Cl **00** *SC* *P* **280** *L* **12** # 189

Dawe, Piers

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Typo.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'filed' to 'field' here and also line 38

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 10

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

There are a number of different terms used for the same thing or capitalization inconsistencies that could be improved:
1. state machine 217, state diagram 614
2. In 1.3 is correct format used for ISO (": yyyy" or ":yyyy"). Document is not consistent.
3. Vendor specific capitalization
4. Next Page (225) and next page (111 including Next page), 802.3an and ap will add extended Next Page and possibly Extended Next Page (multiple options in an). Base Page also needs consistency in both forms.
5. Able versus able. In many cases part of a bit or register name. Many of these were publication changes that probably shouldn't have been done.
6. Physical layer capitalization (PL dominates).
7. high-pass v. high pass
8. common-mode v. common mode

SuggestedRemedy

Pick and implement a couple items to improve consistency.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will do the following for each item in the comment:

[1] Change 'state machine' to 'state diagram'.
[2] Check with editorial staff.
[3] Change 'Vendor specific' to 'vendor specific'
[4] Change all other capitalization versions to next page, base page, extended next page, unformatted next page, base link codeword, unformatted code fields, message code, message page code.
[6] Change to Physical Layer (always capped)
[7] Change to high-pass when adjective
[8] Change to common-mode when adjective.

Also add to IEEE 802.3 dictionary.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 11

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Publication changes are being made to 802.3ap. It appears that publication editor's first draft changes are in this merge, so a diff between first draft to volunteers with published standard would help track and implement changes.

SuggestedRemedy

Review and implement IEEE Std 802.3ap-2007 publication changes.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **615** *L* **1** # 97

D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Table of contents for Section 5 starts here?

SuggestedRemedy

delete pages through 641

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1** *P* **1** *L* **31** # 152

Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

'families of systems supported by this standard are shown in Figure 1-1 and listed in 4.4.2.' Fig 1-1 and 4.4.2 show things wiithin the standard not other things (computers, routers?) supported by it. Not clear what 'system' means.

SuggestedRemedy

Combine with previous sentence: 'several
media types and techniques for a variety of MAC data rates as shown in Figure 1-1 and in 4.4.2.'

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1** *P* **1** *L* **31** # 154

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

'signal rates': not the point, some PMDs are multi-lane but the families are by MAC data rate, per 4.4.2

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'signal rates' to 'MAC data rates'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The current text is correct, the alternative would also be correct, but there is no consensus for change.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1** *P* **1** *L* **32** # 153

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

In addition, it specifies a method for linearly incrementing a systemÆs data rate by aggregating multiple physical links of the same speed into one logical link.

SuggestedRemedy

If the separated link agg is approved, delete. Could show stricken black with editor's note for now.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1** *P* **3** *L* **5** # 158

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

This figure is referred to in 1.1 yet does not appear until two pages later

SuggestedRemedy

Move the anchor to 1.1

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1** *P* **3** *L* **6** # 157

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Two minor problems in this figure can be fixed together. ALL CAPS is not house style, and 7 point is too small. As this figure gets cloned again and again with each new project, it's worth the extra care to improve it. It's probably enough to attend to just this one figure and not modify the several similar figures in other clauses. I've made this a 'T' comment because the capitalisation will need review.

SuggestedRemedy

Use upper and lower case as appropriate. Turn all 7 point and anything smaller into 8 point. Make 'LAN
CSMA/CD layers' more separate from 'Higher layers'

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The risk introducing error exceeds the value of conforming to this style.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1.1.1** *P* **149** *L* **42** # 58

Law, David — 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Physical Layer should be capitalised.

SuggestedRemedy

Change '.. physical layer ..' to read 'Physical Layer ..'.
Change here and throughout the draft.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1.2.1** *P* **2** *L* **12** # 155

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

'waits (defers)'. This word is used elsewhere without explanation. It is not an obvious meaning of the word, especially in the form 'deference'.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an entry for 'deference' to 1.4

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Subclause 4.2.3.2.1 defines 'Deference'. A proposed definition for 1.4 was not provided.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1.3** *P* **2** *L* **54** # 156

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Nice footnote

SuggestedRemedy

Please add a similar one introducing the glossary 1.4 at the first place where a glossary word is used

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will pass to pub edit for consideration for inclusion in IEEE style guide and we will do whatever the recommendation ends up being.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1.3.1** *P* **3** *L* **40** # 159

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

'the family of LAN standards.' Does the document say what that is? Is it all the 802 standards? The information that puts 802.3 in context within 802 seems missing (or I haven't found it yet).

SuggestedRemedy

Say what 'the family of LAN standards.' is. Add information to put 802.3 in context within 802.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

No suggested alternative text.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1.3.1** *P* **3** *L* **53** # 160

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

'Clause 8 (and beyond)' Has this phrase become obsolete?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 'the appropriate clauses'

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1.3.1** *P* **4** *L* **22** # 165

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

1Gb/s

SuggestedRemedy

1 Gb/s

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1.3.2** *P* **4** *L* **34** # 164

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The state of the art is moving beyond exposed XGMII interfaces.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 'strictly' and 'it is recommended, since'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1.3.2** *P* **4** *L* **40** # 163

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The state of the art is moving beyond first generation XAUI. It was always intended as a module interface not just 'chip-to-chip'.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 'strictly' and 'it is recommended, since' and 'The XAUI is intended for use as a chip-to-chip interface.'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

XAUI was originally intended as a chip-to-chip interface, is still used as a chip-to-chip interface and is still often implemented.

Based on this will only delete 'strictly'.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1.3.2** *P* **4** *L* **46** # 161

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

This text is needs udating, and the XSBI (OIF-SFI4) always was intended as a module interface not just 'chip-to-chip'. "While conformance with implementation of this [XSBI] interface is not strictly necessary to ensure communication, it is recommended, since it provides a convenient partition between the high-frequency circuitry associated with the PMA sublayer and the logic functions associated with the PCS and MAC sublayers. The XSBI is intended for use as a chip-to-chip interface. No mechanical connector...'

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 'While conformance with implementation of this interface is not necessary to ensure communication, it provides a convenient partition between the high-frequency circuitry associated with the PMA sublayer and the logic functions associated with the PCS and MAC sublayers. No mechanical connector ...'

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1.3.2** *P* **4** *L* **5** # 162

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

'It is anticipated that most DTEs will be located some distance from their connection to the physical cable.' - not.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 'Some DTEs are located some distance from their connection to the physical cable.'

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1.4** *P* **5** *L* **6** # 166

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

It would help to introduce the names of these interfaces

SuggestedRemedy

The interface between the MAC sublayer and its client (MAC service interface[?]) includes...

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

To do so would introduce yet another list that needs updated every time a new MAC Client is added.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.2.2** *P* **7** *L* **4** # 167

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Too many capitals

SuggestedRemedy

Use upper and lower case as appropriate.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

See comment #157.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **12** *L* # 79

Geoff, Thompson — Nortel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Name format of authors is inconsistent for RFC references
i.e
First name initial then Last name
vs.
Last name, comma, First name initial

SuggestedRemedy

Pick one and stick to it

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

From looking at IEEE Std 802.1Q the style is LastName, FirstNameInitial. Recommend this to publications editor if it is not already in style guide.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **14** *L* **3** # 12

Grow, Robert — Intel

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Isn't this "draft" now available as an approved document?

SuggestedRemedy

Update all references to drafts.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This is a edition that was added as part of the IEEE Std 802.3an project and is still not published as of this resolution date, 28th May 2007.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **14** *L* **51** # 13

Grow, Robert — Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Spurious information "121".

SuggestedRemedy

I can't find where this might have come from. Delete (it is on an inserted definition)?

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **156** *L* **17** # 61

Law, David — 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Normative references should be checked to make sure they are in the body of the draft.

SuggestedRemedy

If not in the body of the draft the reference should be moved to the bibliography.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **8** *L* **18** # 168

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

The following standards

SuggestedRemedy

The following referenced documents

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The following sentence refers to standards, not documents.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **8** *L* **19** # 169

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

All standards are subject to revision,': not for us to say, and in the case of the frozen old IEC 11801, not true.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Not too sure why this is not for us to say - all standards and document are subject to revision. In the case of ISO/IEC 11801 there are enough footnotes to state why we are referencing old editions so that there should be no confusion.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **8** *L* **20** # 170

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

'At the time of publication, the editions indicated were valid.' I woudn't count on it, nor do I want to check them all, nor recheck them on publication day and cause a publication slip, nor should we write the 'blank cheques' of undated references.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence, or replace it with one to the effect that we mean the editions we specify.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The sentence will be deleted.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **9** *L* **1** # 172

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

ANSI X3.263-1995, Revision 2.2 (1 March 1995), FDDI Twisted PairùPhysical Medium Dependent (TP-PMD) (ISO/IEC CD 9314-10). Is it stll a CD?

SuggestedRemedy

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Given that it is not broadly available it would be unwise to delete any potentially useful access information.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **9** *L* **12** # 171

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

ANSI/TIA/EIA-526-4A-1997 (OFSTP-4A), Optical Eye Pattern Measurement Procedure and IEC 61280-2-2 (1998), Fiber optic communication sub-system basic test procedures-Part 2-2: Test procedures for digital systems - Optical eye pattern, waveform, and extinction ratio. Are these the current versions? I believe there is a ~2003 version of IEC 61280-2-2.

