Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **49** *L* **1** # 46

Brett McClellan Marvell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Page 49-50 is a second copy of the Table of Contents

SuggestedRemedy

delete pages 49 to 50.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **14** *L* **15** # 6

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

Add definition for 1000BASE-T1

SuggestedRemedy

Add definition for 1000BASE-T1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert the following definition for 1000BASE-T1:

1.4.28a 1000BASE-T1: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 1000 Mb/s Ethernet using one pair of balanced copper cabling. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 97.)

Cl **01** *SC* **1.5** *P* **14** *L* **21** # 7

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

Add abbreviations for PSAACRF, PSANEXT, MDANEXT.

(FYI: There is an abbrevation of MDNEXT in 802.3-2012 but it is multiple-disturber near-end crosstalk. It does not address the alien element.)

SuggestedRemedy

Add abbreviations for PSAACRF, PSANEXT, MDANEXT.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert the following abbreviations into 1.5 in appropriate location:

PSAACRF multiple disturber power sum alien attenuation crosstalk ratio farend
PSANEXT multiple disturber power sum alien near-end crosstalk
MDANEXT multiple disturber alien near-end crosstalk

Cl **34** *SC* **34** *P* **17** *L* **1** # 47

Brett McClellan Marvell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Clause 34 is missing line numbers

SuggestedRemedy

add line numbers

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **34** *SC* **34.1.3** *P* **18** *L* # 50

Brett McClellan Marvell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

The text as written implies that 1000BASE-T1 supports half duplex because collision domains apply to half duplex links.
"Only one repeater is permitted within a single collision domain, with the exception of 1000BASE-T1 links, where no repeaters are allowed."

SuggestedRemedy

"Only one repeater is permitted within a single collision domain. No repeaters are allowed on 1000BASE-T1 links." where no repeaters are allowed."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"Only one repeater is permitted within a single collision domain. No repeaters are allowed on 1000BASE-T1 links."

Cl **35** *SC* **35.1.1** *P* **21** *L* **24** # 33

Buntz, Stefan Daimler AG

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

In item g) there is a space in the word "m_ultiplex"

SuggestedRemedy

remove space

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
The text was copied incorrectly from 802.3-2012. Change will be applied per comment.

Cl **35** *SC* **35.1.1** *P* **21** *L* **24** # 41

Mitsuru, Iwaoka Yokogawa Electric Cor

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

A space in the word "m ultiplex".

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the space.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
The text is correct in 802.3-2012

Cl **97** *SC* *P* **28** *L* **8** # 25

Chini, Ahmad Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Multiple places, log is used for log10, existing 802.3 uses log10

SuggestedRemedy

Replace log with log10, multiple places

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Both log and log10 are used without much consistency.

Cl **97** *SC* **1** *P* **25** *L* **28** # 21

Tu, Mike Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Add subclauses to 97.1 similar to CL40 and CL55.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following subclauses:

97.1Overview
97.1.1Objectives
97.1.2Relationship of 1000BASE-T1 to other standards
97.1.3Operation of 1000BASE-T1
97.1.3.1Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS)
97.1.3.2Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer
97.1.3.3Physical Medium Dependent (PMD) sublayer
97.1.4Signaling
97.1.5Interfaces
97.1.6Conventions in this clause

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Subclauses will be added per comment and TBD will be inserted into each of these new subclauses. Specific text should be contributed.

A commenter should provide specific content to be included in the draft - the Editor(s) will not produce draft material in attempt to satisfy comments for new content.

Cl **97** *SC* **2** *P* **25** *L* **29** # 22

Tu, Mike Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Add subclauses to define 1000BASE-T1 service primitives and interfaces

SuggestedRemedy

Under new subclause 97.2, add the following:

97.2.1Technology-Dependent Interface
97.2.1.1PMA_LINK.request
97.2.1.1.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.1.1.2When generated
97.2.1.1.3Effect of receipt

