

IEEE P802.3ap draft 2.0 Comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.2.2 P 25 L 36 # 466
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status X open
 1.159
 SuggestedRemedy
 1.155, apparently. Also PICS item MM20a
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.1.2 P 36 L 49 # 494
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 'Wrong bit in 'via bit 7.48.3 that it lacks the ability to perform Backplane Ethernet AN'?
 SuggestedRemedy
 7.48.0 ? Search for more occurrences.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.6.1 P 27 L 31 # 467
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status X open
 Contradiction: is it 'Insert the following subclause before subclause 45.2.1.6.1. Renummer appropriately' or 'Change the first paragraph in subclause 45.2.1.6.1 to read as follows:?'
 SuggestedRemedy
 Sort out. Is there something missing?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.1.3 P 37 L 08 # 482
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status X open
 In clause 45, we don't say 'logic one', 'logic zero', just 'one', 'zero'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete 'logic' or 'a logic'. Scrub the clause.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.7.4 P 28 L 28 # 275
 McClellan, Brett Solarflare
 Comment Type E Comment Status X open
 ""Change the last 4 sentences of the first paragraph of subclause 45.2.1.7.4 to read as follows:""
 This change applies to P802.3REVam prior to ammendments by P802.3an.
 P802.3an adds a sentence to this text.
 This comment also applies to 45.2.1.7.5.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change editor's note to prevent replacement of text added by P802.3an
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.100 P 43 L 06 # 598
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X open
 In table 45-200, the heading for the right-hand column should be ""RW"" not ""RO"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change ""RO"" to be ""RW"".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.100 P 43 L 11 # 492
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 'This bit is an exact copy of bit 1.11.2': not. And it shouldn't be exact copy of bit 1.11.4.
 SuggestedRemedy
 ?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3ap draft 2.0 Comments

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.100 P 43 L 11 # 442
 Kim, Yong Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 ""This bit is an exact copy of bit 1.11.2"" (referring to 7.48.3 10GBASE-KT). Looking at 1.11.2:1 (45.2.1.10, pg 29), it is Reserved.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please delete the line, or correct so that all are consistent
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.100 P 43 L 18 # 429
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The AN ability bit is already defined in 7.1.3, there is no need for another location.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the definition for 7.48.0
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.100 P 43 L 24 # 436
 Kim, Yong Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status X open
 It would be friendly to define the relationship between 7.48.0 and 7.48.1~3 in default value context. What is the meaning of bits 1~3, if 7.48.0 value is 0?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add text in 45.2.7.100.1 to say that if 7.48.0 value is 0, then bits 1~3 defaults to 0 and ignored upon read by mgmt.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.2.6 P 38 L 35 # 483
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 If bit 7.1.4 really is the one and only remote fault, then does it map into aMediaAvailable? (if it isn't, change its name to 'AN remote fault') Does .3ap need to modify aAutoNegLocalTechnologyAbility?
 SuggestedRemedy
 ?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.2.6 P 38 L 40 # 484
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 When do you want to clear this RF bit? Draft says 'Bit 7.1.4 shall be cleared each time register 7.1 is read via the management interface, and shall also be cleared by a AN reset.' This isn't the way a non-AN link can start up - first RF on, then clears itself. Would this clearing be better a little later in the AN process when the PHY has established that it can hear another PHY? Also, would you want an AN restart (as opposed to AN reset) to be able to release the RF?
 SuggestedRemedy
 ?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.2.7 P 38 L 45 # 493
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Bit 7.48.0 seems to duplicate 7.1.3.
 SuggestedRemedy
 If 7.1.3 could apply to other types of AN, spell it out: 'clause 28, clause 37 or clause 73 auto-negotiation', or whatever the case is. If they are duplicates, get rid of 7.48.0 or justify the duplication.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3ap draft 2.0 Comments

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.3 P 39 L 12 # 28
 Marris, Arthur
 Comment Type E Comment Status X open
 What does ""register(s)"" mean?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider changing ""registers(s)"" to ""registers"" on lines 12 and 36 and also on lines 9, 22 and 50 on page 40.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.3 P 39 L 19 # 644
 David V James JGG
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 DVJ-33
 All names should be one word, possibly run-together. Otherwise, they are abused when used in code or equations and hard to parse within sentences.
 SuggestedRemedy
 NoRemedySupplied
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.3 P 39 L 35 # 487
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Which bit? And, might be better not to say 'BP' if we intend to use this AN elsewhere in future.
 SuggestedRemedy
 'If an AN ability bit', 'If any AN ability bit', 'If a BP AN ability bit' or 'If any BP AN ability bit'. Similarly in following subclauses.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.3 P 39 L 40 # 154
 Spagna, Fulvio INTEL
 Comment Type E Comment Status X open
 Sentence need to be rephrased as it is not clear.
 SuggestedRemedy
 I wish I knew. I do not understand what is being said.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.4 P 40 L 12 # 488
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Could 'contain the LP base page ability of the BP Ethernet PHY' be made easier to understand?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Is this better: 'contain the advertised base page ability of the PHY's link partner'
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.4 P 40 L 19 # 489
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Last sentence is nothing to do with this subclause.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move it to 45.2.7.2.5. May be able to shorten or combine it. Move/change PICS AM34 in step.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P802.3ap draft 2.0 Comments

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.4 P 40 L 28 # 285
 McClellan, Brett Solarflare
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 ""7.20.15:5 Technology Ability Field A[0:10] See 73.6.4""
 The bits A[10:0] are listed in reverse order.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change text to:
 ""7.20.15:5 Technology Ability Field A[10:0] See 73.6.4""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.5 P 40 L 46 # 157
 Spagna, Fulvio INTEL
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Incorrect reference to BP AN Ability bit.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 7.48 into 7.48.0
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.5 P 41 L 10 # 286
 McClellan, Brett Solarflare
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 ""7.23.15:0 Unformatted Code Field U[0:15] or U[26:11] See 73.7.7.1""
 The bits U[0:15] are listed in reverse order.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change text to:
 ""7.23.15:0 Unformatted Code Field U[15:0] or U[26:11] See 73.7.7.1""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.6 P 41 L 26 # 159
 Spagna, Fulvio INTEL
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Incorrect reference to BP AN Ability bit.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 7.48 into 7.48.0
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.6 P 42 L 09 # 491
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 R/W?
 SuggestedRemedy
 RO, I think
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.6 P 42 L 10 # 287
 McClellan, Brett Solarflare
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 ""7.26.15:0 Unformatted Code Field U[0:15] or U[26:11] See 73.7.7.1x""
 The bits U[15:0] are listed in reverse order.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change text to:
 ""7.26.15:0 Unformatted Code Field U[15:0] or U[26:11] See 73.7.7.1x""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.5.3.5 P 46 L 54 # 649

David V James JGG

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

DVJ-38

Bad break at bottom of page, leading to a blank line between table rows.

Suggested Remedy

Use debugged templates, at:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/msc/WordProcessors.html>

Proposed Response Response Status O