Cl **1** *SC* **1.2** *P* **24** *L* **40** #
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associate

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *LATE - Definitions*

(LATE) "In addition to the requirements outlined in ISO/IEC 11801-1 and ANSI/TIA-568-C.2-1, IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 14, Clause 23, Clause 25, Clause 40, Clause 55, and Clause 113 specify additional requirements for this cabling when used with 10BASE-T, 100BASE-T, 10GBASE-T, 25GBASE-T, and 40GBASE-T." is not part of the definition of the term, but rather specifies characteristics of the thing being referred to by the term and so belongs in a normative clause. "Each definition should be a brief, self-contained description of the term in question and shall
not contain any other information, such as requirements or elaborative text." (the use of "in addition" and "requirements" are clues either this is elaborative or stating requirements")

SuggestedRemedy

Delete text following first sentence.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Text is consistent with other definitions for category cabling in IEEE 802.3-2015, and there are several.

Cl **113** *SC* **113.5.2.1** *P* **168** *L* **20** #
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *LATE - Editorial*

(LATE) Figure 113–38 I suspect "(need to update)" is obsolete. Otherwise this draft would be technically incomplete and not ready to ballot.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "(need to update)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Implemented by comment i-91

Cl **113** *SC* **113** *P* **79** *L* **1** #
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *LATE - Editorial*

(LATE) Missing editing instructions

SuggestedRemedy

Probably something like "insert the following sub-clause following clause 112" ?

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Introduction (page 12) states: "This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2015 and adds Clause 113 and Annex 113A."
Amendments adding entire new clauses do not generally have additional editing instructions to add them.

Cl **113** *SC* **113.5.4.1** *P* **171** *L* **6** #
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associate

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *LATE - PMA*

the requirement "shall be satisfied" is going to be very hard to validate as no specification for "satisfaction" are given in this standard. I think the "shall" belongs in the previous sentence, and here we mean that the requirement is demonstrated by the frame error ration given.

SuggestedRemedy

Correctly state the required performance.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "are received" to "shall be received" in preceding sentence.
Change "shall be satisfied" to "can be demonstrated".

Commenter to consider submitting maintenance on Clause 55 where the same language exists

---

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general *Topic* **LATE - PMA** Page 1 of 2
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn 1/15/2016 8:53:19 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

Cl **113**   *SC* **113.5.3.3**   *P* **169**   *L* **12**   #

Rolfe, Benjamin   Blind Creek Associate

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *LATE - PMA*

(LATE) "The SLAVE mode RMS period jitter test shall be run using the test configuration shown in Figure 113–3" sounds a lot like a requirement on a pesron, not a conforming device. Behavior of people is outside the scope of this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "shall be run" to "is measured" (consistent with elsewhere in this standard)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Commenter may consider maintenance on same statement in clause 55.

Cl **113**   *SC* **113.4.2.5.6**   *P* **144**   *L* **47**   #

Rolfe, Benjamin   Blind Creek Associate

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *LATE - PMA*

(LATE) The phrasing "Any other value shall not be transmitted and shall be ignored at the receiver" is imprecise. A device that ignores only 1 value not listed in table 113-12 would comply. I suspect "all" is what is really intended.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "any" to "all"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "Any" to "All" and change "value" to "values"

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Topic*   **LATE - PMA**   Page 2 of 2
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   1/15/2016 8:53:19 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic