IEEE P802.3cz D1.0 Multi-Gig Automotive Optical Ethernet PHY 1st Task Force review comments

Pérez-Aranda, Rubén

Comment ID 44

Cl 44 SC 441.4.4 P26 L39 # 6

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Proposed Response

Replace 10GBASE-AU PCS & PMA with 10GBASE-AU PCS/PMA/PMD

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Pérez-Aranda, Rubén

Comment ID 131

Cl 131 SC 1312.3 P67 L50 # 36

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This subclause is not and does not require to be amended. In the Fig 44-1, 105-1, 125-1 and 131-1, FEC sublayer is not included.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove it.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Pérez-Aranda, Rubén

Comment ID 300

Cl 300 SC 300 P71 L9 # 37

Comment Type E Comment Status D

PMD is a sublayer. They are several types (plural)

SuggestedRemedy

Amend title as: Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS), Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer, and Physical Medium Dependent (PMD) sublayer, types 2.5GBASE-AU, 5GBASE-AU, 10GBASE-AU, 25GBASE-AU, and 50GBASE-AU

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Pérez-Aranda, Rubén

Comment ID 125

Cl 125 SC 1251.4 P64 L23 # 29

Comment Type T Comment Status D

For implementation of 2.5GBASE-AU is not mandatory 2.5GBASE-T1. For implementation of 5GBASE-AU is not mandatory 5GBASE-T1. The only thing in common is the re-use of C/55 64B/65B encoding. Also in line 29

SuggestedRemedy

Remove M of rows 2.5GBASE-T1 and 5GBASE-T1, the the columns 2.5GBASE-AU and 5GBASE-AU respectively.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Pérez-Aranda, Rubén

Comment ID 300

Cl 300 SC 3001.1 P71 L43 # 41

Comment Type E Comment Status D

They are five PHYs

SuggestedRemedy

Replace four with five.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Pérez-Aranda, Rubén

PMD is connected to PCS. Terms PMD and PCS exchanged in the PHY of the right side.
Also in line 49

Suggested Remedy
Per comment.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

Pérez-Aranda, Rubén

"PMA functionality is described …". I believe the standard document provides a set of
specifications, but not descriptions. The PMA functionality is specified. Similar wording is
used in several places.

Suggested Remedy
To check all the text to replace describing wording with specifying wording, where
appropriate.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

Pérez-Aranda, Rubén

According to the Figure 300-7 PCS transmit function, this clause should be “Payload data
path”. There is lack of consistency.

Suggested Remedy
Do it consistent, changing block diagram, text or both.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The text will be changed to match the Figure 300-7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SC 030.x.y</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.2.3.6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.2.4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.3.4.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.3.4.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pérez-Aranda, Rubén
Comment Type: T | Comment Status: D | Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Proposed Response**

- Replace with: "The initial value of r[0] is xor-ed with the first bit from the RS-FEC encoder to generate ...."

- **Suggested Remedy**
  - so that the remote PHY can perform clock recovery and train its equalizers (tx_enable <= TRUE).

- **Suggested Remedy**
  - "so that the remote PHY can perform Transmit Block synchronization, clock recovery and train its equalizers (tx_enable <= TRUE)."

- **Proposed REMEDY**
  - Remove. It is implementation decision the algorithms to use.

- **Proposed REMEDY**
  - whether this reception is reliable

- **Proposed REMEDY**
  - whether the 65B blocks reception is reliable.
### IEEE P802.3cz D1.0 Multi-Gig Automotive Optical Ethernet PHY 1st Task Force review comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.3.4.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>“or disable the reception of headers” seems to be related with en_rcvrhdr of Figure 300-17. en_rcvrhdr variable is not defined and it is not assigned by any other state diagram or register. It is not consistent with baseline.</td>
<td>Remove text and variable in the state diagram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.3.4.5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>“on entry” has no meaning.</td>
<td>Remove it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.6.1.1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>“analog signal amplitude”. In reality symbols with value {-1} and {+1}.</td>
<td>Correct per comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Comment ID**: 112
- **Comment Type**: T
- **Comment Status**: D
- **Commentor**: Pérez-Aranda, Rubén
- **KDPOF**: ERP/A现实生活

- **Proposed Response**: Remove text and variable in the state diagram.
- **Response Status**: W

