Comment Status

CommentType   Response Status

CI 00   **SC**   **E / D / W**   **#** 60   Bob Grow

Editing instructions for existing clauses are not consistent. <CR>This may cause unnecessary complications in the publication of<CR>802.3

CI 00   **SC** global   **E / D / W**   **#** 85   Joe Gwinn

The ".pdf" documents containing 802.3z/d3.2 (and earlier) were not <CR>"optimised", making use of the documents by reviewers needlessly

CI 01   **SC** 1.1.2.2(d)   **E / D / W**   **#** 68   Rich Seifert

The GMII does not support operation at any speed other than 1000 Mb/s.

CI 01   **SC** 1.4   **E / D / W**   **#** 189   Kelly McClellan

typographical:<CR>'specialtyshielded' is run together

CI 01   **SC** 1.4   **E / D / W**   **#** 191   Kelly McClellan

definition of 'differential sensitivity' should include<CR>reference to BER

CI 01   **SC** 1.4   **E / D / W**   **#** 190   Kelly McClellan

definition of 'differential skew' should be <CR>closer to useage in Clause 39

CI 01   **SC** 1.4   **E / D / W**   **#** 78   Joe Gwinn

We use the term "power penalty" in a number of places in section 01, <CR>but never define it. There was a definition in section 01 of draft 3

CI 01   **SC** 1.4   **E / D / W**   **#** 124   David Law

1000BASE X should read 1000BASE-X.

CI 01   **SC** 1.4   **E / D / W**   **#** 126   David Law

Suggest that definition should mentioned that 1000BASE-T runs on four pairs<CR><CR>of Cat-5 cabling.

CI 01   **SC** 1.4   **E / D / W**   **#** 125   David Law

The definition used here does not include the changes that were made by<CR>802.3y.

CI 01   **SC** 1.4   **E / D / W**   **#** 128   David Law

Suggest reword of this definition to match others.

CI 01   **SC** 1.4   **E / D / W**   **#** 127   David Law

"The definitions for 'Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS)', Physical Layer<CR>entity (PHY)' and 'Physical Media Attachment (PMA)' seem to be

CI 01   **SC** 1.4   **E / D / W**   **#** 38   Kevin Daines

"Physical Media Attachment (PMA) sublayer" is incorrect.<CR>References - .3u 1.4.150 (page 15)<CR>   - .3z Figure 1-1 (page 1.2)

CI 04   **SC** 4.2.3   **E / D / O**   **#** 12   Shimon Muller

Style of the sentence.

CI 04   **SC** 4.2.3.4   **E / D / O**   **#** 87   Edmund Chen

In Fig. 4-7, the FCS Coverage should not include the FCS field.

CI 04   **SC** 4.2.7.2   **E / D / O**   **#** 129   David Law

The close } is missing from the interFrameSpacingPart2 definition.

CI 04   **SC** 4.3.3   **E / D / O**   **#** 13   Shimon Muller

The NOTE that was deleted from the text should still appear in this version of<CR>the standard, and be shown in "strikethrough" type.

CI 04   **SC** 4.4.2.1   **E / D / O**   **#** 197   Devendra Tripathi

The last part of the sentence "..and the clock skew" should be "... and the<CR>clock tolerances", just like line 27 of page 4.36.

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open   W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Page 1 of 13

P802.3z Draft 3.2
Summary Report

Comment Status

CommentType   Response Status

CI	SC	Type	#	Commenter
CI 04	**SC** 4.4.2.3	**E / D / O**	**#** 198	Devendra Tripathi

Add a note like used for 10 and 1000 Mb/s speeds regarding interframe<CR>spacing in terms of bit time.

| **CI** 04 | **SC** 4.4.2.4 | **E / D / O** | **#** 35 | Kevin Daines |

Spelling error

| **CI** 05 | **SC** 5.2.4.2 | **1 / D / O** | **#** 199 | Devendra Tripathi |

Is 32 bit wide xmt octet counter good enough for Gbit/s speed ?

| **CI** 05 | **SC** 5.2.4.2 | **1 / D / O** | **#** 200 | Devendra Tripathi |

In full duplex mode carrier sense is not defined. Thus<CR>LayerMgmtTransmitCounters may remain on line 36 forever.

| **CI** 05 | **SC** 5.2.4.3 | **1 / D / O** | **#** 201 | Devendra Tripathi |

Is 32 bit wide receive octet counter good enough for Gbit ?

| **CI** 05 | **SC** 5.2.4.3 | **1 / D / O** | **#** 202 | Devendra Tripathi |

The value assigned on lne 44 overwrites any other assignments.