SuggestedRemedy

Check that it is published and can be used instead of ANSI/TIA/EIA-526-4A-1997 and IEC 61280-2-2 (1998). If so, change over (affects probably clauses 38, 52, 53, 68).

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This is a non-trivial proposal for a technical change and beyond the scope of the BRC to evaluate. The submitter is encouraged to make the technical evaluation to see if the references can be updated and submit a maintenance request if appropriate.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **15** *L* **17** # 14

Grow, Robert — Intel

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Update NOTE?

SuggestedRemedy

Consider appropriate additions for requested information across standards (besides 10BASE-T).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete the text:

'The definitions used in this standard are consistent with ISO 2382-9: 1984.
NOTE—A more specific Part 25 pertaining to LAN systems has been approved since the definitions in this standard were established. This standard is ISO/IEC 2382-25: 1992, Information technology—Vocabulary—Part 25: Local area networks.'

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4.266** *P* **181** *L* **11** # 62

Law, David — 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The definition for packet incorrectly references the term 'data frame' however the use of data frame has been deprecated as part of the changes made by IEEE 802.3as-2007 Frame format extensions. The definition for packet should therefore be updated to reference MAC frame instead.

SuggestedRemedy

Change '.. of a data frame as defined ..' to read '.. of a MAC frame as defined ..'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4.54** *P* **18** *L* **39** # 15

Grow, Robert — Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Violation of IEEE Style. "B" is byte, not bit.

SuggestedRemedy

Search and replace 8B/10B and 64B/66B with 8b/10b and 64b/66b respectively.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

While stylistically correct, this is the way the authors named these codes.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4.63** *P* **19** *L* **27** # 82

Barrass, Hugh — Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

PHY layer aggregation (defined by EFM copper) is not moving to 802.1, therefore this subclause must stay.

SuggestedRemedy

Undelete 1.4.63

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.2.6** *P* **54** *L* **25** # 24
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**
Hasn't IEEE Std 802 recently been revised, superceding 802a?

SuggestedRemedy
Verify and update as appropriate.

Response *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

IEEE Std 802 is currently out for revision.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.2.7** *P* **54** *L* **34** # 25
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Merge error?

SuggestedRemedy
Remove underscore through insert flowing onto next page.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.2.7** *P* **55** *L* **8** # 26
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Grammar/punctuation

SuggestedRemedy
Replace comma with "and"

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.2.3.3** *P* **54** *L* **54** # 173
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**
This is a bastard hybrid of good world-wide English and a regionalism. I expect it once said 'from the DA field to the FCS field inclusive'. The touchstone regionalism is 'Monday Through Friday, 9 am to 5 pm'. It's possible to go part way through a day

SuggestedRemedy
Change to 'from the DA field to the FCS field inclusive'.

Response *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

This is a style issue and there was no consensus in BRC to change this.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.2.4.2.1** *P* **72** *L* **30** # 35
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Merge error?

SuggestedRemedy
Text in box should not be underscore.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.2.4.2.1** *P* **72** *L* **38** # 36
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Merge error, "MAC" inserted in wrong locataion.

SuggestedRemedy
Should read "If frame check sequence validation detects an error in such a MAC frame,".

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.2.7.1** *P* **74** *L* **2** # 37
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Merge error.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete strikethrough word.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.2.7.2** *P* **75** *L* **11** # 38
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
There appear to be hard line breaks in this section rather than formatting. The removal of 802.3as strikethrough text has left many short lines like these.

SuggestedRemedy
Improve line breaks in Clause 4to reduce page count.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.2.7.2** *P* **75** *L* **14** # 39
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Merge error -- concatenated words.

SuggestedRemedy
Add space on line 14 and 16.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.2.7.2** *P* **75** *L* **54** # 40
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Font problem.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace "x" with multiplication symbol.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.4.2** *P* **94** *L* **41** # 41
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Merge error -- concatenated words.

SuggestedRemedy
Fix.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **04A** *SC* **4A.2.9** *P* **592** *L* **41** # 42
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Merge error -- strikethrough text not removed.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove stike through comma.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **04A** *SC* **4A.4.2** *P* **598** *L* **48** # 43
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Merge error -- concatenated words.

SuggestedRemedy
Add spsce.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.2.1.9** *P* **250** *L* **10** # 54

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Since Boolean is named after George Boole, the capitalization 'Boolean' should always be used (not 'boolean').

SuggestedRemedy

Change '.. the boolean variable ..' to read '.. the Boolean variable ..'. Please perform this search and replace through the draft, there are 71 instances in total in the draft. 1 in Section 1, 5 in Section 2, 11 in Section 3, 5 in Section 4 and 49 in Section 5.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.5.5** *P* **344** *L* **8** # 63

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Consider updating the remaining instances of data frame in non-deprecated clauses as follows:

SuggestedRemedy

Section 2, subclause 22.2.3
Change 'Data frames transmitted ..' to read Change 'MAC frames transmitted ..'.
Section 2, subclause 27.3.1.2.1, page 190, line 37
Change 'Data frame ..' to read 'MAC frame ..' in the subclause title and the two instances of '.. data frame ..' to read '.. MAC frame ..' in the following paragraph.
Section 2, subclause 27.3.1.3.1, page 191, line 6
Change three instances of '.. Data frame ..' to read '.. MAC frame ..'.
Section 2, subclause 27.3.2.1.2, page 195, line 13
Change three instances of '.. data frame ..' to read '.. MAC frame ..' in definition of all_data_sent variable.
Section 2, subclause 27.3.2.1.2, page 196, line 30.
Change two instances of '.. data frame ..' to read '.. MAC frame ..' in definition of OUT(X) variable.
Section 2, subclause 27.7.4.4
Change five instances of 'Data frames ..' to read 'MAC frames ..' in DH PICS items.

Section 3, subclause 35.2.3, page 18, line 22
Change 'Data frames transmitted ..' to read Change 'MAC frames transmitted ..'.
Section 3, subclause 40.3.1.3.4, page 168, line 2
Change '.. a data frame ..' to read '.. MAC frame ..'.
Section 3, subclause 41.2.1.2.1, page 256, line 3
Change 'Data frame ..' to read 'MAC frame ..' in the subclause title and the two instances of '.. data frame ..' to read '.. MAC frame ..' in the following paragraph.
Section 3, subclause 41.2.1.3.1, page 256, line 30
Change three instances of '.. Data frame ..' to read '.. MAC frame ..'.
Section 3, subclause 41.6.4.4
Change 'Data frames ..' to read 'MAC frames ..' in DH1 PICS items.

Section 4, subclause 46.2, page 196, line 38
Change 'Data frames transmitted ..' to read Change 'MAC frames transmitted ..'.
Section 4, subclause 55.3.2.2, page 473, line 40
Change '.. data frames ..' to read '.. MAC frames ..'.

Section 5, subclause 56.1.2.2, page 3, line 31
Change '.. of each data frame, replacing two octets of the preamble.' to read '.. of each packet, replacing two octets of the preamble.'.
Section 5, subclause 57.1.5.5, page 9, line 15
Change '.. loopback may result in data frame loss.' to read '.. loopback may result in frame loss.'.
Section 5, subclause 64.1.4.1, page 153, line 45
Change '.. the data frame is fragmented by the PAF ..' to read '.. the MAC frame is

fragmented by the PAF ..'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add the following definition to subclause 1.4 'Data frame: Use of this term is restricted to Clause 9, 27 and 41. See MAC Frame.'.

Subclause 22.2.3, change title to read 'MII data stream' and text to read 'Packets transmitted through the MII shall have the format shown in Figure 22–10.'. Change title of Fig 22-10 to 'MII data stream'.

Subclause 35.35.2.3, change 'Data frames ..' to read 'Packets ..'.

Section 3, subclause 40.3.1.3.4, page 168, line 2, change '.. a data frame ..' to read '.. a frame ..'.

Subclause 46.2, change 'Data frames ..' to read 'Packets ..'.

Section 4, subclause 55.3.2.2, page 473, line 40, change '.. data frames ..' to read '.. frames ..'.

Section 5, subclause 56.1.2.2, page 3, line 31, change '.. of each data frame, replacing two octets of the preamble.' to read '.. of each packet, replacing two octets of the preamble.'.

Section 5, subclause 57.1.5.5, page 9, line 15, change '.. loopback may result in data frame loss.' to read '.. loopback may result in frame loss.'.

Section 5, subclause 64.1.4.1, page 153, line 45, change '.. the data frame is fragmented by the PAF ..' to read '.. the MAC frame is fragmented by the PAF ..'.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.1.1** *P* **1** *L* **26** # 16

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Should not be underscore

SuggestedRemedy

Remove.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **21** *SC* **21** *P* **1** *L* # 177

Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Another page 1

SuggestedRemedy

Number the pages through the whole standard consistently: don't restart the sequence just because the document is presented in several portions of pdf.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **28** *SC* **28.2.1.1** *P* **226** *L* **47** # 18

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

Merge error -- Significant text missing that is in 802.3an.

SuggestedRemedy

Add text.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **28** *SC* **28.2.1.1.1** *P* **226** *L* **7** # 112

Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Column heading too informal

SuggestedRemedy

Change # to Item or Name. At line 13, change # to No units, Count or Number. Similarly in Table 73-2, Table 62A-3. In Table 48-5, change # to whatever it means (Number of passes?)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Column heading '#' will be made blank, in units '#' should be '-'. In table 48-5 '#' should be 'Occurrences'.

