in 188.6.4.5 (in a way that matches the suggested remedy); it may be simpler to just point to that and avoid duplicated requirements.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change "the transmitter shall output" to "the PCS transmit function shall output" and clarify that the PMA behaves as in 188.5.2.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 188 SC 188.6.3 P 83 L 3 # 77

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X PMA Electrical

"fixtures... can be used"

"can" indicates capability. Many fixtures can be used, but some may not be adequate.

Here it looks like a requirement for specific fixtures (with allowance of "functional equivalent").

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change "can be" to "shall be" or "is".

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 188 SC 188.6.4 P 83 L 44 # 153

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X PMA Electrical

The first sentence specifies a 50 Ohm resistive differential load connected to the \*transmitter output" when a load is not specified. This seems to indicate a test without the TC1, but only access to TC1 or TC2 is specified and not at the base of the tee connected to the transmitter. I believe the intention here is to state that the transmitter must 'see' a 50 Ohm load unless otherwise specified. This may be made more clear by rearranging the sentences of the paragraph.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Rearrange sentences of the paragraph as follows:

Where a load is not specified, the transmitter shall meet the requirements of this subclause with a 50 Ohm resistive differential load connected to the transmitter output. When both TC1 and TC2 are terminated, the 50 Ohm resistive differential load should be implemented as a 100 termination on each of TC1 and TC2. Transmitter electrical tests are specified with a load tolerance of +/-0.1%. Transmitter electrical specifications shall be measured at both TC1 and TC2.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 188 SC 188.6.4.2 P 84 L 3 # 116

Lusted, Kent

Independent

Comment Type T Comment Status D PMA Electrical

The transmitter output droop test text as written suggests to me that total amount of droop from the positive measurement and the negative measurement together must be less than 30%. For example, if the positive droop was measured as 18% and the negative droop was measured as 20%, the total droop of 38% would fail the requirement.

However, i think that the intent is that the positive droop by itself should be less than 30% and the negative droop by itself should be less than 30%. Clarification would be helpful for the reader.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"When tested using the test fixture shown in Figure 188–12 with the transmitter in test mode 2, the magnitude of both the positive and negative droop measured with respect to the initial peak value after the zero crossing and the value 800 ns after the initial peak, depicted as Vd in Figure 188–14, shall be less than 30%."

To:

"When tested using the test fixture shown in Figure 188–12 with the transmitter in test mode 2, the magnitude of the positive droop measured with respect to the initial peak value after the zero crossing and the value 800 ns after the initial peak, depicted as Vd in Figure 188–14, shall be less than 30%. The magnitude of the negative droop, when measured the same way, shall be less than 30%."

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.6.4.2 P 84 L 10 # 78

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X PMA Electrical

The waveform seems to asymptotically approach some non-zero levels (it is almost flat before the transition). Shouldn't droop from AC coupling cause it to decay to 0 after long enough time?

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change the figure such that the signal has nonzero slope right before the transitions.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 188 SC 188.6.4.3 P 84 L 31 # 79

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status X PMA Electrical

5 ns jitter out of 80 ns nominal period, symbol to symbol, means up to 16 ns peak-to-peak or 0.2 UI in typical jitter units. This is a very loose requirement that suggests that jitter is not considered important in this type of physical layer. It does not prevent transmitters from having deterministic jitter which would occur in high probabilities.

Allowing high jitter in transmitters may result in reduced noise immunity if the channel bandwidth is limited. Channel specifications in this draft are not clear (e.g. with multiple TCIs), but bad channels can occur unexpectedly e.g. by poor connections.

Limiting jitter would provide better protection from unexpected bad channels.

The suggested remedy maintains the peak-to-peak limit but only at the probability of the maximum BER. The suggested RMS value corresponds to a fully Gaussian distribution. The value could be increased somewhat if it is considered challenging - although it should be quite easy to design transmitters with lower jitter than that.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change from

"the maximum jitter at the transmitter side shall be less than 5 ns symbol-to-symbol"

to

"the peak symbol-to-symbol jitter at the transmitter output at a probability of  $1-10^{-10}$  shall be less than 5 ns. The RMS value of the symbol-to-symbol jitter shall be less than 786 ps".

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 188 SC 188.6.4.3 P 84 L 32 # 80

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X PMA Electrical

The clock for measuring the jitter should be specified in some way; measuring jitter with respect to the tx\_clk itself (without filtering) would not include the jitter of tx\_clk, which may be a considerable component. If tx\_clk is not available then a clock recovery unit has to be used, and the measured jitter can vary based on its bandwidth.

The suggested clock recovery bandwidth is 1/100 of the signaling rate, assuming that such bandwidth is feasible for receivers. It may be reduced if the CRG finds it too high.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Specify that the jitter is measured corresponding to a clock generated from either the measured signal or tx\_clk, by a clock recovery unit that acts as a 1st-order high-pass jitter filter with a corner frequency of 1.25 MHz.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

Cl 188 SC 188.6.5.2 P 86 L 16 # 81

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X PMA Electrical

"with a Gaussian distribution bandwidth of 40 MHz and magnitude of -101 dBm/Hz"

Gaussian distribution is independent of the bandwidth.

The numbers cannot be exact; I assume they are they represent the minimum stress (if not, the wording can be changed).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to

"with a Gaussian distribution and a spectral density of at least -101 dBm/Hz at a bandwidth of at least 40 MHz"

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 188 SC 188.6.5.2 P 86 L 20 # 82

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status X PMA Electrical

"may be considered" - but is not an option (allowed behavior).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "is considered".

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 188 SC 188.6.5.2 P 86 L 36 # 83

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PMA Electrical

"Resistor matching to 1 part in 1000"

I assume this requirement is placed to make the source mostly common-mode.

This is good, but it should be accompanied by some requirement about the placement of the coupling into the mixing segment. If the two connections are too far apart, the noise can be partly converted to differential.

There is an additional label "< 0.1 m" but it is not attached to anything. The intent is perhaps that both coupling points are less than 0.1 m from the TCI?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Clarify in the figure, and preferably also in the subclause text, the requirements from the two connection points of the noise source.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 188 SC 188.6.5.2 P 86 L 38 # 304

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type E Comment Status X PMA Electrical

The text reads: "The combination of Rs and the two 500 Ohm resistors matches the source impedance of the noise source". This requires some effort to guess the Rs value.

*SuggestedRemedy*

It would be beneficial to the user to either add an example for Rs for a given source impedance of the generator or add the calculation formula:  $R_s = (1050 \text{ Ohm} * R_{\text{Gen}}) / (1050 \text{ Ohm} - R_{\text{Gen}})$

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 188 SC 188.6.5 P 86 L 50 # 84

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X PMA Electrical

The text does not specify anything about the behavior during PMA local loopback.

The "shall" statement applies always, not just in local loopback mode.

