

Cl 00 SC 0 P 8 L # 55
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial-Layout
 There should not be any blank pages.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete pages 8, 13, 57, and 62 which are blank.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P 22 L 51 # 1
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Expression: "to exchange control".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Eg. "to exchange control data" or "to exchange control information".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.389 P 20 L 58 # 56
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editing instructions
 This section is out of order.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move this to the end of subclause 1.4 as these should be in order and 389 is the highest subclause number in 1.4.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P 23 L 32 # 57
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editing instructions
 1000BASE-T1 is in IEEE802.3-2018. 802.3ca did not add any 1000BASE PHYs. The editor's instructions are not correct.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete: (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P 23 L 37 # 58
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editing instructions
 2.5GBASE-T1 was added by ch, not ca.
 I have added other editor's instructions that refer to ca when it should be ch.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020)
 To: (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3ch-2020)
 Also on lines 41 and 46.
 Also on P25L3, P26L1, P26L11, P26L23, P27L31, P32L9, P44L14, P44L44, P44L51, P52L12, P52L20, P52L34, P54L3, P55L1, P55L40, P55L46, P55L50, P56L5,
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P 23 L 46 # 59
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editing instructions
 10GBASE-PR-U4 is in IEEE802.3-2018. 802.3ca did not add any 10GBASE PHYs. The editor's instructions are not correct.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete: (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 30 **SC 30.5.1.1.2** **P 23** **L 50** # **60**

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *Editing instructions*

40GBASE-T is in IEEE802.3-2018. 802.3ca did not add any 40GBASE PHYs. The editor's instructions are not correct.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete: (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020)

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 44 **SC 44.1.3** **P 25** **L 38** # **2**

Torres, Luisa KDPOF

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *Technical*

In Figure 44-1 the PHY sublayers of 10GBASE-AU do not mention "BASE-U" in PCS/PMA. This is not consistent with the other figures for 2.5/5/25/50 Gbps, nor with the recap of clause 166 (Figure 166-1 on p.65).

SuggestedRemedy
Replace "PCS" with "BASE-U PCS" and "PMA" with "BASE-U PMA" for consistency.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2** **P 40** **L 28** # **61**

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *Editing instructions*

Incorrect subclause number

SuggestedRemedy
This should be 45.5. All subclauses also need to be corrected to 45.5.x

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1** **P 40** **L 31** # **62**

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *Editing instructions*

Incorrect subclause number

SuggestedRemedy
Should be 45.5.3

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.2** **P 40** **L 38** # **63**

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *Editing instructions*

Incorrect subclause number - The correct subclause is in the editor's instructions, but ca didn't modify this subclause.

SuggestedRemedy
Should be 45.5.3.2.
Delete reference to ca as it doesn't include this subclause. I don't know if another ammendment includes this or not.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.3** **P 40** **L 50** # **64**