Cl **28** *SC* **28.2.1.2.2** *P* **227** *L* **52** # 19
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**
Consider update of NOTE text parallel with resolution of similar 1.4 comment.

SuggestedRemedy
Resolve consistent with 1.4 NOTE comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **28** *SC* **28.2.3.4** *P* **232** *L* **38** # 20
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**
Merge error?

SuggestedRemedy
This paragraph does not implement 802.3an changes, plus it has other text that does not agree with base text of 802.3an, and I don't find other amendments changing this text. Similar problems in following paragraphs.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **28** *SC* **28.3** *P* **245** *L* **30** # 21
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Merge error -- residual underscore.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove underscore.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **28** *SC* **28.5.4.8** *P* **271** *L* **30** # 22
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Style violation. Units should be on both numbers.

SuggestedRemedy
Fix here and in many other locations in the Clause 28 PICS.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **28** *SC* **28.5.4.8** *P* **272** *L* **15** # 23
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Font problem.

SuggestedRemedy
Fix font declaration.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **28** *SC* **28.5.4.8** *P* **272** *L* **8** # 53
McClellan, Brett Solarflare

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
typo in text change

SuggestedRemedy
change "ENP:M" to "!ENP:M" per maintenance request 1180

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **28** *SC* **38.2** *P* **224** *L* **48** # 17
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Merge error -- bad hot link?

SuggestedRemedy
802.3an has Figure 28-18 instead of 28-19. Verify what is correct.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **28C** *SC* **28C** *P* **607** *L* **38** # 113

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

All bits and nearly all fields, registers, bits and so on are are called e.g. bit 2 (not bit #2). The # appears to be meaningless. It is present in the descriptions (28C.1 and so on) but not the table.

SuggestedRemedy

Get rid of the #. Also in Annex 73A.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.2.1** *P* **288** *L* **52** # 81

Barrass, Hugh — Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

In the same vein as comments submitted against 802.1ay - the migration of the management definitions needs to be thought through.

A MIB that is fully compliant to 802.3-2005 should not be suddenly made non-compliant to 802.3-2008 (or whatever). Therefore the management definitions for link aggregation as they were in 2005 should be "grandfathered" whilst new implementations are pointed towards the new definitions in 802.1 (802.1AY if a separate document. This means that the object definitions, the branches etc. must all be kept, with the descriptions recording the status change.

SuggestedRemedy

For these object definitions and for multiple further locations in Annex 30A and 30B, include the objects concerned with link aggregation. The description should include the sentiment that these objects are maintained in this information base for backward compatibilty (with revisions up to and including 802.3-2005) but the functional definitions and all future revisions will be included in 802.1AY it is recommended to use the MIB defined for 802.1 to access and control these functions in future.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

All Link Aggregation attributes in Clause 30 will be undeleted and instead marked as deprecated.

All Link Aggregation attributes in Annex 30A will be undeleted and instead marked as deprecated.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.5** *P* **295** *L* **1** # 27

Grow, Robert — Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Strikethrough figure.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove for Sponsor ballot.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.5** *P* **300** *L* **6** # 28

Grow, Robert — Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Capitalization of Mandatory, Optional and Conditional should be lower case.

SuggestedRemedy

Change capitalization on this and similar tables.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.5** *P* **304** *L* **38** # 29

Grow, Robert — Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Merge problem.

SuggestedRemedy

Somehow, the E in ATTRIBUTE isn't displaying on inserted rows.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.5.1.1.15** *P* **372** *L* **54** # 9

Grow, Robert — Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Change marking inappropriate for publication.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this and other maintence request change marking prior to Sponsor ballot.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.5.1.1.2** *P* **366** *L* **10** # 30

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

What is the sort order criteria. I can't figure one out and this list will be getting even longer.

SuggestedRemedy

Review the enumerations and reorder as appropriate. Same problem on 30.6.1.1.5

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

There isn't one. Note however that it is the assigned numeric value that are important and cannot change.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.6.1.1.10** *P* **378** *L* **43** # 33

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Grammar -- sentence fragement.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "It maps to the Message ..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.6.1.1.5** *P* **377** *L* **12** # 31

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Merge error -- superflous white space.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.6.1.1.8** *P* **378** *L* **12** # 32

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Confusing language.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "value" to "enumeration", also line 48.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.6.1.1.8** *P* **378** *L* **12** # 56

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The values that an attribute can take are called enumerations and when a specific enumeration is referenced it is enclosed in quotation marks.

SuggestedRemedy

The text '.. a GET will return the value ethernet.' should read '.. a GET will return the enumeration "ethernet".' A similar change should be made to subclause 30.6.1.1.9, page 378, line 29 as well as subclause 30.6.1.1.10, page 378, line 49.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.6.1.1.8** *P* **378** *L* **9** # 57

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The second sentence of the behaviour states that 'Selector field is defined in 28.2.1.2.1.' but the last sentence then states 'For Clause 73 Auto-Negotiation devices, the Selector Field is defined in 73.6.1.'.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that last sentence be deleted and that the text be changed to read 'The Selector Field is defined in 28.2.1.2.1 for Clause 28 Auto-Negotiation and 73.6.1 for Clause 73 Auto-Negotiation.'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30A** *SC* **30A** *P* **617** *L* **13** # 176

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

What's an arc?

SuggestedRemedy

Please add an explanation ti the glossary, 1.4

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

An arc is a object identifier values as defined in Note 1 above this text. See also Genesis 6:14 through 16 :-)

Cl **30A** *SC* **30A.1** *P* **617** *L* **42** # 71

Law, David — 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The use of smart quotes in the text 'ôCCITT Rec. X.721 (1992) | ISO/IEC 10165-2: 1992ö:top' causes a syntax error. At a minimum these shoudl be corrected to normal quotes throughout this Annex, considerations should also be give to changing the Annex to use couier font.

SuggestedRemedy

See commnet.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30A** *SC* **30A.1.3** *P* **629** *L* **37** # 72

Law, David — 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The registration arc is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

REGISTERED AS {iso(1)member-body(2)us(840)ieee802dot3(10006)csmacdmgt(30)action(9)deleteGroupAddress(3)};

should read:

REGISTERED AS {iso(1)std(0)iso8802(8802)csma(3)csmacdmgt(30)action(9)deleteGroupAddress(3)};

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is not wrong, the arc that is provide will work. It is just inconsistent with the arcs used throughout the rest of the standards.

Cl **30A** *SC* **30A.10.1** *P* **666** *L* **47** # 68

Law, David — 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The notation for a comment in GDMO double en dash ('--') yet these comment are proceeded with an em dash.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the em dashes with double en dash ('--').

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30A** *SC* **30A.15.2** *P* **670** *L* **3** # 69

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Notes have to be included as part of the behaviour, this note at present is a sytax error. Correct it here and for aSectionSESThreshold.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the text 'NOTEùThis counter has a maximum increment rate of 1 count per second' to be part of bPartESs.

Subclause 30A.15.2, page 692, line37.
Move the text 'NOTEùThis counter has a maximum increment rate of 1 count per second' to be part of bSectionSESThreshold.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30A** *SC* **30A.16.1** *P* **699** *L* **25** # 73

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The registration arc is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

REGISTERED AS {iso(1)member-body(2)us(840)ieee802dot3(10006)csmacdmgt(30)managedObjectClass(3)pseObjectClass(15)};

should read:

REGISTERED AS {iso(1)std(0)iso8802(8802)csma(3)csmacdmgt(30)managedObjectClass(3) pseObjectClass(15)};

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #72.

Cl **30A** *SC* **30A.16.2** *P* **701** *L* **26** # 70

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The attribute defined here is not aSectionESs, it is aPSEInvalidSignatureCounter.

SuggestedRemedy

Chnage the text 'aSectionESs' to read 'aPSEInvalidSignatureCounter'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30A** *SC* **30A.8.1** *P* **657** *L* **20** # 74

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The registration arc referenced in the comment is incorrect. Correct this and the other two instances of incorrect reference.

SuggestedRemedy

NAMED BY SUPERIOR OBJECT CLASS --(of oRepeaterPort)
oRepeaterPort AND SUBCLASSES;
--{1.2.840.10006.30.3.5}

Should read:

NAMED BY SUPERIOR OBJECT CLASS --(of oRepeaterPort)
oRepeaterPort AND SUBCLASSES;
--{1.0.8802.3.30.3.5}

Subclause 30A.8.1, Page 657, line 30
{1.2.840.10006.30.3.2} should read {1.0.8802.3.30.3.2}

Subclause 30A.9.1, Page 663, line 34
{1.2.840.10006.30.3.6} should read {1.0.8802.3.30.3.6}

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #72.

Cl **31** *SC* **31.3** *P* **424** *L* **29** # 34

Grow, Robert — Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Merge error -- strikethrough text.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **31B** *SC* **31B.3.7** *P* **753** *L* **41** # 75

Ganga, Ilango — Intel Corporation

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Section 2: Fix missing cross references (in two instances, lines 41 & 42) 22.2.2.3 and 22.2.2.6

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **34** *SC* **34.1.2** *P* **2** *L* **32** # 83

D'Ambrosia, John — Force10 Networks

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

During 802.3ap, it was decided to try and keep it separate from Clause 34 / 44, which has now resulted in issues with the verbiage remaining in these clauses.

See below text
This standard specifies a family of Physical Layer implementations. The generic term 1000 Mb/s MAC refers to any use of the 1000 Mb/s ISO/IEC 8802-3 CSMA/CD MAC (the Gigabit Ethernet MAC) coupled with any physical layer implementation.