| **CI** 22 | **SC** 22.2.4 | **E / D / W** | **#** 37 | Kevin Daines |

Capitalization error. Reference: clause 37

| **CI** 22 | **SC** 22.2.4 | **E / D / W** | **#** 66 | Bob Grow |

I have been informed that the IEEE editor has included editorial changes in 802.3x&y as requested in my ballot comment on 802.3aa. As a r

| **CI** 22 | **SC** 22.2.4.1.3 | **1 / D / W** | **#** 64 | Brad Booth |

The context of a single speed PHY has been changed.

| **CI** 22 | **SC** 22.2.4.2.16 | **E / D / O** | **#** 203 | Devendra Tripathi |

Clause 28 does not define register 8, thus reference to 28.2.4.1 is not<CR>correct.

| **CI** 22 | **SC** 22.2.4.2.8 | **E / D / W** | **#** 14 | Shimon Muller |

Style of the sentence.

| **CI** 22 | **SC** 22.7.3.4 | **E / D / O** | **#** 67 | Bob Grow |

Verify if the subclause references in PICs items MF39 through 51 of 802.3x&y have been corrected as requested on my ballot comment on 8

| **CI** 22 | **SC** 22.7.3.4 | **1 / D / W** | **#** 62 | Brad Booth |

The context of a single speed PHY has been changed in PICS MF12.

| **CI** 22 | **SC** 22.7.3.4 | **1 / D / W** | **#** 63 | Brad Booth |

The context of a single speed PHY has been changed in PICS MF13.

| **CI** 22 | **SC** 22.7.3.4 | **E / D / O** | **#** 150 | David Law |

Is the status correct. It reads that the registers are dependent on the<CR>implementation of the GMII. Aren't these registers in fact depende

| **CI** 22 | **SC** 22.7.3.4 | **E / D / O** | **#** 149 | David Law |

Incorrect subclause reference

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.2.2.2.2 | **E / D / O** | **#** 146 | David Law |

Typo.

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.2.2.2.2 | **E / D / O** | **#** 147 | David Law |

Typo.

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Page 2 of 13

Comment Status

CommentType   Response Status

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.2.2.2.2 | **E / D / O** | **#** 148 | David Law |

Typo.

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.3.1.1.24 | **E / D / O** | **#** 184 | Kevin Daines |

Spelling error.

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.3.1.1.24 | **E / D / O** | **#** 145 | David Law |

"Typo, missing space."

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.3.1.1.25 | **E / D / O** | **#** 144 | David Law |

Suggest we should be consistent in the use of project names.

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.3.2.1.2 | **E / D / O** | **#** 143 | David Law |

"Typo, missing space."

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.3.2.1.5 | **E / D / O** | **#** 152 | David Law |

"The carrier event is not necessarily valid, it is just a carrier event."

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.3.2.1.6 | **E / D / O** | **#** 151 | David Law |

"The note duplicates the text of the behaviour. Remove the note, it is no<CR>longer required."

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.4.3.1.10 | **E / D / O** | **#** 157 | David Law |

Remove the extraneous carriage return after ValidPacketMinTime.

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.4.3.1.2 | **E / D / O** | **#** 155 | David Law |

Match the enumeration to the actual value. Also place inverted commas<CR>around the enumeration.

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.4.3.1.2 | **E / D / O** | **#** 153 | David Law |

Typo.

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.4.3.1.2 | **E / D / O** | **#** 154 | David Law |

Place inverted commas around the enumeration.

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.4.3.1.7 | **E / D / O** | **#** 156 | David Law |

Remove extraneous space.

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.5.1.1.2 | **E / D / O** | **#** 158 | David Law |

Please correct the format of these two paragraphs. They should not be<CR>hanging paragraphs.

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.5.1.1.4 | **E / D / O** | **#** 160 | David Law |

Correct the capitalisation of Auto-Negotiation on both of these lines.

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.5.1.1.4 | **E / D / O** | **#** 159 | David Law |

Suggest new enumeration 'auto negotiation error' should be changed to 'auto<CR><CR>neg error' so that it fits within the size of the other e

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.5.1.1.4 | **E / D / O** | **#** 161 | David Law |

"Text 'auto negotiation, applies only ...' should read 'Auto-Negotiation<CR>error ...'. I assume this text runs into the enumeration due to the le

| **CI** 30 | **SC** 30.6.1.1.5 | **E / D / O** | **#** 162 | David Law |

"Text '... (RF1)as ...' and '... (RF2)as ...' should read '... (RF1) as<CR>...' and '... (RF2) as ...', that is add a space before 'as' in both<CR>cas

| **CI** 30B | **SC** 30B.2 | **E / D / O** | **#** 163 | David Law |

"Text '... of clause 40 ...' should read '... of clause 40...', that is<CR>remove additional space."