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *Editing instructions*

Incorrect subclause number
ca added M230, so cz should add MM231 and 232

SuggestedRemedy
Should be 45.5.3.3
P41L1 Change: Insert PICS items MM230 through MM231
To: Insert PICS items MM231 through MM231
Change: (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3ch-2020)
To: (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020)
Change MM230 to MM231 and MM231 to MM232.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.3 P41 L 8 # 18
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Typo: "only one of the mode of operation"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace: "...modes of operation".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.3 P41 L 10 # 3
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 Inside the table, a reference to register 135.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with register 1.72
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.6 P29 L 47 # 4
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editing instructions
 Typo in editorial indications. New subclause 45.2.1.23aa and Table 45-26aa are announced but not inserted.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Assuming typo: the new subclause and table are respetively 45.2.1.54a and 45-52a. Correct editorial indications.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.6 P41 L 20 # 65
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editing instructions
 Incorrect subclause number
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should be 45.5.3.6
 Delete reference to ca as it doesn't include this subclause. I don't know if another ammendment includes this or not.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.7 P41 L 20 # 66
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editing instructions
 Incorrect subclause number
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should be 45.5.3.7
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.134 P30 L 36 # 5
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editing instructions
 Conflicting numbering. Text on l.36 refers to subclause 45.2.1.134aa but heading is 45.2.1.134a.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct heading number to 45.2.1.134aa.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.134 P 30 L 46 # 6 [REDACTED]
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 "... and advertised by register 135." Register 135 seems an error.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with register 1.72
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.134 P 30 L 46 # 7 [REDACTED]
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Typo: "only one of the mode of operation".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace: "...modes of operation".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.134 P 30 L 47 # 8 [REDACTED]
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 "Register 135" seems a typo. Also in the table on p.41, I.11 (MM230).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with register 1.72
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.80a.1 P 32 L 50 # 9 [REDACTED]
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 Typo: TXO_REQ is not 3.2335.15
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct to register 3.2330 in the title, and in the text on lines 51-53 (another 3 occurrences).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.80a.5 P 34 L 3 # 10 [REDACTED]
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Typo: "Bits ... contains". Also "and registers ... contains".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace: "Bits... contain" and "registers ... contain".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.80a.5 P 34 L 7 # 11 [REDACTED]
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Clarification-Technical
 The "protocol number" format is not specified.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Complete the last sentence:
 "The protocol number and the content of TXO_DATA2 to TXO_DATA8 shall be vendor specific to the assignee of the OUI or CID"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.80b P 34 L 17 # 12 [REDACTED]
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Typo: "Registers ... contains".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace: "Registers ... contain".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.80b P 34 L 33 # 13
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Clarification-Technical
 RXO_DATA0 register is described as "message data type information". However, in transmission table, TXO_DATA0 entry is defined as message first 12 bits, and in clause 45.2.380a.5 registers TXO_DATA0 and TXO_DATA1 contain a 28-bit BASE-U OAM protocol iden
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace by "Receive BASE-U OAM message first 12 bits"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.80b.3 P 35 L 11 # 14
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Typo: "Bits ... contains".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace: "Bits... contain".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.80d.11 P 38 L 40 # 15
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Expression (use of "both" and "either").
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove "both", or change eg to: "indicates both that the remote PHY has BASE-U OAM capability and that the BASE-U OAM is enabled". Same in I.47.
 Also on I.42 and I.48, would prefer eg: "indicates either that the remote PHY does not have BASE-U OAM ability"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.80e.1 P 39 L 33 # 16
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 "Link margin is defined in 166.3.5.1 and ...", but in 166.3.5.2 "The link margin is defined ... with a quality specified in 166.3.5.1"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the reference to 166.3.5.2
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.80f.1 P 40 L 4 # 17
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 "Link margin is defined in 166.3.5.1 and ...", but in 166.3.5.2 "The link margin is defined ... with a quality specified in 166.3.5.1"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the reference to 166.3.5.2
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 105 SC 105.2 P 49 L 35 # 19
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Technical
 RS not marked in table for 25GBASE-AU
 SuggestedRemedy
 Mark as Mandatory the Clause 106 RS for 25GBASE-AU
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 105 SC 105.5 P 50 L 41 # 20
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 Inside the table, in the notes column "See ." without reference.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add missing reference 166.13.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 105 SC 105.7 P 51 L 6 # 21
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 "Clause 112, Clause 114, Clause 300 ..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to Clause 166.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 125 SC 125.1.4 P 55 L 14 # 22
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Typo-Technical
 Last but one column title says "2.5GBASE-U", seems incorrect.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with "2.5GBASE-AU".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 125 SC 125.1.4 P 55 L 25 # 23
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Technical
 RS not marked in table for 2.5GBASE-AU nor 5GBASE-AU
 SuggestedRemedy
 Mark as Mandatory the Clause 46 RS for 2.5GBASE-AU and 5GBASE-AU
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 125 SC 125.3 P 56 L 16 # 24
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 Inside the table, in the notes column "See ." without reference.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add missing reference 166.13.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 125 SC 125.3 P 56 L 24 # 25
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 Inside the table, in the notes column "See ." without reference.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add missing reference 166.13.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 131 SC 131.1.2 P 58 L 37 # 26
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial-Layout
 Confusing layout of the legend in Figure 131-1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Revise for readability (smaller character size?).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Due to the template update, the size of the font was increased and part of the legend is not readable.