The term 1000BASE-X refers to a specific family of physical layer implementations specified in Clause 36 through Clause 39. The 1000BASE-X family of physical layer standards has been adapted from the ANSI X3.230-1994 [B20] (Fibre Channel) FC-0 and FC-1 physical layer specifications and the associated 8B/10B data coding method. The 1000BASE-X family of physical layer implementations is composed of 1000BASE-SX, 1000BASE-LX, and 1000BASE-CX.

All 1000BASE-X PHY devices share the use of common PCS, PMA, and Auto-Negotiation specifications (see Clause 36 and Clause 37). The 1000BASE-T PHY (Clause 40) uses four pairs of balanced copper cabling, as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995 (Class D) and ANSI/EIA/TIA-568-A-1995 (Category 5), and
tested for the additional performance parameters specified in NSI/EIA/TIA-568-B1 Annex D. Clause 40 defines its own PCS, which does not use 8B/10B coding.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to proposed text (which has been drafted in the spirit of early decision on keeping Backplane easy to pull out)

This standard specifies a family of Physical Layer implementations. The generic term 1000 Mb/s MAC refers to any use of the 1000 Mb/s ISO/IEC 8802-3 CSMA/CD MAC (the Gigabit Ethernet MAC) coupled with any physical layer implementation.

The term 1000BASE-X refers to a specific family of physical layer implementations specified in Clause 36 through Clause 39 and Clause 70. The 1000BASE-X family of physical layer standards has been adapted from the ANSI
X3.230-1994 [B20] (Fibre Channel) FC-0 and FC-1 physical layer specifications and the associated 8B/10B data coding method. The 1000BASE-X family of physical layer implementations is composed of 1000BASE-SX, 1000BASE-LX, 1000BASE-CX, and 1000BASE-KX. 1000BASE-KX is specific to Ethernet operation over electrical backplanes (See Clause 69).

This clause is specific to 1000 Mb/s MAC operation with 1000BASE-SX, 1000BASE-LX, and 1000BASE-CX devices, which share the use of common PCS, and PMA specifications and Auto-Negotiation specifications (see Clause 36 and Clause 37). The 1000BASE-T PHY (Clause 40) uses four pairs of balanced copper cabling, as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995 (Class D) and NSI/EIA/TIA-568-A-1995 (Category 5), and tested for the additional performance parameters specified in ANSI/EIA/TIA-568-B1 Annex D. Clause 40

defines its own PCS, which does not use 8B/10B coding.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[1] Change the text to read:

This standard specifies a family of Physical Layer implementations. The generic term 1000 Mb/s MAC refers to any use of the 1000 Mb/s IEEE 802.3 MAC (the Gigabit Ethernet MAC) coupled with any physical layer implementation.

The term 1000BASE-X refers to a specific family of physical layer implementations specified in Clause 36 through Clause 39 and Clause 70. The 1000BASE-X family of physical layer standards has been adapted from the ANSI X3.230-1994 [B20] (Fibre Channel) FC-0 and FC-1 physical layer specifications and the associated 8B/10B data coding method. The 1000BASE-X family of physical layer implementations is composed of 1000BASE-SX, 1000BASE-LX, 1000BASE-CX, and 1000BASE-KX.

This clause is specific to 1000 Mb/s MAC operation with 1000BASE-SX, 1000BASE-LX, and 1000BASE-CX devices, which share the use of common PCS, and PMA specifications and Auto-Negotiation specifications (see Clause 36 and Clause 37). The 1000BASE-T PHY (Clause 40) uses four pairs of balanced copper cabling, as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995 (Class D) and NSI/EIA/TIA-568-A-1995 (Category 5), and tested for the additional performance parameters specified in ANSI/EIA/TIA-568-B1 Annex D. Clause 40 defines its own PCS, which does not use 8B/10B coding. 1000BASE-KX is specific to Ethernet operation over electrical backplanes (See Clause 69).

[2] Add the use of IEEE 802.3 MAC, as opposed to CSMA/CD MAC, to the IEEE 802.3 dictionary.

Cl **34** *SC* **34.1.4** *P* **3** *L* **18** # 84

D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

Handling of merging of 802.3ap has left some inconsistencies in Clause 34 / 44.

See verbiage below -
34.1.4 Auto-Negotiation, type 1000BASE-X
Auto-Negotiation (Clause 37) provides a 1000BASE-X device with the capability to detect the abilities (modes of operation) supported by the device at the other end of a link segment, determine common abilities, and configure for joint operation. Auto-Negotiation is performed upon link startup through the use of a special sequence of reserved link codewords. Clause 37 adopts the basic architecture and algorithms from Clause 28, but not the use of fast link pulses.

SuggestedRemedy

Add sentence at end -

Auto-Negotiation for 1000BASE-KX is defined in Clause 73.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will add the sentence 'Backplane Auto-Negotiation defined in Clause 73 applies to 1000BASE-KX.'.

Cl **36** *SC* **36.1.1** *P* **33** *L* **9** # 85

D'Ambrosia, John — Force10 Networks

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

Related to merger of 802.3ap into document has created issues -

This clause specifies the Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) and the Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer that are common to a family of 1000 Mb/s Physical Layer implementations, collectively known as 1000BASE-X. There are currently three embodiments within this family: 1000BASE-CX, 1000BASE-LX, and 1000BASE-SX. The 1000BASE-CX embodiment specifies operation over a single copper media: two pairs of 150 ┘ balanced copper cabling. 1000BASE-LX specifies operation over a pair of optical fibers using long-wavelength optical transmission. 1000BASE-SX specifies operation over a pair of optical fibers using short-wavelength optical transmission. The term 1000BASE-X is used when referring to issues common to any of the subvariants.

While it is assumed that this was done to keep 802.3ap stand-alone, Clause 70 states that Clause 36 is required, therefore Clause 36 needs to be modified to handle these references.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with

This clause specifies the Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) and the Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer that are common to a family of 1000 Mb/s Physical Layer implementations, collectively known as 1000BASE-X. There are currently four embodiments within this family: 1000BASE-CX, 1000BASE-KX, 1000BASE-LX, and 1000BASE-SX. The 1000BASE-CX embodiment specifies operation over a single copper media: two pairs of 150 ┘ balanced copper cabling. The 1000BASE-CX embodiment specifies operation over an electrical backplane. 1000BASE-LX specifies operation over a pair of optical fibers using long-wavelength optical transmission. 1000BASE-SX specifies operation over a pair of optical fibers using short-wavelength optical transmission. The term 1000BASE-X is used when referring to issues common to any of the subvariants.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will add 1000BASE-KX to list as suggested and will also change 'The 1000BASE-CX embodiment specifies operation over a single copper media: two pairs of 150 ..' to read 'The 1000BASE-CX embodiment specifies operation over two pairs of 150 ..'

Cl **36** *SC* **36.2.4.13** *P* **47** *L* **35** # 106

Thaler, Pat — Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

Treatment of alignment of the start delimiter is inconsistant between 1 Gb/s and 10 Gb/s Ethernet. In 1 Gb/s, the alignment is done by allowing an octet of preamble to be dropped if it overlaps the end of an /I/ and overwritting the next octet with /S/. In 10 Gb/s the full preamble is preserved by delaying the start of the preamble by up to 3 octets when necessary for alignment.

Allowing an option for a 1 Gb/s PHY to behave in a manner similar to a 10 Gb/s PHY will cause no problems. It produces at most 1 octet of IPG shrinkage but IPG shrinkage can occur from clock compensation and must be tolerated.

SuggestedRemedy

Add, "Alternatively, when TX_EN is asserted during transmission of an ordered_set, the PCS may delay the packet to align the first octet of preamble to after the ordered_set and replace that octet with SPD."

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

The state diagram, which takes precedence over this text, requires that /T/ be sent when TX_EN is de-asserted. If a FIFO were added in front of the TX state machine the last byte of the CRC would be over written by the /T/. To insert the proposed text without introducing ambiguity would require changes to the state diagram.

---000---

First motion

Proposed REJECT.

Proposed response text. The state machine specifies operation the other way and the state machine would have precedence over this text.

Y: 4 N: 2 A: 8

Cl **36A** *SC* *P* **289** *L* **8** # 87

D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

handling of merging of 802.3ap data has created issues with existing text.

"This annex defines test patterns that allow 1000BASE-X PMDs to be tested for compliance while in a system environment." is in conflict with Clause 70, which states - The data pattern for jitter measurements shall be the jitter
test frame described in 59.7.1. (Clause 70.7.1.9, page 391, line 5).

SuggestedRemedy

It is assumed that 802.3ap intended to use the data pattern specified. Therefore, Annex 36A verbiage should be modified to clafiy which 1000BASE-X PMDs the Annex is addressing.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will add the text '.. with the exception of 1000BASE-KX ..'

Cl **37** *SC* **37.1.1** *P* **81** *L* **8** # 86

D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

Merger of 802.3ap has created issues with existing text -

Clause 37 describes the 1000BASE-X Auto-Negotiation (AN) function that allows a device (local device) to advertise modes of operation it possesses to a device at the remote end of a link segment (link partner) and to detect corresponding operational modes that the link partner may be advertising.