Is it the intent that the PMA and PCS behave normally, but the collision detection specified in 188.4.5 is disabled? If so, it should be written explicitly.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Clarify what the effect of PMA local loopback is.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 188 SC 188.6.6 P 86 L 50 # 154

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X PMA Electrical

It is unclear from the text in the first sentence which signal is being referred to. Recommend reverting the paragraph back to the form it had in Clause 147.5.6 for clarity.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the paragraph in lines 50-51 as follows:

The PMA and PCS Receive functions shall pass to the MII RX the data decoded from the signal which is normally received during a transmission for the purpose of detecting collisions.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 188 SC 188.7 P 87 L 7 # 85

Ran, Adeel

Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Management

Is it just the MDIO electrical interface that is optional? In many places in this draft the text suggests that the MDIO registers are optional and alternative management methods can be used.

The PICS MDIO item also suggests that the registers are optional.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Rephrase to clarify that the registers are optional, or if that is not the intent, apply changes across the draft to clarify that a MDIO registers are required.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.8 P 87 L 19 # 26

Jones, Peter

Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

The second paragraph of this clause starts with:

"The mixing segment shall be a linear topology, with DTE attached to a trunk at a TCI"

"with DTE attached" doesn't make sense.

#### SuggestedRemedy

replace

"with DTE attached to a trunk at a TCI"

with

"with DTEs attached to a trunk at using TCIs" or similar.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.8 P 87 L 25 # 305

Schreiner, Stephan

Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type T Comment Status D Mixing Segment

The text reads: "met with TCIs in place with or without attached DTEs". All specifications and limits are given with a DTE or a simulated DTE equivalent attached. Thus, with or without is problematic

#### SuggestedRemedy

Remove: "with or without attached DTEs"

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.8 P 87 L 26 # 264

Wienckowski, Natalie

IVN Solutions LLC

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

When determining article and whether a verb is singular or plural, you ignore the text in parenthesis.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change: but rather a (set of) interface planes.

To: but rather an (set of) interface plane.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.8 P 87 L 26 # 134

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

"but rather a (set of) interface planes." is awkward when the parenthetical text is omitted.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Remove the parentheses, or change to "one or more interface planes"

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.8 P 87 L 30 # 306

Schreiner, Stephan

Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type T Comment Status D Mixing Segment

The text reads: "The mixing segment specifications in 188.8 are referenced to these designated points and are to be met without the DTE or other loads attached.". However, all tests are described with DTE or simulated DTEs attached.

#### SuggestedRemedy

change "without" to "with"

Proposed Response Response Status W



## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 188 SC 188.8 P 88 L 5 # 86

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Editorial

The mixing segment and DTE stub in the diagram include pipe-like elements that imply some kind of shield. Is it the intent that the balanced pairs be electrically shielded? or is it just a non-conducting protection?

In addition, the balanced pairs do not appear to be twisted in the figure; is there an expectation that non-twisted pairs can be used? (note that the words "twisted-pair" only appear in 189.6.1.1.1 and 189.6.1.1.3)

#### SuggestedRemedy

Clarify in this figure and/or elsewhere if the medium is expected to be shielded and/or twisted. If multiple options are considered, please state that explicitly.

Specifically, clarify what the "pipes" in the figure mean.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.8.1 P 88 L 33 # 87

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status X Mixing Segment

Equation 188-3 is not easy to mentally visualize. It would help readers if a plot of the insertion loss limit is provided.

Also applies to other equations, RL in 188-4, mode conversion in 188-5, TCI IL in 188-6, and TCI RL in 188-7; figures would help. Equations like these are typically accompanied with figures in other clauses, and this amendment should follow precedence.

Also, the equation is almost too long for the page width; consider changing "Insertion loss" to "IL" (matching Equation 188-4), removing some parentheses, etc. to make it fit better into the page. Similarly in other equations.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Edit equations and add figures per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 188 SC 188.8.2 P 89 L 14 # 317

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Mixing Segment

Channel Return Loss Limit and TCI Return Loss Limit crossing each other at 22.2 MHz and 36.9 MHz. Within this range, the Channel Return Loss Limit is higher than the TCI Return Loss Limit. This can lead to a case, where the TCI specification is met but the channel specification is not met caused by the TCI.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change Return Loss Limit in the frequency range from 2.8 MHz  $\leq f \leq 40$  MHz from:  $-42.5 - 20 \log_{10}(f) - (0.024/f) + 47.5 \sqrt{f} - 6.39 \sqrt{f} + 0.0259 f^2$  to:  $-45.8 - 20 \log_{10}(f) - (4.3/f) + 53 \sqrt{f} - 8 \sqrt{f} + 0.046 f^2$

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 188 SC 188.8.2 P 89 L 14 # 296

Paul, Michael Analog Devices

Comment Type E Comment Status X Mixing Segment

Are there unnessecary parenthesis in the equation?

#### SuggestedRemedy

remove parens around  $-20 \log \dots$  to  $\dots 0.0259 f^2$

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 188 SC 188.8.3 P 89 L 22 # 311

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type T Comment Status X Mixing Segment

Mode conversion loss of mixing segment does not mention the DTE attachment. If the TCI is integrate into the DTE (cf. p. 90 line 32), the mixing segment would not be closed, if no DTE is attached. Thus, the measurement can not be performed in this case.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Add the DTE load attachment sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 188 SC 188.9 P 89 L 39 # 265

Wienckowski, Natalie

IVN Solutions LLC

Comment Type E

Comment Status D

TCI

There is a run-on sentence that needs a comma to make it readable.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add comma between "segment" and "mandates" in the following sentence.

While technically the TCI aligns with the definition of an MDI in 1.4.395, the fact that the TCI has two connections to the medium and plays a role in mixing segment specifications by connecting the upstream and downstream sides of the linear mixing segment mandates it has a unique role beyond what is normally considered in an MDI.

Proposed Response

Response Status W

---

CI 188 SC 188.9 P 90 L 24 # 307

Schreiner, Stephan

Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type T

Comment Status D

Mixing Segment

The text reads: "the requirements of 188.8 are met with TCIs in place with or without attached DTEs as specified for the particular specification". However, there is no specification without DTEs attached

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove: "or without"

Proposed Response

Response Status W

---

CI 188 SC 188.9 P 90 L 30 # 88

Ran, Adeel

Cisco

Comment Type TR

Comment Status D

TCI

Item 1 says "a two-conductor connection to the DTE" - but from figure 188-18, a TCI needs at least 4 conductors (2 for TC1 and 2 for TC2)?

Item 3 suggests that the TCI is integrated with the PMA - in which case there will indeed be 4 conductors.

Is item 1 intended to represent a DTE which includes a termination, and thus has only one TC?

Note that Figure 188-17 shows only two TCIs, not three as suggested by the last sentence in this subclause.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please clarify or correct.

