

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 00 SC P L # 513

802.3ak Task Force

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Type: TR

Clause: 54

SubClause: 54.6

Page #: 28

Line #: 8

Comment: Time values reported in Table 54-5 are not specified in pS but in UI.

Proposed Remedy: Either report times in pS (therefore being consistent with Figure 54-6) or change columns 1,3,5,7 headers from "Time (pS)" to "Time (UI)".

Resolution: Accept, using UI nomenclature.

From Dan Dove:

PG 7/43 Line 40 Change "Clause 48, 53 and 54, refers" to "Clauses 48, 53 and 54, refer".

ACCEPT

PG 8/43 Line 36 the word "manufacturer" is underlined... I don't think it was supposed to be.

ACCEPT

PG 13/43 Line 41 "19GBASE-CX4" becomes "10GBASE-CX4".

ACCEPT

PG 14/43 Line 30 add a comma after "Clause 53"

Withdraw

PG 15/43 Line 19 add a comma and space after "Clause 53".

Accept, added space

PG 19/43 Figure 54-2 There is a black line under TP4 that I can't figure has any meaning. A thick black line.

ACCEPT

PG 21/43 Line 34 delete the words "by setting...1.0.0,"

ACCEPT

PG 21/43 Line 36 change "device is" to "device must be".

ACCEPT

PG 21/43 Line 53 Change "ONE otherwise" to "ONE. Otherwise"

ACCEPT, put comma in.

PG 22/43 Line 4 Change "ONE otherwise" to "ONE. Otherwise"

ACCEPT, put comma in.

PG 22/43 Line 9 Change "ONE otherwise" to "ONE. Otherwise"

ACCEPT, put comma in.

PG 22/43 Line 48 Change "low swing" to "low-swing"

ACCEPT

PG 23/43 Line 6 Change "operate up to..54.8." to "operate on twinaxial cables up to 15m in length, as described in 54.8."

ACCEPT

PG 23/43 Line 14 Do a global search for "transmitter" and change to "transmitter". Be sure to keep caps on those words that require them.

ACCEPT

PG 24/43 Line 20 Figure 54-3 the capacitor is bunged up and signal shield is partially dashed, partially solid.

ACCEPT

PG 25/43 Lines 3,23 "Transmitter" again.

ACCEPT

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

PG 27/43 Line4-6 Change "Figure 54--6--" and "Figure 54--6--" to "Figure 54-6 and Figure 54-5"

ACCEPT

PG 27/43 Line 7 Change ". All transmitters... SHALL be disabled" to "while all other transmitters are disabled" to remove the shall statement.

ACCEPT

PG 27/43 Line39 Figure 54-6 the lower limit should have a slope at time zero. The lower axis should be in UI. Change the title from "..at MDI.." to "..at TP2.." Add the Transition time lines to the figure.

ACCEPT

PG 28/43 Table 54-5 Change "Time(ps)" to "Time(UI)" on four columns.

ACCEPT

PG 29/43 Line 49 "transmitter" again.

ACCEPT

PG 30/43 Line 8 Change "between ports" to "between network ports"

ACCEPT

From Ze'ev,

Comment Type: (TR)
 Clause: 54
 SubClause: 8.5
 Page #: 34
 Line #:

Comment:
 There seems to be a discrepancy between equations 54.10, 54.11 and figure 54-10.

In the figure itself I think the label of ELFEXT and MDELFEEXT are crossed (MDELFEEXT should be larger than ELFEXT hence the loss should be smaller therefore it should appear higher in the figure).

A. Regarding ELEFEXT In order for the equation to fit the figure we should have:

$$\text{ELEFEXT}(f) \geq 17 - 21.85 \cdot \log(f/2000)$$

(2000 in the denominator of the log rather than 50).

I've taken 4 points off figure 54-10 and they seem to fit well the above equation

f	ELFEXT (figure)	17-21.85*log(f/2000)
100	45.5	45.4
200	39	
39		
1000	23.5	23.6
2000	17	
17		

B. Regarding MDELFEEXT in order for the equation to fit the figure we should have:

$$\text{MDELFEEXT}(f) \geq 21 - 21.85 \cdot \log(f/2000)$$

(2000 in the denominator of the log rather than 50 & 21 instead of 15).

f	MDELFEEXT (figure)	21-21.85*log(f/2000)
100	49.5	49.4
200	43	
42.9		
1000	28	27.6
2000	21	
21		

Equation 54.11 as is makes little sense: for f=50 they yield positive results while for f=500 they yield negative results. For instance

MDELFEEXT (100) = 8.4225
 MDELFEEXT (200) = 1.8450
 MDELFEEXT(1000) = -13.4275
 MDELFEEXT(2000) = -20.0050
 Implying that @2GHz you have 20 dB gain.

