Cl **00**　　*SC* **0**　　　　　　*P* **9**　　　*L* **1**　　　# 61

Hajduczenia, Marek　　　　　　　Charter Communications

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*Alignment*

802.3de is amendment to 802.3dc, so I would assume the text of Introduction to match.

SuggestedRemedy

Copy text of Introduction, including text of all sections 1 - 9 from 802.3dc-D2.2 into next revision of 802.3de

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Front matter and introduction text are aligned with 802.3dc-D3.0 by comments marked with the 'Alignment' topic.

Cl **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　　*P* **9**　　　*L* **6**　　　# 45

Grow, Robert　　　　　　　　RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*Alignment*

Does the revision beng in SA ballot meet the intended stability condition in the second paragraph of the note? I think it does.

SuggestedRemedy

Do any additional alignment and perhaps note any changes to the draft revision will be tracked as new revision drafts become available.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Comments on this draft align with 802.3dc D3.0, currently in SA ballot.
Front matter and introduction text are aligned with 802.3dc-D3.0 by comments marked with the 'Alignment' topic.
Delete editor's note at lines 6 & 7.

Cl **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　　*P* **9**　　　*L* **17**　　　# 23

Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*Alignment*

"Ethernet at 10 Mb/s was approved" does not align with intro text in 802.3dc D3.0

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Ethernet at 10 Mb/s" with ""Local Area Networks: Carrier sense multiple access with collision detection (CSMA/CD) access method and physical layer specifications"" (including quotes around text)

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　　*P* **9**　　　*L* **19**　　　# 24

Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*Alignment*

"A full duplex MAC protocol was added
in 1997." does not align with intro text in 802.3dc D3.0

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "was added" with "and the ability to use an Ethertype to specify the MAC client protocol were added"

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　　*P* **9**　　　*L* **24**　　　# 25

Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*Alignment*

Trademark symbols on 802.3z, 802.3ae, and 802.3ba is also likely to get a TM in SA ballot…

SuggestedRemedy

Add TM symbol to 802.3z, 802.3ae, and 802.3ba

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　　*P* **9**　　　*L* **36**　　　# 26

Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　*Alignment*

Section 1 ends at Annex K in 802.3dc D3.0. Annex H should be Annex K to align with 802.3dc D3.0

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Annex H" to "Annex K"

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general　　　　*Topic* **Alignment**　　Page 1 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn　　1/3/2022 8:38:14 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　　　*P* **9**　　　*L* **40**　　　# 27
Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,
Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Alignment*
　　Section 2 ends at Annex 33A - there is no Annex 33E, this was an error in the intro to
　　802.3-2018
SuggestedRemedy
　　Change "Annex 33E" to "Annex 33A"
Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**
　　PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　　　*P* **10**　　*L* **13**　　　# 28
Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,
Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Alignment*
　　"as well the 40 Gb/s" should be "as well as 40 Gb/s" to align with 802.3dc D3.0
SuggestedRemedy
　　Change "as well the" to "as well as"
Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**
　　PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　　　*P* **10**　　*L* **25**　　　# 29
Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,
Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Alignment*
　　The introductory text for section eight reflects IEEE Std 802.3-2018 which only went to
　　clause 126. This has substantially changed in 802.3dc D3.0, which includes new clauses
　　to 140, as well as a section 9 for clauses through 160.
SuggestedRemedy
　　Replace "Section Eight" paragraph (lines 25 - 29) with text from IEEE P802.3dc D3.0 for
　　Section Eight and Section Nine (pg 26 of IEEE P802.3dc D3.0 lines 26 through 43).
Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**
　　PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **Introdu**　　*SC* **Introduction**　　　　*P* **10**　　*L* **25**　　　# 52
Kabra, Lokesh　　　　　　　　Synopsys Inc
Comment Type **ER**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Alignment*
　　Section 8 Description incomplete
SuggestedRemedy
　　Replace Section 8 description with

　　Includes Clause 116 through Clause 140 and Annex 119A through Annex 136D. Clause
　　116 through Clause 124 and associated annexes include general information on 200 Gb/s
　　and 400 Gb/s operation as well as 200 Gb/s and 400 Gb/s Physical Layer specifications.
　　Clause 125 includes general information on 2.5 Gb/s and 5 Gb/s operation. Clause 126
　　through Clause 130 and associated annexes include 2.5 Gb/s and 5 Gb/s Physical Layer
　　specifications. Clause 131 provides general information on 50 Gb/s operation. Clause 132
　　through Clause 140 and associated annexes include 50 Gb/s Physical Layer specifications
　　and additional 100 Gb/s, 200 Gb/s, and 400 Gb/s Physical Layer specifications.
Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**
　　PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
　　Accomodated by comment #29
　　Response to comment #29 is: ACCEPT
　　(Replace "Section Eight" paragraph (lines 25 - 29) with text from IEEE P802.3dc D3.0 for
　　Section Eight and Section Nine (pg 26 of IEEE P802.3dc D3.0 lines 26 through 43).)

