Cl **00**　　*SC*　　　*CR*　　　*P* **1**　　　*L* **34**　　# `13`
Bob Grow　　　　　　　　　　　Intel

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

The copyright text has been modified for a maintenance request and is no longer appropriate

SuggestedRemedy

Change "...IEEE P802.3 draft revision request." to "...draft of a proposed IEEE Standard."

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00**　　*SC*　　　*CR*　　　*P* **2**　　　*L* **1**　　# `7`
David Law　　　　　　　　　　3Com

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

Add the list of special symbols table.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the list of special symbols table.

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add an editors note 'This table of special symbols is to be included in the published pdf of the approved standard.'.

Cl **00**　　*SC*　　　*CR*　　　*P* **2**　　　*L* **3**　　# `6`
David Law　　　　　　　　　　3Com

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

With the approval of IEEE Std. 802.3af-2003 the IEEE P802.3aj draft should be checked to ensure that the changes are based on IEEE Std. 802.3-2002 as amended by both IEEE std. 802.3ae-2002 and IEEE Std. 802.3af-2003.

SuggestedRemedy

Check to ensure that the changes are based on IEEE Std. 802.3-2002 as amended by both IEEE std. 802.3ae-2002 and IEEE Std. 802.3af-2003.

Amend the header to read 'Changes to IEEE Std. 802.3-2002 as amended by IEEE std. 802.3ae-2002 and IEEE Std. 802.3af-2003.'.

Amend the editorial note to read '...
IEEE Std. 802.3-2002 as amended by IEEE std. 802.3ae-2002 and IEEE Std. 802.3af-2003 .

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00**　　*SC*　　　*CR*　　　*P*　　　*L*　　　# `14`
Bob Grow　　　　　　　　　　　Intel

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

Pervasive font problems (not IEEE style). (A serif font has been substituted in the .pdf for the sans serif font.)

SuggestedRemedy

If a problem in the FrameMaker source, reapply IEEE styles to title on page 1, 2, and all Hx styles.

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

It is believed that this is a printer/PDF issue. The Framemaker Fonts are correct.

Cl **00**　　*SC*　　　*CR*　　　*P* **2**　　　*L* **9**　　# `15`
Bob Grow　　　　　　　　　　　Intel

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

With approval of IEEE Std 802.3af-2003 additional information in the EDITORIAL NOTE is appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

After the first sentence add:
"(This draft does not modify any text included in IEEE Std 802.3af-2003 which is also an approved amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2002.)"

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add the text "(This draft does not modify any text of IEEE Std 802.3af-2003.)" to the end of the editors notes.

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: Clause, Subclause

Page 1 of 5
CR　　　*Cl* **00**　　*SC*

Cl **08**　　*SC*　　　*CR*　　　*P* **9**　　*L* **6**　　# **16**

Pat Thaler　　　　　　　　　　　　Agilent

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

"As of the 2002 publication of IEEE Std 802.3, no further
maintenance changes are being considered for this clause." This statement seems to be
immediately contradicted. The 2002 publication has occurred but the statement is followed by
page of further maintenance changes to the clause. Clauses 8, 11, 12 23, and 32 all have the
same problem.

Perhaps I can interpret the statement as meaning that we aren't going to let any more
maintenance changes start the process for the clause - a point that is a bit subtle. However, I
think we started on aj after 2002 was published so even that isn't quite true.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with a more accurate statement: "No mainenance changes will be considered for thi
clause after P802.3aj." or "No maintnenance changes will be considered for this clause."

I prefer the latter as it is clear and isn't tied to a project name that will disappear into the front
matter of the published spec.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will change the text to read:

"No maintnenance changes will be considered for this clause."

Also perform this change to Clause 16.

Cl **1**　　*SC* **3**　　　*CR*　　　*P* **3**　　*L* **37**　　# **27**

Stephen Haddock　　　　　　　　Extreme Networks

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

I believe that 802a was approved by RevCom in the June meeting.

SuggestedRemedy

Change reference to "Std 802a-2003".

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In addition:

Delete the related Editors Notes and footnote.

Change subclause 3.2.6 (p5, l8) as follows:

'P802a' to read 'Std 802a-2003'.
Remove related Editors Note.