97.2.1.2PMA_LINK.indication
97.2.1.2.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.1.2.2When generated
97.2.1.2.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2PMA service interface
97.2.2.1PMA_TXMODE.indication
97.2.2.1.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.1.2When generated
97.2.2.1.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2.2PMA_CONFIG.indication
97.2.2.2.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.2.2When generated
97.2.2.2.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2.3PMA_UNITDATA.request
97.2.2.3.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.3.2When generated
97.2.2.3.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2.4PMA_UNITDATA.indication
97.2.2.4.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.4.2When generated
97.2.2.4.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2.5PMA_SCRSTATUS.request
97.2.2.5.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.5.2When generated
97.2.2.5.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2.6PMA_PCSSTATUS.request
97.2.2.6.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.6.2When generated
97.2.2.6.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2.7PMA_RXSTATUS.indication
97.2.2.7.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.7.2When generated
97.2.2.7.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2.8PMA_REMRXSTATUS.request
97.2.2.8.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.8.2When generated
97.2.2.8.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2.9PMA_ALERTDETECT.indication
97.2.2.9.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.9.2When generated
97.2.2.9.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2.10PCS_RX_LPI_STATUS.request
97.2.2.10.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.10.2When generated
97.2.2.10.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2.11PMA_PCSDATAMODE.indication
97.2.2.11.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.11.2When generated
97.2.2.11.3Effect of receipt

97.2.2.12PMA_FR_ACTIVE.indication
97.2.2.12.1Semantics of the primitive
97.2.2.12.2When generated
97.2.2.12.3Effect of receipt

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

It is not clear whether these subclauses are intended to replace existing subclauses or move them back.

Cl **97** *SC* **2** *P* **25** *L* **30** # 20

Tu, Mike Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Add subclause for "1000BASE-T1 Service Primitives and Interfaces"

SuggestedRemedy

1. Move D1.0 subclauses "97.2" to "97.3", "97.3" to "97.4", "97.4" to "97.5", and "97.5" to "97.6".

2. Add subclause 97.2 "1000BASE-T1 Service Primitives and Interfaces".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement per comment. Insert TBD into new 97.2.

Cl **97** *SC* **4.4.1.1** *P* **27** *L* **41** # 23

Chini, Ahmad Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Common terms can be simplified for Equation (97-1)

SuggestedRemedy

Use the simplified equation in the attached document

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Reference: chini_3bp_01_1114.pdf

Cl **97** *SC* **4.4.1.1** *P* **27** *L* **47** # 24

Chini, Ahmad Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Redundant and incomplete information, link segment type A is already defined

SuggestedRemedy

Remove line 47 and line 48

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **4.4.1.4** *P* **28** *L* **23** # 28

Chini, Ahmad Broadcom

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

Frequency range in the equation starts at 10MHz instead of 1MHz

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 1MHz with 10MHz in the text.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **4.4.1.4** *P* **28** *L* **26** # 45

Brillhart, Theodore Fluke Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

Measurements and experiments contributed thus far to derive these performance limits have not been conducted in situ. While the measurements have been very controlled and repeatable, they may not reflect the actual levels of mode conversion experienced in a vehicle with a non-uniform or discontinuous ground plain. This could lead to PHY being designed with optimistic expectations for the link segments.

SuggestedRemedy

Mark equation (97-3) F.F.S. (For Further Study).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Insert editorial note under equation 97-3: Eqution 97-3 is for further study.

Cl **97** *SC* **4.4.1.4** *P* **28** *L* **26** # 27

Chini, Ahmad Broadcom

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *Equation (97-3)*

Equation (97-3) needs to be corrected for loss instead of gain. Replace "ln" with equivalent log10 to be consistent with other equations as well.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the equation in the attached document.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Reference: chini_3bp_01_1114.pdf - needs alignment with comment #50

Cl **97** *SC* **4.4.1.4** *P* **28** *L* **33** # 29

Chini, Ahmad Broadcom

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

ConversionLoss definition ?

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "conversion insertion loss" with "mode conversion loss"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **4.4.2** *P* **28** *L* **41** # 43

Brillhart, Theodore Fluke Networks

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

Ambiguous length limit. The user cannot tell if it is a minimum or a maximum requirement.

SuggestedRemedy

Change
From: ...for up to at least 40 m.
To: ..for at least 40 m in length.

Alternatively, change
From: ...for up to at least 40 m.
To: ..for up to 40 m in length.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **4.4.2** *P* **29** *L* **43** # 44

Brillhart, Theodore Fluke Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

Link segment type B transmition parameters must include requirements for differential to common mode conversion performance. This requirement is necessary to ensure immunity performance for any unshielded cabling constructions, just as is assumed to be true for the unshielded type A link segment. Note: Subclause 97.4.4 Link segment characteristics part b), does not prescribe any cabling constructions, so the user must assume unshielded and shielded cabling may be employed.