Cl 131 SC 131.1.3 P 59 L 3 # 27
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Typo in editorial indications: "a new paragraphs".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with "a new paragraph".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 131 SC 131.2.24 P 60 L 25 # 28
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Technical
 RS not marked in table for 50GBASE-AU
 SuggestedRemedy
 Mark as Mandatory the Clause 132 RS for 50GBASE-AU
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 131 SC 131.4 P 61 L 18 # 29
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 Inside the table, in the notes column "See 300.12."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to Clause 166.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 131 SC Figure 131-1 P 58 L 37 # 67
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting/KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial-Layout
 List of expansions is not consistent with P802.3/D1.0. Font size appears larger, but where are the missing rows?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make list of expansions consistent
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. See comment #26

Cl 166 SC 166.1 P 69 L 23 # 68
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting/KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Technical
 PHY is not an expansion for Physical Layer.
 SuggestedRemedy
 "...50GBASE-AU Physical Layer entity (PHY)."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.1.3 P 65 L 11 # 30
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Technical
 Inconsistent tagging of XGMII as optional feature or not. It is marked Optional in Table 105-1 (p.49, 25G) and in the recap of clause 166 for all speeds (Figure 166-1 on p.65); also in Figure 125-1 (p.53) for 2.5/5 Gbps; but NOT in Figure 44-1 (p.25, 10G)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Try to keep consistency across sections, or at least between speed-specific Figures and the recap Figure 166-1.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This comment may be beyond the TF editing scope, as it is referring to 802.3 document consistency as a whole. Consider to generate a comment to the Maintenance TF.