Cl **10**　　*SC* **7.1**　　*CR*　　　*P* **11**　　*L* **22**　　# **23**

Geoff Thompson　　　　　　　　Nortel Networks

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

Suggest for editorial clarity that 4.4.2.strikeout1/strikeout should be changed to read
strikeout4.4.2.1/strikeout underscore4.4.2/underscore.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12**　　*SC* **2.3.1**　　*CR*　　　*P* **13**　　*L* **29**　　# **24**

Geoff Thompson　　　　　　　　Nortel Networks

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

Suggest for editorial clarity that 4.4.2.strikeout1/strikeout should be changed to read
strikeout4.4.2.1/strikeout underscore4.4.2/underscore.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response　　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12**　　*SC* **9.5**　　*CR*　　　*P* **14**　　*L* **11**　　# **25**

Geoff Thompson　　　　　　　　Nortel Networks

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

Suggest for editorial clarity that 4.4.2.strikeout1/strikeout should be changed to read
strikeout4.4.2.1/strikeout underscore4.4.2/underscore.

(Do global search "4.4.2.1" and destroy on rest of draft).

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response　　　　　　　*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: Clause, Subclause

Page 2 of 5
CR　　　*Cl* **12**　　*SC* **9.5**

Cl **15**   *SC* **3.1.1**   *CR*   *P* **19**   *L* **36**   *#* **4**

David Law   3Com

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

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

Change the edition of ISO/IEC 11801 referenced in the note to be the 2002 edition.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In addition strike the text '[B16]', as this was the 568 reference, from subclause 15.3.1.1 (P19 L37), subclause 15.3.1.2 (P19, L50).

Cl **15**   *SC* **3.1.2**   *CR*   *P* **19**   *L* **49**   *#* **5**

David Law   3Com

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

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

Change the edition of ISO/IEC 11801 referenced in the note to be the 2002 edition.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **23**   *SC* **1.5.3**   *CR*   *P* **23**   *L* **27**   *#* **1**

David Law   3Com

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

Typo.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... 1 through <XREF>4 ...' to read '... 1 through 4 ...'

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **26**   *SC* **4.1**   *CR* **1037**   *P* **26**   *L* **10**   *#* **8**

Piers Dawe (Non-voter)   Agilent

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

This revision creates a problem:

26.4.1 Medium Dependent Interface (MDI)
Change subclause 26.4.1 as follows:
[Maintenance request 1037 - http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/request/maint_1037.pdf]
The 100BASE-FX medium dependent interface (MDI) shall conform to one of the following connectors.
The recommended alternative is the Low Cost Fibre Optical Interface Connector.
a) The duplex SC connector as specified in IEC 61754-4 [B25] and IEC 61754-4, Interface 4-(See 38.11.3).
b) Media Interface Connector (MIC) as specified in fiber-PMD 7 and Annex F. When the MIC used, the receptacle shall be keyed as "M".
c) Optical Medium Connector Plug and Socket (commonly called ST connector) as specified 15.3.2.

The problem is that we have deleted the words "Low Cost Fibre Optical Interface Connector" which is preferred! (except in the PICS).

SuggestedRemedy

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #12.

Cl **26**   *SC* **5.4**   *CR*   *P* **26**   *L* **30**   *#* **12**

Steven Swanson (Non-voter)   Corning

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

In subclause 26.4.1, a change was made to the reference to a fiber optic connector from Low Cost SC to Duplex SC. However, the PICs in 26.5.4 still says "Support Low Cost..."

SuggestedRemedy

Recommend deleting "Low Cost" if possible.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the first paragraph of 26.5.4 to read:

"The 100BASE-FX medium dependent interface (MDI) shall conform to one of the following connectors. The recommended alternative is the duplex SC Connector."

Change the Feature column text of item FSC in subclause 26.5.4 to read:

"Supports duplex SC Connector"

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: Clause, Subclause

Page 3 of 5
CR   *Cl* **26**   *SC* **5.4**

Cl **28**   *SC* **2.4.1.4**   *CR*   *P* **27**   *L* **33**   **#** **20**
Benjamin Brown   Independent

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**
There appears to be some significant text missing from this section.

SuggestedRemedy
Find the missing text and insert it. The last sentence is not complete.

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

The following text:

"determines where the Link Partner Next Pages are stored."

Will be restored. This text is new text and will be marked in underscore.

Cl **28**   *SC* **2.4.1.4**   *CR*   *P* **27**   *L* **33**   **#** **21**
Rich Seifert   Networks & Communic

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
The dramatic tension rises as the central character in our story, bit (6.6) in the Auto-Negotiati expansion register, is set to logic one. But then the reader is left without a resolution to this critical plot dilemma, as the fate of bit (6.5) is never revealed! Will we ever find out what happens next? Inquiring minds want to know!