Furhtermore, it is noted in Clause 73 - "It is recommended that a device that has negotiated 1000BASE-KX operation through this clause not perform
Clause 37 Auto-Negotiation." (Clause 73.1 Page 453, L36), which would seem to suggest to not point to Clause 37 AN for 1000BASE-KX, which also does not specify Clause 37 as optional in Table 70-1.

SuggestedRemedy

change to
Clause 37 describes the Auto-Negotiation (AN) function for 1000BASE-LX, 1000BASE-SX, and 1000BASE-CX that allows a device (local device) to advertise modes of operation it possesses to a device at the remote end of a link segment (link partner) and to detect corresponding operational modes that the link partner may be advertising. Use of "1000BASE-X" in this clause refers to 1000BASE-LX, 1000BASE-SX, and 1000BASE-CX physical sublayers.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Clause 37 is optionally allowed for 1000BASE-KX. Instead will add the text 'Backplane Auto-Negotiation defined in Clause 73 applies to 1000BASE-KX.'.

Cl **38** *SC* **38** *P* **105** *L* **2** # 123

Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The parathetical items e.g. (Long Wavelength Laser) are not proper names, just descriptions

SuggestedRemedy

Set in lower case. Also Clause 52.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **38** *SC* **38** *P* **105** *L* **2** # 122

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

An optical fibre is not a baseband medium. Very far from it! It works with a carrier about 10^14 Hz.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 'baseband', all or most occurrences, here and in 53. This has the side benefit of making some very long titles slightly shorter.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

You are technically correct however the text is correct in the context of the standard.

Cl **40** *SC* **40.12.9** *P* **250** *L* **33** # 119

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Dead link '40.8.2'

SuggestedRemedy

Make clickable

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **40** *SC* **40.4.4** *P* **192** *L* **4** # 114

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Didn't we decide that as all 1000BASE-T devices ever sold have automatic crossover, that we would make it a mandatory function? Then, would the X marking still be needed? (affects 41.5, 42.3)

SuggestedRemedy

?

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This is only a requirement on 1Gb/s repeaters of which there are very few subject to new design. The decision has been made to deprecate the 1Gb/s repeater clause.

Cl **40** *SC* **40.4.4.1** *P* **192** *L* **14** # 115

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Linear Feedback Shift Register

SuggestedRemedy

Please remove the gratuitous capitals

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **40** *SC* **40.4.4.1** *P* **192** *L* **14** # 116

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Linear Feedback Shift Register'. It's digital: why is is called 'linear'? What is fed back is XORd, not linear in my mind.

SuggestedRemedy

Do we have more usual terminology in 49?

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

XOR is linear mathematical function, that is Fn(x + y) = F(x) + F(y) and F(ax) = aF(x).

Cl **40** *SC* **40.6.1.2.4** *P* **219** *L* **7** # 105

Thaler, Pat — Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

CLAUSE 40.6.1.2.4 Transmit Distortion. The current text could be interpreted to call for application of peak distortion test procedure over all timing phases within the UI. However, in actual application, error due to distortion is only relevant at the instant in time where the receiver samples the signal. To properly recover data, a receiver must sample in the eye opening, not in the transition region of the received signal. Clause 40.6.1.2.4 is somewhat ambiguous on the timing phase for this measurement - specifying only "an arbitrary phase". In practice, a receiver will not sample at an arbitrary phase within the UI but rather within an interval where the eye is open. Specifying distortion error in the transition region, rather than the eye opening, places unnecessary constraints on the transmitter and is not necessary to insure interoperability.

In addition, during the transition region of the UI, the measurement technique of 40.6.1.2.4 cannot distinguish between error due to transmit jitter and error due to distortion. It is mathematically impossible to meet the 10mV level specified by 40.6.1.2.4 in the transition region when the transmitter has jitter levels allowed by the transmitter timing jitter clause 40.6.1.2.5. This is because the error voltage during the transition region due to jitter alone will exceed the 10mV limit if the jitter approaches the allowable legal limit. Clauses 40.6.1.2.4 and 40.6.1.2.5 specify mutually exclusive test criteria if the transmit distortion test is to be applied over the full UI. The test procedure of 40.6.1.2.4 is not significantly effected by timing jitter for phases within the eye opening. Clause 40.6.1.2.3 allows the transition region to occupy 5ns of the 8ns UI (62.5%). Measured transmit distortion within the "settled region" (approx 3ns/8ns = 37.5% of the UI) will not be effected by high transmit jitter.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following clarifying sentence to the second paragraph of 40.6.1.2.4 (following sentence ending with "...filtered by test filter": "A PHY is considered to pass this test if at least 30% of the peak distortion through the UI is below 10mV".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[1] Add the following sentence to the second paragraph of 40.6.1.2.4 "A PHY is considered to pass this test if the peak distortion is below 10mV for at least 30% of the UI.".

[2] Add an editors note 'The 30% value needs confirmation.'.

[3] The ballot announcement will include information to draw the balloters attention to this change.

Cl **40** *SC* **40.7.5** *P* **227** *L* **20** # 55

Law, David — 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Intersymbol should be spelt as one word.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'Inter-Symbol Interference ..' to read 'Intersymbol Interference ..'.
Also perform this change to Section 5, Annex 69A.1, page 595, line 22.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **40** *SC* **40.8.2** *P* **228** *L* **40** # 117

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Text says 'it is a functional requirement that a crossover function be implemented in every link segment' and 'Crossover functions may be implemented internally to a PHY or else-where in the link segment.' yet per 1.4.214, a link segment is 'The point-to-point full-duplex medium connection between two and only two Medium Dependent Interfaces (MDIs).' The PHYs are outside of it.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise this text to be technically correct. May apply to 55 also.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace '.. be implemented in every link segment ..' with '.. be implemented for every link segment ..'.

Cl **40** *SC* **40.8.2** *P* **228** *L* **43** # 118

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

else-where

SuggestedRemedy

elsewhere

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **41** *SC* **41** *P* **253** *L* **1** # 104
Thaler, Pat Broadcom

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

I believe that few 1000 Mb/s repeaters were ever produced commercially and they have not been available for some time. This Clause is an appropriate candidate for the not reccomended for new installations note.

SuggestedRemedy

Add after the Clause title:

NOTE - This Repeater is not recommended for new installations. Since Month 200x, maintenance changes are no longer being considered for this clause.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

NOTE - This Repeater is not recommended for new installations. Since May 2007, maintenance changes are no longer being considered for this clause.

Cl **41** *SC* **41.6.4.12** *P* **277** *L* **11** # 121
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Port Types

SuggestedRemedy

Port types

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This Clause is being deprecated.

Cl **41** *SC* **41.6.4.12** *P* **277** *L* **7** # 120
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Data Rate

SuggestedRemedy

Data rate

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This Clause is being deprecated.

Cl **43** *SC* **43** *P* **287** *L* **1** # 103
Thaler, Pat Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Will the title of this Clause really be "Clause 43 is no longer in use"?

Can't we come up with something better?

SuggestedRemedy

"Empty" or "Content moved to IEEE Std 802.1AX-200X"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"Content moved to IEEE Std 802.1AX-200X"

Cl **45** *SC* **2.1.8** *P* **25** *L* **3** # 100
Valliappan, Magesh Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Document says - "The assignment of bits in the 10G PMD transmit disable registE is shown in Table 45-10"
This registE is described in Table 45-9 and not 45-10.

SuggestedRemedy

"The assignment of bits in the 10G PMD transmit disable registE is shown in Table 45-9"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **2.3.12** *P* **104** *L* **20** # 102
McConnell, Mike KeyEye Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Duplicated "T"

SuggestedRemedy

Delete extra "T" from first word in sentence; "TThe" should be "T"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2** *P* **11** *L* **15** # 174
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Bad Engish, does not close the range (although the next row implies that 28 is the last point in the range)

SuggestedRemedy

Change '8 through 28' to '8 to 28'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

See comment #173.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2** *P* **13** *L* **27** # 127
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

On line 11 we have '1 1 = bits 5:2 select speed' where = is treated as sort of a word and does not trigger a capital. Here we have '1 x x x = Reserved where = is treated as sort of a new-cell delimiter in a table, which does trigger a capital. Does the manual of style give guidance?

SuggestedRemedy

?

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

No.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2** *P* **13** *L* **3** # 125
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

'R/W' is not a useful column heading

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 'Type' unless we can think of a better term: several tables in 45.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This proposal was discussed and rejected when doing IEEE 802.3REVam and the BRC agrees with that previous decision.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2** *P* **13** *L* **36** # 126
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Self Clearing

SuggestedRemedy

Self clearing or Self-clearing or self clearing or self-clearing. Other similar examples below the tables in this clause.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will use self-clearing or Self-clearing when an adjective.

This will be added to the IEEE 802.3 dictionary.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1** *P* **15** *L* **45** # 50
McClellan, Brett Solarflare

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

register title change was cut short

SuggestedRemedy

change "10GBASE-T TX power backoff and PHY short setting"
to
"10GBASE-T TX power backoff and PHY short reach setting"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1** *P* **15** *L* **45** # 124
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Unnecessary line

SuggestedRemedy

Resize the table's column widths to the contents

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.1.4** *P* **18** *L* **30** # 8
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
puntuation

SuggestedRemedy
Delete comma after 10GBASE-KR

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.8** *P* **25** *L* **10** # 1
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Punctuation and broken links

SuggestedRemedy
Missing period after 52.4.7.