Cl **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　　　*P* **10**　　*L* **30**　　　# 41
Murty, Ramana　　　　　　　　Broadcom
Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　*Alignment*
　　Add section nine describing Clauses 141 - 160 per 802.3dc D3.0.
SuggestedRemedy
　　Per comment
Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**
　　PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
　　Accomodated by comment #29
　　Response to comment #29 is: ACCEPT
　　(Replace "Section Eight" paragraph (lines 25 - 29) with text from IEEE P802.3dc D3.0 for
　　Section Eight and Section Nine (pg 26 of IEEE P802.3dc D3.0 lines 26 through 43).)

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: Topic
Topic **Alignment**　　Page 2 of 16
1/3/2022 8:38:14 AM

Cl **Introdu**   *SC* **Introduction**   *P* **10**   *L* **30**   # 53

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Alignment*

Section 9 Description missing

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following :
Section Nine—Includes Clause 141 through Clause 160 and Annex 142A through Annex 154A. Clause 141 through Clause 144 and associated annexes specify symmetric and asymmetric operation of Ethernet passive optical networks over multiple 25 Gb/s channels. Clause 145 and associated annexes specify increased power delivery using all four pairs in the structured wiring plant. Clause 146 through Clause 149 and associated annexes add Physical layers for 10 Mb/s, 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s operation over a single balanced pair of conductors. Clause 150 and Clause 151 add 400 Gb/s Physical Layer specifications. Clause 153 and Clause 154 specify 100 Gb/s operation over DWDM systems. Clause 157 through Clause 160 add 10 Gb/s, 25 Gb/s, and 50 Gb/s bidirectional Physical Layer specifications.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #29
Response to comment #29 is: ACCEPT
(Replace "Section Eight" paragraph (lines 25 - 29) with text from IEEE P802.3dc D3.0 for Section Eight and Section Nine (pg 26 of IEEE P802.3dc D3.0 lines 26 through 43).)

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **10**   *L* **39**   # 9

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Alignment*

IEEE Std 802.3-2018

SuggestedRemedy

IEEE Std 802.3-202x

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **10**   *L* **39**   # 21

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Alignment*

"changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018" should be "changes to IEEE Std 802.3"

SuggestedRemedy

delete "-2018"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #9, response to comment #9 is ACCEPT
"IEEE Std 802.3-202x"

Cl **Introdu**   *SC* **Introduction**   *P* **10**   *L* **39**   # 54

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Alignment*

Incorrect reference to 802.3 standard version

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "802.3-2018" with "802.3-202x"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #9, response to comment #9 is ACCEPT
"IEEE Std 802.3-202x"

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **10**   # 62

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communications

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Alignment*

I believe the baseline text is NOT taken from 802.3dc-D2.2. Entry for "50GMII (Clause 132)," is missing

SuggestedRemedy

The list of supported xMII should be as follows: "The MII (Clause 22), GMII (Clause 35), XGMII (Clause 46), 25GMII (Clause106), XLGMII (Clause 81), CGMII (Clause 81), 50GMII (Clause 132), 200GMII (Clause 117), and 400GMII (Clause 117)"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic* **Alignment**   Page 3 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:14 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **3** *L* **3** # 1

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

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

For consistency with the title of the document, replace "single pair" with "single-pair" when the term is used before Ethernet.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Single Pair" with "Single-Pair"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **10** *L* **34** # 2

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

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

For consistency with the title of the document, replace "single pair" with "single-pair" when the term is used before Ethernet. Request Editor of the P802.3dd project to adjust the title of this amendment accordingly.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Single Pair" with "Single-Pair"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make the change suggested. Comment on 802.3dd title will need to be made on text draft, separately to that project.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **10** *L* **39** # 3

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

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

For consistency with the title of the document, replace "single pair" with "single-pair" when the term is used before Ethernet.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Single Pair" with "Single-Pair"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **12** *L* **11** # 4

Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

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

For consistency with the title of the document, replace "single pair" with "single-pair" when the term is used before Ethernet.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Single Pair" with "Single-Pair"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **90** *SC* **90** *P* **13** *L* **6** # 30

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

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

The editing instruction could be written more compactly to be resistant to any changes in IEEE 802.3dc ballot since only the first sentence is changed

