

P802.3ak Draft 5.2 Comments

Cl 00 SC FM P 3 L 3 # 8
 Geoff Thompson Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A

This material is marked for deletion upon publication. It shouldn't be.

SuggestedRemedy

This material should not be deleted upon publication. It should be left in the PDF version of the published standard for a printer check. Moving to the back of the document is acceptable.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Will remove the sentence:
 "Editor's Note: to be removed prior to final publication"

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P 4 L 15 # 7
 Geoff Thompson Nortel Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The new definition:
 1.4.xxx Cable assembly: An assembly containing one or more insulated conductors, terminated in a connector at each end, for use as a link segment between MDIs.
 ...is not technically correct for inclusion within the 802.3 standard.
 Elsewhere in the standard effective equivalents of this definition are defined as link sections. The restriction in this clause of one and only one link section in the link segment is not true throughout the standard. Clause 1.4 applies to the entire standard.

SuggestedRemedy

There are many reasonable solutions to this. Unfortunately, all acceptable solutions that I can think of will result in delay of the approval of the standard. I believe that a change to the draft is required, even if it is the simple removal of this definition.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will remove 1.4.xxx Cable assembly: ...

The original addition of this definition was added in response to comment #54 against D5.1. A more detailed search indicates that "cable assembly" is used in multiple places in 802.3 (e.g. 8.5.3 & 22A.2) making it extremely difficult to create a generic definition.

To maintain the resolution of comment #54 against D5.1 the following change will be made: Change the first sentence of 54.7 to: "The 10GBASE-CX4 cable assembly contains insulated conductors terminated in a connector at each end for use as a link segment between MDIs. This cable assembly is primarily intended as a point-to-point interface of up to 15 m between network ports using controlled impedance cables."

Cl 54 SC 54.6.3.2 P 28 L 33-34 # 1
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status R

The impedance specification in this clause is ambiguous. The test fixture is shown in Figure 54-3 to have two ports, one that connects to the transmitter output and one that connects to the "Post Processing" block. The clause does not specify whether the impedance specification applies to the port that connects to the transmitter output, the "Post Processing" block or both. In addition, the return loss specification applies to the actual impedance applied to the transmitter output by the test fixture, not to the nominal value of the impedance.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the text of the section with the following. "The differential load impedance applied to the transmitter output by the test fixture depicted in Figure 54-3 shall have a return loss greater than 20 dB from 100 MHz to 2000 MHz. The reference impedance for differential return loss measurements shall be 100 Ohms."

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

The suggested change is out of scope for D5.2 recirculation as the only change from D5.1 to D5.2 is the capitalization of the "O" in Ohms and a space between "20" and "dB".

Cl 54 SC 54.6.3.5 P 30 L 48 # 2
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The title of Figure 54-5 is incorrect. The figure is a line graph of the values of the right sides of equations 54-1 and 54-2. The right sides of these equations are by definition the minimum values of the differential return loss of the transmitter. The Figure is entitled "Transmit differential output return loss" which it is not. It is the "Minimum permissible transmit differential output return loss". The fact that the figure is marked "informative" does not relieve the need for the title to be correct.

SuggestedRemedy

Either remove the figure or change the title of the figure to "Minimum transmit differential output return loss (informative)"

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

No change was made to this portion of the document in either D5.1 or D5.2 and the proposed remedy, while arguably clarifying, does not substantially improve the document enough to warrant an out of scope change.

P802.3ak Draft 5.2 Comments

CI 54 SC 54.7.2 P 35 L 45 # 3
Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The title of Figure 54-7 is incorrect. The figure is a line graph of the values of the right side of equations 54-3. The right side of this equation is by definition the maximum values of the cable assembly insertion loss. The Figure is entitled "Cable assembly insertion loss" which it is not. It is the "Maximum permissible cable assembly insertion loss". The fact that the figure is marked "informative" does not relieve the need for the title to be correct.

Suggested Remedy

Either remove the figure or change the title of the figure to "Maximum cable assembly insertion loss (informative)"

Proposed Response REJECT. Response Status C

No change was made to this portion of the document in either D5.1 or D5.2 and the proposed remedy, while arguably clarifying, does not substantially improve the document enough to warrant an out of scope change.

CI 54 SC 54.7.3 P 36 L 44 # 4
Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The title of Figure 54-8 is incorrect. The figure is a line graph of the values of the right sides of equations 54-4 and 54-5. The right sides of these equations are by definition the minimum values of the cable assembly return loss. The Figure is entitled "Cable Assembly return loss" which it is not. It is the "Minimum permissible cable assembly return loss". The fact that the figure is marked "informative" does not relieve the need for the title to be correct.

Suggested Remedy

Either remove the figure or change the title of the figure to "Minimum cable assembly return loss (informative)"

Proposed Response REJECT. Response Status C

No change was made to this portion of the document in either D5.1 or D5.2 and the proposed remedy, while arguably clarifying, does not substantially improve the document enough to warrant an out of scope change.

CI 54 SC 54.7.4.2 P 38 L 27 # 5
Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The title of Figure 54-9 is incorrect. The figure is a line graph of the values of the right sides of equations 54-6 and 54-7. The right sides of these equations are by definition respectively the minimum values of the cable assembly NEXT loss and MDNEXT loss. The Figure is entitled "Cable Assembly NEXT/MDNEXT loss" which it is not. It is the "Minimum permissible cable assembly NEXT/MDNEXT loss". The fact that the figure is marked "informative" does not relieve the need for the title to be correct.

Suggested Remedy

Either remove the figure or change the title of the figure to "Minimum cable assembly NEXT/MDNEXT loss (informative)"

Proposed Response REJECT. Response Status C

No change was made to this portion of the document in either D5.1 or D5.2 and the proposed remedy, while arguably clarifying, does not substantially improve the document enough to warrant an out of scope change.

CI 54 SC 54.7.5.2 P 40 L 27 # 6
Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The title of Figure 54-10 is incorrect. The figure is a line graph of the values of the right sides of equations 54-9 and 54-10. The right sides of these equations are by definition respectively the minimum values of the cable assembly ELFEXT loss and MDELFFEXT loss. The Figure is entitled "Cable Assembly ELFEXT/MDELFFEXT loss" which it is not. It is the "Minimum permissible cable assembly ELFEXT/MDELFFEXT loss". The fact that the figure is marked "informative" does not relieve the need for the title to be correct.

Suggested Remedy

Either remove the figure or change the title of the figure to "Minimum cable assembly ELFEXT/MDELFFEXT loss (informative)"

Proposed Response REJECT. Response Status C

No change was made to this portion of the document in either D5.1 or D5.2 and the proposed remedy, while arguably clarifying, does not substantially improve the document enough to warrant an out of scope change.