Also broken links on 52.4.7 and other references in this sub-clause.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.7.2** *P* **138** *L* **30** # 2
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Extra row in table and unnecessary under-lining

SuggestedRemedy
Delete first row in Table 45-123 for bits 7.1.15:8

Remove all underlining of entries for bits 7.1.9 and 7.1.8 in Table 45-123

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.7.2.3** *P* **139** *L* **16** # 3
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Change 'in in' to 'in'

SuggestedRemedy
Change 'in in' to 'in'

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.7.9** *P* **143** *L* **19** # 5
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Unnecessary under-lining

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the unnecessary under-lining

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.5.3.9** *P* **178** *L* **34** # 51
McClellan, Brett Solarflare

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
editor's note inconsistent with text change

SuggestedRemedy
change "This paragraph has been added based on maintenance request 1188. "
to
" Feature item in AM41 above changed based on maintenance request 1188"

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45-4** *P* **17** *L* **10** # 6

Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Table 45-4 does not match 802.3ap

SuggestedRemedy

On lines 10 and 21 change 0.6 to 1.0.6 and 0.13 to 1.0.13.

On line 10 change 'Speed selection' to 'Speed selection (LSB)'

On line 21 change 'Speed selection' to 'Speed selection (MSB)'

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **Table 45-139** *P* **139** *L* **40** # 4

Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Table 45-139 is not very elegantly split between two pages.

SuggestedRemedy

Have Table 45-139 on a single page.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **48** *SC* **48.1** *P* **229** *L* **7** # 88

D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

Integration of 802.3ap into document has resulted in issues -

This clause specifies the Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) and the Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer that are common to a family of 10 Gb/s Physical Layer implementations, collectively known as 10GBASE-X. The 10GBASE-LX4 PMD described in Clause 53 and 10GBASE-CX4 PMD described in
Clause 54 are members of the 10GBASE-X PHY family.

SuggestedRemedy

change to
This clause specifies the Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) and the Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer that are common to a family of 10 Gb/s Physical Layer implementations, collectively known as 10GBASE-X. The 10GBASE-X PHY family consists of 10GBASE-CX4 (See Clause 54), 10GBASE-KX4 (See Clause 71), and 10GBASE-LX4 (see Clause 53).

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **48** *SC* **48.1.3.3** *P* **231** *L* **26** # 89

D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

Integration of 802.3ap

10GBASE-X supports the PMD sublayer and MDI specified in Clause 53 and Clause 54. The 10GBASE-LX4 and 10GBASE-CX4 PMDs perform the following functions:

SuggestedRemedy

change to
10GBASE-X supports the PMD sublayer and MDI specified in Clause 53, Clause 54, and Clause 71. The 10GBASE-CX4, 10GBASE-KX4, and 10GBASE-LX4 perform the following functions:

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **48** *SC* **48.2.4.2.3** *P* **240** *L* **2** # 49

Brad, Booth AMCC

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

There is a double "shall". The first shall applies to the list, and the second applies to the item d. Item d shall needs to be removed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
... shall not be deleted.
to be:
... are not deleted.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **48** *SC* **48.7.3** *P* **259** *L* **18** # 91

D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Support of 10GBASE-KX4 not named

SuggestedRemedy

add entry to table

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The option of supporting 10GBASE-KX4 is included in the PICS subclause 48.7.4.2 which states in item AN1 'Support for use with a 10GBASE-KX4 PMD'.

Cl **48** *SC* **48.7.4.x** *P* **260** *L* **1** # 93

D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R**

Table at top looks to be for AN function, but no clause title.

SuggestedRemedy

add clause title above top table and re-order as appropriate

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

This table spans a page break - the title is at the start of the table on the previous page.

Cl **49** *SC* **49.1.1** *P* **261** *L* **9** # 92

D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Merging of 802.3ap related issue:

This PCS can connect directly to one of the 10GBASE-R
Physical Layers: 10GBASE-SR, 10GBASE-LR, 10GBASE-ER, and 10GBASE-LRM.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to
This PCS can connect directly to one of the 10GBASE-R
Physical Layers: 10GBASE-SR, 10GBASE-LR, 10GBASE-ER, 10GBASE-LRM, and 10GBASE-KR.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **49** *SC* **49.3.3** *P* **286** *L* **1** # 94

D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

table for "Major Capabilities / Options" does not list PMDs supported

SuggestedRemedy

add entries for pmds as necessary

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

PICS subclause 49.3.6.5 'Auto-Negotiation for Backplane Ethernet functions' includes item AN1 'Support for use with a 10GBASE-KR PMD'.

Cl **52** *SC* **52.9.9.2** *P* **371** *L* **42** # 128

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

There are small things in this subclause that are ambiguous (as well as other things that are controversial). Here is one of the ambiguous ones 'defined by peak values that include all but 0.1% for VECP and all but 1% for jitter of their histograms.' This is one case where industry participants have asked each other the question and come to an agreement on how it is to be interpreted. We might as well document where there is agreement.

SuggestedRemedy

I'll try to list these out before the meeting

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The commenter did not provide the promised references.

Cl **52** *SC* **52.9.9.2** *P* **372** *L* **26** # 129

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

'two thirds of the vertical eye closure penalty value' is ambiguous. With respect to eqn 52-4, this could be a linear basis (set A0 2/3 of the way from OMA to the final A0) or 2/3 of the VECP expressed in dB. We believe the industry has settled on the second interpretation.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 'two thirds of the vertical eye closure penalty value expressed in dB should'

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter. The commenter will submit a maintenance request when he has gathered more information.

Cl **53** *SC* **53.7.1** *P* **397** *L* **41** # 139

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Format: this clause uses the format RIN12(OMA) while others use RIN12OMA (the number 12 could be an x, and is usually a subscript. This comment is not about 12 vs. x, there's a reason for that, but about the brackets round OMA.

SuggestedRemedy

I'm not yet saying which is right, but we should stick with one notation style throughout

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

No suggested remedy. If the optical experts have a recommendation we would be interested in hearing it.

Cl **54** *SC* **54.6.3.5** *P* **439** *L* **17** # 66

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

There is no reference to Figure 54-5 in the body of the text. Add a reference to this figure, and other similar figures missing references.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the the following text be added:
'The minimum transmit differential output return loss is shown in Figure 54-5.'

Subclause 54.7.2, page 444, line 16.
'The maximum cable assembly insertion loss is shown in Figure 54-7.'

Subclause 54.7.3, page 445, line 15.
'The minimum cable assembly return loss is shown in Figure 54-8.'

Subclause 54.7.4, page 446, line 29.
'The minimum cable assembly NEXT / MDNEXT loss is shown in Figure 54-9'

Subclause 54.7.5.2, page 447, line 16.
'The minimum cable assembly ELFEXT / MDELFEXT loss is shown in Figure 54-10'

Subclause 71.7.1.5, page 441, line 30 (see also comment about title).
'The minimum transmitter differential output return loss is shown in Figure 71-4'

Subclause 72.7.1.5, page 416, line 51 (see also comment about title).
'The minimum transmitter differential output return loss is shown in Figure 72-9'

Subclause 72.7.1.6, page 417, line 43 (see also comment about title).
'The minimum transmitter common-mode output return loss is shown in Figure 72-10'

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

As per suggested remedy except for:

Subclause 71.7.1.5, page 441, line 30 (see also comment about title).
'The minimum differential output return loss is shown in Figure 71-4'

Subclause 72.7.1.5, page 416, line 51 (see also comment about title).
'The minimum differential output return loss is shown in Figure 72-9'

Subclause 72.7.1.6, page 417, line 43 (see also comment about title).
'The minimum common-mode output return loss is shown in Figure 72-10'

Cl **55** *SC* **55** *P* **459** *L* **2** # 178

Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Per definitions, e.g. '1.4.227 Medium Dependent Interface (MDI): The ... interface between the transmission medium and the ... PHY...', the medium is the wire or optical fibre. It isn't 'baseband' or (in the case of a wire for 10GBASE-T) not baseband, it's agnostic. It doesn't apply here. We use the word only to distinguish from non-baseband transmission formats, of which the only instance in 802.3 is the deprecated 10BROAD36.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 'baseband' when it comes before 'medium' - probably every time in all the maintained clauses but I haven't checked.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

See comment #122.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.12.6** *P* **553** *L* **25** # 52

McClellan, Brett Solarflare

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

typo in editor's note

SuggestedRemedy

change "10GBASE Thie chnage"
to
"This change"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.8.2.2** *P* *L* # 186

Dawe, Piers

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

The small fonts (7, 6, even 4.5 point!) make Figure 55-35 unnecessarily hard to read.

SuggestedRemedy

If modifying this figure at all, make all the text in this figure bigger, e.g. 10 point for the "E"s, 8 point for everything else

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

We are not modifying the figure.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.8.2.2** *P* *L* # 182

Dawe, Piers

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

This quantity Z_bal is not an impedance so should not be called Z - causes confusion. It's a measure of the balance of the impedance, not the impedance of the balance. (I'm using _ to indicate subscript here.)

SuggestedRemedy

Change its name to something else, e.g. -SCD11 or -S_bal or even Bal_Z (three occurrences, all in 55.8.2.2)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change Z_Bal to Bal.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.8.2.2** *P* *L* # 185

Dawe, Piers

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Scd11: it would be nicer to use the format S_CD11 (where _ denotes subscript).

SuggestedRemedy

If this sentence is altered, change the format per comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The sentence is not being altered.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.8.2.2** *P* *L* # 181

Dawe, Piers

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

In 55.7, equations are carefully labelled "(dB)" when appropriate. At the moment, without reading the rest of the subclause it looks like this Z_bal could be in ohms: more than seemed sort of plausible! 40.8.3.2 also says "dB".

