There should not be any blank pages.

Delete pages 8, 13, 57, and 62 which are blank.

There is an expression: "to exchange control".

Eg. "to exchange control data" or "to exchange control information".

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.

This section is out of order.

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.

10GBASE-PR-U4 is in IEEE802.3-2018. 802.3ca did not add any 10GBASE PHYs. The editor's instructions are not correct.

1000BASE-T1 is in IEEE802.3-2018. 802.3ca did not add any 1000BASE PHYs. The editor's instructions are not correct.

10GBASE-PR-U4 is in IEEE802.3-2018. 802.3ca did not add any 10GBASE PHYs. The editor's instructions are not correct.
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Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  Editing instructions

Cl 30  SC 30.5.1.1.2  P 23  L 50  # 80
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 45  SC 45.2.1  P 40  L 31  # 52
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  # 53
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 amendment 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 28  # 51
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

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  # 34
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

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Typo: &quot;only one of the mode of operation&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Inside the table, a reference to register 135.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Typo in editorial indications. New subclause 45.2.1.134aa and Table 45-26aa are announced but not inserted.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**COMMENT STATUS:** D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected  
**RESPONSE STATUS:** O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn  
**SORT ORDER:** Clause, Subclause, page, line  

**Comment Status:** D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected  
**Response Status:** O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn  
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### Comment Report

#### IEEE P802.3cz D1.1 Multi-Gig Automotive Optical Ethernet PHY 2nd Task Force review comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.134</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bad reference</td>
<td>Replace with register 1.72</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Grammar and syntax</td>
<td>Replace: &quot;...modes of operation&quot;.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bad reference</td>
<td>Replace with register 1.72</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Grammar and syntax</td>
<td>Replace: &quot;...only one of the mode of operation&quot;.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Grammar and syntax</td>
<td>Complete the last sentence: &quot;The protocol number and the content of TXO_DATA2 to TXO_DATA8 shall be vendor specific to the assignee of the OUI or CID&quot;</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Grammar and syntax</td>
<td>Replace: &quot;...contains&quot;.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Grammar and syntax</td>
<td>Correct to register 3.2330 in the title, and in the text on lines 51-53 (another 3 occurrences).</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**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  Z/withdrawn  
**Sort Order:** Clause, Subclause, page, line  
**Date:** 07/06/2021  17:02:25
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

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace by "Receive BASE-U OAM message first 12 bits"

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status** W

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

---

Typo: "Bits … contains".

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace: "Bits… contain".

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status** W

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

---

Expression (use of "both" and "either").

**Suggested Remedy**

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.**
IEEE P802.3cz D1.1 Multi-Gig Automotive Optical Ethernet PHY 2nd Task Force review comments

D 1.1 Comment Report

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.

Suggested Remedy
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 ..."

Suggested Remedy
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.

Suggested Remedy
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

Suggested Remedy
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.

Suggested Remedy
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.

Suggested Remedy
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.

Suggested Remedy
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
Type in editorial indications: "a new paragraphs".

Suggested Remedy
Replace with "a new paragraph".

Proposed Response
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>131.2.24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS not marked in table for 50GBASE-AU</td>
<td>Mark as Mandatory the Clause 132 RS for 50GBASE-AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>131.4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Inside the table, in the notes column &quot;See 300.12.&quot;</td>
<td>Change to Clause 166.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.1.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT. Try to keep consistency across sections, or at least between speed-specific Figures and the recap Figure 166-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.1.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Typo: &quot;time division multiplexing these two&quot;.</td>
<td>Replace with &quot;time division multiplexing of these two&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment 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  Z/withdrawn

**Sort Order:** Clause, Subclause, page, line

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

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

**Sort Order:** Clause, Subclause, page, line
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.

Suggested Remedy
Replace "payload blocks" by "65-bit blocks containing payload"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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.

Suggested Remedy
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.

The 5140-bit RS-FEC message is 5220 bits long. In 166.2.2.4 "RS-FEC encoder takes the 5220-bit message ..."

Suggested Remedy
Replace 5140 with 5220.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment Status Reason</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.2.1.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Field PHD.TX.NEXT.MODE is not explained, contains a &quot;TBD&quot; reference and is only generically mentioned on p.71 l.12-13, with no clear meaning.</td>
<td>Add editor note and link the specification to the approval of test modes baseline.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.2.1.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Wrong register number for PCS Status 3.</td>
<td>Replace 3.525.7:0 with 3.2351.7:0</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.2.1.4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>The sentence &quot;Each of the 240 information bits...&quot; the word &quot;each&quot; should be replaced by &quot;each one&quot;.</td>
<td>Replace by &quot;Each one of the 240 information bits...&quot;</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.2.3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>“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 … 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 …</td>
<td>Add the following sentence after &quot;where the leftmost digit corresponds to the initial value of the register element r[0]&quot;: &quot;Therefore, the rightmost bit of the rightmost digit corresponds to the initial value of register element r[24]&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.2.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>In Figure 166-10, last section, the payload blocks size is wrong.</td>
<td>Replace &quot;80 64-bit blocks&quot; with &quot;80 65-bit blocks&quot;.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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  Z/withdrawn

**SORT ORDER:** Clause, Subclause, page, line

**Page 9 of 11**

07/06/2021  17:02:25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.5.5.5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Continuous L_BLOCK_T instead of &quot;A LBLOCK_T&quot;.</td>
<td>Replace &quot;A LBLOCK_T … is transmitted&quot; by &quot;Continuous L_BLOCK_T … are transmitted&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.6.1.2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T_TYPE_NEXT is not used in the Figure 166-13</td>
<td>Remove the description</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Typo: &quot;The 36 20-bit encoded PHD sub-block that are in a Transmission Block, are TRC...&quot;.</td>
<td>Replace with: &quot;The 36 20-bit encoded PHD sub-blocks that are in a Transmission Block are TRC...&quot;.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.3.3.2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Typo: &quot;due optical signal conversion&quot;.</td>
<td>Replace with &quot;due optical signal conversion&quot;.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Status:** D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected  
**Response Status:** O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 166 SC 166.3.4.1</th>
<th>P 91 L 54</th>
<th># 51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torres, Luisma</td>
<td>KDPOF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar and syntax</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In text: &quot;...64B/65B PCS encoder encodes predefined data to be used for the link partner alignment&quot;, &quot;local fault sequence ordered sets&quot; instead of &quot;predefined data&quot; can be written.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace <em>predefined data</em> by <em>local fault sequence ordered sets</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 166 SC 166.3.4.4</th>
<th>P 95 L 3</th>
<th># 52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torres, Luisma</td>
<td>KDPOF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar and syntax</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typo: &quot;that waits for the local receiver reliability is recovered&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace with &quot;that waits for the local receiver reliability to be recovered&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 166 SC 166.3.5.2</th>
<th>P 96 L 45</th>
<th># 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torres, Luisma</td>
<td>KDPOF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar and syntax</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression: &quot;the ratio of corrected symbols per CW carried out by the RS-FEC decoder&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace with: &quot;the ratio of symbols corrected by the RS-FEC decoder per CW&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>