

IEEE P802.3REVam Draft 2.2 Comments

CI 00 SC P L MyBallot # 4

COORDINATION, SCC14

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

All observable changes were made to the satisfaction of SCC14. We greatly appreciate the communications that happened between the WG and SCC14 that led up to this recirculation.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Thank you.

CI 00 SC P L MyBallot # 2

BRADSHAW, P D

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Pull-up is NOT hyphenated in the following locations in D2P2:

Section 2 subclause 27.7.3.2, SF37 (is "pullup")  
(probably also in 22.2.2.12 where a line-break has forced apparent hyphenation)

Section 4 Figures 45A-1,2,3 & 4 (is "Pull up")

Pull-down is NOT hyphenated in the following location in D2P2:  
Section 2 subclause 27.7.3.2, SF38 (is "pulldown")

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the remaining "pullup" and "pull up"s to "pull-up".

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This editorial comment will be supplied to the Standards Project Editor.

CI 00 SC 0 P 0 L 0 MyBallot # 5

JAMES, DAVID V

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The proposed resolutions to many items has been to ask the IEEE editors to consider these when they do their editing.

This is unacceptable and not supported by the IEEE Style Guide and IEEE Editors policy, both of which recommends this be done only for small changes, that are well identified, and come after the last recirculation.

These changes should have been incorporated for other Sponsor ballot reviewers to see, as incorporated in the text. Not doing so is as bad as not letting the commenter make proposed resolutions in the BRC.

SuggestedRemedy

- 1) Identify the few changes in the file attachment (summarized from previous comments) that are objectionable.
- 2) Accept and incorporate all other comments, leaving none for hypothetical IEEE Editor incorporation.
- 3) Recirculate the draft, so that others can see the 100's of changes and judge if that changes their vote (something they cannot do after changes by the IEEE Editors).

Proposed Response Response Status W

REJECT.

This comment is Out of Scope. The issues in this comment are reiterations of previous comments that were considered, responded to, and recirculated. The response was affirmed by the ballot group (eg see D2.0 comment 1900 and D2.1 comment 7).

The items referenced in the 'file attachment' are D2.0 initial ballot comments that were recirculated with responses in the P802.3REVam/D2.1 first recirculation ballot, and the other issues raised in the current comment are reiterations of comments submitted on D2.1 and included in this second recirculation.

CI 44 SC 44.5 P 6 L 43 MyBallot # 3

BRADSHAW, P D

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The second sentence, which reads "Suitable entries for Table F4 of ISO/IEC 11801: 2002, Annex F, is exemplified in Table 444." is grammatically incorrect; the "is" should be plural, as in "are".

Similarly, the third sentence (page 7, line 1), has the same problem.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace both instances of "is" by "are" in the subclause.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This editorial comment will be supplied to the Standards Project Editor.

IEEE P802.3REVam Draft 2.2 Comments

Cl 45 SC 45.5 P127 L9 MyBallot # 1

BOOTH, MR BRAD J

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The subclause headings in 45.5 are incorrectly numbered. This problem existed in the original 802.3ae. The first subclause after 45.5 should be 45.5.1, not 45.5.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the subclause numbering.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This editorial comment will be supplied to the Standards Project Editor.