SuggestedRemedy

Change editing instruction to "Change the first sentence of the second paragraph of 90.1 as follows (unchanged sentences not shown):" Delete second and subsequent sentences from line 9 through 13.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **90** *SC* **90.1** *P* **13** *L* **8** # 12

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

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

Don't make life hard for the reader. There are now too many PHY types and clauses for the reader to be expected to memorise them. There is only one PHY type in Clause 147.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "as well as Clause 147 PHYs" to "as well as for 10BASE-T1S (see Clause 147)". See other comments on the same text.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #13:
Response to comment #13 is ACCEPT
(This might be better reversed:
The TSSI is defined for 10BASE-T1S (see Clause 147) in the point-to-point full-duplex and half-duplex modes of operation only, and for other PHY types in full-duplex mode.)

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general *Topic* **Editorial** Page 4 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn 1/3/2022 8:38:14 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **8**   # 13

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

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

As the standard order is slow to fast, and "as well as" implies some kind of priority (in date?)...

SuggestedRemedy

This might be better reversed:
The TSSI is defined for 10BASE-T1S (see Clause 147) in the point-to-point full-duplex and half-duplex modes of operation only, and for other PHY types in full-duplex mode.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **8**   # 55

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

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

Better sentence construct.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "The TSSI is defined for the full-duplex mode of operation, as well as Clause 147 PHYs" with
"The TSSI is defined for full-duplex mode of operation, as well as for Clause 147 PHYs"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #13:
Response to comment #13 is ACCEPT
(This might be better reversed:
The TSSI is defined for 10BASE-T1S (see Clause 147) in the point-to-point full-duplex and half-duplex modes of operation only, and for other PHY types in full-duplex mode.)

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **8**   # 15

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Editorial*

While the base text in 99.1 made sense discussing one end of a link, "a point-to-point link with a pair of MACs and a single PHY" doesn't make sense.

SuggestedRemedy

See suggestion in another comment on the same text

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Comment or response does not provide sufficient detail to make a change.

Accomodated by comment 39:
Response to comment 39 is:
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace the first sentence of 99.1 (with appropriate change marks and change instruction from the base text), to read:

"This clause specifies an optional MAC Merge sublayer for use on a point-to-point link with a pair of MACs and a single PHY operating on a point-to-point link. The clause is applicable to full-duplex operation with 10BASE-T1L (Clause 146) and 10BASE-T1S (Clause 147) PHYs and all PHYs 100 Mb/s and above. It is also applicable to half-duplex point-to-point operation with the 10BASE-T1S (Clause 147) PHY, but operation with the 10BASE-T1S PHY in multidrop mode is not specified."

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **1**   *L* **11**   # 5

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

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

There should be an amendment number here (although it may change). According to line 28 and page 10, this is predicted to be amendment 2.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Amendment:" to Amendment 2:"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic* **EZ**   Page 5 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:14 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **3**   *L* **1**   # 42

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *EZ*
    Awkward grammar

SuggestedRemedy
    Change "This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-202x to specify additions to..." to "This
    amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-202x specfies additions to…".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
    Resolved by comment #18
    Response to comment #18 is ACCEPT
    (Change: This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-202x to specify additions to
    To: This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-202x specifies additions to)

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **3**   *L* **1**   # 60

Jones, Peter   Cisco

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *EZ*
    Editorial problem in abstract. The text says
    This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-202x to specify additions to and appropriate
    modifications of

SuggestedRemedy
    Replace "to specify" with "specifies"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
    Resolved by comment #18
    Response to comment #18 is ACCEPT
    (Change: This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-202x to specify additions to
    To: This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-202x specifies additions to)

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **3**   *L* **1**   # 18

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *EZ*
    poor wording

SuggestedRemedy
    Change: This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-202x to specify additions to
    To: This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-202x specifies additions to

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

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **3**   *L* **4**   # 8

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *EZ*
    802.3cg

SuggestedRemedy
    802.3de

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
    Add "802.3de™ " to keyword list.
    (802.3cg should remain because this amendment relates to PHYs added by 802.3cg)

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **4**   *L* **8**   # 22

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *EZ*
    Editorial note contains exception to IEEE style which is obsolete.

SuggestedRemedy
    delete "One exception to IEEE style that is consciously used to simplify the balloting
    process is the numbering of
    the front matter. Instead of the front matter being lower case Roman numeral page
    numbers, with the draft
    restarting at 1 with Arabic page numbers, balloted front matter and draft are numbered
    consecutively with
    Arabic page numbers." on lines 8 -11 from editor's note.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
    Resolved by comment 43, Response to comment 43 is ACCEPT
    (Delete second paragraph of the note.)

