<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>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.134</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bad reference</td>
<td>Replace with register 1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.134</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bad reference</td>
<td>Replace with register 1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.3.80a.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bad reference</td>
<td>Replace with register 1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.3.80e.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bad reference</td>
<td>Change the reference to 166.3.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bad reference</td>
<td>Add missing reference 166.13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bad reference</td>
<td>Change to Clause 166.</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Comment Status: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn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: Topic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Add missing reference 166.13.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Change to Clause 166.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Delete &quot;A&quot; in &quot;Table 166-2A&quot; and substitute &quot;168.2.2.1.2&quot; by &quot;168.2.2.1.1&quot;.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Changes:**
- Add missing reference 166.13.
- Change to Clause 166.
- Delete "A" in "Table 166-2A" and substitute "168.2.2.1.2" by "168.2.2.1.1".

**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.
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.

Suggested Remedy
Add editor note and link the specification to the approval of test modes baseline.

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  Clarification-Technical


Suggested Remedy
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.

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".

Suggested Remedy
Replace "A LBLOCK_T ... is transmitted" by "Continuous L_BLOCK_T ... are transmitted"

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
IEEE 802.cz Multi-Gig Aut  IEEE P802.3cz D1.1 Multi-Gig Automotive Optical Ethernet PHY 2nd Task Force review comments  D 1.1 Comment Report

**Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2**  **P 23  L 46  # 69**

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 45 SC 45.2.1.134**  **P 30  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**  **P 40  L 28  # 51**

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**

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 45.2.1.13**  **P 29  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 respectively 45.2.1.54a and 45-52a.

**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  # 53**

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.2</td>
<td>Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrect subclause number - The correct subclause is in the editor's instructions, but ca didn't modify this subclause.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should be 45.5.3.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delete reference to ca as it doesn't include this subclause. I don't know if another amendment includes this or not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.3</td>
<td>Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrect subclause number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca added M230, so cz should add MM231 and 232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should be 45.5.3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P41L1 Change: Insert PICS items MM230 through MM231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To: Insert PICS items MM231 through MM231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change: (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3ch-2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To: (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change MM230 to MM231 and MM231 to MM232.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.7</td>
<td>Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrect subclause number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should be 45.5.3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be changed when updating the editing instructions to refer to the new 802.3 draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Expression: "to exchange control".

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

Proposed Response
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Typo: "only one of the mode of operation".

Suggested Remedy
Replace: "...modes of operation".

Proposed Response
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Typo: "Bits … contain". Also "and registers … contain".

Suggested Remedy
Replace: "Bits… contain".

Proposed Response
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Typo: "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 l.47.
Also on l.42 and l.48, would prefer eg: "indicates either that the remote PHY does not have BASE-U OAM ability"

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>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Typo: &quot;only one of the mode of operation&quot;</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>131.1.3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Typo in editorial indications: &quot;a new paragraphs&quot;</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.1.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Typo: &quot;time division multiplexing these two&quot;</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.1.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Expression: unnecessarily confusing &quot;repeatedly&quot;</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.1.4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>The text says: &quot;Each encoded PHD sub-block is placed in the Transmit Block after a group of payload blocks.&quot; However, payload blocks have not been defined at this point.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.2.1.4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Wrong syntax in sentence: &quot;The RS-FEC message is 5220 length&quot;</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.6.1.2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T_TYPE_NEXT is not used in the Figure 166-13</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE:** TR/technical required, ER/editorial required, GR/general required

**COMMENT STATUS:** D/dispatched, A/accepted, R/rejected

**RESPONSE STATUS:** O/open, W/written, C/closed, Z/withdrawn

**SORT ORDER:** Topic

**Page 7 of 10**

**07/06/2021  17:03:05**
Typos: "The 36 20-bit encoded PHD sub-block that are in a Transmission Block, are TRC...".

Suggested Remedy
Replace with: "The 36 20-bit encoded PHD sub-blocks that are in a Transmission Block are TRC...".

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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.

