Register bit 1.2309.15 is PMA/PMD reset. But this statement refers to 149.3.2.1, which is PCS reset.

**Suggested Remedy**

On page 35, line 44, change the reference from 149.3.2.1 to 149.4.2.1.

**Proposed Response**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ch D2.1 and D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the change suggested has identified an error in the draft, and the proposed response is a substantive change which fixes the cross reference to point to the correct subclause.

**Comment Type**  
T

**Comment Status**  
D

**Response Status**  
W

The Precoder registers and text were modified in D2.2, but there is still a reference in D2.2 to register bits that were deleted.

**Suggested Remedy**

Delete: In normal operation, this value shall mirror the value in the MultiGBASE-T1 PMA control register bits 1.2309.10:9. P57 L17: Also, delete PICS MM227 as the "shall" has been removed.

**Proposed Response**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment Type**  
T

**Comment Status**  
D

**Response Status**  
EZ

Typos in Table 45-155g. 1.2314 should be 1.2315 on the first column.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the first column of Table 45-155g from "1.2314.xx:yy" to "1.2315.xx:yy".

**Proposed Response**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
SuggestedRemedy
- Change line 25 to: "45.2.1.200.1 MultiGBASE-T1 link partner user defined data (1.2317.15:0)".

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Status D Response Status W
Tu, Mike Broadcom

SuggestedRemedy
- Change the reference from 149.3.2.22 to 149.4.2.4.5.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Status D Response Status W
Tu, Mike Broadcom

SuggestedRemedy
- Change the reference from 149.3.2.22 to 149.4.2.4.5.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Status D Response Status W
Tu, Mike Broadcom

SuggestedRemedy
- Change "(Octet 9 bit 7)" to "(Octet 10 bit 6)"

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Status D Response Status W
Tu, Mike Broadcom

SuggestedRemedy
- Change the reference from 149.3.2.22 to 149.4.2.4.5.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ch D2.1 and D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the change suggested has identified an error in the draft, and the proposed response is a substantive change which fixes the cross reference to point to the correct subclause.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ch D2.1 and D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the change suggested has identified an error in the draft, and the proposed response is a substantive change which fixes the reference to the EEE capability bit which was changed in D2.1.
The PCS reset control register bit is 3.2322.15, not 1.2309.15.

Suggested Remedy

On page 93, 149.3.2.1, line 47, change from "1.2309.15" to "3.2322.15".

Proposed Response

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ch D2.1 and D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the change suggested has identified an error in the draft, and the proposed response is a substantive change which fixes the reference to the PCS reset bit which currently refers to the PMA reset bit.

grammar

change 'encoder' to 'encoders'

Proposed Response

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ch D2.1 and D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the change suggested has identified an error in the draft, and the proposed response is a non-substantive editorial change which improves clarity.

change "RS-FE" to "RS-FEC"

Proposed Response

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ch D2.1 and D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the change suggested has identified an error in the draft, and the proposed response is a non-substantive editorial change which improves clarity.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ch D2.1 and D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the change suggested has identified an error in the draft, and the proposed response is a non-substantive editorial change which improves clarity.

change "A" to "A_n" change "B" to "B_n" with _n indicating a subscript

Proposed Response

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ch D2.1 and D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the change suggested has identified an error in the draft, and the proposed response is a non-substantive editorial change which improves clarity.

change "A" to "A_n" change "B" to "B_n" with _n indicating a subscript

Proposed Response

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ch D2.1 and D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the change suggested has identified an error in the draft, and the proposed response is a non-substantive editorial change which improves clarity.

change "A" to "A_n" change "B" to "B_n" with _n indicating a subscript

Proposed Response

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ch D2.1 and D2.2 or the unsatisfied negative comments from earlier ballots. Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the change suggested has identified an error in the draft, and the proposed response is a non-substantive editorial change which improves clarity.
### P802.3ch D2.2

**D2.2 Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for 2.5 Gb/s, 5 Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment Description</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>149.5.1</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Register bits 1.2309.10:9 do not exist. It should be 1.2313.10:9.</td>
<td>Change from: &quot;... by the value set in register 1.2309:10:9, ...&quot; To: &quot;... by the value set in register 1.2313.10:9, ...&quot;.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>149.5.2.4</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LPSD: The L seems smaller than the other characters</td>
<td>Fix the size of the L</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>149.7.1.3.2</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>In Figure 149–54 N=1 and N=0 are not aligned to the associated RL curves.</td>
<td>In Figure 149–54 move N=1 and N=0 to be aligned to the associated RL curves.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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