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **4**   *L* **8**   # 43

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *EZ*
    The IEEE Style Manual has changed and the second paragraph of the note is no longer
    appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy
    Delete second paragraph of the note.

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic* **EZ**   Page 6 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:14 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **7**   *L* **27**   # 44

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

The ballot group is now known, please add it so WG members can review their listings.

SuggestedRemedy

Add 802.3 ballot group list.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **12**   *L* **3**   # 10

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

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

Amendment X

SuggestedRemedy

As it says in page 10: Amendment 2

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **9**   # 63

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communications

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

Clause 146 and Clause 147 should be marked as external references, i.e., Forest Green.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **16**   # 31

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

IEEE P802.3dc D3.0 includes the edit to add 10BASE-T1L and 10BASE-T1S, so there is no need to make that here.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete lines 16-29, including 90.4.1, 90.4.1.1, editor's note, and edit to change the NOTE.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **20**   # 46

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

The edited text is included in P802.3/D3.0 in response to Maintenance request #1389. (Maintenance change approved during P802.3 WG ballot.)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the subclause, optionally include an editor's note indicating changes included in previous drafts were deleted as the changes were approved in P802.3 WG ballot and are now included in P802.3/D3.0.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #31
Response to comment #31 is ACCEPT:
(Delete lines 16-29, including 90.4.1, 90.4.1.1, editor's note, and edit to change the NOTE.)

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **20**   # 47

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

The edited text is included in P802.3/D3.0 in response to Maintenance request #1390. (Maintenance change approved during P802.3 WG ballot.)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete lines 11-16, optionally include an editor's note indicating changes included in previous drafts to the note to Figure 99-1 were deleted as the changes were approved in P802.3 WG ballot and are now included in P802.3/D3.0.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #31
Response to comment #31 is ACCEPT:
(Delete lines 16-29, including 90.4.1, 90.4.1.1, editor's note, and edit to change the NOTE.)

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic* **Figure NOTE**   Page 7 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:15 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.1.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **27**   # 19

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

change to match 802.3cx D2.1 text

SuggestedRemedy

Change: NOTE 1—In this figure, the xMII is used as a generic term for the Media
Independent Interfaces for implementations of
10BASE-T1L, 10BASE-T1S, and 100 Mb/s and above. For example: for 100 Mb/s
implementations
To: NOTE 1—In this figure, the xMII is used as a generic term for the Media Independent
Interfaces for implementations of
10 Mb/s and above. For example: for 10 Mb/s and 100 Mb/s implementations

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accomodated by comment #31
Response to comment #31 is ACCEPT:
(Delete lines 16-29, including 90.4.1, 90.4.1.1, editor's note, and edit to change the NOTE.)

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.1.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **27**   # 35

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

As of 802.3dc D2.3, Note 1 in Figure 90-1 has the effiective text in this draft. Therefore it
needs no amendment.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the content of 90.4.1 and its subclauses, including the editor's note and editorial
instruction.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #31
Response to comment #31 is ACCEPT:
(Delete lines 16-29, including 90.4.1, 90.4.1.1, editor's note, and edit to change the NOTE.)

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.1.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **28**   # 38

Nicholl, Shawn   Xilinx

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

The NOTE does not provide the mapping for the newly-added 10 Mb/s rates. Also, the
NOTE is inconsistent with latest P802.3cx_D2p1 draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to replace with:
NOTE—In this figure, the xMII is used as a generic term for the Media Independent
Interfaces for implementations of 10 Mb/s and above. For example: for 10 Mb/s and 100
Mb/s implementations this interface is called MII; for 1 Gb/s implementations …

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #31
Response to comment #31 is ACCEPT:
(Delete lines 16-29, including 90.4.1, 90.4.1.1, editor's note, and edit to change the NOTE.)
(note - this aligns with the text of 802.3dc D3.0. P802.3cx_D2p1 follows this amendment,
and a comment has been made to bring 802.3cx in alignment with 802.3dc and this
proposed response)

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.1.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **28**   # 49

Healey, Adam   Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

IEEE P802.3de will be an amendment to the next revision of IEEE Std 802.3. Draft 2.2 of
the revision (IEEE 802.3dc) includes the change to NOTE 1 in Figure 90-1. This change
instruction is redundant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove change to NOTE 1 in Figure 90-1 and the associated editor's note.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #31
Response to comment #31 is ACCEPT:
(Delete lines 16-29, including 90.4.1, 90.4.1.1, editor's note, and edit to change the NOTE.)

