

CommentID: 1

CommenterName: Rich Seifert

CommenterEmail: rich@richseifert.com

CommenterPhone: (408) 395-5700

CommenterCompany: Networks & Communications

RevisionNumber: 1.1

Clause: Comment 1021

Subclause:

Line:

Page:

CommentType: (E, T, ER, or TR) TR

Comment:

Either I am seeing words that aren't there, or something has changed since my copy of 802.3 was printed. Looking at 802.3-1998, subclause 4.2.7.4 (Summary of Interlayer Interfaces), page 61, fourth and fifth lines from the bottom of the page:

transmitting: Boolean; {Indicates outgoing bits}

wasTransmitting: Boolean; {Indicates transmission in progress or just completed}

These entries are present under "The interface to the Physical Layer, defined in ...".

The resolution to my comment said, ""wasTransmitting" is not in 4.2.7.4 (b), only "transmitting". I reiterate that "wasTransmitting" is there, and that the original commenters request should not be implemented.

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

Do not implement the proposed revision, or show me that this section no longer contains the indicated line of Pascal.

RemedyEnd:

Response:

Reject.

The commenter is indeed correct that "wasTransmitting" is in subclause 4.2.7.4, item b). It appears the response to the comment in the previous ballot (D1.0) was incorrect.

What the change is stating is that wasTransmitting is not an input from the Physical Layer and therefore should not be shown as such in Figure 2-1b. This is indeed true, in the Pascal on Page 66 of 802.3-1998, in process deference, wasTransmitting is assigned a value (wasTransmitting = transmitting) hence it cannot be an input from the Physical Layer and a search of 802.3-1998 shows that wasTransmitting only appears in process deference. Further, while subclause 4.2.7.4 item b) lists wasTransmitting, it states it is summarising the interface defined in 4.3.3, yet 4.3.3 does not include wasTransmitting. Due to this the change request is still valid and should in fact be augmented to add an additional change that the variable definition for wasTransmitting should be removed from subclause 4.2.7.4 item b) and placed in the deference process.

ResponseEnd:

CommentID: 2

CommenterName: Bob Musk

CommenterEmail: bob.musk@uk.jdsuniphase.com

CommenterPhone: +44 1752 312671

CommenterCompany: JDS Uniphase

RevisionNumber:

Clause: 1,26

Subclause: 26.4.1

Line:

Page:

CommentType: (E)

Comment: IEC 61754-4, Interface 4-2 is for simplex SC connectors not duplex SC connectors

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy: Replace 'Interface 4.2' with 'Interface 4.3'

RemedyEnd:

Response:

Accept in principle

We accept that it is correct that interface 4-2 is not the duplex SC plug, but incorrect that interface 4-2 is the simplex SC plug. Rather, interface 4-2 is the simplex SC adapter. Interface 4-1 is the simplex plug.

For duplex SC plugs the correct reference is interface 4-3. For duplex SC adapters the correct reference is interface 4-4.

Since clause 26 specifies the MDI, it is appropriate to refer to the adapter specification. This means reference interface 4-4. Here is a summary of the interface designations:

4-1 = simplex SC plug

4-2 = simplex SC adapter

4-3 = duplex SC plug

4-4 = duplex SC adapter.

So reference should be IEC 61754-4 Interface 4-4.

In addition, subclause 38.11.3 'Medium Dependent Interface (MDI)' references IEC 61754-4 Interface 4-2 in relation to a Duplex SC MDI connector so is also incorrect. The change request will therefore be modified to include the correction of this subclause.

ResponseEnd:
