

IEEE Std 1802.3-2001 10BASE-T Conformance test - reaffirmation comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 8
 DICKEY, SUSAN R Individual
 Comment Type G Comment Status X
 At several places in the document, the phrase "bit s zero crossing" occurs
 SuggestedRemedy
 Assume this is a typo for "bit's zero crossing" and an apostrophe needs to be inserted.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 3
 SAYOGO, BARTIEN Individual
 Comment Type G Comment Status X
 For next revision, the number and title of this standard should be revised:
 "IEEE Std. 802.3.1, IEEE Std for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks - Part 3.1: Specific Rqmt for Carrier Sense Multiple Access with Collosion Detection (CSMA/CD) Access Method and Physical Layer Specifications - Conformance Test Methodology".
 In family of IEEE Std 802, the position of this standard is under IEEE Std 802.3.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 0 P 192 L 26 # 4
 MELLITZ, RICHARD I Individual
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 sub-clause 69b.4.6: Return loss does not descrimate between simple traget impedance mismatch and residual ISI.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove channel return loss and replace with a residual ISI parameter. See presenation.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 01 SC 1.2 P 10 L # 2
 THALER, PATRICIA A Individual
 Comment Type G Comment Status X
 The instructions for reaffirmation say "If you enter an affirmative vote, you will be implying that this standard continues to reflect the state-of-the-art and contains no obsolete or erroneous information."
 The scope of this standard says: "The Clause 14 options excluded from this conformance test suite are support for Auto-Negotiation and full-duplex operation. The test suite should demonstrate conformance to Clause 14 of the ISO/IEC 8802-3 standard [IEEE Std 802.3]."
 Also 6.1.1 of this standard says: "Many of these tests do not apply to embedded MAUs where the physical AUI does not exist. In those cases, other standards may apply."
 At the current time, the vast majority of existing implementations of 10BASE-T support Auto-Negotiation and full-duplex operation. The vast majority of operation is in full-duplex mode rather than the original half-duplex mode. Almost no instances of 10BASE-T transceivers ship with an exposed AUI. Most are embedded.
 Therefore, much of the information here does not apply to state of the art implementations. Only 6.2.1.10 and 6.2.1.11 contain tests that can clearly be applied to current implementations
 SuggestedRemedy
 Given the amount of out of date material and that we have not chosen to write conformance standards for the later PHYs, the standard should probably be withdrawn rather than revised.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 06 SC 6.2.1.9 P 26 L # 1
 THALER, PATRICIA A Individual
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Note: the page number above is the number printed on the page. The pdf page is 35 because of the front matter pages.
 The test refers to IEC 60950 which according to the references section is IEC 60950-1991. The corresponding clause in 802.3, 14.3.1.1, has been updated to reference IEC 60950-1-2001. The reference section of 1802.3 says that when the publicaition is superseded by an approved revision the revision shall apply. However, the text here refers to subclause numbers in IEC 60950-1 are different than the subclause numbers in the earlier standard so the references to them are no longer correct. E.g. 5.3.2 of IEC 60950-1991 is 5.2.2 of IEC 60950-1-2001.
 Also, the reference to IEC 60060 was updated to 60950-1-2001 Annex N in IEEE 802.3. I am unsure whether the change in this one area represents enough obsolete material to justify withdrawing the standard.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Update the references.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE Std 1802.3-2001 10BASE-T Conformance test - reaffirmation comments

Cl 70 SC 70.7.2 P 66 L 29 # 5 [REDACTED]
MELLITZ, RICHARD I Individual
Comment Type T Comment Status X
sub-clause 70.7.2: Test fixture section need for return loss
SuggestedRemedy
Add test fixture (w/TP4) for return loss or the editorial equivalent.
Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 71 SC 71.7.2 P 83 L 22 # 6 [REDACTED]
MELLITZ, RICHARD I Individual
Comment Type T Comment Status X
sub-clause 71.7.2: Test fixture section need for return loss
SuggestedRemedy
Add test fixture (w/TP4) for return loss or the editorial equivalent.
Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 72 SC 72.7.2 P 115 L 29 # 7 [REDACTED]
MELLITZ, RICHARD I Individual
Comment Type T Comment Status X
sub-clause 72.7.2: Test fixture section need for return loss
SuggestedRemedy
Add test fixture (w/TP4) for return loss or the editorial equivalent.
Proposed Response Response Status O