P802.3aj Draft 2.1 Comments

CR 0000 CI 00 SC P L # 5

Robert Grow Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Copyright year on even footer was not updated.

SuggestedRemedy
Update to 2003

Response Response Status C ACCEPT.

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Existing equipment is more likely to return a value of "0" for bit 6.6. The default value should match what existing equipment returns.

SuggestedRemedy

Change bit 6.6's default value to "0".

Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The default values for both 6.5 and 6.6 will be changed to be blank.

Comment Status A

CR 1078 C/ 28 SC 2.4.1.5 P 4 L 46 # 6

Robert Grow Intel

E

I finally saw something I had missed before, and perhaps it wasn't noticed by others during preparation of the response. This register problem may have started with an incompletely edited copy and paste that was never corrected. Reviewing the change at the referenced line, I noted that clause 22 and 28 use very different names for register 8. (Most registers in this clause only have slightly different names from clause 22.) Register 8 isn't an ability register.

SuggestedRemedy

Comment Type

In the referenced subclause, change: "Auto_Negotiation link partner Next Page ability register (Register 8)." to "Auto-Negotiation Link Partner Received Next Page register (Register 8)."

If accepted, would also require change to:

page 230 of IEEE Std 802.3-2002: 28.2.4.1.7 subclause heading plus three occurrences in first paragraph.

page 231: Table 28-7 title end of first line of change request page 6, line 23

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CR 1079 C/ 43 SC 2.10 P 2 L 37 # 7

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Typos.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Claus e4 [Par t1]" to "Clause 4 [Part 1]".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CR 1080 C/ 15 SC 15.3.1 P 1080-2 L 1 # 2

Paul Kolesar Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Page:354 of IEEE 802.3.1998

The present standard uses non-optimal reference to a fiber specification in first sentence of designated clause. What is needed is a cable specification. ISO/IEC11801 is an appropriate cable specification unto itself. ISO/IEC11801 references this fiber specification within its cable specification. So if ISO/IEC11801 is referenced, it becomes redundant to reference the same fiber specifications in clause 15. ISO/IEC11801:2002 is the latest edition, and cables meeting this edition are compliant with the specifications of clause 15. ISO/IEC11801:2002 obsoletes its 1995 edition, making it the preferred reference. However, in the context of clause 15, the specifications for identified fiber-type have not changed. So no cable plant compliant to clause 15 of the presently published 802.3 standard will become obsolete by updating the reference to the 2002 edition.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the first sentence to read:

"The optical medium requirements are satisfied by the $62.5/125~\mu m$ nominal diameter fiber specified in ISO/IEC11801:2002 with the exceptions noted in 15.3.1.1 to 15.3.1.4."

Response Status C

REJECT.

The note to subclause 15.3.1.1 and 15.3.1.2 provide refernces to ISO/IEC 11801.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Change Request, Clause, Subclause

Page 1 of 3

CR 1080 C/ 15 SC 15.3.1

P802.3aj Draft 2.1 Comments

CR 1080 C/ 15 SC 15.3.1.1 P 1080-3 L 23 # 1
Paul Kolesar Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The note regarding attenuation uses non-optimal reference to fiber specification, IEC 60793-2:1992. What is needed is a cable specification. ISO/IEC11801 is an appropriate cable specification unto itself. ISO/IEC11801 references this fiber specification within its cable specification. So if ISO/IEC11801 is referenced, it becomes redundant to reference the same fiber specifications in clause 15. ISO/IEC11801:2002 is the latest edition, and cables meeting this edition are compliant with the specifications of clause 15. ISO/IEC11801:2002 obsoletes its 1995 edition and is therefore preferred. However in the context of clause 15, the specifications for the identified fiber-type have not changed. So no cable plant compliant to clause 15 of the presently published 802.3 standard will become obsolete by updating the reference to the 2002 edition.

SuggestedRemedy

SuggestedRemedy: Change the note to read:

"NOTE - This value of attenuation is a relaxation of the standard ISO/IEC11801:2002."

Response Status C

REJECT.

We wish to continue to include the direct reference to ISO/IEC 60793 so that the reader does not have to go through two levels of references to find the fibre specification.

CR 1080 C/ 15 SC 15.3.1.2 P 1080-3 L 31 # 3 Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The note regarding modal bandwidth uses non-optimal reference to fiber specification, IEC 60793-2:1992. What is needed is a cable specification. ISO/IEC11801 is an appropriate cable specification unto itself. ISO/IEC11801 references this fiber specification within its cable specification. So if ISO/IEC11801 is referenced, it becomes redundant to reference the same fiber specifications in clause 15. ISO/IEC11801:2002 is the latest edition, and cables meeting this edition are compliant with the specifications of clause 15. ISO/IEC11801:2002 obsoletes its 1995 edition, making it the preferred reference. However, in the context of clause 15, the specifications for identified fiber-type have not changed. So no cable plant compliant to clause 15 of the presently published 802.3 standard will become obsolete by updating the reference to the 2002 edition.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the note to read:

"NOTE - This value of modal bandwidth is a relaxation of the standard ISO/IEC11801:2002."

Response Status W

REJECT.

We wish to continue to include the direct reference to ISO/IEC 60793 so that the reader does not have to go through two levels of references to find the fibre specification.

CR 1080 Cl 15 SC 15.8.6.1 P 1080-2 L 1 # 4

Paul Kolesar Avaya

E

PICS Proforma M4 and M5 are associated with clause 15.3.1.3 on chromatic dispersion of the fiber medium. Clause 15.3.1.3 is proposed for deletion. The PICS Proforma must be coordinated with this change.

SuggestedRemedy

Comment Type

Harmonize the PICS Proforma with changes to clause 15.3.1.3.

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C ACCEPT.

CR 1090 C/ 35 SC 5.3.2 P 3 L 10 # 8

Comment Type E Comment Status A

nment Type **E** Comment Status
Typo.

SuggestedRemedy

Move ")" from end of line 12 to end of line 10.

Response Response Status C ACCEPT.

CR 1095 C/ 1 SC 1.3 P 1095-2 L 37 # 11

Pat Thaler

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The reference for 1155 doesn't appear to have any changes so it doesn't need to be in the change request.

SuggestedRemedy

Take out the refernce to 1155 for the convenience of the voters.

Response Status Z

Withdrawn.

P802.3aj Draft 2.1 Comments

CR 1095 C/ 3 SC 2.6 P 2 L 44 # 9

Robert Grow Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Typos, misplaced spaces.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IEE ESt d802" to read "IEEE Std 802".

Response Status C

ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Change Request, Clause, Subclause