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Page 3 of 13

Comment Status
CommentType   Response Status

| CI 31 | SC 31B.3.7 | E / D / O | # 15 | Shimon Muller |

Typo.

| CI 31B | SC 31B.3.7 | E / D / O | # 141 | David Law |

"Typo, missing close ')'."

| CI 31B | SC 31B.3.7 | E / D / O | # 142 | David Law |

Typo.

| CI 31B | SC 31B.4.3 | E / D / O | # 140 | David Law |

The order of the columns seems to have been changed from that published in<CR>31B.

| CI 31B | SC 31B.4.6 | E / D / O | # 139 | David Law |

Transcription error.

| CI 31B | SC 31B.4.6 | E / D / O | # 138 | David Law |

Please remove the strikethrough word 'out' from 'without'. These seems to<CR>be a strikethrough from marking a change made to the last d

| CI 34 | SC 34.1 | E / D / W | # 16 | Shimon Muller |

See comment #555.<CR>This editorial comment was accepted by the editor, but the change was not incor-<CR>porated in the specified tex

| CI 34 | SC 34.1.2 | E / D / W | # 130 | David Law |

Rather than '(under development)' suggest that same text as is used<CR>elsewhere should be used to note that clause 40 is not yet comple

| CI 35 | SC 35 | E / D / O | # 106 | Bill Quackenbush |

Text was approved at the 9/30-10/1 intermin in Santa Clara<CR>for insertion at the beginning of clause 35.4.3. Some of<CR>the approved t

| CI 35 | SC 35.1.1 | E / D / O | # 112 | Bill Quackenbush |

"provides" should be singular.

| CI 35 | SC 35.1.2 | E / D / O | # 113 | Bill Quackenbush |

Period and start of sentence missing.

| CI 35 | SC 35.1.2 | E / D / O | # 114 | Bill Quackenbush |

Sentence is awkward.

| CI 35 | SC 35.1.3 | E / D / O | # 115 | Bill Quackenbush |

Awkward usage.

| CI 35 | SC 35.1.4 | E / D / W | # 36 | Kevin Daines |

Incorrect acronym. Reference .3u 1.4.150

| CI 35 | SC 35.2.1.5 | E / D / O | # 131 | David Law |

Typo.

| CI 35 | SC 35.2.2.10 | E / D / O | # 205 | Devendra Tripathi |

These line are pretty much duplicated again on lines 51 to 54.

| CI 35 | SC 35.2.2.10 | T / D / O | # 206 | Devendra Tripathi |

Since bit 0.8 defines full duplex mode only when manual configuration is<CR>enabled, the sentence describing CRS and COL<CR>on these

| CI 35 | SC 35.2.2.10 | E / D / W | # 45 | Kevin Daines |

Essentially both paragraphs are identical with the exception of the last line in the 2nd paragraph. Since the two are written differently, it mak

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Page 4 of 13

Comment Status
CommentType   Response Status

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.10   **E / D / W**   **#** 44   Kevin Daines
Spelling error.

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.4   **E / D / O**   **#** 116   Bill Quackenbush
"first GTX_CLK" is unclear.

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.5   **E / D / O**   **#** 117   Bill Quackenbush
"data" not "data code-groups" are present on TXD. Certain<CR>encodings of TXD, TX_EN and TX_ER request that the PHY generate<CR>

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.5   **E / D / W**   **#** 43   Kevin Daines
Redundant text. The note about TXD encodings is found in text and in table (line 26, same page).

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.5   **E / D / O**   **#** 132   David Law
Suggest in this case table should not have been changed to have an<CR>uppercase 'T'.

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.6   **E / D / O**   **#** 204   Devendra Tripathi
The last word "deasserted" is not correct when used for state. I think<CR>inactive word is more appropriate.

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.6   **E / D / O**   **#** 133   David Law
"The text 'The TX_ER signal shall be implemented at the GMII of a PHY and<CR>in a repeater, at the GMII of a port. The TX_ER shall be im

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.6   **E / D / O**   **#** 118   Bill Quackenbush
The paragraph is rather unclear, at least to me.

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.6   **E / D / W**   **#** 40   Kevin Daines
Punctuation error.

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.7   **E / D / O**   **#** 119   Bill Quackenbush
RX_DX does not indicate whether the data on RXD<7:0> is synchronous<CR>to RX_CLK.

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.7   **E / D / O**   **#** 120   Bill Quackenbush
Change "shall remain asserted continuously" to "shall be asserted<CR>continuously".

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.7   **E / D / O**   **#** 121   Bill Quackenbush
"first RX_CLK" is unclear.

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.8   **E / D / O**   **#** 134   David Law
Suggest in this case table should not have been changed to have an<CR>uppercase 'T'.

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.8   **E / D / O**   **#** 122   Bill Quackenbush
I think that the sentence should begin "In a DTE".

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.8   **E / D / W**   **#** 42   Kevin Daines
Redundant text. The note about RXD encodings is found in the text and in table.

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.8   **E / D / W**   **#** 41   Kevin Daines
Spelling error.

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.9   **E / D / O**   **#** 123   Bill Quackenbush
"and" should be "an".

CI 35   **SC** 35.2.2.9   **E / D / O**   **#** 135   David Law
Typo.