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic* **Figure NOTE**   Page 8 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:15 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **11**   # `33`

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

Change to Note on Figure 99-1 is made in IEEE P802.3dc D3.0, no need to make it here.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete lines 11-16, including editing instruction and change to note.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #36
Response to comment #36 is ACCEPT:
(Remove the second editorial instruction in 99.1 and the paragraph following it.)

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **12**   # `36`

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

As of 802.3dc D2.3, Note 1 in Figure 99-1 has the effiective text in this draft. Therefore it needs no amendment.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the second editorial instruction in 99.1 and the paragraph following it.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **14**   # `40`

Nicholl, Shawn   Xilinx

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

The NOTE does not provide the mapping for the newly-added 10 Mb/s rates. Also, the NOTE is inconsistent with latest P802.3cx_D2p1 draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to replace with:
NOTE—In this figure, the xMII is used as a generic term for the Media Independent Interfaces for implementations of 10 Mb/s and above. For example: for 10 Mb/s and 100 Mb/s implementations this interface is called MII; for 1 Gb/s implementations …

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #36
Response to comment #36 is ACCEPT:
(Remove the second editorial instruction in 99.1 and the paragraph following it.)

(note - this aligns with the text of 802.3dc D3.0. P802.3cx_D2p1 follows this amendment, and a comment has been made to bring 802.3cx in alignment with 802.3dc and this proposed response)

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **15**   # `20`

Wienckowski, Natalie   General Motors

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

change to match 802.3cx D2.1 text in NOTE1 in 90.4.1.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: 10BASE-T1L, 10BASE-T1S, and 100 Mb/s and above. For example: for 100 Mb/s
To: 10 Mb/s and above. For example: for 10 Mb/s and 100 Mb/s

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #36
Response to comment #36 is ACCEPT:
(Remove the second editorial instruction in 99.1 and the paragraph following it.)

(note - this aligns with the text of 802.3dc D3.0. P802.3cx_D2p1 follows this amendment, and a comment has been made to bring 802.3cx in alignment with 802.3dc and this proposed response)

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic* **Figure NOTE**   Page 9 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:15 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **15**   # 50

Healey, Adam   Broadcom Inc.

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Figure NOTE*

IEEE P802.3de will be an amendment to the next revision of IEEE Std 802.3. Draft 2.2 of the revision (IEEE 802.3dc) includes the change to NOTE in Figure 99-1. This change instruction is redundant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the change to NOTE in Figure 99-1.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment #36
Response to comment #36 is ACCEPT:
(Remove the second editorial instruction in 99.1 and the paragraph following it.)

Cl **Abstrac**   *SC* **Abstract**   *P* **3**   *L* **1**   # 51

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Frontmatter*

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Blank comment. Presumably, by location, this comment is on the grammar in the abstract resolved by comment #18. Commenter has been contacted and confirmed that this the case.

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **12**   *L* **48**   # 11

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Frontmatter*

IEEE P802.3bj and IEEE P802.3bk are ancient history and "modified" in the past tense reinforces that. Also, it would help the reviewers and editors more if the correct list of "other IEEE 802.3 amendment projects running in parallel" were given.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "e.g., IEEE P802.3bj and IEEE P802.3bk" to the correct list of other IEEE 802.3 amendment projects running in parallel that modify the same text and tables "IEEE P802.3cx". (If there were none, delete "(e.g., IEEE P802.3bj and IEEE P802.3bk)".) Change "modified" to "modify".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The CRG disagrees with the commenter. 802.3bj and 802.3bk are given purely as an example, and the reader gets the point - they are amendments with adjacent (or near-adjacent) designations running at the same time.

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.3.1.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **39**   # 37

Slavick, Jeff   Broadcom

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Half-Duplex*

The sentence is describing a behavior that TimeSync Client will see for half-duplex PHYs. This is not defining what TS_TX.indication is.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "NOTE" before the sentence beginning with "When using the half-duplex"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic* **Half-Duplex**   Page 10 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:15 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.3.2.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **42**   # 56

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Half-Duplex*

Note about multiple TS_RX.indications for a packet in half-duplex mode missing

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a new final paragraph in 90.4.3.2.1 as shown:
When using the half-duplex mode of operation, multiple TS_RX indications may be
produced for a single packet as a result of collisions on the media.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Task Force to Discuss
Editor's recollection was discussion during study group that further changes were not
needed.
If a change is needed, this would be a new note, and the change would be:
90.4.3.2 TS_RX.indication primitive
90.4.3.2.1 Semantics
Insert a new final paragraph in 90.4.3.2.1 as shown:
"NOTE - When using the half-duplex mode of operation, multiple TS_RX indications may
be produced for a single packet as a result of collisions on the media."