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "(dB)" into the two lines of this equation. Two sentences after this equation, change "The impedance balance is defined as:" to "The impedance balance expressed in decibels is defined as:". In maintenance, remember to do similar for (55-53), (55-54), (55-56) and (55-57).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.8.2.2** *P* *L* # 187

Dawe, Piers

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Text says "During the test the PHY is connected to the MDI as in normal operation, but with the transmitter output disabled. It's not clear if this applies only to the network analyser method or to the Ecm/Edif method also. NOTE 1 above apparently says the opposite: "Triggered averaging can be used to separate the component due to the applied commonmode sine wave from the transmitted data component." Are you sure that disabling the transmitter output gives a valid result, and are you sure it is necessary with a network analyser (which can do averaging also - but it may depend on whether it's a scalar or vector network analyser)?

SuggestedRemedy

Choose whether the transmitter should be on or off and (now or later) make changes to make the choice clear.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This was the text that was approved a few months ago by the IEEE P802.3an project and there was no consensus in the BRC to change this.

Review by experts outside the BRC indicated disagreement with the comment.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.8.2.2** *P* *L* # 184

Dawe, Piers

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Figure 55-35 shows 50 ohm common mode termination while the paragraph below shows 75 ohm common-mode impedance, also implied for 1000BASE-T in figs 40-31 and 40-32. It's not reasonable to expect the reader to spontaneously understand that "common mode termination" is not the same as "common-mode impedance", especially as the former term is not defined anywhere in 802.3. The common-mode coupling circuit does not present a common-mode termination to the MDI pair under test: what it presents is the commonmode impedance.

SuggestedRemedy

Now or later, change "a differential termination of 100 ohm and a common-mode termination of 50 ohm" to "a differential impedance of 100 ohm and a common-mode impedance of 75 ohm". Make similar changes (two instances) in Figure 55-35.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

A Y termination with 50 ohms in each leg results in a 100 ohms differential termination between two terminals and the third leg which is 50 ohms is tried to ground which is 50 ohms common mode termination. Note, this is an industry practice when using baluns. If you measure the resistance by tying the two differential inputs together, between this and ground it results in 75 ohms common mode impedance. Also the paragraph below applies to the text that precedes it, in which you can manually set the impedance with the analyzer.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.8.2.2** *P* *L* # 188

Dawe, Piers

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Text says that measurement of Scd11 is equivalent to measuring ~Ecm/Edif. Scd11 means the common-mode power out over the differential-mode power in, while the formula for Z_bal ~ Ecm/Edif is more-or-less the common-mode power in over the differential-mode power out. Apart from a possible sign change (see another comment), I believe this relies on reciprocity: Scd11 being known to be equal to Sdc11.

SuggestedRemedy

If this is so, (now or later), please add a sentence to state it.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This is well know among those skilled in the art and the BRC didn't feel it was necessary to add this to the standard.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.8.2.2** *P* *L* # 183

Dawe, Piers

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Text says "Impedance balance is the S parameter measurement of Scd11 in dB at the MDI where..." I think this definition has the opposite sign to Z_bal, also called impedance balance, given by equations 55-55 to 55-57.

SuggestedRemedy

Now or later, change to "Impedance balance is the inverse of the S parameter SCD11 [SDC11? see another comment] in dB at the MDI where..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This was the text that was approved a few months ago by the IEEE P802.3an project and there was no consensus in the BRC to change this.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.8.2.2** *P* **544** *L* # 130

Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Resubmitting comments against 802.3aw (IEEE P802.3- 2005/ Cor 2) D1.1 that were out of scope then

SuggestedRemedy

See 802.3aw D1.1 comments 4 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comments #181 through #189.

Cl **57** *SC* **57.6.2.1** *P* **47** *L* **43** # 180

Beck, Michael Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The sentences "If the Variable Width field is set to 0xFF ... OAMPDU ends." are obsolete. They are part of an earlier version of maintenance request #1174, and are obsoleted by the two lines immediately preceding.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete lines 43-46.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **57** *SC* **57.6.3** *P* **49** *L* **23** # 179
Beck, Michael Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
wrong spelling "preceed"

SuggestedRemedy
change to "precede"

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.7.1** *P* **108** *L* **34** # 78
Ganga, Ilango Intel Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**
Section 5: In Clause 59.7.1, table 59-14, row "Phase Jump, Repeat one time for 9 bytes", however there are only 8 bytes defined in the corresponding rows. Either this should be 8 bytes or if it is 9 one more byte pattern has to be defined.

SuggestedRemedy
Change row to read as follows "Phase Jump, Repeat one time for 8 bytes" (instead of 9 bytes).

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

In addition:

[1] Add an editors note 'The change from 9 to 8 in the table above was to correct what is believed to have been an error.'.

[2] The ballot announcement will include information to draw the balloters attention to this change.

Cl **64** *SC* **64.3.5.6** *P* **289** *L* **1** # 80
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Figure 64-28 - Style of this state machine differs from the convention: line thickness and state names on grey background.

SuggestedRemedy
As part of pre-publication preparation, publication editor should modify the style of this state machine to match the conventional style.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **65** *SC* **65** *P* **305** *L* **2** # 131
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Hard return after 'for' messes up entry in contents. Haven't we noticed this before?

SuggestedRemedy
Fix

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Yes, this will be fixed as always during publication preparation.

Cl **69A** *SC* **69a.2.2** *P* **597** *L* **20** # 96
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
broken link - 69b.4.2

SuggestedRemedy
fix link

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **69B** *SC* **69B.4.5** *P* **605** *L* **8** # 65
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**
'10321.5 MHz' should read '10312.5 MHz'.

SuggestedRemedy
See comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **70** *SC* **70** *P* **383** *L* # 136
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

No layer diagram

SuggestedRemedy

Should clauses 70-72 have the traditional layer diagram like 73-1?

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Figure 69-1 was considered sufficient and there was no need to duplicate that information in all these other Clauses. This has been done in the past, for example Clause 36 and Clause 39.

Cl **70** *SC* **70.1** *P* **383** *L* **26** # 133
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Non-functioning cross-reference. Also at line 32

SuggestedRemedy

Enable the cross-references

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **70** *SC* **70.10.3** *P* **395** *L* **20** # 77
Ganga, Ilango Intel Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Consider to delete "Analog" from line 20 (70.10.3). Instead SD can be simply stated as "Signal Detect Generation"

Similarly in 72.10.3

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **70** *SC* **70.3** *P* **383** *L* **37** # 132
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

The PMD clause is trying to impose a 'shall' on a PCS. That is outside of its power. Also this violates layering because the PCS is not directly connected to the PMD, it's connected to the AN sublayer (see Fig, 73-1; the old Clause 37 AN is different, it is presented as part of the PCS). In principle, this clause could contain an informative NOTE that reminds the reader of a requirement on something else, made by another clause (or document). But I can't see any point in this case. The main issue is the wish to enforce Clause 73 AN with this PMD, which is addressed in 70.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete subclause 70.3 and associated PICS 70.10.4. Similarly delete 72.3, 72.10.4.1, 71.3, 71.10.4.1.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[1] Change 70.3 to read 'The PCS associated with this PMD is required to support the AN service interface primitive AN_LINK.indication as defined in 73.9. (See 36.2.5.2.7.).'

[2] Remove subclause 70.10.4.1 (PICS).

Cl **70** *SC* **70.5** *P* **384** *L* **1** # 138
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Should this title say function mapping? The tables refer to variable mapping and the next subclause to three (different) functions. On the other hand, PMD funcions and MDIO functions can be different things

SuggestedRemedy

Consider a change to 'PMD MDIO control and status variable mapping? Similarly in 71.5, 72.5, 52.3, 68.3 and 54.4 (words in text also), 53.3, 55.4.2.3.3.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The text has been in use in IEEE 802.3 ever since Clause 52 and was used again in the recently approved IEEE Std 802.3ap Backplane Ethernet standard. There was no consensus in the BRC to change it.

Cl **71** *SC* **71.10.3** *P* **448** *L* **9** # 90
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Named wrong PMD

SuggestedRemedy
change "10GBASE-X" to "10GBASE-KX4"

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **71** *SC* **71.7.1.5** *P* **441** *L* **48** # 67
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**
The title of the figure doesn't seem to be correct, or detailed enough. This figure doesn't plot the return loss, it plots the minimum return loss. Further it should be stated that this the minimum output return loss of the transmitter.

The above also seems to be the case for Figure 72-9 and 72-10.

SuggestedRemedy
Suggest that the title be changed to read:
'Minimum transmitter differential output return loss'

Subclause 72.7.1.5, page 417, line 23.
'Minimum transmitter differential output return loss'

Subclause 72.7.1.6, page 418, line 24.
'Minimum transmitter common-mode output return loss'

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In subclause 72.7.1.5, page 417, line 23 change the title to read 'Minimum differential output return loss'.

Cl **72** *SC* *P* **399** *L* # 95
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**
Order of clauses is not correct. Clause 72 comes before Clause 71

SuggestedRemedy
re-order clauses so 71 is before 72

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **72** *SC* **6.10.2.3.2** *P* **405** *L* **23** # 99
Valliappan, Magesh Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**
The document says - "Updated status shall be returned for each coefficient when the coefficient update is completed."