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open   W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   Page 5 of 13

Comment Status
CommentType   Response Status

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.2.2.9 | **E / D / W** | **#** 39 | Kevin Daines |

Spelling error.

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.2.2.9 | **E / D / O** | **#** 136 | David Law |

Typo.

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.2.3.5 | **E / D / O** | **#** 207 | Devendra Tripathi |

In the beginning of the line the text "transmit path" is redundant. It has<CR>already been mentioned in line 41, in the same sentence.

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.2.4 | **T / D / W** | **#** 17 | Shimon Muller |

See comment #570. This technical comment was accepted during the ballot comment resolution, but the required change was not incorporat

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.4.1 | **E / D / O** | **#** 104 | Bill Quackenbush |

As written, the paragraph suggests that only the physical layer is<CR>subject to this issue.

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.4.3 | **T / D / O** | **#** 208 | Devendra Tripathi |

The period 7.5 ns is out of range of 100 ppm tolerance. On what basis it<CR>has been decided ? <CR>Likewise 2.5 ns high comes to abou

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.4.3 | **E / D / O** | **#** 105 | Bill Quackenbush |

Text was approved at the 9/30-10/1 intermin in Santa Clara<CR>for insertion at the beginning of clause 35.4.3. Some of<CR>the approved t

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.4.3 | **E / D / O** | **#** 107 | Bill Quackenbush |

Too any "and"s.

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.4.3 | **E / D / O** | **#** 108 | Bill Quackenbush |

As written, the AC thresholds apply only to the clocks.

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.4.3 | **E / D / O** | **#** 109 | Bill Quackenbush |

Sentence needs some clean up.

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.4.3 | **E / D / O** | **#** 111 | Bill Quackenbush |

The title of Table 35-9 is not symmetric with the title of Table 35-10.

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.4.3 | **E / D / O** | **#** 110 | Bill Quackenbush |

Change "insure" to ensure"

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.5.3.2 | **E / D / W** | **#** 61 | Brad Booth |

Correct to Comment is incorrect.

| **Cl** 35 | **SC** 35.5.3.2 | **E / D / O** | **#** 137 | David Law |

Suggest that both SF27a and SF27b are both depended on being connected to a<CR><CR>repeater. This may require another condition or

| **Cl** 36 | **SC** 36 | **E / D / O** | **#** 101 | Scott Mason |

Typos and minor grammatically errors in clause 36.

| **Cl** 36 | **SC** 36 | **TR / D / O** | **#** 99 | Scott Mason |

Clause 36 is inconsistent in its description of the PCS client. At times the<CR>client is called: MAC, reconcilliation sub-layer, GMII, repeater,

| **Cl** 36 | **SC** 36.1.4.1 | **TR / D / O** | **#** 100 | Scott Mason |

New text that reads "for half-duplex PHYs" was added to item b. 1000 Base-X<CR>does not support half-duplex PHYs.<CR><CR>I don't se

| **Cl** 36 | **SC** 36.1.5 | **E / D / O** | **#** 47 | Kevin Daines |

The acronym TBI is not previously defined. Clause 36 describes GMII,<CR>for example, in 36.1.5, even though it was defined in 36.1.4.1, y

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Page 6 of 13

Comment Status

CommentType   Response Status

CI 36   **SC** 36.1.5   **E / D / O**   **#** 164   David Law

Please define the meaning of 'TBI' before using it.

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.4.15   **E / D / O**   **#** 188   Don Wong

TX_ER should also be mentioned as being = 1, to cause the generation of<CR>/R/.

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.4.15   **E / D / O**   **#** 195   Don Wong

On lines 4 & 5, a reference is made to EPD2 and EPD3, however on page <CR>36.20 the definition of EPD2 & EPD3 (lines 41 & 45, respect

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.4.16   **E / D / O**   **#** 97   Scott Mason

New text states that "The PCS indicates reception of /V/ or an invalid<CR>code-group on the GMII through the use of RX_DV signal asserte

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.4.17   **TR / D / O**   **#** 98   Scott Mason

The second paragraph states that "The conversion from a MAC frame to code-<CR>group stream and back to a MAC frame is transparent t

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.4.17   **E / D / O**   **#** 46   Kevin Daines

The PCS encapsulates packets. We fixed this in the previous paragraph<CR>but missed it on line 46 and on line 49.

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.4.7.1   **E / D / O**   **#** 11   Don Alderrou

Tables 36-1 Valid data code-groups, 36-2 Valid special code-groups, and <CR>36-3 Defined ordered_sets are inconsistent and confusing. T

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.1.1   **E / D / O**   **#** 48   Kevin Daines

Formatting problem.

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.1.2   **E / D / O**   **#** 196   Don Wong

/INVALID/ is end of the line. should be at the beginning of a line

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.1.2   **E / D / O**   **#** 49   Kevin Daines

Lines 48-50 are duplicates of lines 27-29 and not needed I believe.