Proposed Response

Response Status W

---

CI 188 SC 188.9 P 90 L 36 # 308

Schreiner, Stephan

Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type E

Comment Status D

TCI

Text reads: "Figure 188-17 shows two configurations examples." and Line 28 to 32 indicating three possible configurations. The figure shows configurations 1) and 2), configuration 3 is missing.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert configuration 3) in Figure 188-17 or change to "Figure 188-17 shows two example configurations"

Proposed Response

Response Status W

---

CI 188 SC 188.9.1.1 P 91 L 1 # 309

Schreiner, Stephan

Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type E

Comment Status D

Editorial

Sub-clause number is 188.9.1.1, however there is no 188.9.1.2. The following section is 188.9.2

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change number to: 188.9.1

Proposed Response

Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 188 SC 188.9.2 P91 L 20 # 310

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Text reads: "... Equation (188-7) with the other trunk TC ( i.e. ..." However, the "T" in "TC" abbreviates the word trunk.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove: "trunk"

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.9.2 P91 L 26 # 298

Paul, Michael Analog Devices

Comment Type T Comment Status X TCI

Power coupling network for each node is limited by TCI return loss, but not necessarily specified anywhere else - like in clause 189. Ideally we can optimize power coupling networks based on power (current) at each node. However these RL lines are too rigid for this optimization.

SuggestedRemedy

See upcoming presentation mpaul\_da\_01.... Can we have different TCI RL limits for different unit load levels?

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.9.3 P91 L 35 # 89

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X TCI

The subclause is under TCI specifications, but the requirement is from the DTE. A standalone TCI can probably withstand much higher voltages.

Similarly for 188.8.4; The TCI should have no issue with having an interface shorted or grounded - it's the PMA that should tolerate it.

SuggestedRemedy

Move these specifications to 188.6 PMA electrical specifications. Possibly under 188.6.1 (which would require renaming it).

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 188 SC 188.9.4 P92 L 10 # 295

Paul, Michael Analog Devices

Comment Type T Comment Status X TCI

Assuming some systems may have the high rail as 'ground', is there a better way to describe this table?

SuggestedRemedy

Rename the fault voltages Va and Vb where  $|V_a - V_b| \leq 60V$

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 188 SC 188.10.3 P93 L 31 # 90

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Environmental

"may connect telephony voltages to a DTE", in standard language, makes it allowed by the standard. It should not be so.

These statements about telephony are legacy and may not be required nowadays. If they are mentioned, these connections should be discouraged, as the voltages listed in this subclause are higher than the normal requirements and can damage components.

Also applies to 189.7.5.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "may" to "might" here and in the next sentence.

Add statements that care should be taken to avoid such connections because they can damage equipment.

Apply similarly in 189.7.5.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.10.3 P93 L 34 # 2

Nikolic, Paul Self

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The abbreviation "DC" when used to mean "direct current" should be capitalized everywhere in the document. 4 instances are capitalized (see Table 189-5, page 114), 20 instances are not.

SuggestedRemedy

Please change multiple instances of "dc" to "DC" throughout the document

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 188 SC 188.10.3 P 93 L 40 # 268

Brychta, Michal Analog Devices

Comment Type E Comment Status X Environmental

I have seen in other 802.3 clauses where this requirement was written, (e.g. 14.7.2.4), it was with wording stating "Although equipment is not required to survive such wiring hazards without damage, application of any of the above voltages shall not result in any safety hazard."

My understanding is that the wording "...shall not preclude conformance with 188.10.1 and 188.10.2" here is addressing more specifically the "hazard". The "damage" piece may be missing here.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Adding appropriate wording to acknowledge that the DTE may get damaged under such condition may add clarity here.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 188 SC 188.11 P 93 L 45 # 91

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Delay

Delay constraints are typically given from the MII to the MDI, in conjunction with "predictable operation of the MAC Control PAUSE operation". See 24.6 for a full explanation and 146.10 for an example in a similar PHY.

The current content of 188.11 does not provide the necessary information for this purpose, at least not in the expected format, and it is unclear if all the details are required.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace the existing content with the necessary information as explained in 24.6 using 146.10 as an example.

The current content may be moved to a separate subclause (with a different name) as additional specifications.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 188 SC 188.12.3 P 96 L 13 # 92

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X Editorial

The subclause reference for "MII" seems incorrect.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change it to whatever this item refers to.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 188 SC 188.12.4.5.2 P 99 L 9 # 135

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status X PMA

The comment for PMAE2 suggests that the ability to enable test modes is required whether or not MDIO is implemented, since it describes an MDIO implementation and then says 'similar functionality provided otherwise'. As such, the Status of MDIO:M seems incorrect, since the MDIO condition is defined in 188.12.3 based on clause 45.1

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the Status to M (i.e., the ability to enable test modes is required, either via MDIO or via an equivalent mechanism), or remove the "similar functionality provided otherwise" part of the comment, so that the item is in fact conditional on an MDIO per clause 45 being implemented.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 188 SC 188.12.4.5.2 P 99 L 44 # 312

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type E Comment Status D PMA

Feature: "AC coupling at TCI" should be "AC coupling to TCI" [cf. 188.6.4 page 83 line 42]

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to: "AC coupling to TCI"

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 188 SC 188.12.4.5.2 P 99 L 46 # 313

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status X PMA

PMAE10 might become obsolete because of introduction of TCI.

## SuggestedRemedy

Delete PMAE10 and insert the termination loads as well as accuracy into Value/Comment of PMAE11

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 188 SC 188.12.4.5.2 P 100 L 29 # 136

Huber, Thomas Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status X PMA

PMAE19 and PMAE20 have the same feature name. 19 is about the ability to enable/disable PMA local loopbacks via MDIO, and is tagged MDIO:O (indicating that the ability to enable/disable PMA loopbacks via MDIO is optional when MDIO is implemented), whereas 20 is about the behavior of the loopback itself and is tagged MDIO:M (indicating that PMA loopbacks are mandatory if an MDIO is implemented). Per 188.6.6, the entire PMA loopback is optional and is invoked via MDIO or equivalent interface. The PICS items are not consistent with the text in 186.6.6

## SuggestedRemedy

Change PMAE19 to be about the implementation of the loopback itself; this should be identified as \* PMAE19 so it can be used as a condition. The status for PMAE19 should be O (without any conditions - it is entirely optional to implement the loopback). Change PMAE20 to be about the MDIO support for PMA loopback. The status should be (PMAE19 \* MDIO):M. In other words, if the optional PMA loopback is present, and the optional MDIO interface is present, it is mandatory to provide the MDIO bits to control the PMA loopback.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 188 SC 188.12.4.6 P 101 L 11 # 314

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Mixing Segment

Item MXS3, the "Return loss at each PMA port of TCI" is not defined. Additionally, this point is not accessible in all DTE / TCI configurations. (This test point was called TC3 in former version of the document and TC3 was removed intentionally from the document)

## SuggestedRemedy

Remove Item MXS3

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.12.4.7 P 101 L 25 # 315

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PICS

There is a mix between "Feature" and "Value / Comment" at TCI1.