- **Comment ID**: 113
- **Comment Type**: E
- **Comment Status**: D
- **Commentor**: Pérez-Aranda, Rubén
- **KDPOF**: ERP/A现实生活

- **Proposed Response**: Remove it.
- **Response Status**: W

- **Comment ID**: 122
- **Comment Type**: T
- **Comment Status**: D
- **Commentor**: Pérez-Aranda, Rubén
- **KDPOF**: ERP/A现实生活

- **Proposed Response**: Correct per comment.
- **Response Status**: W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>300,12</td>
<td>300,12</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Table 300-5. The delay is the same for all the data-rates: 11264 bit times, 22 pause quanta. Delay in ns is result of multiplying the number of bit-time by the bit transmission period (i.e. bit time).</td>
<td>Correct table per comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>300,12</td>
<td>300,12</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>General: figures should be placed close to the clauses where they are referred to facilitate reading the draft.</td>
<td>Correct table per comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Comment ID**: 125
- **Comment Type**: E
- **Comment Status**: D
- **Commentor**: Pérez-Aranda, Rubén
- **KDPOF**: ERP/A现实生活

- **Proposed Response**: General: figures should be placed close to the clauses where they are referred to facilitate reading the draft.
- **Response Status**: W

---

**Sorting Order**: Comment ID

**Comment Status**: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected

**Response Status**: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn

**Comment ID**: 125

**Page**: 4 of 15

**Date and Time**: 05/03/2021 22:40:45
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>L30</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>CI FM</td>
<td>SC FM</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>L12</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>CI FM</td>
<td>SC FM</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>CI FM</td>
<td>SC FM</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment 131**

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** D  
**SuggestedRemedy:**  
- Change IEEE 802.cz Multi-Gig Automotive Optical Ethernet PHY Task Force to IEEE P802.3cz Multi-Gigabit Optical Automotive Ethernet Task Force. Also correct on page 8 lines 13 and 14.

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

**Comment 132**

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** D  
**SuggestedRemedy:**  
- Replace with "Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for Multi-Gigabit Optical Automotive Ethernet" here; p. 10, l. 4; and p. 18, l. 17.

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

**Comment 133**

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** D  
**SuggestedRemedy:**  
- Multiple problems: 1) typo "IEE"; 2) different grammar than on published standards ("of" instead of "to"); 3) as is indicates we are likely to be first amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-20xx his does not agree with front matter introduction (nor current timelines).

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

**Comment 134**

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** D  
**SuggestedRemedy:**  
- Obsolete note. While the Roman and Arabic numbering convention described in this note was once the style, it is no longer the style (see 2020 IEEE Standards Style Manual 11.1).

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

**Comment 135**

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** D  
**SuggestedRemedy:**  
- Add to Keywords.

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

**Comment 136**

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** D  
**SuggestedRemedy:**  
- (Amendment to IEEE Std 802.3TM-20xx as amended by [list to be populated during publication process]). Request update of draft templates ("of" instead or "to").

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status:** W
The TBD here and above on line 17 are perhaps misleading as this list does not affect technical completeness of the draft, and the list will be determined by the voter list generated after the WG meeting at which WG ballot is approved.

Suggested Remedy
- Delete TBD at line 4, consier replacing the TBD at line 17 with an Editor's Note that the list should be added after initial WG ballot.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Old WG officer list

Suggested Remedy
- Delete line for Pete and *, Phase 2 from Jon's line.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

As the editor's note implies actual amendment order and which amendments will be included in the next revision won't be very clear until early 2022. Mr. Law in early February proposed amendment numbers up to Amendment 17. P802.3cs (proposed Amendment 15) will very likely be an amendment to 802.3-2018. P802.3ck (proposed Amendment 16) is also expected to begin WG ballot in March (but with a longer timeline). P802.3cw (proposed Amendment 17), P802.3cx, and P802.3 db (no draft yet) all have timelines projecting completion about the same time as P802.3ck. So we could be anywhere from Amendment 1 to Amendment 6 based on February data. With this uncertainty, we probably should not assume amendment numbers because it might lead others to assume they have been assigned.

Suggested Remedy
- Either leave number blank on all amendments listed until they are assigned by WG leadership. Or only include the descriptions.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
The current P802.3ck draft has a self description.