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.1.3   **E / D / O**   **#** 50   Kevin Daines

Spelling error (or grammatical error).

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.2   **E / D / O**   **#** 72   Benjamin Brown

The Transmit and Receive state diagrams each cover 2 pages. Designing to<CR>these would be much easier if the pairs were on facing pa

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.2   **T / D / O**   **#** 54   Jon Frain

Recent changes in the receive state diagram have created a problem <CR>in that errors in the /I/ interpacket gap preceding /S/ can cause a

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.2.1   **E / D / O**   **#** 73   Benjamin Brown

PCS transmit code-group state diagram state : GENERATE_code_groupS should<CR>be uppercased.

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.2.2   **E / D / O**   **#** 93   Scott Mason

The transitions from PCS transmit states CONFIGURATION and IDLE to state<CR>TX_TEST_XMIT are redundant. Exit from these states is

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.2.2   **TR / D / O**   **#** 94   Scott Mason

If xmit becomes DATA while the GMII client is sending a packet, the transmit<CR>PCS will place a start delimiter on the packet in progress,

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.2.2   **T / D / O**   **#** 2   Mike Morrison

The transition from state IDLE_D to RX_INVALID causes a potential<CR>deadlock situation. Upon completion of autonegotiation, one end

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.2.2   **TR / D / O**   **#** 91   Scott Mason

Recent major revisions have been made to the PCS receive state diagram to<CR>enable /C/ and /I/ to be always sent to the auto-negotiatio

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open   W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   Page 7 of 13

Comment Status

CommentType   Response Status

CI 36   **SC** 36.2.5.2.2   **E / D / O**   **#** 92   Scott Mason

The assignment of TRUE to RX_ER in PCS receive state EXTEND_ERR is redundant.<CR>No path exists to this state where RX_ER is not

CI 36   **SC** 36.3.3   **E / D / O**   **#** 51   Kevin Daines

Spelling error.

CI 36   **SC** 36.3.6.2   **E / D / O**   **#** 27   Brad Booth

extra period in last sentence of footnote

CI 36   **SC** 36.5.1   **E / D / O**   **#** 28   Brad Booth

need a period at the end of the last sentence in the paragraph

CI 36   **SC** 36.5.1   **E / D / O**   **#** 52   Kevin Daines

Punctuation mistake.

CI 36   **SC** 36.5.1   **E / D / O**   **#** 26   Brad Booth

need a space between "CRS" and "de-assert"

CI 36   **SC** 36.5.1.3   **E / D / O**   **#** 96   Scott Mason

The new variables cgbad and cggood include the comparision:<CR><CR> rx_code_group = /INVALID/<CR><CR>This is not valid syntax. r

CI 36   **SC** 36.5.1.4   **TR / D / O**   **#** 95   Scott Mason

In D3.2, a change was introduced that "detects carrier when a two or more bit<CR>difference between [/x/] and the expected /K28.5/ based

CI 36A   **SC** 36A.4   **E / D / O**   **#** 74   Benjamin Brown

Disparity Flip bytes are no longer necessary. They should have been<CR>removed for D3.2.

CI 36B   **SC** 36B   **E / D / O**   **#** 3   Amrit Kalla

The page numbers for Annex 36B are give as 36A.1 and 36A.2. These page numbers are the same as for Annex 36A.

CI 36B   **SC** 36B   **E / D / O**   **#** 53   Kevin Daines

<< Note: it should be page "36B.1", but Annex 36A and 36B are both <CR>give the same page numbers. >><CR><CR>Punctuation error.

CI 36B   **SC** 36B   **T / D / O**   **#** 5   Howie Johnson

Please include an additional 8B/10B coding example (our editorial staff mistakenly omitted this example from the draft D3.2).<CR><CR>This

CI 36B   **SC** 36B   **E / D / O**   **#** 4   Howie Johnson

Page numbering appears incorrect.

CI 37   **SC** 37.1.4.4   **E / D / O**   **#** 1   John Cagle

bad grammar

CI 37   **SC** 37.2.1.7   **E / D / O**   **#** 69   Linda Cheng

Add helpful text stolen from Clause 28.2.1.2.5 to explain that a <CR>device can be Next Page able but set the NP bit to zero.

CI 37   **SC** 37.2.2   **T / D / O**   **#** 56   Kevin Daines

This comment will be subject to interpretation. The line in question<CR>reads "The first /C/ ordered_sets exchanged ... after [reset] ... <CR>

CI 37   **SC** 37.2.2   **E / D / O**   **#** 209   Devendra Tripathi

"Auto-Negotiation protocol error" has not been defined anywhere. I believe<CR>it is referring to "Auto-Negotaion_Error".