SuggestedRemedy

Add clause 97.4.4.2.5 Titled "Differential to common mode conversion"
similar or identical to the type A link segment requirements (97.4.4.1.4) with performance limits TBD.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **4.4.3.4** *P* **31** *L* **26** # 26

Chini, Ahmad Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Equation (97-9) may be reduced to 83.64-20log(f) for easier reading.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with the reduced format in the attached document

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Reference: chini_3bp_01_1114.pdf

Cl **97** *SC* **97.1** *P* **25** *L* **23** # 2

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

"intended to be operated in automotive environment over a single pair of twisted pair cable, as defined in 97.4.4.1"
Right now, we have two link types, called Type A and Type B. Both should be mentioned in the introduction

SuggestedRemedy

Change the selected text to read: "intended to be operated over a single pair of balanced copper cabling, referred to as an automotive link segment (Type A) or additional link segment (Type B), defined in 97.4.4"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.1** *P* **25** *L* **25** # 5

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

"(Medium Dependent Interface (MDI))"
unnecessary closing parentheses

SuggestedRemedy

remove unnecessary closing parenthese

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4** *P* **27** *L* **18** # 3

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

"1000BASE-T1 is designed to operate over 1-pair balanced cabling" - wording consistency would suggest to use the term "a single pair of balanced copper cabling" for consistency with PAR.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read: "1000BASE-T1 is designed to operate over a single pair of balanced copper cabling"
Simialrly, in the same subclause, make the following changes:
a) "The single pair supports an" to read "A single pair of balanced copper cabling"
b) "one twisted-pair operating in full duplex" to read "a single pair of balanced copper cabling"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.1.1** *P* **27** *L* **42** # 8

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

An illustration of the Insertion Loss limit given in EQ 97-1 improves readability.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an illustration of the Insertion Loss limit given in EQ 97-1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
No said illustration was provided for inclusion in the draft. A commenter should provide specific content to be included in the draft - the Editor(s) will not produce draft material in attempt to satisfy comments for new content.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.1.1** *P* **27** *L* **47** # 4

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

"This function InsertionLoss(f) accounts for the insertion loss" - the wording could be improved for better readability.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "This function InsertionLoss(f) accounts for the insertion loss" to "The insertion loss for the link segment calculated using Equation (97-1) accounts for the insertion loss"
Also, change "the balanced cablign pair" to "a single pair of balanced copper cabling"
Apply the same changes in 97.4.4.2.1 for type B.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.1.3** *P* **28** *L* **10** # 9

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

An illustration of the Return Loss limit given in EQ 97-2 improves readability.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an illustration of the Return Loss limit given in EQ 97-2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
No said illustration was provided for inclusion in the draft. A commenter should provide specific content to be included in the draft - the Editor(s) will not produce draft material in attempt to satisfy comments for new content.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.1.4** *P* **28** *L* **23** # 42

Mitsuru, Iwaoka Yokogawa Electric Cor

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

A text states "Each type A link segment shall meet the values determined using Equation (97-3) at all frequencies from 1 MHz to 600 MHz.".
However, the Equation (97-3) is not defined at frequencies from 1 MHz to 10 MHz.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "1 MHz" to "10 MHz" in line 23, and Change "1" to "10" in line 32.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.1.4** *P* **28** *L* **24** # 51

DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *Equation (97-3)*

change equation 97-3 to use log10 and yield positive values (loss).

SuggestedRemedy

Change equation 97-3 to ConversionLoss>/= [50 10 </=f </= 80]dB [72-11.51*log(f) 80 < f </= 600]dB where f is frequency in MHz

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Needs alignment with comment #27

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.1.4** *P* **28** *L* **26** # 10

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

An illustration of the Diff to CM Conversion limit given in EQ 97-3 improves readability.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an illustration of the Diff to CM Conversion limit given in EQ 97-3.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
No said illustration was provided for inclusion in the draft. A commenter should provide specific content to be included in the draft - the Editor(s) will not produce draft material in attempt to satisfy comments for new content.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.2.1** *P* **28** *L* **47** # 11

