

IEEE P802.3as D3.1 Frame format extensions Comments

Cl 01 SC 1.3 P L # 101  
David Law

Comment Type T Comment Status X

I have to say if I had spotted that we had changed the text associated with normative referenc I would have likely voted Disapprove. What concerns me is the new text has impacted all references that are dated - and that is the vast majority of them.

Take as an example a favourite at the moment, IEC 60950. The latest revision is IEC 60950-2005. In a lot of places in the standard however we reference IEC 60950-1991 which as we discovered, when we came to work on IEEE 802.3au DTE Power via MDI Isolation Corrigendum, is no longer available. In the end we had to purchase it through ebay. Now the current text 'All standards are subject to revision, and parties subject to agreements based on this standard are encouraged to investigate the possibility of applying the most recent editions of the standards indicated below.'. I would hope this would allow somebody to test conformance using IEC 60950-2005 rather than IEC 60950-1991. With the new text it seems IEC 60950-1991 has to be used regardless.

This seem a very significant change to implement at this point in this particular project.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 01 SC 1.3 P 10 L # 102  
Piers Dawe

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

This is way outside the scope of the PAR. The relation between 802.3 and its normative references would be changed by the change shown here. Such a change would be technical would affect very many places in 802.3, and would need careful and wide review by the whole 802.3 in working group ballot.

Attempting to slip a global, technical change through a closed, unpublicised sponsor ballot recirculation is not acceptable - does not satisfy openness, does not allow an adequate numb of review stages. Examples of specific concerns are: For dated references, what happens if the document cited is obsolete, unavailable, or known to be defective? For undated referenc is it wise for the IEEE to say that documents that it has not seen, shall apply? What differenc does changing from 'constitute provisions of this standard.' to 'indispensable for the applicatio of this document.' have?

SuggestedRemedy

Undo this change and progress 802.3as without it. If anyone wants to propose such a chang he can do so through the proper method with a maintenance request.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 03 SC 3.2.6 P 24 L 35 # 103  
Piers Dawe

Comment Type E Comment Status X

We decided to restore the capitals for field names as de-capitalising them was controversial and not necessary for this project. But, here we are talking about the size of the data, or at lir 41, the data itself. See 57.7.3.3 for a nice example.

SuggestedRemedy

In bullet a: 'the number of MAC client data octets'.

In b: 'pads the supplied MAC client data' (or just 'data'). In 5.2.4.3: 'minimum MAC client data size that', 'MAC client data octets', 'the minimum MAC client data size'. Similarly in 30.3.1.1.2

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 03 SC 3.2.7 P 21 L 43 # 1  
PARSONS, GLENN W Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status X

c3.2.7, p.21, line 43: says "The original MAC service data unit maximum remains 1500 octets" Given Figure 3-2, the m\_sdu also includes the L/T and maybe Pad fields. So this is not the right term. I believe the correct term here should be "The original MAC Client Data maximum remains 1500 octets"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The original MAC service data unit maximum remains 1500 octets"to"The original MAC Client Data maximum remains 1500 octets"

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 03 SC 3.2.9 P 26 L 33 # 104  
Piers Dawe

Comment Type E Comment Status X

I preferred the former wording with "which are" because this is the first and only place where the protected fields are defined, and just a color looks like it's a reminder and the reader should have learnt this already.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'of the MAC frame: the Destination' to 'of the MAC frame, which are the Destination'.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3as D3.1 Frame format extensions Comments

Cl 04 SC 4.2.3.2.2 P 26 L 25 # 105

Piers Dawe

Comment Type E Comment Status X

(Different p26) Unwanted space between inter packet gap and full stop.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the space.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 04 SC 4.2.3.2.7 P 28 L 29 # 2

PARSONS, GLENN W Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Figure 4-5, p.28: still uses the term "MAC Frame" in 3 instances. The editor should have chagned all instances of frame here.The correct term here should be "Packet" in all cases.

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 4-5 change "MAC Frame" to "Packet" in 3 instances

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 04 SC 4.2.3.2.7 P 28 L 29 # 107

Piers Dawe

Comment Type E Comment Status X

w/ is slang.

SuggestedRemedy

Write it out: 'with'.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 04 SC 4.2.3.2.7 P 28 L 29 # 106

Piers Dawe

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Surely the things between InterPacket must now be packets, not MAC Frames? (Editorial: no need for capital F.)

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'MAC Frame' to 'Packet' (or as decided) three times.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 04 SC 4.2.8 P 35 L 12 # 3

PARSONS, GLENN W Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status X

c4.2.8, p.35: looks like the editor's search and replace for "ifs" to "ipg" missed this page, there are 16 instances of "ifs" that should be "ipg", check the following lines:12, 18, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50 (where some lines have 2 instances)

SuggestedRemedy

replace "ifs" with "ipg"

Proposed Response Response Status O