Suggested Remedy
Add reference to the R_BLOCK_TYPE, eg: "by setting the R_BLOCK_TYPE of the affected 65-bit blocks equal to /E/".

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: D
Grammar and syntax

Typo, missing word: "due optical signal conversion".

Suggested Remedy
Replace with "due to optical signal conversion".

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: D
Grammar and syntax

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

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI 166</td>
<td>SC 166.6.1.3.1</td>
<td>P 101</td>
<td>L 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres, Luisma</td>
<td>KDPOF</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 ACCEPT. | |
| CI 44 | SC 44.1.3 | P 25 | L 38 | 
| Torres, Luisma | KDPOF | 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 ACCEPT. | |
| CI 105 | SC 105.2 | P 49 | L 35 | 
| Torres, Luisma | KDPOF | 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 ACCEPT. | |
| CI 166 | SC 166.1.3 | P 65 | L 11 | 
| Torres, Luisma | KDPOF | 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 | 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. | W | Response Status |

**Proposed Response for CI 125:**

| CI 125 | SC 125.1.4 | P 55 | L 25 | 
| Torres, Luisma | KDPOF | 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 | PROPOSED ACCEPT. | W | Response Status |

**Proposed Response for CI 131:**

| CI 131 | SC 131.2.24 | P 60 | L 25 | 
| Torres, Luisma | KDPOF | 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 | PROPOSED ACCEPT. | W | Response Status |
IEEE 802.3cz D1.1 Multi-Gig Automotive Optical Ethernet PHY 2nd Task Force review comments

**IEEE P802.3cz D1.1 Comment Report**

<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>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>125.1.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166.2.7.1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
<td>Typo-Technical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type: T - Technical, E - Editorial, G - General**

**Comment Status: D - Dispatched, A - Accepted, R - Rejected**

**Response Status: W - Written, O - Open, C - Closed, Z - Withdrawn**

**Comment Details:**

1. **Cl 166 SC 166.1 P 69 L 23 # 68**
   - **Comment:** PHY is not an expansion for Physical Layer.
   - **Suggested Remedy:** "...50GBASE-AU Physical Layer entity (PHY)."
   - **Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

2. **Cl 166 SC 166.2.1 P 68 L 47 # 57**
   - **Comment:** RS-FEC message is 5220 bits long.
   - **Suggested Remedy:** Replace 5140 with 5220.
   - **Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

3. **Cl 125 SC 125.1.4 P 55 L 14 # 22**
   - **Comment:** Last but one column title says "2.5GBASE-U", seems incorrect.
   - **Suggested Remedy:** Replace with "2.5GBASE-AU".
   - **Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

4. **Cl 166 SC 166.2.1 P 68 L 48 # 38**
   - **Comment:** RS-FEC message is 5220 bits long.
   - **Suggested Remedy:** Replace 5140 with 5220.
   - **Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

5. **Cl 166 SC 166.2.1 P 68 L 41 # 55**
   - **Comment:** Error in RS-FEC length, should be 5220 bits not 5140 bits. Also on l.47. But OK in the detailed description of next pages.
   - **Suggested Remedy:** Replace 5140 with 5220.
   - **Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

6. **Cl 166 SC 166.2.3 P 76 L 35 # 44**
   - **Comment:** Wrong number in "195839 Transmit Block bits".
   - **Suggested Remedy:** Replace 195839 by 195840.
   - **Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

7. **Cl 166 SC 166.2.7.1 P 83 L 44 # 45**
   - **Comment:** Error in RS-FEC, length should be 5220 bits not 5140 bits. Also on l.47. But OK in the detailed description of next pages.
   - **Suggested Remedy:** Replace 5140 with 5220.
   - **Proposed Response:** PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Typo:**

- **Cl 125 SC 125.1.4 P 55 L 14 # 22**
- **Cl 166 SC 166.2.1 P 68 L 41 # 55**
- **Cl 166 SC 166.2.3 P 76 L 35 # 44**
- **Cl 166 SC 166.2.7.1 P 83 L 44 # 45**