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

An illustration of the Insertion Loss limit given in EQ 97-4 improves readability.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an illustration of the Insertion Loss limit given in EQ 97-4.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
No said illustration was provided for inclusion in the draft. A commenter should provide specific content to be included in the draft - the Editor(s) will not produce draft material in attempt to satisfy comments for new content.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.2.3** *P* **29** *L* **18** # 12

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

An illustration of the Return Loss limit given in EQ 97-5 improves readability.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an illustration of the Return Loss limit given in EQ 97-5.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
No said illustration was provided for inclusion in the draft. A commenter should provide specific content to be included in the draft - the Editor(s) will not produce draft material in attempt to satisfy comments for new content.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.2.3** *P* **29** *L* **18** # 39

Buntz, Stefan Daimler AG

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

According to http://www.ieee802.org/3/bp/public/jul14/diminico_3bp_01b_0714.pdf, referenced in Motion#2 from July 2014. The RL parameter of the optional link segment should also be noted with an additional "TBD"

SuggestedRemedy

add "TBD"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
It is not clear where the said definition should be inserted.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.3.2** *P* **30** *L* **26** # 13

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

An illustration of the PSANEXT improves readability.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an illustration of PSANEXT.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
No said illustration was provided for inclusion in the draft. A commenter should provide specific content to be included in the draft - the Editor(s) will not produce draft material in attempt to satisfy comments for new content.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.3.2** *P* **30** *L* **31** # 52

DiMinico, Christopher MC Communications

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Equation (97-7)*

Use loss in PSNEXT equations (97-6) and (97-7). In (97-7) change 60 to 54 two places as 60 was changed to 54 per committe motion.

SuggestedRemedy

Use loss in PSNEXT equations (97-6) and (97-7) i.e.,
PSANEXTloss.

In (97-7) change 60 to 54 two places as 60 was changed to 54 per committe motion.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.3.2** *P* **30** *L* **44** # 38

Buntz, Stefan Daimler AG

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Equation (97-7)*

The formula of PSANEXT is according to Motion 8 from Meeting in September 2013. However this was overwritten by Motion 4 in the March 2014 meeting. Therefore the constant value for PSANEXT in formula 97-7 should not be 60, but 54.

SuggestedRemedy

change in both lines of 97-7 "60" to "54"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.3.3** *P* **31** *L* **6** # 1

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Several acronyms need to be added to the list of acronyms with expansion: ACRF, FEXT, NEXT, MDAFEXT, PSAACRF - they are used extensively, but are not really defined anywhere.

SuggestedRemedy

ACRF: attenuation to crosstalk ratio far-end
FEXT: far-end crosstalk
NEXT: near-end crosstalk
MDAFEXT: multiple disturber alien far-end crosstalk
MDANEXT: multiple disturber alien near-end crosstalk
PSAACRF: multiple disturber power sum alien attenuation crosstalk ratio far-end
PSANEXT: multiple disturber power sum alien near-end crosstalk
MDAFEXT: multiple disturber alien far-end crosstalk

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.3.4** *P* **31** *L* **9** # 14

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

An illustration of the PSAACRF improves readability.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an illustration of PSAACRF.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
No said illustration was provided for inclusion in the draft. A commenter should provide specific content to be included in the draft - the Editor(s) will not produce draft material in attempt to satisfy comments for new content.

Cl **97** *SC* **97.4.4.4.3** *P* **32** *L* **14** # 34

Buntz, Stefan Daimler AG

Comment Type T *Comment Status* **D**

AS PSANEXT is a functional requirement of the PHY to its link segment, it does not make sens to define different limits for different connector solutions (single port vs. multiport)

SuggestedRemedy

reduce PSANEXT to one requirement instead of two different requirements

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Please provide a specific change to the existign text to achieve the said goal.

A commenter should provide specific content to be included in the draft - the Editor(s) will not produce draft material in attempt to satisfy comments for new content.

Cl **97A** *SC* **97A.4** *P* **40** *L* **1** # 48

Brett McClellan Marvell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

I can find no precedent in 802.3 of an annex for a test procedure that includes PICs. PICS for test items should be listed in clause 97.5.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete section 97A.4

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove 97A.3

Cl **97A** *SC* **Figure 97A-1** *P* **38** *L* **1** # 15

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

Consider changing instances of "jig" to "test fixture". The term "jig" does not appear anywhere in IEEE Std 802.3-2012.