CI 37   **SC** 37.2.3.1   **E / D / O**   **#** 30   Brad Booth

Statement is incorrect. While receiving a /I/ ordered_set, a RUDI(/I/) is always set by the PCS receive process.

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   Page 8 of 13

Comment Status

CommentType   Response Status

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3	**E / D / O**	**#** 75	Benjamin Brown

Missing the phrase "and the NP bit set to logic zero".

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3	**E / D / O**	**#** 70	Linda Cheng

Add helpful text taken and modified from Clause 28.2.3.4.11 to explain <CR>that a device must send a null next page if it is willing to receive

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3	**E / D / O**	**#** 29	Brad Booth

Next page operation is also controlled by the Next Page Able bit in register 6.

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3	**E / D / O**	**#** 32	Brad Booth

Statement is invalid. No next page transmission will happen after the base page if the link partner didn't advertise next page ability, if the loc

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3	**E / D / O**	**#** 210	Devendra Tripathi

The phrase "standard Auto-Negotiation" is confusing.

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3	**E / D / O**	**#** 211	Devendra Tripathi

1. One line 49, the phrase "normal Auto-Negotiation" is confusing. <CR>2. On line 54, "a" in "a next page exchange ..." is awkward.

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3.11	**E / D / O**	**#** 213	Devendra Tripathi

"... is invoked unless either the local device or link partner ..." is<CR>confusing and if am getting the sentence right, it is wrong<CR>even. It

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3.11	**E / D / O**	**#** 58	Kevin Daines

Wrong polarity.

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3.11	**E / D / O**	**#** 33	Brad Booth

Statement is not clear and not correct.

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3.12	**E / D / O**	**#** 214	Devendra Tripathi

The usage of "may be" here is not consistent with "shall" on line 38.

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3.6	**E / D / O**	**#** 212	Devendra Tripathi

"This bit take the opposite..." should be "This bit takes the opposite ..."

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3.6	**E / D / O**	**#** 55	Kevin Daines

Spelling mistake.

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3.6	**E / D / O**	**#** 31	Brad Booth

Missing "s" in "takes"

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.4.3.8	**E / D / O**	**#** 76	Benjamin Brown

Extra end square bracket.

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.5.1	**E / D / O**	**#** 215	Devendra Tripathi

Since here "shall" is used, I believe we should mention here that<CR>"registers 7 and 8 need not be implemented if next page is<CR>not su

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.5.1.5	**T / D / O**	**#** 216	Devendra Tripathi

Since next page is optional we should add bit 6.3 as "Link Partner Next<CR>Page Able". Please refer to 802.3u pp 251 table 28-5.

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.5.1.5	**E / D / O**	**#** 217	Devendra Tripathi

"For next pages ..." is confusing because Page Recieved bit is always<CR>cleared upon read whether it is because of base page or next pa

CI 37	**SC** 37.2.5.1.8	**E / D / O**	**#** 34	Brad Booth

Statement is not correct. Register 15 doesn't indicate the status of Auto-Negotiation.

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open   W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   Page 9 of 13

Comment Status
CommentType   Response Status

CI 37   **SC** 37.2.5.1.9   **E** / **D** / **O**   **#** 218   Devendra Tripathi
The word signal has been used at some places instead of variable. Some<CR>places it should be variable like on line 12. On lines 15 and 1

CI 37   **SC** 37.3   **E** / **D** / **O**   **#** 19   Mike Morrison
In fig 37-6, state AN_ENABLE, the action:<CR><CR>IF (mr_an_enable=TRUE) THEN<CR>   tx_Config_Reg<D15:D0> <=0<CR>   xmit<=C

CI 37   **SC** 37.3.1.1   **1** / **D** / **O**   **#** 219   Devendra Tripathi
Two times it is said here that "mr_page_rx" or "mr_lp_np_rx" must be read<CR>for next page exchange to progress. It is incorrect becuase s

CI 37   **SC** 37.3.1.1   **E** / **D** / **O**   **#** 57   Kevin Daines
Punctuation mistake.

CI 37   **SC** 37.3.1.1   **1** / **D** / **O**   **#** 65   Rich Taborek
Auto-Negotiation protocol should be invoked whenever the condition<CR>signal_detect=FAIL occurs and subsequently singnal_status=OK.<

CI 37   **SC** 37.3.1.2   **1** / **D** / **O**   **#** 10   Don Alderrou
The first sentence of the definition for the ability_match function <CR>which starts at line 41 is not clear.   The complete sentence is: <CR>"

CI 37   **SC** 37.3.1.5   **TR** / **D** / **O**   **#** 89   Myles Kimmitt
There appears to be a state missing in the Autonegotiation State Diagram as<CR>it relates to bringing up a port when autonegotiation is dis

CI 37   **SC** 37.4   **1** / **D** / **O**   **#** 71   Linda Cheng
When mr_np_able = TRUE and mr_adv_ability<16>= 0 there is no condition<CR>for exit from the complete_acknowlege state. When this c

CI 37   **SC** Fig. 37-6   **TR** / **D** / **O**   **#** 90   Steve Dreyer
One invalid /C/ code will cause autonegotiation to restart because RUD(INVALID) is an input to AN_ENABLE.   It was decided in previous m

CI 38   **SC**   **TR** / **D** / **O**   **#** 187   Geoff Thompson
I can not approve a standard that has such a large unsolved technical deficiency as that alluded to in the rather cryptic note on page 38.6 &

CI 38   **SC** 38.1.1   **E** / **D** / **O**   **#** 165   David Law
Suggest text 'These PMD sublayers within 1000BASE-X PMD services are<CR>described in an abstract manner and ...' is not clear.

CI 38   **SC** 38.1.1   **E** / **D** / **O**   **#** 166   David Law
General comment on clause. '... of encoded 8B/10B characters ...'. Is it<CR>correct that the 8B/10B characters are encoded or are the char

CI 38   **SC** 38.1.1   **E** / **D** / **O**   **#** 167   David Law
General comment on clause. I don't think the style used for the note is<CR>correct. For example 'Note -Delay ...' should read 'Note-Delay ...'

CI 38   **SC** 38.10   **1** / **D** / **O**   **#** 103   Ray Lin
Insert recommendation (standard reference) for optical power loss<CR>measurements of installed multimode fiber cable plant.

CI 38   **SC** 38.10   **TR** / **D** / **O**   **#** 79   Joe Gwinn
Table 38-11 "Channel insertion loss" is a bit confusing as it nowhere <CR>explicitly states the ranges in meters used to compute the given <

CI 38   **SC** 38.11   **E** / **D** / **O**   **#** 174   David Law
Suggest '... the optical connector plug specified in 38.11.3.' is not<CR>correct as 38.11.3 is an informative drawing of the connector. The<C

CI 38   **SC** 38.11.2.3   **E** / **D** / **O**   **#** 175   David Law
I may have missed it but I cannot find the PICSs entries for the two new<CR>shalls added here.

CI 38   **SC** 38.12.3   **E** / **D** / **O**   **#** 176   David Law
Suggest that the SD entry in the Major options table is not longer required<CR><CR>as this is no longer an option. SD is also no longer req

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open   W/written   S/sent to commentor for review C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   Page 10 of 13

CI 38   **SC** 38.12.4.1   **E / D / O**   **#** 177   David Law
Delete the condition 'SD' from entries FN6 to FN8 as Signal detect is now<CR>mandatory.

CI 38   **SC** 38.12.4.2   **E / D / O**   **#** 81   Joe Gwinn
A "lessor" is someone who leases something; "lesser" was intened.

CI 38   **SC** 38.2.4   **E / D / O**   **#** 168   David Law
"Text '... PMD_SIGNAL.indicate (SIGNAL_DETECT)' should read'...<CR>PMD_SIGNAL.indicate(SIGNAL_DETECT)', that is remove the inc

CI 38   **SC** 38.3   **E / D / O**   **#** 169   David Law
This note is no longer is complete.

CI 38   **SC** 38.3   **TR / D / O**   **#** 185   Howie Johnson
Clause 38 includes references to non-international<CR>standards. Here are the six locations I found (has<CR>anyone spotted any others?

CI 38   **SC** 38.3   **TR / D / O**   **#** 186   Howie Johnson
The fundamental issue underlying D3.1 comment #754 has not yet been resolved. Attached is a copy of the record for D3.1 comment #754.

CI 38   **SC** 38.3, 38.4, 38   **TR / D / O** **#** 88   Ray Lin
The Annex 38A physical media dependent link model used to establish link <CR>penalties may need to include a differential mode delay (D

CI 38   **SC** 38.3.2 & 38.4   **E / D / O**   **#** 102   Vince Melendy
The receiver specification for sensitivity the min and max words are reversed on both of these tables. The highest positive number is the mini

CI 38   **SC** 38.4   **E / D / O**   **#** 170   David Law
Suggest that the diameter of the singlemode fibre supported should be<CR>listed in the same way as the multimode fibre is.

CI 38   **SC** 38.4   **E / D / O**   **#** 171   David Law
This note is no longer is complete.

CI 38   **SC** 38.5   **TR / D / O**   **#** 86   Paul Kolesar
Due to the recently discovered jitter generation caused by the possible<CR>equal-amplitude split-impulse response of multimode fiber when

CI 38   **SC** 38.6.6   **E / D / O**   **#** 77   Joe Gwinn
The term "backed out" is colloquial, and not clear.

CI 38   **SC** 38.6.8   **E / D / O**   **#** 172   David Law
Suggest text '... shall substitute use of the BT filter ...' should read<CR>'... shall substitute the use of the Bessel-Thompson filter ...'

CI 38   **SC** 38.9   **E / D / O**   **#** 173   David Law
"I do not understand what parameter labelling is required by the statement<CR>'... include 62.5 mm MMF, 50 mm MMF', please clarify."

CI 38A   **SC** 38A.2   **E / D / O**   **#** 178   David Law
I note that the extra space at the beginning of the paragraph has been<CR>removed. If you want to remove these additional spaces note tha

CI 38A   **SC** 38A.5   **E / D / O**   **#** 179   David Law
On the basis of previous changes I have noted suggest that micrometers<CR>should use the symbol.

CI 38A   **SC** 38A.6   **E / D / O**   **#** 180   David Law
"Is there reference to 38L.7 correct, suggest it should be to 38A.3."

CI 38B   **SC** 38B.1   **1 / D / O**   **#** 83   Joe Gwinn
Reference problem: "This method" actually points to restricted launch, <CR>while OFL was intended.

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

Page 11 of 13

Comment Status
CommentType   Response Status

CI 38B   **SC** 38B.2   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 82   Joe Gwinn
Stray character.

CI 38B   **SC** 38B.2   **T** / D / **O**   **#** 84   Joe Gwinn
Are the document references exact? Specifically, aren't the <CR>parenthetical references to "TIA-455-xxx" incomplete, as the "EIA/" <CR>p

CI 38B   **SC** global   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 80   Joe Gwinn
Paragraph numbers are wrong. This is annex 38B, but 38A is used.

CI 39   **SC** 39.3.1   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 192   Kelly McClellan
typographical error? in Table 39-2

CI 39   **SC** 39.3.2   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 194   Kelly McClellan
a Differential Sensitivity - Maximum of 2000mV is specified,<CR>but the intent seems to be specifying a maximum input level<CR>tolerance

CI 39   **SC** 39.3.2   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 193   Kelly McClellan
"Differential Sensitivity" is used in Table 39-4<CR>but "receiver sensitivity" is used in line 7 of pg. 39-7

CI 39   **SC** 39.3.3   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 181   David Law
"Is the reference to Table 38-8 correct, suggest it should be to Table 38-<CR>10."

CI 39   **SC** 39.4   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 21   Steve Brewer
Typo in <CR>'A 1000Base-CX compliant jumper cable assembly shall consist of two<CR>polarized, shielded PLUG as described in 39.5.1 a

CI 39   **SC** 39.5   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 22   Steve Brewer
Typo & wording in <CR>'-3, having pinouts matching those in Figure 39.6, and the signal quality<CR>AND AND electrical requirements of thi

CI 39   **SC** 39.5.1   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 20   Steve Brewer
Typo in 'Style-1 or style-2 connectrors may be used....'

CI 39   **SC** 39.5.1.2   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 23   Steve Brewer
Similar to previous comment for style 1 connectors...<CR>(Note the typo 39-7-)<CR>'-103, having pinouts matching those shown in Figure 3

CI 39   **SC** 39.5.1.2   **T** / D / **O**   **#** 24   Steve Brewer
Pin 5 for a style-2 connector has been reserved for two functions.<CR><CR>ie PWR from line 42 and Output Disable from line 47.<CR>Not

CI 39   **SC** 39.6   **T** / D / **O**   **#** 25   Steve Brewer
Type<CR>'Electrical measurements shall be PERFORMMED as described in this...'

CI 39   **SC** 39.7   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 182   David Law
Reference to 11801 seems to be incorrect. If comment accepted also need to<CR>correct PICS item OR14 in 39.8.4.4

CI 39   **SC** 39.8.3   **E** / D / **O**   **#** 183   David Law
Suggest that the SD entry in the Major options table is not longer required<CR><CR>as this is no longer an option. SD is also no longer req

CI 39   **SC** 4   **TR** / D / **O**   **#** 6   Robert Campbell
The text in this sub-clause is not consistent with the resoution of<CR>comment 204 of draft 3.1.

CI 39   **SC** 6.5   **T** / D / **O**   **#** 9   Robert Campbell
Differentiate this specification from the skew measurement between<CR>pairs in a cable.

CI 39   **SC** 6.7   **T** / D / **O**   **#** 8   Robert Campbell
Change `NEXT' to `NEXT Loss'.

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   Page 12 of 13

Comment Status

CommentType   Response Status

CI 39   **SC** 6.7   **TR / D / O**   **#** 7   Robert Campbell

Add `loss' after `(NEXT)'.

CI 41   **SC** 41.1.1   **E / D / O**   **#** 18   Shimon Muller

I believe we agreed that all the notes under the figures should be deleted.

CI 42   **SC** 42.3.1   **E / D / O**   **#** 59   Kevin Daines

SFD has the wrong acronym definition. <CR><CR>Reference - .3z 35.2.2.7 (page 35.11, line 22)<CR>   - .3 3.2.2   (page 13)

Comment Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open   W/written S/sent to commentor for review C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   Page 13 of 13