Suggested Remedy

The current P802.3ck/D1.4 description is: This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and adds Clause 161 through Clause 163, Annex 120F, Annex 120G, and Annex 162A through Annex 162D. This amendment includes Physical Layer specifications and management parameters for 100 Gb/s, 200 Gb/s, and 400 Gb/s electrical interfaces based on 100 Gb/s signaling.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

The current P802.3cx draft has a self description.

Suggested Remedy

The P802.3cx/D0.99 description is: This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and adds Clause 155 and Clause 156. This amendment adds 400 Gb/s Physical Layer specifications and management parameters for operation over DWDM systems with reaches of at least 80 km.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

The current draft does not have a self description.

Suggested Remedy

Instead of a generic description indicate "P802.3cx/0.4 does not include a self description."

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
The word "publication" is generally reserved for IEEE publication after approval. We will need to update numbering for our balloting. The latest timelines have us able to do this for WG ballot. A revision draft should be available 2 months prior to our projected WG ballot, but it probably won't include multiple amendments to 802.3-2018 in the initial revision draft (waiting for SASB approval before merging amendments into the revision).

Suggested Remedy
Change note to: "Subclause, Table and Figure numbers will change in the next revision of IEEE Std 802.3. It is expected that P802.3cz numbering will be updated for WG ballot based on a future 802.3 revision draft." Similarly update other Editor's Notes that talk about draft publication.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

"temporal"?

"Optical fiber" in the aMAUType definitions should be updated to reflect TBD specifications.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Tracking base text is difficult, and some reviewers will be checking for accuracy of base text. I’ve found it helpful to note the source of base text on change instructions (and sometimes on insert instructions). Because we will be citing revision drafts when available, we might even do this for now identifying IEEE Std 802.3-2018 base text or, for example "IEEE Std 802.3ch-2020" or "as last modified by P802.3ox/Dy.z" as we will want to indicate the source revision draft e.g., "P802.3/Dy.z" when we have one.

Suggested Remedy
For example, this one would read: Change the first paragraph of 44.1.1 (IEEE Std 802.3ch-2020) as follows:

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
The reserved rows probably won’t look like this in the revision. Most of the reserved values are defined by other amendments in progress. More importantly, the value (1011110) used here for AU types is also defined by P802.3ck/D1.4.

With the combined change and insert instruction, I think we should underline the inserted rows.

The instruction does not agree with the table that only adds rows through 1.525, not 1.541. Also, we are trying to use “through” instead of “to” to remove the ambiguity of the second value being included in a range.

"25 BASE-AU" is missing the “G".

*new rows for registers 1.523 through 1.526
Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  EZ

Proposed Response

Grow, Robert  RMG Consulting, KDPOF

50GBASE-AU is included in specifications, sometimes with assumptions about what will be adopted. All 50GBASE-AU specifications are TBD until baseline proposals are adopted by the TF.

Comment Status: D  Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  EZ

Proposed Response

Grow, Robert  RMG Consulting, KDPOF

Replace "and" with "or". Also on line 37.

Comment Status: D  Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  EZ

Proposed Response

Grow, Robert  RMG Consulting, KDPOF

Oops, five PHY types are listed.

Comment Status: D  Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  EZ

Proposed Response

Grow, Robert  RMG Consulting, KDPOF

Delete "also included in the Transmit Block", it is redundant with the next sentence.

Comment Status: D  Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  EZ

Proposed Response

Grow, Robert  RMG Consulting, KDPOF

Start sentence with "A".

Comment Status: D  Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.1.4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting, KDPOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong>: E</td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong>: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong>: Bad hot link references.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Suggested Remedy**
  - PMA is 300.3, PMD is 300.6.

- **Proposed Response**: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.2.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting, KDPOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong>: E</td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong>: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong>: Typo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Suggested Remedy**
  - XMLI -> XGMII (unless we decide to use xMII instead of a list).

- **Proposed Response**: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.2.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting, KDPOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong>: E</td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong>: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong>: Fewer words often is better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Suggested Remedy**
  - Delete "by".

- **Proposed Response**: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.2.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting, KDPOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong>: E</td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong>: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Suggested Remedy**: Awkward language: "and they conform". One incorrect interpretation (as I understand things) is: "...information bits. The 220 parity bits form an RS-FEC Codeword (CW)."