Cl **99**   *SC* **99**   *P* **14**   *L*   # 58

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Half-Duplex*

I am not sure whether the effect of collisions & retransmissions of fragments is considered
in Receive Processing state diagram; For example, in Figure 99-6, in state
P_RECEIVE_DATA, if the incoming continuation fragment is terminated due to collision
(!RX_MCRC_OK & !rRxDx), the state transitions to FRAME_COMPLETE. When the
remote station retransmits the continuation fragment, it will be declared as a BAD_FRAG;
Is this intended?

SuggestedRemedy

Receive Processing to be updated for handling of collisions/retransmission of fragments in
half-duplex mode

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Task Force to Discuss

Editor's inclination is to reject this comment based on lack of a sufficiently detailed remedy,
and recollection of discussion during study group that further changes were not needed. It
would be helpful if presentations provided a remedy - if one is needed.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99**   *P* **14**   *L*   # 59

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Half-Duplex*

Similarly, impact of ollisions/retransmission of fragments in not fully considered/explained
in Transmit Processing. For example, if collision occurs during transmission of preemptable
fragment, then Transmit processing remains in PREEMPTABLE_TX state because pTxCplt
= FALSE. In such a case, express packet will remain in queue and gets delayed until teh
retransmission of the fragment is compete after the random back-off. Is this intended?

SuggestedRemedy

Transmit Processing to be updated for handling of collisions/retransmission of fragments in
half-duplex mode

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Task Force to Discuss

Editor's inclination is to reject this comment based on lack of a sufficiently detailed remedy,
and recollection of discussion during study group that further changes were not needed. It
would be helpful if presentations provided a remedy - if one is needed.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **9**   # 14

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Half-Duplex*

This would extend MAC Merge to half-duplex PHYs at 100 Mb/s and 1000 Mb/s which I do
not believe is the intention and is outside the scope of the PAR (5.2.b says "10 Mb/s Single
Pair Ethernet point to point PHYs"). TR because outside the scope of the PAR.

SuggestedRemedy

Undelete "full-duplex" here where it applies to 100 Mb/s or higher, or change the PAR.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment 39:
Response to comment 39 is:
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace the first sentence of 99.1 (with appropriate change marks and change instruction
from the base text), to read:

"This clause specifies an optional MAC Merge sublayer for use on a point-to-point link with
a pair of MACs and a single PHY operating on a point-to-point link. The clause is
applicable to full-duplex operation with 10BASE-T1L (Clause 146) and 10BASE-T1S
(Clause 147) PHYs and all PHYs 100 Mb/s and above. It is also applicable to half-duplex
point-to-point operation with the 10BASE-T1S (Clause 147) PHY, but operation with the
10BASE-T1S PHY in multidrop mode is not specified."

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic* **Half-Duplex**   Page 11 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:15 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **14** *L* **9** # 39

Nicholl, Shawn   Xilinx

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Half-Duplex*

The introduction sentence is becoming somewhat awkward to read.

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to break it into two sentences:
 - This clause specifies an optional MAC Merge sublayer for use on a point-to-point link with a pair of MACs and a single PHY. The single PHY shall be a Clause 146 10BASE-T1L PHY, or a Clause 147 10GBASE-T1S PHY, or a PHY operating at 100 Mb/s or higher.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace the first sentence of 99.1 (with appropriate change marks and change instruction from the base text), to read:

"This clause specifies an optional MAC Merge sublayer for use on a point-to-point link with a pair of MACs and a single PHY operating on a point-to-point link. The clause is applicable to full-duplex operation with 10BASE-T1L (Clause 146) and 10BASE-T1S (Clause 147) PHYs and all PHYs 100 Mb/s and above. It is also applicable to half-duplex point-to-point operation with the 10BASE-T1S (Clause 147) PHY, but operation with the 10BASE-T1S PHY in multidrop mode is not specified."

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **14** *L* **9** # 16

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Half-Duplex*

As the standard order is slow to fast, short to long, and "as well as" implies some kind of priority (in date?)...

SuggestedRemedy

This might be better reversed:
This clause specifies an optional MAC Merge sublayer for use on a point-to-point link with 10BASE-T1S (see Clause 147) or 10BASE-T1L (see Clause 146) PHYs, or PHYs operating at 100 Mb/s or higher, and a pair of full-duplex MACs for each PHY.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The proposed rewording could be introduces confusion as to whether point-to-point, clause 147 PHYs with a pair of half-duplex MACs are included (they are).

