<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>SC 0</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>den Besten, Gerrit NXP Semiconductors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type** TR | **Comment Status** D | **Late**
---|---|---

The clause title currently reads as: Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for Greater Than 1 Gb/s Automotive Ethernet

**Suggested Remedy**
Given that we will only specify 2.5/5/10 Gbps in this clause, I recommend replacing "Greater than 1 Gbps" with "2.5, 5, and 10 Gbps". If there will be another Automotive Ethernet PHY beyond 1 Gbps standardized in the future, it will get its own clause I expect.

**Proposed Response** PROPOSED REJECT.
This name is required to be the name in the PAR, which it is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>SC 0</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>ER</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>den Besten, Gerrit NXP Semiconductors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type** ER | **Comment Status** D | **Late**
---|---|---

adds point-to-point 2.5 Gbps Physical Layer (PHY), 5 Gbps Physical Layer (PHY) and 10 Gbps Physical Layer (PHY) specifications and management parameters for operation on automotive cabling in an automotive application.

**Suggested Remedy**
adds 2.5Gbps, 5Gbps, and 10Gbps Physical Layer (PHY) specifications and management parameters for single balanced pair link segments and suitable for automotive applications

**Proposed Response** PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See Comment #164.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>SC 0</th>
<th>P21</th>
<th>L27</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>den Besten, Gerrit NXP Semiconductors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type** E | **Comment Status** D | **Late**
---|---|---

2018 comprehensive

**Suggested Remedy**
2018 comprehensive ()

**Proposed Response** PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #80.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 1.4.344a</th>
<th>P22</th>
<th>L34</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>den Besten, Gerrit NXP Semiconductors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type** E | **Comment Status** D | **Late**
---|---|---

of 1000 Mb/s

**Suggested Remedy**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #108

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 30</th>
<th>P23</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>den Besten, Gerrit NXP Semiconductors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type** E | **Comment Status** D | **Late**
---|---|---

[Notes for editors (not to be included in the published draft - not even D1.0)]:

**Suggested Remedy**
Forgot to delete???

**Proposed Response** PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comments #109 and #166.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 44.1.4.4</th>
<th>P29</th>
<th>L10</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>den Besten, Gerrit NXP Semiconductors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type** E | **Comment Status** D | **Late**
---|---|---

64B/65B PCS

**Suggested Remedy**
RS-FEC PCS (consistency with 10GBASE-T1)

**Proposed Response** PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #128.

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
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change: for transmission on a single
To: for transmission over a single

SuggestedRemedy over a single

A hard reset time of 0.5s is standard for ethernet PHYs in 802.3. Since that bit is a copy of
a standard bit, which already has the reset time defined, changing the requirement for
response would be problematic.

This is the same value as for 1000BASE-T1.

---

PROPOSED REJECT.

Wouldn't it better to out these bits at 7:6 instead (at start of lower byte) to allow reserved
space in between for logical grouping of features in the future? In fact these bits are not
really control but configuration bits.

PROPOSED REJECT.

Control bits and configuration bits are the same thing. Leaving the reserved block as one
big block allows greater flexibility during draft development.

PROPOSED REJECT.

"The data path of the MultiGBASE-T1 PMA, depending on type and temperature, may take
many seconds to run at optimum error ratio after exiting from reset or low-power
mode."

Is that really acceptable? I would expect a more tightly defined start-up time, like 100ms

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #82.

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change: R/W
To: R/W
This fine-grained SNR resolution seems overdone. Looking at other clauses with and SNR margin parameter (55, 113, 126), it seems that a 4 bit field with 0.5dB resolution is common.

Suggested Remedy

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Previous comment is #187

The resolution and range of measurement should be discussed. The resolution used here is the same used in all the MultiGBASE-T SNR margin registers for reporting. The 4 bit fields mentioned by the commenter are those reported during startup and are for a much coarser measurement done via infofields and optionally used by the PHY during startup, not for runtime monitoring.

This fine-grained signal power resolution seems overdone. 0.5dB resolution should be enough. Accuracy cannot be that high as analog front-end gain variability is not negligible.

Suggested Remedy

PROPOSED REJECT.

The resolution and range of measurement should be discussed. The resolution used here is the same used in all the MultiGBASE-T power registers for reporting. The allowed range of transmit power is usually only 2 dB in the MultiGBASE-T PHYs, making 0.5 dB steps quite coarse. Currently there is only an upper bound on transmit power in 149.5.2.4, which makes it difficult to provide interoperable noise immunity. comments are invited to provide a lower bound in 149.5.2.4.
190. Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.72.2 P40 L31 # 190
den Besten, Gerrit
NXP Semiconductors

Comment Type E Comment Status D late
Was BASE-T1 intentionally strikes through here?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.

Not a comment.

To answer the question, yes, it was changed so to say "transmitted by the PHY" without specifying the specific PHY.

193. Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.73 P41 L5 # 193
den Besten, Gerrit
NXP Semiconductors

Comment Type E Comment Status D late
"the remaining 4 octets are"

SuggestedRemedy
Replace by "there are 4 additional octets"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See Comment #97.

191. Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.73 P41 L6 # 191
den Besten, Gerrit
NXP Semiconductors

Comment Type E Comment Status D late
Reference to wrong registers 2328/2329 (which are reserved)

SuggestedRemedy
Should be 3.2318 and 2319

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See Comment #87.

192. Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.74 P41 L40 # 192
den Besten, Gerrit
NXP Semiconductors

Comment Type T Comment Status D late
This bit shall self clear when register 3.2317 is read.