- **Suggested Remedy**
  - "The 80 PDBs, PHD block, and 220 parity bits form an RS-FEC Codeword (CW)."

- **Proposed Response**: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.2.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting, KDPOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong>: E</td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong>: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong>: This paragraph mixes two topics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Suggested Remedy**
  - Include the first sentence in the previous paragraph.

- **Proposed Response**: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.2.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting, KDPOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong>: E</td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong>: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong>: We (myself included) have a tendency to create too many proper names (capitalization). Try to avoid this tendency. Is is really necessary to capitalize PCS Transmit when it is typically followed by either &quot;function&quot; or &quot;process&quot; (without capitalization).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Suggested Remedy**
  - Transmit -> transmit, Receive -> receive in next sentence. A search will show that capitalization is not consistent throughout the draft.

- **Proposed Response**: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.2.1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting, KDPOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong>: E</td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong>: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong>: The labeling on PDUs highlights a problem we created decades ago with keeping the name 8B/10B. IEEE style should have had us changing the name from the inventor 8B/10B to 8b/10b. (Capital B is byte and lower case b is bit.) We have consistently used a capital B in code names since, but hopefully do not use a capital B for bit anywhere else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Suggested Remedy**
  - Change 65B to 65-bit (like is done for 20-bit).

- **Proposed Response**: PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>300.13</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Grow, Robert RMG Consulting, KDPOF</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.3.50.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Hayashi, Takehiro HAT Lab., Inc.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Hayashi, Takehiro HAT Lab., Inc.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.3.56a.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Hayashi, Takehiro HAT Lab., Inc.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.3.56a.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Hayashi, Takehiro HAT Lab., Inc.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type: E Comment Status: D

Suggested Remedy:

- Insert page break before PICS.
- Chose correct one either of 1.7.6:0 or 1.7.5:0.
- Bit 3.500.12 ... when it accepts ... (simultaneously setting bit 3.500.15 to zero), acting as a one bit sequence number.
- Bit 3.500.12 ... when it accepts ..., acting as a one bit sequence number, simultaneously bit 3.500.15 shall be set to zero.
- Chose correct one either of 1.7.6:0 or 1.7.5:0.
- Add the table reference of "bit 3.524.1"
- Add the table reference of "bit 3.524.0"
Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.5b P 36 L 12 # 225
Hayashi, Takehiro  HAT Lab., Inc.
Comment Type E  Comment Status D  EZ
Comparing to other names in the table, "local" may be added.

SuggestedRemedy
BASE-H OAM ability ® local BASE-H OAM ability

Proposed Response  Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.5b P 36 L 14 # 226
Hayashi, Takehiro  HAT Lab., Inc.
Comment Type E  Comment Status D  EZ
Comparing to other names in the table, "local" may be added.

SuggestedRemedy
EEE ability ® local EEE ability

Proposed Response  Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.5b P 36 L 17 # 227
Hayashi, Takehiro  HAT Lab., Inc.
Comment Type E  Comment Status D  EZ
"LH = Latching high" is not used in the table.

SuggestedRemedy
delete it from the foot note.

Proposed Response  Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Comment ID: 246

Table 45-226b is a wrong reference.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Response Status: W

Comment ID: 247

"1" is just a number, an article is not used.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Response Status: W

Comment ID: 248

"0" is just a number, an article is not used.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Response Status: W

Comment ID: 249

"1" is just a number, an article is not used.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Response Status: W

Comment ID: 250

"0" is just a number, an article is not used.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Response Status: W

Comment ID: 297

2.5GBASE-AU "M" for 2.5GBASE-T1 is wrong

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Response Status: W

Comment ID: 298

5GBASE-AU "M" for 5GBASE-T1 is wrong

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Response Status: W

Comment ID: 305

position of PCS TX/RX and PMD TX/RX in the right side is wrong.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Response Status: W
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Hayashi, Takehiro</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>add the reference of &quot;PHD reception monitor state diagram&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Hayashi, Takehiro</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>use the same the reference</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Swanson, Steve</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Rationale: there are 5 distinct PHY types.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Swanson, Steve</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>Delete &quot;...concrete...&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>