## SuggestedRemedy

Change Feature to: "TCI insertion loss between TC1 and TC2"; Change Value/Comment to: "In each direction, measured with a reference impedance of 100 Ohm and with DTE loading attached"

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 188 SC 188.12.4.7 P 101 L 28 # 316

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PICS

Items "TCI1" and "TCI2" are identical in the feature description. Think it should be "return loss" instead of "insertion loss in the feature description of item TCI2.

## SuggestedRemedy

Change: "insertion loss" to "return loss" at item TCI2. Please consider comment to Item "TCI1" of this table for this remedy"

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 1 P 102 L 6 # 300

Fuller, Paul Marvell  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Change comma to a semi-colon?

## SuggestedRemedy

After the word "entities", it seems like this should be a semi-colon instead of a standard colon. A dash could also work?

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

Cl 189 SC 189.1 P 102 L 9 # 27

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type ER Comment Status D MPoE

"189.1 Overview" first paragraph includes  
"MPoE can provide a multidrop single pair Ethernet Physical Layer device with an interface"  
The capitalization and hyphenation of "single pair Ethernet" is not consistent with other  
examples in the document, e.g. "Single-Pair Ethernet", "Single Pair Multidrop", "Single Pair  
Ethernet".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Decide how " single pair Ethernet" is supposed to be capitalized/hyphenated, and change all  
instances to be consistent.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 189 SC 189.1 P 102 L 16 # 28

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X MPSE

Item c) says "A method for determining the presence of one or more MPDs prior to applying  
power".  
It doesn't mention detecting Type 0 vs Type 1 MPDs

*SuggestedRemedy*

replace  
"A method for determining the presence of one or more MPDs prior to applying power."  
with  
"A method for determining the presence of one or more MPDs, Type 0 and/or Type 1, prior to  
applying power"

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 189 SC 189.1.1 P 102 L 32 # 29

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X TCI

The last sentence is "Such compatibility may require additional specifications found within this  
clause (see 189.6.2)."  
I don't think it adds anything useful.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove "Such compatibility may require additional specifications found within this clause (see  
189.6.2)."

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 189 SC 189.1.3.3 P 103 L 19 # 215

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Why is Figure 189-1 here? It should follow 189.1.2 where it is referenced.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move Figure 189-1 to follow 189.1.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 189 SC 189.1.3.3 P 103 L 19 # 137

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Figure 189-1 is about the content of clause 189.2, but appears before that clause.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the anchor point for the figure to be below the heading for 189.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 189 SC 189.2 P 103 L 40 # 30

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

The last sentence of the first para says "The dc loop resistance of the cable..."  
DC should be capitalized.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace  
"The dc loop resistance of the cable..."  
with  
"The DC loop resistance of the cable..."  
and check for other instances.

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 189 SC 2 P 103 L 40 # 302

Fuller, Paul

Marvell

Comment Type T Comment Status X Mixing Segment

What is the value of the AC coupling cap?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest to add value of the AC cap in the text (at least a nominal value) and possibly include a reference to electrical characteristics table. Also, the figure above (189-1) could also include the value of the AC caps.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 189 SC 189.2 P 103 L 44 # 138

Huber, Thomas

Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Stray space between the m and omega at the end of the sentence

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the extra space.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.3 P 104 L 3 # 93

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Power

It is unclear what "system type" means and whether MPSE of one system type is compatible with PMD of a different system type. If so, is it a device type rather than a system type?

Also on the 3rd paragraph there is "Type Mixed MPDs" which is not explained.

You have to go to 189.5.1 to figure out what "Type Mixed" is, and also to understand the compatibility considerations, which are not straightforward.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Find a better term than "system type" that applies to devices rather than systems.

Move the compatibility considerations to 189.3 or provide appropriate cross-references.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 189 SC 189.3 P 104 L 9 # 94

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Per the style manual, a space should separate the value and the unit.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 1W to 1 W (or 1 Watt). Similarly for 2W.  
Change elsewhere if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.3 P 104 L 16 # 214

Jones, Chad

Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status X Unit Load

Unit loads again. I've been vocal that I hate that the concept "leaves power on the table", mostly because I know the biggest complaint we will get after approval is "why isn't there more power available?"

I still don't have a good solution to make it easy to keep a unit load concept and optimize the power budget, therefore I propose that we tell the reader that the unit load concept doesn't allocate all the power.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add at the end of the section: "The unit load concept will result in a system that will work but one that has power left over that cannot be allocated. Unit loads were introduced to make it easy for the uninitiated to install a network. It is possible to design the network to completely comply with all the other requirements while exceeding the unit load restrictions. This should be done only by experienced installers or under engineering supervision."

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 189 SC 189.3 P 104 L 21 # 31

Jones, Peter

Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Editorial

Table 189–1—System power types defines the 30V and 50V system types, but doesn't associate them with the Type 0/Type 1 labels.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "Type 0" and "Type 1" to the 30V and 50V row headers respectively.

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 189 SC 189.3 P 104 L 26 # 269

Brychta, Michal Analog Devices

Comment Type T Comment Status D Power

30V Max MPSE: VMPSE min 26V

SuggestedRemedy

I think the intention was this voltage to be <24V, is 21.6V correct value?

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.3 P 104 L 26 # 297

Paul, Michael Analog Devices

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Power

Vpse,min has a typo.

SuggestedRemedy

26 should be 21.6

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.4 P 104 L 38 # 32

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X MPSE

Item a) says "To search the mixing segment for at least one available MPD."  
I don't think we define " available MPD", and this should probably be " voltage compatible MPD"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace  
"To search the mixing segment for at least one available MPD."  
with  
"To search the mixing segment for at least one voltage compatible MPD."

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.4.1 P 104 L 51 # 33

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

Grammar

SuggestedRemedy

Replace  
"listed in Table 189-1 for the relevant type."  
with  
"listed in Table 189-1 for its type."

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.4.2 P 105 L 3 # 216

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D MPSE

"Table 189-2 in conjunction with Figure 189-1 illustrates the MPSE pinout." I see what the table tells me, but what do I get from Figure 189-1? I see nothing helping me identify the pinout. I don't think we need to refer to the figure.

SuggestedRemedy

change text to: "Table 189-2 illustrates the MPSE pinout."

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.4.3 P 105 L 29 # 139

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status X Power

The wording of the last sentence in the 4th and 5th paragraphs is awkward: "Current is measured as the sum of both higher voltage pins on MP1 and MP2 or both lower voltage pins on MP1 and MP2." The intent is presumably to sum the currents that are measured at those pins.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text to "Current is measured as the sum of the currents at the higher voltage pins on MP1 and MP2 or the sum of the currents at the lower voltage pins on MP1 and MP2".

Proposed Response Response Status O



## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 189 SC 189.4.3 P 105 L 32 # 178

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D Power

Extraneous comma between two specifications. Remove redundant text.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace "If the specification calls for the voltage to be above a value, or below a value, both..." with "If the specification calls for the voltage to be above or below a value, both..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.4.3 P 105 L 34 # 140

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D Power

The last sentence of the 5th paragraph is duplicating the last sentence of the fourth paragraph, and isn't really related to the rest of the 5th paragraph (which is about compliance to voltage specifications).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the last sentence of the 5th paragraph.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.4.4 P 106 L 4 # 34

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type ER Comment Status D MPSE

Change "valid MPD" to "voltage-compatible MPD".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace  
"MPSE determines the presence of at least one valid MPD."  
with  
"MPSE determines the presence of at least one voltage compatible MPD."

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.4.4 P 106 L 10 # 217

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status X MPSE

"After full operating voltage has been applied, the MPSE removes full operating voltage in response to a command from the management entity that results in mpse\_enable being set to disable. For example, the management entity could monitor the link to determine if at least one MPD remains attached, and there have been no changes in the network topology." The second sentence are examples of keeping power, not removing it. Need to invert the logic to make it match the sentiment of the first sentence.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change text to: "For example, the management entity could monitor the link to determine if no MPDs remain attached or there have been changes in the network topology."

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 189 SC 189.4.4 P 106 L 11 # 165

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Last sentence of the paragraph refers to the management entity monitoring the \*link\* for at least one MPD being attached. I believe "link" as in "link segment" is typically reserved for point-to-point topologies and is not appropriate for multidrop.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change:  
"...monitor the link to determine..."  
To:  
"...monitor the mixing segment to determine..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

**Cl 189**    **SC 189.4.4.3**    **P 108**    **L 3**    # **166**

Baggett, Tim    Microchip

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

The timers in this section need improved references to the appropriate entries in the referenced tables. As presently written, it is not clear which parameters some of the timers refer too.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Apply subscripts as necessary.

P108 L3 (discovery\_backoff\_timer)

Change: "See Table 189-3."

To: "See TBackoff in Table 189-3."

L108 L6: (mark\_timer)

Change: "See Table 189-3."

To: "See TMark\_measure in Table 189-3."

L108 L10: (measure\_timer)

Change: "See Table 189-3."

To: "See TDiscover\_measure in Table 189-3."

L108 L13: (mpse\_inrush\_timer)

Change: "See Table 189-5."

To: "See TInrush in Table 189-5."

L108 L16: (tdiscover\_high\_timer)

Change: "See Table 189-3."

To: "See TDiscover\_high in Table 189-3."

L108 L18: (tdiscover\_low\_timer)

Change: "See Table 189-3."

To: "See TDiscover\_low in Table 189-3."

L108 L21: (ted\_timer)

Change: "See Table 189-5."

To: "See TED in Table 189-5."

L108 L24: (ttpsdo\_timer)

Change: "See Table 189-5."

To: "See TTPSDO in Table 189-5."

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

---

**Cl 189**    **SC 189.4.4.4**    **P 109**    **L 9**    # **213**

Zimmerman, George    CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

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

Variables language is verbose. Of course a variable is set per the description. Also, values returned from do\_discovery\_high obviously represent the current at the time the function is called. The language is a relic of when we used to have do\_discovery\_high also present the mark voltage. We no longer need to say "during do\_discovery\_high" in the description, and in the two values.

**SuggestedRemedy**

delete "This variable is set per this description." at lines 10-11.

delete "during do\_discovery\_high" at lines 9, 12, and 13-14.

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

---

**Cl 189**    **SC 189.4.4.5**    **P 111**    **L 11**    # **294**

Paul, Michael    Analog Devices

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

We may need a DO\_DISCOVERY6 and DO\_MARK6 state if we expand the discovery interpretations

**SuggestedRemedy**

See presentation mpaul\_da\_02...

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status O**

---

**Cl 189**    **SC 189.4.4.5**    **P 111**    **L 32**    # **218**

Jones, Chad    Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

off page marker "A" not attached to the arrowhead.

**SuggestedRemedy**

attach the marker "A" to the arrowhead.

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

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 189 SC 189.4.5 P 112 L 3 # 35

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X MPSE

The first sentence of "189.4.5 Discovering the presence of an MPD before powering" starts with "The ability for the MPSE to query all attached MPDs".

I don't think the MPSE queries all attached MPDs since it doesn't get individual responses.

#### SuggestedRemedy

replace

"The ability for the MPSE to query all attached MPDs"

with

"The ability for the MPSE to query any attached MPDs"

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.4.5 P 112 L 12 # 219

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status X Editorial

I found this sentence hard to parse: "The MPSE waits TMark\_measure between applying the mark event voltage at the entrance of HIGH\_MARK before measuring the mark event current IDiscovery in DISCOVERY\_HIGH\_MARK."

I'll take a crack at making it better in the remedy.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change text to: "The MPSE waits TMark\_measure between applying the mark event voltage at the entrance of the HIGH\_MARK state before measuring the mark event current IDiscovery in the DISCOVERY\_HIGH\_MARK state."

Alternately, this paragraph seems to be describing the state diagram with no new information, I could support deleting the paragraph.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.4.5 P 112 L 19 # 212

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,APLgp,Cisco,Marvell,Onsemi,Son

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

State names shouldn't be hyphenated if it can be avoided.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Editor to invoke suppress hyphenation in lines 18 through 25.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 4.5 P 113 L 1 # 301

Fuller, Paul Marvell

Comment Type E Comment Status X Editorial

Naming convention in the table that will be used for other parts of the document. Recommend to have consistent naming for Parameters and Symbols.

#### SuggestedRemedy

TBackoff signal could become T\_Discovery\_Backoff. This is a longer Symbol name but helps to describe it is part of Discovery. VDiscovery could be V\_Discovery\_LowV and VMark could be V\_Discovery\_HighV.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.4.6 P 114 L 6 # 220

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

Table 189-5 needs the additional information column filled.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Add this additional information for the following items:

Item 2 see 189.4.7 (remove divider, same info for each type)

item 4 see 189.4.9

item 5 see 189.4.9

item 7,8,9 see 189.4.10.1

item 11,12 see 189.4.8

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.4.6 P 114 L 8 # 183

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Remove empty table columns.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Delete column "Additional Information" in Table 189-5 and Table 189-10