Test fixture is a more common term used in P802.3bj, P802.3bm, Clause 40 1000BASE-T, Clause 54 10GBASE-CX4, Clause 55 10GBASE-T, etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Change jig to test fixture

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97A** *SC* **Figure 97A-2** *P* **38** *L* **29** # 16

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

Consider changing instances of "jig" to "test fixture". The term "jig" does not appear anywhere in IEEE Std 802.3-2012.

Test fixture is a more common term used in P802.3bj, P802.3bm, Clause 40 1000BASE-T, Clause 54 10GBASE-CX4, Clause 55 10GBASE-T, etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Change jig to test fixture

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97B** *SC* **97B.3** *P* **44** *L* **44** # 40

Buntz, Stefan Daimler AG

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

For the common mode impedance in http://www.ieee802.org/3/bp/public/sep14/diminico_3bp_01_0914.pdf slide 10 200ohms had been proposed.

SuggestedRemedy

replace "TBD" by "200 (TBD)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97B** *SC* **97B.3** *P* **44** *L* **48** # 37

Buntz, Stefan Daimler AG

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

The text states a five around one alien crosstalk test configuration, but I understood that we decided to use 4-around-1 bundles (see picture 97B-4).

SuggestedRemedy

correct text to 4-around-1

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97B** *SC* **97B.4** *P* **46** *L* **1** # 49

Brett McClellan Marvell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

I can find no precedent in 802.3 of an annex for a test procedure that includes PICs. PICS for test items should be listed in clause 97.5.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete section 97B.4

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97B** *SC* **97B-2** *P* **45** *L* **5** # 35

Buntz, Stefan Daimler AG

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

Figure shows only 3 parallel link segments. I understood that we decided to use the 4-around-1 setup, as this is shown in Figure 97B-3. So there should be in sum 5 lines, also the pictures (slide 9 and 10) in http://www.ieee802.org/3/bp/public/jul14/diminico_3bp_02_0714.pdf which is referenced to (?? "a" missing) in Motion#1 from the July 2014 meeting minutes shows always 5 lines (4-around-1)..

SuggestedRemedy

draw 2 more lines with 3 x 1.66m

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97B** *SC* **97B-3** *P* **45** *L* **20** # 36

Buntz, Stefan Daimler AG

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

Figure shows only 4 parallel link segments. I understood that we decided to use the 4-around-1 setup, as this is shown in Figure 97B-3. So there should be in sum 5 lines, also the pictures (slide 9 and 10) in http://www.ieee802.org/3/bp/public/jul14/diminico_3bp_02_0714.pdf which is referenced to (?? "a" missing) in Motion#1 from the July 2014 meeting minutes shows always 5 lines (4-around-1).

SuggestedRemedy

draw one more line with 3 x 1.66m

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97B** *SC* **Figure 97B-1** *P* **44** *L* **8** # 17

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

Consider changing instances of "jig" to "test fixture". The term "jig" does not appear anywhere in IEEE Std 802.3-2012.

Test fixture is a more common term used in P802.3bj, P802.3bm, Clause 40 1000BASE-T, Clause 54 10GBASE-CX4, Clause 55 10GBASE-T, etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Change jig to test fixture

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **97B** *SC* **Figure 97B-2** *P* **45** *L* **2** # 18

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Figure 97B-2 uses the term "inlines" but Figure 97B-3 uses the term "inline". One has an "s" and one does not. Is it intended to be the same term?

SuggestedRemedy

Consider aligning the term "inline(s)" between Figure 97B-2 and 97B-3.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Use the term "inline"

Cl **97B** *SC* **Figure 97B-4** *P* **45** *L* **30** # 19

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

The bottom part of circle #4 and #5 is cut off. Is this intended?

SuggestedRemedy

Consider fixing it.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Conversion problem - will be fixed.

Cl **99** *SC* *P* **5** *L* **36** # 32

Buntz, Stefan Daimler AG

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

The link to http://standards.ieee.org/about/sasb/patcom/patents.html does not "match" to the blue text, it is above on the black text

SuggestedRemedy

correct hyperlink

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.