This line is inconsistent with the reset of the specification. From the state diagram in Figure 72-6, "Maximum", "Minimum" and "Updated" are allowed status. FurthE, the line preceding this one specifies "...will then continue to be sent until no coefficent status field indicates not_updated".

SuggestedRemedy
The text should instead say, "Status othE than not_updated shall be returned for each coefficient when the coefficient update is completed."

Response *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

There is a sort of double negative here - the text states '.. until no coefficient status field indicates not_updated.'.

Cl **72** *SC* **72** *P* **399** *L* # 135
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Clause 72 comes before Clause 71

SuggestedRemedy
Switch

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **72** *SC* **72** *P* **399** *L* **1** # 60
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Clause 72 and 71 are in the wrong order.

SuggestedRemedy
Correct the book file.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **72** *SC* **72.3** *P* **399** *L* **45** # 137

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

This sentence 'In order to form a complete PHY, a PMD shall be combined with the appropriate sublayers' attempts to impose a condition on a complete PHY - but this clause is responsible for the PMD alone. The PMD is the lowest sublayer, not responsible for anything above it. Also there is no requirement to combine, merely to connect. If it is thought necessary to define what makes up a complete PHY of any name, then it must be done somewhere else e.g. using Table 69-1

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "When {forming|part of} a complete PHY, a PMD is connected to the appropriate sublayers'. Same change for 71.1, 72.1. 53.1.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

This was discussed during the balloting of IEEE P802.3ap and this was the consensus of the IEEE P802.3ap Task Force.

M: Thaler
S: Grow

Y: 6 N: 1 A: 0

Cl **72** *SC* **72.3** *P* **399** *L* **46** # 134

Dawe, Piers — Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Broken cross-reference to 49.2.16

SuggestedRemedy

Fix

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **72** *SC* **72.6.10.2.3.1** *P* **405** *L* **7** # 98

Valliappan, Magesh — Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The document says - "At that point the outgoing initialize field shall be set to zEo." This paragraph talks about the "preset" field. Also the previous line refEs to the "preset" field. "initialize" field is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "At that point the outgoing preset field shall be set to zEo."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Also change 'initialize field' to 'initialize control' and 'preset field' to 'preset control'. Also correct '.. all coefficients indicates updated ..' to read '.. all coefficients indicate updated ..'.

Cl **72** *SC* **72.6.10.3.4** *P* **410** *L* **35** # 101

Magesh , Valliappan — Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The document says -
"If preset is TRUE then the function returns the coefficient value equivalent to no equalization (c(-1) & c(1) coefficients are set to zero, c(-1) set to maximum)."
The last reference to "c(-1)" is incorrect. It should be c(0)

SuggestedRemedy

"If preset is TRUE then the function returns the coefficient value equivalent to no equalization (c(-1) & c(1) coefficients are set to zero, c(0) set to maximum)."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **73** *SC* **73.10.1** *P* **470** *L* **23** # 59

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The definition of the variable mr_parallel_detection_fault includes the text:
1) link_status_ [1GKX] = OK
2) link_status_[10GKX4] = OK
Values: false; Exactly one of the above three indications was true when the autoneg_wait_timer expired, and an_receive_idle = true.
true; either zero or more than one of the above three indications was true when the autoneg_wait_timer expired, or an_receive_idle = false.
As can be seen there are two options, 1) and 2), yet the definition of true and false include reference to 'three' indications. It is believed this error was introduced when ability to parallel detect 10GBASE-KR was removed.

SuggestedRemedy

In the two instances change '.. above three indications ..' to read '.. above two indications ..'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **73** *SC* **73.5.2** *P* **456** *L* **3** # 64

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The text current reads 'A transition absent from an even-numbered DME position represents a logic zero' however it has been suggested that this should actually read 'A transition absent from an even-numbered transition position represents a logic zero' since they are transition positions, not DME positions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change '.. DME position ..' to read '.. transition position ..'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **73** *SC* **Figure 73-11** *P* **478** *L* **40** # 7

Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Redundant term in transition condition.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the term '(link_status_[HCD]=FAIL + link_status_[HCD]=OK) *' in the transition condition from AN GOOD CHECK to TRANSMIT DISABLE because it is redundant.

I think this problem was introduced when the 802.3ap task force decided to delete the READY link status state.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There is another transition out of this state that is based simply on link_status_[HCD]=OK. Hence to avoid a theoretical race condition this condition should still include link_status_[HCD]=FAIL so only link_status_[HCD]=OK will be deleted.

Cl **74** *SC* **74.8.4.1** *P* **502** *L* **41** # 76

Ganga, Ilango Intel Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The definition for corrected block (FEC) can be rephrased for better readability, as follows:

"A corrected block is an FEC block that has invalid parity, and that the error corrector in the FEC decoder had attempted to correct it."

Similarly the definition for uncorrected block (74.8.4.2), line 50) can be rephrased for better readability, as follows:

"An uncorrected block is an FEC block that has invalid parity, and that the error corrector in the FEC decoder was not able to correct it."

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will be changed to read "A corrected block is an FEC block that has invalid parity, and has been corrected by the FEC decoder." and "An uncorrected block is an FEC block that has invalid parity, and has not been corrected by the FEC decoder.".

Cl **99** *SC* *P* **1** *L* **1** # 44
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Correct project number as assigned by NesCom

SuggestedRemedy
NesCom assigned number is P802.3. Fix in title, cover pages and headers.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* *P* **1** *L* **31** # 45
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Grammar and punction could improve

SuggestedRemedy
Fix lines 31.33.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Bob to provide text.

Cl **99** *SC* *P* **2** *L* **2** # 46
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Awkward sentence

SuggestedRemedy
Replace comma with "and".

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* *P* **3** *L* **1** # 47
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Need front matter before Sponsor ballot

SuggestedRemedy
WG Chair to provide new front matter incorporating recent required text changes and appropriate edits to 2005 front matter introduction.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* *P* **3** *L* **1** # 48
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**
Can probably dispense with this page now.

SuggestedRemedy
Check with WG, expecially international users if symbol table is useful? If not, delete at publication.

Response *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

Resubmit and ask question at July plenary.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **1** *L* # 146
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
The page after lxxii (still within the contents) is numbered 1

SuggestedRemedy
Should be lxxiii

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **11** *L* **15** # 151
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
(pdf page 133) Why is 'Egress control' over to the right?

SuggestedRemedy
Fix

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **15** *L* # 147
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Two blank pages (pdf 88, 89)

SuggestedRemedy
Remove

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **30** *L* # 148
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Five blank pages (pdf 118-122)

SuggestedRemedy
Remove

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **35** *L* # 149
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
The page after 34 is page 1 (pdf page 123)

SuggestedRemedy
Number the contents through continuously

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **i** *L* **31** # 108
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
at the time January 2007 Maintenance meeting

SuggestedRemedy
on XX January 2007' (or if you prefer, 'at the time of the January 2007 Maintenance meeting')

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **i** *L* **32** # 109
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
with the exception of request

SuggestedRemedy
with the exception of the request? the N requests? any requests?

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **i** *L* **8** # 107
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**
Draft Standard for Information technology

SuggestedRemedy
Draft standard for information technology (or if it is impertant to save typing when approved, Draft Standard for information technology)

Response *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

The reason is this will be published as:
Standard for
Information technology -

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **ii** *L* **1** # 111
Dawe, Piers
Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
speeds

SuggestedRemedy
rates?

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will be provide to WG Chair for consideration.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **ii** *L* **5** # 141
Dawe, Piers
Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
selected: what does this mean? Surely one can use all the PHYs in this document, and most can work with MIIs?

SuggestedRemedy
allow a choice of physical layer... ?

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will be provide to WG Chair for consideration.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **ii** *L* **5** # 140
Dawe, Piers
Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**
physical layer (PHY) interfaces - compare 1.1.1 Scope

SuggestedRemedy
physical layer devices (PHYs)

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **ii** *L* **6** # 110
Dawe, Piers
Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**
multisegment

SuggestedRemedy
hyphenate?

Response *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

We don't hyphenate multimode and multiport therefore we shouldn't hyphenate this.

Will add multisegment to IEEE 802.3 dictionary.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **iii** *L* **26** # 142
Dawe, Piers
Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
One in style of Shift+x, several in style of Shft-x

SuggestedRemedy
Change all to style of Shift-x

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **iv** *L* # 143
Dawe, Piers
Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Blank page, also page vi

SuggestedRemedy
If you allow 'Changes (Maintenance request and others)' to start on an even page, will they go away?

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Pagination will change before and during publication preparation.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **lxix** *L* # 145

Dawe, Piers
Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Four blank pages

SuggestedRemedy

Remove

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **v** *L* # 144

Dawe, Piers
Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

This page is helpful and would be even more helpful if it had sub-clause numbers as well

SuggestedRemedy

Consider showing the subclause numbers as well as page numbers.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will be provide to WG Chair for consideration.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **xvi** *L* # 150

Dawe, Piers
Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Difficulties with indents and long lines in contents

SuggestedRemedy

Can you set up the tabs for the contents so that the indents start small and increase for each level deeper?

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This is style issue controlled by staff. Whatever we do will be changed to meet the current style guide during preparation for publication.

Cl **A** *SC* **A** *P* **509** *L* **1** # 175

Dawe, Piers
Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

If instead of saying:
Annex A
(informative)
Bibliography
we had
Annex A Bibliography (informative)
then the annex title would show up properly in the contents

SuggestedRemedy

Rearrange per comment, all annexes

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.