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 189 SC 189.4.6 P 114 L 11 # 270  
Brychta, Michal Analog Devices  
Comment Type T Comment Status X MPSE  
VMPSE V: Min 26V  
SuggestedRemedy  
I think the intention was this voltage to be <24V, is 21.6V correct value?  
Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.4.6 P 114 L 12 # 141  
Huber, Thomas Nokia  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
In table 189-5, the table cells in the Unit column for Item 1 should be merged, since the unit for both of the subsequent rows is V  
SuggestedRemedy  
Merge the table cells  
Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.4.8 P 114 L 53 # 221  
Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.  
Comment Type T Comment Status D MPSE  
We state that Icut is "PMPSE/VMPSE" in item 11 and never explain this. As a previous comment has pointed the reader here, this is where we explain.  
SuggestedRemedy  
add the text: "The minimum value of Icut is PMPSE/VMPSE to ensure that the PSE delivers the guaranteed power regardless of VMPSE. Icut is required to scale with VMPSE if the MPSE cannot support a minimum of 1A at any VMPSE. There is no maximum ICUT as the minimum ILIM bounds the maximum ICUT."  
Of course, fix the subscript text as required.  
Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.4.10.1 P 115 L 30 # 222  
Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.  
Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ  
"...ERROR\_DELAY state in Table 189-4." This should be Figure, not Table.  
SuggestedRemedy  
Change to: "ERROR\_DELAY state in Figure 189-4."  
Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.5 P 115 L 37 # 36  
Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
Comment Type E Comment Status X MPD  
The last sentence of the first para of "189.5 Multidrop Powered Device (MPD)" says "An MPD requiring power from the MPI may simultaneously draw power from an alternate power source."  
In this usage, I think the MPD is requesting power, not requiring it.  
SuggestedRemedy  
Replace  
"An MPD requiring power from the MPI "  
With  
"An MPD requesting power from the MPI "  
Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.5.1 P 115 L 50 # 223  
Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
Need to point the reader to figures to help them understand what was just stated.  
SuggestedRemedy  
Add: "See Figure 189-1 and Figure 189-5." to the end of the paragraph.  
Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

Cl 189 SC 189.5.2 P 116 L 16 # 95

Ran, Adeel Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X MPD

"MPDs are current sinks. See Figure 189-5"

It is not clear what "current sink" means. By Kirchhoff's current law, a 2-port network (which an MPD is) has the same current entering and exiting it, so cannot be current sink. Figure 189-5 does not clarify this statement.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Clarify the sentence. Perhaps "power sink" is intended.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 189 SC 189.5.2 P 116 L 22 # 142

Huber, Thomas Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

The wording of the last sentence in paragraph above the note is awkward: "Current is measured as the sum of both higher voltage pins on MP1 and MP2 or both lower voltage pins on MP1 and MP2." The intent is presumably to sum the currents that are measured at those pins.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the text to "Current is measured as the sum of the currents at the higher voltage pins on MP1 and MP2 or the sum of the currents at the lower voltage pins on MP1 and MP2".

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 189 SC 189.5.2 P 116 L 27 # 224

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status X EZ

"The current used by the MPD lowers the current supplied to the output MP feeding the rest of the MPDs that follow in the mixing segment."

What is the output MP? Do we mean MPx? I'm guessing MPI, but I could be wrong.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to: "... to the output MPI feeding the rest..."

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 189 SC 189.5.2 P 116 L 40 # 96

Ran, Adeel Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

"MPSD" in the figure is not defined. I assume it is "MPD", but if not, some other change needs to be made.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "MPD".

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 189 SC 189.5.2 P 116 L 40 # 173

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

MPSD DTE box in Figure 189-5 appears mislabeled. Should be MPD DTE.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the text in the box labeled "MPSD DTE" in figure 189-5 to "MPD DTE"

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 189 SC 189.5.2 P 116 L 41 # 37

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Type in Figure 189-5, it says "MPSD" where it should say "MPD".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace  
"MPSD"  
With  
"MPD"

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 189 SC 189.5.3.2 P 117 L 7 # 167

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Some of the constants in this section need improved references to the appropriate entries in the referenced tables. As presently written, it is not clear which parameters some of the constants refer too.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Apply subscripts as necessary.

P117 L7 (VDiscovery\_th)

Change: "Mark discovery threshold voltage (see Table 189–7)"

To: "Mark discovery threshold voltage, VDiscovery\_th (see Table 189–7)"

P117 L12 (VReset\_th)

Change: "Mark discovery threshold voltage (see Table 189–7)"

To: "Mark discovery threshold voltage, <insert correct Symbol> (see Table 189–7)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.5.3.2 P 117 L 10 # 174

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Definition of VReset\_MPD\_max refers to wrong voltage symbol in Table 189-7

*SuggestedRemedy*

<x> denotes subscript 'x'

Change: V<Reset\_MPD>

To: V<MPD\_reset>

See P122 L23

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.5.3.2 P 117 L 14 # 168

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X MPD

It is not clear to me what the values of Vtype0\_th and Vtype1\_th should be.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please improve the description in L14 for Vtype0\_th and L 17 for Vtype1\_th

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 189 SC 189.5.3.3 P 117 L 42 # 38

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

the indentation for the values of 'present\_sig' is not quite right

*SuggestedRemedy*

Fix indentation.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.5.3.3 P 118 L 1 # 169

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X State Diagrams

The variable present\_mpi\_power is missing a description.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a description for the present\_mpi\_power variable.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 189 SC 189.5.3.3 P 118 L 5 # 175

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"Transmit Power Signature TPS" is redundant

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace "Transmit Power Signature TPS" with "TPS"

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 189 SC 189.5.3.3 P 118 L 10 # 170

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X MPD

The entry for V<MPD> variable includes a reference to Table 189-9. I do not, however, see any connection to an entry in this table, not that their should be. This is simply the measured voltage at the MPD MPI, right?

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete the reference to Table 189-9, or include a reference to a specific symbol/parameter within the table.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.5.3.5 P 120 L 52 # 293

Paul, Michael Analog Devices

Comment Type T Comment Status X State Diagrams

We may need a DO\_DISCOVERY7 and DO\_MARK7 state if we expand the discovery interpretations

**SuggestedRemedy**

See presentation mpaul\_da\_02...

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.5.3.5 P 121 L 22 # 225

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status X EZ

arrowhead enters into the box for PON\_LOAD\_ON.

**SuggestedRemedy**

fix arrowhead to just touch the edge.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.5.4 P 122 L 8 # 226

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status X MPD

Additional information column needs filled out.

Also, what does 2.7V to 19.1V mean in item 9? It seems like not enough additional information. I suggest that is moved to the text and point to the section in the table (after we figure out what else to say).

**SuggestedRemedy**

Seems all this additional info is "see 189.5.4", which is the section we are in. Therefore, delete the column after relocating the 2.7 to 19.1 V into the text and explaining it. I apologize as I don't know wha the solution is, not sure why it was needed in the table. I'm also happy with just deleting that with the column.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.5.4 P 122 L 19 # 97

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Some current values are expressed in mA while others are in uA. This is contrary to the style manual (16.3.1: "The same units of measure shall be used throughout each column"). Using mA always would still yield easily readable values.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change the rows that use uA units to mA (200 uA ==> 0.2 mA).  
Change elsewhere if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.5.4 P 122 L 30 # 98

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Per the style manual, a space should separate the value and the unit.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change "2.7V to 19.1V" to "2.7 V to 19.1 V"

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

Cl 189 SC 189.4.5 P 122 L 30 # 291

Paul, Michael Analog Devices

Comment Type E Comment Status X Editorial

T\_{Discover\_backoff} is not in table 189-3.

**SuggestedRemedy**

I believe we are looking for T\_{Backoff} here.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 189 SC 189.5.4 P 122 L 39 # 227

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Two discovery symbols on this line that don't have the proper subscript: IMPD\_discover and IMPD\_mark.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change them to match Item 4 and 5 in Table 189-7.

I{IMPD\_discover} and {IMPD\_mark}.

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 189 SC 189.5.4 P 122 L 40 # 228

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"During event 3, Type 0 MPDs respond and Type 1 and Type mixed MPDs do not. During event 4, Type 1 MPDs respond and Type 0 and Type mixed MPDs do not. During event 5, Type mixed MPDs respond and Type 0 and Type 1 MPDs do not." X respond and Y do not. I don't like the "and" and would prefer it replaced with "while".

**SuggestedRemedy**

Replace "and" with "while" in 3 spots"

"During event 3, Type 0 MPDs respond and Type 1 while Type mixed MPDs do not. During event 4, Type 1 MPDs respond and Type 0 while Type mixed MPDs do not. During event 5, Type mixed MPDs respond while Type 0 and Type 1 MPDs do not."

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 189 SC 189.5.4 P 123 L 17 # 292

Paul, Michael Analog Devices

Comment Type T Comment Status X MPD

Potentially add other interpretations of the bits to table 189-8 so that we can use the da power standard for other point-to-point systems (dg)

**SuggestedRemedy**

See presentation mpaul\_da\_02...

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 189 SC 189.5.5 P 123 L 27 # 229

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Table 189-9 needs the additional information column filled. Also, the value in item 5 needs the leading 0

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add text:

Item 3, delete what's there and replace with see 189.5.5.2

Item 5, see 189.5.5.1.

Also item 5, change .01 to 0.01.

Item 8, see 189.5.5.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 189 SC 189.5.5 P 123 L 41 # 99

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Per the style manual, multiplication should be denoted by the sign ×. An asterisk should not be used.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change per comment.

Change elsewhere if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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: Page, Line

Pa 123

Li 41

Page 56 of 63

12/24/2024 9:30:11 AM



## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 189 SC 189.5.5 P 123 L 44 # 100

Ran, Adeel Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Per the style manual (16.3.2) "the decimal point should be preceded by a zero".  
Also, other current values in this table are in mA.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change ".01" to "10" and units from "A" to "mA".

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.5.5.3 P 124 L 6 # 176

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"transmit power signature (TPS)" is redundant

**SuggestedRemedy**

Replace, "transmit power signature (TPS)" with "TPS" in the first sentence of the clause.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.5.5 P 124 L 11 # 230

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D MPD

Table 189-9, item 10. We put a value of 180uF in there and asked people to evaluate if that's acceptable. I've tried to (and failed so far) reach the original author of the 180uF in 802.3af to confirm my recollection. What I recall is that this is the biggest value that can be designed into a PD without putting inrush control while in the POWER\_ON state. This was to ensure a PD didn't force a PSE to exceed the voltage slew rate in the case of a PSE changing from Vportmax to Vportmin or vice versa (for example in a redundant supply configuration during a failover).

As such, this 180uF is the TOTAL capacitance that can be on the mixing segment and needs to be divided by all the MPDs.

Also, the min to max range of AF was 13V. our worst case min to max is 16V, so I think the 180 needs scaled by 13/16. This would yield 9uF per unit load. Since a min to max swing is highly unlikely, I think we can round to 10uF.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change the max value of item 10 to "10" and put "per unit load" in the additional information column. We might choose to 189.5.5.4 to explain this better.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.5.5 P 124 L 22 # 245

Potterf, Jason Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X MPD

The MPD current slew rate requires a test procedure to prove that the PD meets the appropriate limits.

**SuggestedRemedy**

After Table 189-9, insert test from 104.5.7.4 PD ripple and transients. I shall provide a presentation with specific suggested text for the Task Force to consider.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.5.5.1 P 124 L 26 # 172

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X MPD

Lines 26, 27, and 35 refer to conditions when the MPD voltage measured at its MDI, V<MPD>, is greater than Vtype0\_th. By examination of Figure 189-6 and Figure 189-7 it appears that V<MPD> is compared to V<Discovery\_th>.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change "Vtype0\_th" in lines 26, 27, and 35 to "VDiscovery\_th"

Proposed Response Response Status O

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: Page, Line

Pa 124

Li 26

Page 57 of 63

12/24/2024 9:30:11 AM

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

CI 189 SC 189.5.5.2 P 124 L 41 # 39

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X Unit Load

A lot of the text in "189.5.5.2 MPD unit load" is repeating text from "189.3 System type power requirement" where it could use a reference instead.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Replace

"MPDs consume integer units of load, known as "unit loads".

For Type 0 and Type Mixed MPDs, one unit load represents 1W. For Type 1 MPDs, one unit load represents

2W.

A mixing segment can support up to 16 unit loads. Each MPD is allocated a minimum of 1 unit load and

may consume no more than 16 unit loads. The MPD system type and unit load level should be clearly indicated so users can track loading on a mixing segment.

MPD unit load level shall be an integer indicating the maximum power required by the MPD, where Nunit \* PMPD\_1U is greater than the MPD's power requirements for the MPD system type."

With

"MPD unit loads are described in 189.3 System type power requirements.

MPD unit load level shall be an integer indicating the maximum power required by the MPD, where Nunit \* PMPD\_1U is greater than the MPD's power requirements for the MPD system type."

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.5.5.2 P 124 L 44 # 101

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Per the style manual, a space should separate the value and the unit.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change 1W to 1 W (or 1 Watt). Similarly for 2W.

Change elsewhere if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 189 SC 189.5.5.2 P 124 L 52 # 102

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X EZ

Per the style manual, multiplication should be denoted by the sign ×. An asterisk should not be used.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change per comment.

Change elsewhere if necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 189 SC 189.5.5.2 P 125 L 3 # 231

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Editorial

We should repeat the unit load text here, to explain it for those that might only read the PD section (cause experience tells us that WILL happen). copied my previous comment:

Unit loads again. I've been vocal that I hate that the concept "leaves power on the table", mostly because I know the biggest complaint we will get after approval is "why isn't there more power available?"

I still don't have a good solution to make it easy to keep a unit load concept and optimize the power budget, therefore I propose that we tell the reader that the unit load concept doesn't allocate all the power.

#### SuggestedRemedy

See what we did for 189.3 and copy it here.

Add at the end of the section: "The unit load concept will result in a system that will work but one that has power left over that cannot be allocated. Unit loads were introduced to make it easy for the uninitiated to install a network. It is possible to design the network to completely comply with all the other requirements while exceeding the unit load restrictions. This should be done only by experienced installers or under engineering supervision."

Proposed Response Response Status W

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 189 SC 189.5.5.3 P 125 L 10 # 171

Baggett, Tim Microchip

Comment Type E Comment Status X MPD

The text attempts to state that the MPD may have its power removed if it does not send a Transmit Power Signature every T<TPSDO> seconds. However it states that power may be removed \*within\* the limits of T<TPSDO>. This should state that power will be removed after the timer expires without receiving a TPS, not during the timer.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change:

"An MPD that does not report TPS may have its power removed within the limits of T<TPSDO> as defined in Table 189-5."

