

IEEE 802.3ay (IEEE P802.3) D2.2 Maintenance #9 (Revision) comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # 1 [REDACTED]  
 Turner, Michelle

Comment Type GR Comment Status A  
 This document has met all editorial requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status U  
 ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1.3 P L # 6 [REDACTED]  
 Thompson, Geoffrey Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Comment #2

My previous comment regarding TLV definition has been satisfied for the moment by the editorial change in the TLV definition. As the scope of use for TLV will expand beyond OAM in 802.3 with the adoption of P802.3at, there will be a need for some reorganization/change of placement of the TLV definition/specification within 802.3 so that its standard wide applicability is more apparent and appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1.3 P L 12 # 5 [REDACTED]  
 Thompson, Geoffrey Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment references based on:  
 page and line references from  
 802.3-2005\_REV\_D2p2\_section1\_to\_5\_CMP.pdf  
 Comment #1 Editorial (I would like to make it a DISAPPROVE but will not for sake of progress of the document)  
 Page 154, PDFpage 5, Line 12  
 Comment

The text that says: "NOTE -Local and national standards such as those supported by ANSI, EIA, IEEE, MIL, NPFA, and UL are not..."  
 Should not include IEEE in the list.  
 I believe that this is appropriately in the scope of the recirculation because it is a new effect of the approval of the PSDO which declares that IEEE Standards are appropriate for peer reference in ISO and ISO/IEC standards.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "IEEE" from the list.  
 This should be "an editorial change" as it is in a note.  
 I believe that it is arguable that it could be done without causing a recirculation.  
 Of course, if there is another recirc for other reasons, then this change should be included.

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

Also correct 'NPFA' to 'NFFA'.

IEEE 802.3ay (IEEE P802.3) D2.2 Maintenance #9 (Revision) comments

CI 01 SC 1.4.358 P177 L 50 # 2  
 Dawe, Piers J G Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status A

"The type value is locally defined and needs to be unique within the protocols defined in this standard." What defines a protocol? Until you explain that the reader doesn't know how far it extends so cannot know what is "local" to it.  
 According to the front matter, CSMA/CD is a MAC protocol, and there are flow control protocol, management attributes for multiple protocols, control and management protocols (also Slow Protocols). 1.2.1 says "The operation of a protocol can be described by subdividing the protocol into a number of interrelated functions. The operation of the functions can be described by state diagrams."  
 More relevantly, 57.5.2.1 Local Information TLV says "OAM Version. This one-octet field indicates the version supported by the DTE. This field shall contain the value 0x01 to claim compliance with Version 1 of this protocol." Is the whole of the OAM transport sublayer a protocol, or just the (Local) Information TLV? Are there any other relevant protocols in this standard? Do you really mean "needs to be unique within the protocols" or "needs to be unique within each protocols" or something like "may have a different meaning for each protocol"?

SuggestedRemedy

Please rework the sentence quoted.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete this sentence but keep the references.

CI 36 SC 36.1.2 P32 L 39 # 3  
 Dawe, Piers J G Individual

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

As stated in D2.1 comment 20, the recent modifications made to the 5 km network extent objective in 36.1.2 Objectives are not correct. per 36.1.1, the name "1000BASE-X" a is family of 1000 Mb/s Physical Layer implementations (created within whichever project - and they all eventually refer back to this Clause 36 anyway). It is/was not the name of a former project. Old projects have no relevance after their amendments have been rolled up. And the objective was 3 km not 5 (see <http://ieee802.org/3/z/public/minutes/CDA0996.txt> and I'm not aware that it was changed again). Rewriting history is a problem but telling people that 1000BASE-X is good to only 5 km is flat wrong when the bulk of the market at 1310 nm is 10 km rated, as well as further PMDs in Clause 59 and Clause 60.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a NOTE of explanation (a NOTE being not part of the standard) at the end of 36.1.2: 'NOTE - The 1000BASE-X PCS and PMA do not constrain the network extent. PMDs in Clause 59 and Clause 60 have ranges beyond 5 km.' or, 'NOTE - The full duplex 1000BASE-X PCS and PMA do not constrain the network extent. PMDs in Clause 59 and Clause 60 have ranges beyond 5 km.'

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will add the following note:

NOTE - The 1000BASE-X PCS and PMA do not constrain the extent of a full duplex network. PMDs in Clause 59 and Clause 60 have ranges beyond 5 km.

CI 37 SC 37.3.1.5 P100 L 36 # 4  
 Dawe, Piers J G Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Figure 37-6 Auto-Negotiation state diagram is in the middle of the PICS.

SuggestedRemedy

Force 37.5 to start a new page

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.