Cl 166 SC 166.1.4 P 66 L 8 # 31
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Typo: "time division multiplexing these two".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with "time division multiplexing of these two".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.1.4 P 66 L 10 # 32
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Expression: unnecessarily confusing "repeatedly".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove "repeatedly" or clarify meaning.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.1.4 P 66 L 18 # 33
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 The text says: "Each encoded PHD sub-block is placed in the Transmit Block after a group of payload blocks." However, payload blocks have not been defined at this point.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "payload blocks" by "65-bit blocks containing payload"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.1 P 68 L 34 # 34
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 "Table 166-2A (see 166.2.2.1.2)". Table is 166-2, and it is defined in section 166.2.2.1.1. Section 166.2.2.1.2 describes PHD all data path stages.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete "A" in "Table 166-2A" and substitute "168.2.2.1.2" by "168.2.2.1.1".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.1 P 68 L 41 # 35
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Typo-Technical
 "The 5140-bit RS-FEC ...", but $80 \times 65 + 20 = 5220$. In 166.2.2.4 "RS-FEC encoder takes the 5220-bit message ..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 5140 with 5220.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.1 P 68 L 43 # 36
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Typo-Technical
 Error in RS-FEC length, should be 5220 bits not 5140 bits. Also on I.47. But OK in the detailed description of next pages.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 5140 with 5220.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.1 P 68 L 47 # 37
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Typo-Technical
 RS-FEC message is 5220 bits long.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 5140 with 5220.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.1 P 68 L 48 # 38
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Typo-Technical
 RS-FEC message is 5220 bits long.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 5140 with 5220.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.2.1.1 P 69 L 25 # 39
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Clarification-Technical
 Field PHD.TX.NEXT.MODE is not explained, contains a "TBD" reference and is only generically mentioned on p.71 l.12-13, with no clear meaning.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add editor note and link the specification to the approval of test modes baseline.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.2.1.1 P 70 L 12 # 40
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Bad reference
 Wrong register number for PCS Status 3.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 3.525.7:0 with 3.2351.7:0
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.2.1.4 P 72 L 38 # 41
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 The sentence "Each of the 240 information bits..." the word "each" should be replaced by "each one".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace by "Each one of the 240 information bits..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.2.3 P 73 L 14 # 42
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Wrong syntax in sentence: "The RS-FEC message is 5220 length"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace by "The RS-FEC message is 5220 long"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.2.5 P 75 L 27 # 43
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Clarification-Technical
 "value of 0x0FB9659 at the ..., where the leftmost digit corresponds to the initial value of the register element r[0]". r[0:3]=0 r[4:7]=F r[8:11]=B r[12:15]=9 ... or r[0:3]=7 r[4:7]=D r[8:11]=C r[12:15]=B ... or r[3:0]=9 r[7:4]=5 r[11:8]=6 r[15:12]=9 ...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following sentence after "where the leftmost digit corresponds to the initial value of the register element r[0].": "Therefore, the rightmost bit of the rightmost digit corresponds to the initial value of register element r[24] "
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.3 P 76 L 35 # 44
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Typo-Technical
 In Figure 166-10, last section, the payload blocks size is wrong.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "80 64-bit blocks" with "80 65-bit blocks".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.5.5.5 P 81 L 29 # 45
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Clarification-Technical
 In text: "A LBLOCK_T containing two local fault ordered set is transmitted when the PCS transmit process is in training mode" It would be better to say "Continuous LBLOCK_T" or "Consecutive LBLOCK_T" instead of "A LBLOCK_T".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "A LBLOCK_T ... is transmitted" by "Continuous L_BLOCK_T ... are transmitted"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.6.1.2 P 83 L 4 # 46
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 T_TYPE_NEXT is not used in the Figure 166-13
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the description
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.7 P 83 L 38 # 47
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Typos: "The 36 20-bit encoded PHD sub-block that are in a Transmission Block, are TRC...".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with: "The 36 20-bit encoded PHD sub-blocks that are in a Transmission Block are TRC...".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.7.1 P 83 L 44 # 48
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Typo-Technical
 Wrong number in "195839 Transmit Block bits".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 195839 by 195840.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.2.7.2 P 83 L 52 # 49
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Confusing expression: "by marking the affected 65-bit blocks with the flag /E/". In previous text the only reference to "/E/" is the error character/code.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add reference to the R_BLOCK_TYPE, eg: "by setting the R_BLOCK_TYPE of the affected 65-bit blocks equal to /E/".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 SC 166.3.3.2 P 89 L 41 # 50
 Torres, Luisma KDPOF
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Grammar and syntax
 Typo, missing word: "due optical signal conversion".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with "due to optical signal conversion".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 166 **SC 166.3.4.1** **P 91** **L 54** # **51**

Torres, Luisma KDPOF

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** *Grammar and syntax*

In text: "...64B/65B PCS encoder encodes predefined data to be used for the link partner alignment", "local fault sequence ordered sets" instead of "predefined data" can be written.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace "predefined data" by "local fault sequence ordered sets"

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

Cl 166 **SC 166.3.4.4** **P 95** **L 3** # **52**

Torres, Luisma KDPOF

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** *Grammar and syntax*

Typo: "that waits for the local receiver reliability is recovered".

SuggestedRemedy
Replace with "that waits for the local receiver reliability to be recovered".

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

Cl 166 **SC 166.3.5.2** **P 96** **L 45** # **53**

Torres, Luisma KDPOF

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** *Grammar and syntax*

Expression: "the ratio of corrected symbols per CW carried out by the RS-FEC decoder".

SuggestedRemedy
Replace with: "the ratio of symbols corrected by the RS-FEC decoder per CW".

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

Cl 166 **SC 166.6.1.3.1** **P 101** **L 36** # **54**

Torres, Luisma KDPOF

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** *Grammar and syntax*

Expression is slightly confusing: "A signal_detect=OK ... link_status=FAIL."

SuggestedRemedy
Revise this note. Suggested: "A signal_detect=OK indication with average optical power enough to allow the PHY partners to start establishing the link but not to meet the RFER target (see 166.3.5.1) results into the PHY indicating link_status=FAIL."

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