To:

"An MPD that does not report TPS within the limits of T<TPSDO> as defined in Table 189-5 may have its power removed."

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 189 SC 189.5.5.3 P 125 L 17 # 232

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

There is no additional information to add to Table 189-10.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the additional information column of Table 189-10.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.6.1.1 P 125 L 43 # 246

Potterf, Jason Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status X Environmental

The current isolations environments need additional refinement.

*SuggestedRemedy*

I will provide a presentation for the task force to consider.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 189 SC 189.6.1.1 P 125 L 47 # 40

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Using "a LAN" or "a LAN or LAN segment" is more complicated than it needs to be. Just say "a mixing segment".

*SuggestedRemedy*

in MPoE Environment A/B/C, replace  
""a LAN" or "a LAN or LAN segment" "  
With  
"a mixing segment"

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.6.1.1.1 P 126 L 15 # 41

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

In "189.6.1.1.1 MPoE Environment A requirements", the text includes "isolation requirements of the MAU or PHY" and "isolation requirement of the MAU/PHY"  
T1M doesn't include an MAU.

*SuggestedRemedy*

in MPoE Environment A/B/C, replace  
" the MAU or PHY" or "the MAU/PHY"  
With  
"the PHY"

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.7 P 127 L 17 # 103

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X Editorial

The title "Environmental" seems lacking. This subclause covers more than environmental things. Installation and labeling are not what people consider environmental.  
Also in 188.10 "Environmental specifications".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Find the correct heading or restructure this subclause.  
Align with 188.10.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

Cl 189 SC 189.7 P 127 L 17 # 182

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Align clause header with 188.10 "Environmental specifications"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace, "189.7 Environmental" with "189.7 Environmental specifications"

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 189 SC 189.7.2 P 127 L 34 # 104

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The list has both dashes and letters.  
Letters don't contribute here.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the letters.

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

Cl 189 SC 189.7.2 P 127 L 41 # 143

Cox, Ian Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status X EZ

Installati looks like it should be Installation

*SuggestedRemedy*

change installatio to installation

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 189 SC 189.7.2 P 127 L 41 # 233

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status X EZ

incomplete word: installati

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to installation

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

---

Cl 189 SC 189.7.2 P 127 L 42 # 105

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X EZ

"Installati" on the second line and "on" on the third line indicate an interesting clerical error.

The whole paragraph seems to be garbled in comparison to the similar text in the base standard, e.g. in 145.6.2:

"Such electrical safety hazards should be avoided or appropriately protected against for proper network installation and performance. In addition to provisions for proper handling of these conditions in an operational system, special measures should be taken to verify that the intended safety features are not negated during installation of a new network or during modification of an existing network."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Correct the text to what it should be, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 189 SC 189.7.2 P 127 L 42 # 234

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status X EZ

extra and/or missing word(s): "...are not negated during installation on and performance..."  
not 100% sure what we are trying to say so I'm gonna guess in my proposed remedy.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to: "...are not negated during installation or on performance..."

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 189 SC 189.7.2 P 127 L 44 # 144

Cox, Ian Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status X EZ

Words joined together systemof

*SuggestedRemedy*

change systemof to system of

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

CI 189 SC 189.7.2 P 127 L 44 # 235

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status X EZ

last sentence of this paragraph isn't complete and "systemof" needs a space. "In addition to provisions for proper handling of these conditions in an operational systemof a new network or during modification of an existing network."  
again, not 100% sure what we are trying to say, but I'll guess.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to: "In addition, provisions should be take for proper handling of these conditions in an operational system of a new network or during modification of an existing network."

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 189 SC 189.7.3 P 128 L 1 # 236

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"... and electrically secure in a..." "secure" needs to be "secured"

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to "secured"

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.7.3 P 128 L 2 # 237

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

missing a word: "...should be routed in way to provide..."

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to "...should be routed in a way to provide..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.7.3 P 128 L 6 # 180

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Environmental

This is a generalization, so it's really not helpful. Automative application system designers understand their environmental requirements.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete, "Automotive environmental conditions are generally more severe than those found in many commercial and industrial environments."

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.7.4 P 128 L 11 # 181

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting and Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial

I think we mean current carrying capacity (i.e., ampacity). Sentence could be more succinct.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace "It is possible that the current carrying capability of a cabling cross-connect may be exceeded by the current capacity of the MPSE. " with "The current capacity of the MPSE may exceed the current carrying capacity of a cabling cross-connect."

Proposed Response Response Status W

---

CI 189 SC 189.7.8 P 129 L 5 # 107

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status X Editorial

Item a lists quantities as unit names ("in terms of Watts, Amps"). This seems to contrast the style manual: "Unit symbols may not be used to stand for the quantity being measured" (14.4). Also "Amps" is not a proper unit.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Rephrase this sentence to use the quantities rather than the units.

Proposed Response Response Status O

## IEEE P802.3da D2.0 10 Mbps Multidrop Enhancements

---

Cl 189 SC 189.7.8 P 129 L 5 # 106

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X EZ

The items in the list do not seem to have a logical order. For example I would expect item c to be the last one.

This is a lettered list, which seem to indicate the order is important.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Reorder the list based on importance of the information (Suggestion: using the current letters - b, d, g, f, a, e, c).

Consider making it a dashed list.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 189 SC 189.7.8 P 129 L 12 # 108

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X Editorial

"Type 0" and "Type 1" seem to apply to MPDs rather than to systems. See 189.5.1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "System type" to "MPD type".

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 189 SC 189.8.3 P 131 L 6 # 109

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X MPSE

I assume a device conforming to clause 189 is either MPSE or MPD, both not both (although I didn't find it not stated anywhere).

The PICS should reflect that. See 21.6.2 for the notation.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the status of items MPSE and MPD to O/1.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 189 SC 189.8.4.1 P 131 L 20 # 110

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status X PICS

The items in 189.8.4.1 appear as mandatory, but they do not apply to MPSEs and MPDs - only to mixing segments (installation). They should be made conditional on a major option (which is currently missing).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a major option for mixing segment and make these items conditional on it. Apply also in 189.8.4.4 where necessary.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl J SC J.1 P 133 L 13 # 111

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status X Editorial

Removing the subclause references is not a good idea. This Annex is referenced from many places and many readers may not know what PI or MPI are and where the "relevant specific requirements associated with option c" can be found.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Keep the references to clause 33 and 145, add references to clause 189 as appropriate, with editorial license.

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

Cl 189 SC 189.8.4.3 P 133 L 17 # 112

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Typo "wiht"

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to "with"

Proposed Response Response Status W

Cl 189

SC 189.8.4.4

P 133

L 29

# 

113

Ran, Adee

Cisco

Comment Type

E

Comment Status

X

PICS

Some items seem to be conditional on Environment A, B, or C.

SuggestedRemedy

Add major options for environment and make these items conditional on the corresponding options.

Proposed Response

Response Status

O