SuggestedRemedy
Finish the sentence.

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

See comment #20.

Cl **28**   *SC* **2.4.1.5**   *CR*   *P* **28**   *L* **35**   **#** **26**
David Law   3Com

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
'.. Register 5 ..' should read '.. register 5 ..'.

SuggestedRemedy
See comment.

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

Cl **28**   *SC* **2.4.1.5**   *CR*   *P* **28**   *L* **7**   **#** **3**
David Law   3Com

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**
Suggest that the 'Default' column should read 'N/A' rather than blank.

SuggestedRemedy
Suggest that for bits 6.6 and 6.5 that default column should be changed to read 'N/A'. A footnote should be added to the Table that reads 'N/A - Not applicable'

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

Add an em-dash.

Cl **28**   *SC* **2.4.1.5**   *CR*   *P* **28**   *L* **8**   **#** **2**
David Law   3Com

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**
The change of these reserved bits to be the NP Location Able and Storage Location bits requires changes to the PICS.

SuggestedRemedy
Include the necessary changes to the PICS.

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

Add new option to subclause 28.5.3

Feature: *NPSL Link Partner Next Page Storage Location bit
Subclause: 28.2.4.1.5
Status: O
Value/comment: N/A

Add two new items to subclause 28.5.4.6:

Insert new Item 21a:
Feature: Link Partner Next Page Storage Location bit.
Subclause: 28.2.4.1.5
Status: NPSL * MII:M
Value/comment: Indicates location of Link Partner Next Page.

Insert new Item 21b:
Feature: Receive Next Page Location Able bit
Subclause: 28.2.4.1.5
Status: MII:M
Value/comment: Indicate if Link Partner Next Page Storage Location bit is supported.

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: Clause, Subclause

Page 4 of 5
CR   *Cl* **28**   *SC* **2.4.1.5**

Cl **28**   *SC* **Table 28-6**   *CR*   *P* **29**   *L* **30**   *#* **19**
Benjamin Brown   Independent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**
Missing "is"

SuggestedRemedy
Replace "8.15:0 Auto-Negotiation" with "8.15:0 is Auto-Negotiation". The same thing applies line 31, replace "5.15:0 Auto-Negotiation" with "5.15:0 is Auto-Negotiation". This matches the text on line 33.

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

Cl **31B**   *SC* **4.6**   *CR*   *P* **67**   *L* **17**   *#* **18**
Benjamin Brown   Independent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**
Some text not deleted and inserted text in wrong place.

SuggestedRemedy
It appears that the I in MDI has not been deleted. The newly inserted MII should be directly at MDI, so that there is a space between MII and the less than or equal sign.

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

The I in "MDI" will be included in the strikeout text.
Add additional new space marked with a underscore will be added between the new text 'MII' and the less than or equal sign.

Cl **32**   *SC* **13.5.4**   *CR*   *P* **37**   *L* **11**   *#* **9**
Piers Dawe (Non-voter)   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**
Font size: "ratio" is bigger than other PICS text.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Cl **35**   *SC* **5.3.2**   *CR*   *P* **39**   *L* **7**   *#* **10**
Piers Dawe (Non-voter)   Agilent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**
Font size: "or time between adjacent edges", " RX_CLK below limits specified in Table 35-8" bigger than other PICS text.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Cl **9**   *SC* **1**   *CR*   *P* **10**   *L* **15**   *#* **22**
Geoff Thompson   Nortel Networks

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**
Suggest for editorial clarity that 4.4.2.strikeout1/strikeout should be changed to read strikeout4.4.2.1/strikeout underscore4.4.2/underscore.

SuggestedRemedy
See comment.

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

Cl **B**   *SC* **2.3**   *CR*   *P* **62**   *L* **24**   *#* **17**
Benjamin Brown   Independent

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**
Reference to subclause 12.7.4 uses a color other than black.

SuggestedRemedy
Change the color of this reference, and that on line 28, to black.

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

Cl **B**   *SC* **2.3**   *CR*   *P* **62**   *L* **26**   *#* **11**
Piers Dawe (Non-voter)   Agilent

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **A**
Line 27 has a second "rate": should that be changed to "ratio" also?

SuggestedRemedy

Response   *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: Clause, Subclause

Page 5 of 5
CR   *Cl* **B**   *SC* **2.3**