SuggestedRemedy
This condition is adapted by the paragraph below the table. Probably better to say: this bit shall self-clear on reading the last link partner AOM register. (and leave the more detailed explanation as is in the paragraph below).

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "This bit shall self clear when register 3.2317 is read" to "See 45.2.3.74.1 for self-clearing behavior". Note - this eliminates a "duplicate shall", as well as provides the reference to the more complete behavior without relying on the names of the registers being the same.

194. Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.75 P42 L41 # 194
den Besten, Gerrit
NXP Semiconductors

Comment Type E Comment Status D late
"the remaining 4 octets are"

SuggestedRemedy
Replace by "there are 4 additional octets"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See Comment #87.
P802.3 D1p0

IEEE P802.3ch D1.0 Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for Greater Than 1 Gb/s Automotive Ethernet 3rd Task Force review comments

**Comment Type**: T  **Comment Status**: D  **late**

"Register 3.2313.15 shall be cleared when register 3.2317 is read."

**Suggested Remedy**
Confusing incomplete statement and redundant here as this belongs to the paragraph about register 2313. Suggest to remove this sentence.

**Proposed Response**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is for existing text in Clause 45. Removing the redundant text requires a Maintenance request which George Zimmerman will enter.

**Comment Type**: T  **Comment Status**: D  **late**

"For MultiGBASE-T1 PHYs, register 3.2313.15 shall be cleared when register 3.2321 is read."

**Suggested Remedy**
Confusing incomplete statement and redundant here as this belongs to the paragraph about register 2313. Suggest to remove this sentence.

**Proposed Response**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See Comment #86.

**Comment Type**: E  **Comment Status**: D  **late**

What is the reason to define new PCS control, status 1 and status 2 register, as they contain exactly the same fields as 1000BASE-T1. The OAM registers are reused (and extended). Why not do the same for these PCS registers?

**Suggested Remedy**
Can we defined the PCS registers as BASE-T1 registers instead that can be reused for all speed grades?

**Proposed Response**
PROPOSED REJECT.

Commenter provides insufficient information for remedy. At this time it is unknown whether the registers will remain identical to those in 1000BASE-T1. If the content remains the same as we approach working group ballot, commenter is invited to come with a proposal to merge the registers.

**Comment Type**: T  **Comment Status**: W  **late**

"The control and management interface shall be restored to operation within 0.5 s from the setting of bit 3.2322.15."

**Suggested Remedy**
Does 0.5s make sense? I would have expected a maximum value of 50ms rather than 500ms.

**Proposed Response**
PROPOSED REJECT.

A hard reset time of 0.5s is standard for ethernet PHYs in 802.3. Since that bit is a copy of a standard bit, which already has the reset time defined, changing the requirement for response would be problematic.

**Comment Type**: E  **Comment Status**: D  **late**

Typo in register number

**Suggested Remedy**
Change 1.2304.10:9 to 1.2309.10:9

**Proposed Response**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI 45</th>
<th>SC 45.2.3 P38 L47</th>
<th>Cl 174</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wienckowski, Natalie</td>
<td>General Motors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Editor's note for content added in D1.0 needs to be removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Editor's note. The section was reviewed and other comments request updates to the text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI 45</td>
<td>SC 45.2.3.80 P46 L44</td>
<td>Cl 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wienckowski, Natalie</td>
<td>General Motors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Incorrect Register number in Table 45-244e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In table 45-244e, change 3.2306.x to 3.2324.x in all rows.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI 78</td>
<td>SC 78.2 P50 L49</td>
<td>Cl 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>den Besten, Gerrit</td>
<td>NXP Semiconductors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>What is the tolerance on these time values? There is zero margin between min and max.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As these are actually an integer number of symbol periods (or blocks or frames), it might be better to specify them that way, without tolerance window.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>den Besten, Gerrit</td>
<td>NXP Semiconductors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>“using 64B/65B encoding”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shouldn't that be &quot;Reed-Solomon&quot; given that the BASE-T flavors mention LDPC?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Comment #145.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Status:** D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected 
**Response Status:** O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn 
**Type:** TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general 
**Sort Order:** Clause, Subclause, page, line
"the PCS receives four XGMII data octets provided by two transfers on the XGMII service interface on TXD<31:0>, and groups ..."

**SuggestedRemedy**

It seems that four should be eight in this sentence. Alternative it could read: "the PCS receives four data octets per XGMII transfer, and groups ...

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The wording is correct as is (because it goes on to say "and groups two of them"), but is is awkward. Use the wording from clause 126 in 802.3-2018. Change "In the transmit direction, in normal mode, the PCS receives eight XGMII data octets provided by two consecutive transfers on the XGMII service interface on TXD<31:0> and groups them into 64-bit blocks with the 64-bit block boundaries aligned with the boundary of the two XGMII transfers." to "In the transmit direction, in normal mode, the PCS receives eight XGMII data octets provided by two consecutive transfers on the XGMII service interface on TXD<31:0> and groups them into 64-bit blocks with the 64-bit block boundaries aligned with the boundary of the two XGMII transfers."

"detect the presence of the other, validate link, and"

**SuggestedRemedy**

Sentence reads strange: "validate link" what does this mean here?

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TFTD. Text is copied from Clause 97.

---

LPARAMETERS FOR GREATER THAN 1 Gb/s AUTOMOTIVE ETHERNET 3RD TASK FORCE REVIEW COMMENTS

**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