Accomodated by comment 39:
Response to comment 39 is:
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace the first sentence of 99.1 (with appropriate change marks and change instruction from the base text), to read:

"This clause specifies an optional MAC Merge sublayer for use on a point-to-point link with a pair of MACs and a single PHY operating on a point-to-point link. The clause is applicable to full-duplex operation with 10BASE-T1L (Clause 146) and 10BASE-T1S (Clause 147) PHYs and all PHYs 100 Mb/s and above. It is also applicable to half-duplex point-to-point operation with the 10BASE-T1S (Clause 147) PHY, but operation with the 10BASE-T1S PHY in multidrop mode is not specified."

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: Topic

Topic **Half-Duplex**   Page 12 of 16
1/3/2022 8:38:15 AM

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **9**   # `32`

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Half-Duplex*

unneeded comma between "10BASE-T1L" and "and Clause 147"

SuggestedRemedy

change "Clause 146 10BASE-T1L, and Clause 147 10BASE-T1S PHYs" to "Clause 146
10BASE-T1L and Clause 147 10BASE-T1S PHYs"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment 39:
Response to comment 39 is:
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace the first sentence of 99.1 (with appropriate change marks and change instruction
from the base text), to read:

"This clause specifies an optional MAC Merge sublayer for use on a point-to-point link with
a pair of MACs and a single PHY operating on a point-to-point link. The clause is
applicable to full-duplex operation with 10BASE-T1L (Clause 146) and 10BASE-T1S
(Clause 147) PHYs and all PHYs 100 Mb/s and above. It is also applicable to half-duplex
point-to-point operation with the 10BASE-T1S (Clause 147) PHY, but operation with the
10BASE-T1S PHY in multidrop mode is not specified."

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **9**   # `57`

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Half-Duplex*

The new sentence does not look proper. The first part refers to a "pair of MACs and a
single PHY operating at 100 Mb/s or higher" but the second part "as well as Clause
146/147 PHYs" does not tie up.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "MACs and a single PHY operating at 100 Mb/s or higher, as well as Clause 146
10BASE-T1L, and Clause 147 10BASE-T1S PHYs"   with
"MACs and a single PHY operating at 100 Mb/s or higher, or a Clause 146 10BASE-T1L
PHY, or a Clause 147 10BASE-T1S PHY"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accomodated by comment 39:
Response to comment 39 is:
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace the first sentence of 99.1 (with appropriate change marks and change instruction
from the base text), to read:

"This clause specifies an optional MAC Merge sublayer for use on a point-to-point link with
a pair of MACs and a single PHY operating on a point-to-point link. The clause is
applicable to full-duplex operation with 10BASE-T1L (Clause 146) and 10BASE-T1S
(Clause 147) PHYs and all phys 100 Mb/s and above. It is also applicable to half-duplex
point-to-point operation with the 10BASE-T1S (Clause 147) PHY, but operation with the
10BASE-T1S PHY in multidrop mode is not specified."

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic* **Half-Duplex**   Page 13 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:15 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **14**   *L* **10**   # 17

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Half-Duplex*

As for Clause 90, need to make clear which modes of 10BASE-T1S can and can't use
MAC Merge (according to the scope of the project in the PAR, only the point to point
modes can). The draft text is too brief, and may be ambiguous.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a sentence "The MAC Merge sublayer is optional with 10BASE-T1S in full-duplex point-
to-point and half-duplex point-to-point modes, and not applicable with 10BASE-T1S half-
duplex shared-medium mode (referred to as multidrop mode);
or make this clear and unambiguous another way;
or change the PAR.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment 39:
Response to comment 39 is:
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace the first sentence of 99.1 (with appropriate change marks and change instruction
from the base text), to read:

"This clause specifies an optional MAC Merge sublayer for use on a point-to-point link with
a pair of MACs and a single PHY operating on a point-to-point link. The clause is
applicable to full-duplex operation with 10BASE-T1L (Clause 146) and 10BASE-T1S
(Clause 147) PHYs and all phys 100 Mb/s and above. It is also applicable to half-duplex
point-to-point operation with the 10BASE-T1S (Clause 147) PHY, but operation with the
10BASE-T1S PHY in multidrop mode is not specified."

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.6**   *P* **14**   *L* **27**   # 48

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Other*

The edited text is included in P802.3/D3.0 in response to Maintenance request #1344.
(Maintenance change approved during P802.3 WG ballot.)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete lines 27-34, optionally include an editor's note indicating changes included in
previous drafts were deleted as the changes were approved in P802.3 WG ballot and are
now included in P802.3/D3.0.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The text in 99.4.6 in the base standard does not include this change. Perhaps the
commenter was referring to the change in 99.1 to the note in Figure 99-1, which is included
in 802.3/D3.0 and is covered by other comments.

