Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **10**   *L* **21**   # 10

Law, David

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**

I have to say if I had spotted that we had changed the text associated with normative references I would have likely voted Disapprove. What concerns me is the new text has impacted all references that are dated -and that is the vast majority of them.Take as an example a favourite at the moment, IEC 60950. The latest revision is IEC 60950-2005. In a lot of places in the standard however we reference IEC 60950-1991 which as we discovered, when we came to work on IEEE 802.3au DTE Power via MDI Isolation Corrigendum, is no longeravailable. In the end we had to purchase it through ebay. Now the currenttext 'All standards are subject to revision, and parties subject to agreements based on this standard are encouraged to investigate the possibility of applying the most recent editions of the standardsindicated below.'. I would hope this would allow somebody to testconformance using IEC 60950-2005 rather than IEC 60950-1991. With the new text it seems IEC 60950-1991 has to be used regardless.This seem a very significant change to implement at this point in thisparticular project.

SuggestedRemedy

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

See comment 4

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **10**   *L* **21**   # 4

Dawe, Piers

Comment Type **G**   *Comment Status* **R**

This is way outside the scope of the PAR. Therelation between 802.3 and its normative referenceswould be changed by the change shown here. Such achange would be technical, would affect very manyplaces in 802.3, and would need careful and widereview by the whole of 802.3 in working group ballot.Attempting to slip a global, technical change througha closed, unpublicised sponsor ballot recirculation isnot acceptable - does not satisfy openness, does notallow an adequate number of review stages. Examplesof specific concerns are: For dated references, whathappens if the document cited is obsolete,unavailable, or known to be defective? For undatedreferences, is it wise for the IEEE to say thatdocuments that it has not seen, shall apply? Whatdifference does changing from 'constitute provisionsof this standard.' to 'indispensable for theapplication of this document.' have?

SuggestedRemedy

Undo this change and progress 802.3as without it. Ifanyone wants to propose such a change, he can do sothrough the proper method with a maintenance request.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The change to this paragraph was made to align with the 2005 IEEE-SA style manual.

The convention for an undated reference specifying the latest version was in place when the 2002 revision was published. In doing the 2005 revision, we did not remove the dates from references. This draft only removes the date from 802.1Q as requested by the chair of 802.1 (D3.0/#13). We fully expect that 802.1 will maintain compatibility with legacy 802.3 devices and consequently a date is not needed.

No global change is being made here.

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 **01**
SC **1.3**

Page 1 of 3
5/15/2006 4:28:04 AM

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.2.6**   *P* **24**   *L* **35**   # 5

Dawe, Piers

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

We decided to restore the capitals for field names asde-capitalising them was controversial and notnecessary for this project. But, here we are talkingabout the size of the data, or at line 41, the dataitself. See 57.7.3.3 for a nice example.

SuggestedRemedy

In bullet a: 'the number of MAC client data octets'.In b: 'pads the supplied MAC client data' (or just'data'). In 5.2.4.3: 'minimum MAC client datasize that', 'MAC client data octets', 'the minimum MAC client data size'. Similarly in 30.3.1.1.23

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change
In bullet a: 'the number of MAC client data octets'.

In b: 'pads the supplied MAC client data'

In 5.2.4.3: 'minimum MAC client datasize that', 'MAC client data octets', 'the minimum MAC client data size'.

Similarly in 30.3.1.1.23
change 3 instances of
'MAC Client Data size' to 'MAC client data size'

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.2.7**   *P* **21**   *L* **43**   # 1

PARSONS, GLENN W   Individual

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

c3.2.7, p.21, line 43: says "The original MAC service data unit maximum remains 1500 octets"Given Figure 3-2, the m_sdu also includes the L/T and maybe Pad fields. So this is not the right term.I believe the correct term here should be "The original MAC Client Data maximum remains 1500 octets"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The original MAC service data unit maximum remains 1500 octets"to"The original MAC Client Data maximum remains 1500 octets"

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to

"The original MAC Client Data field maximum remains 1500 octets"

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.2.9**   *P* **26**   *L* **33**   # 6

Dawe, Piers

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **R**

I preferred the former wording with "which are"because this is the first and only place where theprotected fields are defined, and just a colon lookslike it's a reminder and the reader should have learntthis already.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'of the MAC frame: the Destination' to 'of theMAC frame, which are the Destination'.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT.

This would reverse the resolution of a previous comment (D3.0/#128) that the task group agreed simplifies the sentence.

Cl **04**   *SC* **4.2.3.2.2**   *P* **26**   *L* **25**   # 7

Dawe, Piers

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

(Different p26) Unwanted space between inter packetgap and full stop.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the space.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **04**   *SC* **4.2.3.2.7**   *P* **28**   *L* **29**   # 9

Dawe, Piers

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

w/ is slang.

SuggestedRemedy

Write it out: 'with'.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT.

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 **04**
SC **4.2.3.2.7**

Page 2 of 3
5/15/2006 4:28:08 AM

Cl **04**   *SC* **4.2.3.2.7**   *P* **28**   *L* **29**   # 8

Dawe, Piers

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

Surely the things between InterPacket must now bepackets, not MAC Frames? (Editorial: no need forcapital F.)

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'MAC Frame' to 'Packet' (or as decided) threetimes.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 2

Cl **04**   *SC* **4.2.3.2.7**   *P* **28**   *L* **29**   # 2

PARSONS, GLENN W   Individual

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

Figure 4-5, p.28: still uses the term "MAC Frame" in 3 instances. The editor should have chagned all instances of frame here.The correct term here should be "Packet" in all cases.

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 4-5 change "MAC Frame" to "Packet" in 3 instances

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In Figure 4-5 change "MAC Frame" to "MAC Packet" in 3 instances

---

Cl **04**   *SC* **4.2.8**   *P* **35**   *L* **12**   # 3

PARSONS, GLENN W   Individual

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

c4.2.8, p.35: looks like the editor's search and replace for "ifs" to "ipg" missed this page, there are 16 instances of "ifs" that should be "ipg", check the following lines:12, 18, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50 (where some lines have 2 instances)

SuggestedRemedy

replace "ifs" with "ipg"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In 4.2.8 replace "ifs" with "ipg"

Further discussion noted issues with unopened clauses. To resolve this, add a footnote to Table 4-2 (in the same style as Table 57-1) as follows:

References to interFrameGap or interFrameSpacing in other clauses (e.g., 13, 35 & 42) shall be interpreted as interPacketGap

---

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 **04**
SC **4.2.8**

Page 3 of 3
5/15/2006 4:28:08 AM