## IEEE P802.3an D4.0 10GBASE-T Comments

CI **00** SC **0** P L # 3

THALER, PATRICIA A Individual

Comment Type G Comment Status R

I would like to add my support to Hugh Barrass's comment on the suitability of MyBallot. In addition, I find that MyBallot is even more unacceptable as a tool on recirculation to view the comments of disapprove voters. The formats presented for viewing the comments either require to click on each comment and back to review it or present the comment in an unviewably wide multi-column format with the heavy text fields in narrow columns with a few words per line. Required comments are mixed in with trivial editorial comments with no way to sort for a reasonable view.

## SuggestedRemedy

My ballot needs to allow for providing a comment report document with viewable versions of the comments similar to that used by IEEE 802.3 groups during working group ballots. This allows a reviewer to go over the comments in the order they apply to the draft in a readable, browse-able, easily searched format.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Changes to MyBallot are out of the scope of this project.

This comment has been forwarded by the working group vice-chair to the MyBallot staff. MyBallot staff has been very responsive to this request.

This comment will also be brought to the attention of Revcom by Geoff Thompson.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The entries on lines 44 and 47 in table 45-117 need to be deleted. 7.17 through 7.18 is part of the AN advertisement register. 7.20 through 7.21 is part of the AN LP pase page ability register.

SuggestedRemedy

In table 45-117 delete:

7.17 through 7.18 Reserved

7.20 through 7.21 Reserved

Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

These specific register bits are being held in reserve for use by other ongoing active projects for the standard they are drafting. As it stands now, on one line we say 7.17 and 7.18 are listed as reserved for AN advertisement, and in another place we just say they are Reserved. The reality is that they are reserved for future AN advertisement for the other project.

It is not essential for us to make this change now since 10GBASE-T will be published first, and we are not using those registers, and the other project (backplane) will, in any case, have to amend the description of these registers when they are published.

Motion:

The BRC believes that this change is editorial.

Mover: B. McClellan Seconder: G. Zimmerman

In favor: 19 Opposed: 0 Abstain: 0 Motion passes.

We will pass this comment on to the publication editor for implementation prior to publication with the following instructions:

Publication editor:

Please delete the rows in table 45-117 corresponding to:

7.17 through 7.18 7.20 through 7.21

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general 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, line

Cl **45** SC **45.2.7**  Page 1 of 2 5/24/2006 9:53:50 AM

## IEEE P802.3an D4.0 10GBASE-T Comments

Comment Type T Comment Status R

Is it really the local devices advertisement register that is valid when bit 7.1.6 is set for the first time?

SuggestedRemedy

Consider changing 'register 7.16' to 'the AN LP base page ability register 7.19-7.21'

Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment is out of the scope of this recirculation.

The text as it stands is inelegant and the suggested remedy would make the text clearer however the change is being deferred. It can be handled by 802.3ap - a comment to do this has already been submitted by the commenter, who is the editor for clause 45 for 802.3 ap. to do make this change in that project.

It is being deferred because:

- a) the text, as it stands, does not have a technical error and
- b) the validity of 7.19 is covered by text in 45.2.7.6 as well as by the requirements on the equivalent register bit in Clause 28.

See posted text from Brett McClellan/Todd Thompson for a more detailed description on (b). The text is available at:

http://www.ieee802.org/3/an/public/may06/mcclellan\_1\_0506.pdf

ELLADO, JOSE Individua

Based on information provided by Gottfried Ungerboeck on an early reference to DSQ type constellations:

SuggestedRemedy

Comment Type E

Add an additional reference to Annex A in the section listing informative additional reference material (page 69, after line 17):

Comment Status A

[Bxampm] Ungerboeck, G., "Channel coding with multilevel/phase signals", IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, Vol. 28. pp. 55-67, Jan. 1982.

Also modify the change instructions on lines 9-10 to read:

Insert the following informative references in alphabetic order, changing the xD\_2 in [BxD\_2], the xampm in [Bxampm] and the xldpc in [Bxldpc] to be the appropriate numbers. Renumber subsequent references.

Append the following text to the footnote on page 79:

DSQ constellations have previously been introduced under the name "AMPM" (See [Bxampm], p. 57, for examples of 8 point and 32 point AMPM/DSQ constellations).

Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This comment requests addition of another reference in the informative additional reference section of Annex A. The change requested by this comment does not in any way affect the products that will be defined in accordance with this standard.

Motion:

The BRC believes that this change is editorial.

Mover: B. McClellan Seconder: G. Zimmerman

In favor: 18 Opposed: 0 Abstain: 0 Motion passes

This comment will be passed on to the publication editor for consideration prior to publication.

Publication editor:

Please consider the suggested remedy for incorporation prior to publication of this standard.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general 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, line

Cl **55** SC **55.1.3**  Page 2 of 2 5/24/2006 9:53:53 AM