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **1**   *L* **29**   # 6

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *PAR scope*

In Section 7, "MAC Merge sublayer" appears 54 times and "MAC Merge function" does not
appear at all.

SuggestedRemedy

Follow the established terminology; change "MAC Merge function" to "MAC Merge
sublayer" in three places.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "MAC Merge function" to "MAC Merge sublayer" in the Abstract on page 3.

Leave it as "MAC Merge function" on pages 1 and 10, to align with the PAR Scope in 5.2b.

"MAC Merge function" is the terminology used in the PAR, and the purpose of the
amendment needs to match the PAR in the description of the amendment on page 1 and in
the frontmatter. This difference was discussed when the PAR was written, and the
"function" is what we specify - the "sublayer" is the mechanism we specify that function in.
For the text on page 1 and the description, "function" is correct, while the abstract defines
what specifications actually changed (not why it was changed) and therefore the change to
sublayer is appropriate there.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic* **PAR scope**   Page 14 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:15 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **FM**	*SC* **FM**	*P* **1**	*L* **30**	# 7

Dawe, Piers   Nvidia

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *PAR scope*

Here, MAC Merge and TSSI support PHYs while on page 10, PHYs support MAC Merge TSSI. It can't be both ways round. The floor supports the table, the table doesn't support the floor.

SuggestedRemedy

Preferably, use better words than "support". The text here could be:
"... MAC Merge function and the Time Synchronization Service Interface (TSSI) for use with/on/over 10 Mb/s Single-Pair Ethernet point to point PHYs".
Similarly in the abstract on page 3.
The description of 802.3de on page 10 could be:
"... PHYs compatible with the MAC Merge function and the Time Synchronization Service Interface (TSSI)."
Also: shouldn't the abstract and the description be very similar?

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The CRG disagrees with the commenter.
The purpose text is aligned with the scope of the PAR (5.2b). In the physical devices, the PHYs support the specification, which aligns with the PAR scope as well, and is clear.
Changing the description text in the frontmatter is unneeded for clarity would cause unnecessary churn in subsequent amendments already in process.

Cl **99**	*SC* **99.4.5**	*P* **14**	*L* **25**	# 34

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *PICS*

Two new requirements (shalls) are added (one in 99.4.5, one in 99.4.6), which need PICs

SuggestedRemedy

Add 99.5.3.1 Functional specifications PICS table to draft, inserting new PICS items, with editing instruction and inserts:
Insert new rows for PICS items MM11a and MM13a as shown (unchanged rows not shown):

"MM11a,
 Feature = Receive processing PLS_SIGNAL.indication, Section = 99.4.5, Value/Comment = If PLS_SIGNAL.indication is received, indication with the same SIGNAL_STATUS is sent to the pMAC.
Status = M
Support = Yes [ ]"
"MM13a,
 Feature = Express filter processing PLS_SIGNAL.indication, Section = 99.4.6,
Value/Comment = If PLS_SIGNAL.indication is received, indication with the same SIGNAL_STATUS is sent to the eMAC.
Status = M
Support = Yes [ ]"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic* **PICS**   Page 15 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:15 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **99** *SC* **99.4.5**   *P* **14**   *L* **25**   # **64**

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communications

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *PICS*

 New shall added, no PICS added / updated.
 The same in line 33 on page 14

SuggestedRemedy

 Per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Accomodated by comment #34
 Response to comment #34 is ACCEPT:
 (Add 99.5.3.1 Functional specifications PICS table to draft, inserting new PICS items, with
 editing instruction and inserts:
 Insert new rows for PICS items MM11a and MM13a as shown (unchanged rows not shown):

 "MM11a,
 Feature = Receive processing PLS_SIGNAL.indication, Section = 99.4.5, Value/Comment
 = If PLS_SIGNAL.indication is received, indication with the same SIGNAL_STATUS is sent
 to the pMAC.
 Status = M
 Support = Yes [ ]"
 "MM13a,
 Feature = Express filter processing PLS_SIGNAL.indication, Section = 99.4.6,
 Value/Comment = If PLS_SIGNAL.indication is received, indication with the same
 SIGNAL_STATUS is sent to the eMAC.
 Status = M
 Support = Yes [ ]")

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic*   **PICS**   Page 16 of 16
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/3/2022 8:38:15 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic