Comment Type: T
Comment Status: D

I think the name of the amendment could be improved from "Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for Greater Than 1 Gb/s Automotive Ethernet".

This is an amendment for 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s PhyS and the title should state that.

Also there is likely to be a project for a 25G automotive PHY in the future and this would also be greater than 1G.

Proposed Remedy
Change the title of the amendment to:
"Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s Automotive Ethernet"

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: D

The amendment title may cause confusion now that IEEE 802.3 has a study group focused on 10 Gb/s and greater automotive electrical PHYs. Amendment titles must be within the scope of the PAR. See [1] Subclause 4.2.3.2 'Review of draft standards' of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual <https://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/opman/sb_om.pdf> states 'Title of Document: The title on the draft document and submittal form shall be within the scope as stated on the most recently approved PAR, or action(s) shall be taken to ensure this.'.

[2] The IEEE-SA 2014 Style manual <https://development.standards.ieee.org/myproject/Public/mytools/draft/styleman.pdf> has similar text in subclause 9.2 'Title' that reads 'Per 4.2.3.2 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, the title on the draft document shall be within the scope as stated on the most recently approved PAR.' The proposed change is within the scope of the PAR.

[3] Item 2 Of the RevCom check list <https://development.standards.ieee.org/myproject/Public/mytools/approve/subchklist.pdf> reads 'Is the Title of the submitted draft within the Scope of the PAR?'. The proposed change is within the scope of the PAR.

Proposed Remedy
Now that there is another effort that will likely become a project for greater than 10 Gb/s operation, the title may not be sufficiently unique.

**SuggestedRemedy**
Consider a title listing 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, 10 Gb/s operation to make it clear that the >10 Gb/s interfaces are not included.

**PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**


---

**Comment Type:** E  **Comment Status:** D  **EZ2**

**Comment:** Shall statement missing associated PICS item

**SuggestedRemedy**
Insert new PICS entry after TSE15 of Draft 2.0, with the following content:
Feature: EOJpk-pk Jitter
Subclause: 149.5.2.3.2
Value/Comment: Less than 4/S ps
Status: M
Support: Yes[] N/A[]

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Comment Type:** E  **Comment Status:** D  **EZ2**

**Comment:** Typo.

**SuggestedRemedy**
Change '10G return loss' to '10GBASE-T1 return loss'

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.