Proposed Remedy:
 Replace equation 54.10 by:
 $\text{ELEFEXT}(f) \geq 21 - 21.85 \cdot \log(f/2000)$

Replace equation 54.11 by:
 $\text{MDELFEEXT}(f) \geq 17 - 21.85 \cdot \log(f/2000)$

Regards,
 Ze'ev

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 00 SC Cover P1 L 21 # 319
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E319

The entire document isn't changes, there are two parts: the changes to the published standard, and a new clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Cut the two lines beginning ""Changes to ..."" and replace the heading on page two with the cut lines.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC Front matter P2 L 3 # 379
Thompson, Geoff Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E379

The text: ""This amendment is based on the current edition of IEEE Std 802.3-2002 plus changes incorporated by IEEE 802.3ae-2002."" ..doesn't (or shouldn't) describe the document being changed.

SuggestedRemedy

Perhaps: ""This amendment is based on the current revision of IEEE Std 802.3-2002 plus changes incorporated by all subsequently approved projects. These are IEEE 802.3ae-2002, P802.3af and P802.3aj (both expected to be approved in 2003). Changes dues to P802.3ah are expected to follow rather than lead this project. (also on page 46)

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change first sentence of first paragraph to: "This amendment is based on the current revision of IEEE Std 802.3-2002 plus changes incorporated by all subsequently approved projects. These are IEEE 802.3ae-2002, P802.3af and P802.3aj (both expected to be approved in 2003). Changes dues to P802.3ah are expected to follow rather than lead this project."

For page 14 modification see comment #333.

CI 44 SC 1.1 P7 L 11 # 2
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type E Comment Status A E002

Missing comma

SuggestedRemedy

Add comma 10GBASE-CX4, 10GBASE-LR,

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 44 SC 1.1 P7 L 11 # 15
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type E Comment Status A E015

Need comma.

SuggestedRemedy

Add comma so line reads ""...10GBASE-CX4, 10GBASE-LX4...""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 44 SC 1.1 P7 L 11 # 72
Plunkett, Timothy NSWCCD

Comment Type E Comment Status A E072

comma needed after ""10GBASE-CX4""

SuggestedRemedy

add comma in specified location

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 44 SC 1.1 P7 L 11 # 322
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E322

Typos

SuggestedRemedy

Missing comma after ""10GBASE-CX4"". The change marks are strange, ""10GBASE-CX4,"" should be underlined and nothing else.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 44 SC 1.1 P7 L 8 # 321
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E321

Only paragraph 1 is changed.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete ""& 2"" from the instruction, delete the second paragraph of text.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 44 SC 1.2 P7 L 21 # 323
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E323
 Missing space. (I assume you have replacated the Heading3 style instead of applying that style.)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert space following section number.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 44 SC 1.2 P7 L 21 # 92
 Dove, Daniel hp ProCurve Networki
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E092
 The word Objectives is mashed against the section number
 SuggestedRemedy
 add a space between them.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 44 SC 1.2 P7 L 21 # 57
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E057
 Missing space between heading number and heading title.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Re-apply ""heading3"" to the text.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 44 SC 1.2 P7 L 33 # 93
 Dove, Daniel hp ProCurve Networki
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR058
 suggested wording change
 SuggestedRemedy
 change ""operation over 15m"" to ""operation over distances up to 15m""
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #58

CI 44 SC 1.3 P7 L 41 # 59
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E059
 Bullet point on its own is confusing.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Include referring text for clarity.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 Instructions say to change just this one item.

CI 44 SC 1.3 P7 L 41 # 325
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E325
 The change marking is not correct
 SuggestedRemedy
 The additions start with the comma, not LX4, therefore no strikeout/insertion is required for LX4.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 44 SC 1.4.4 P7 L 46 # 326
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E326
 The change marking though technically correct is unconventional.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add an underlined "", 53"" after ""Clause 48"", strike through ""53"", and add an underlined ""54"". Alternatively, change to read ""The term 10GBASE-X in Clause 48, refers to ..."" by striking out the ""s"" in Clauses up through ""Clause 53"".
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #300

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 44 SC 1.4.4 P 7 L 48 # 300
 Brown, Benjamin Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E326
 extra word
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace ""Clauses 48, 53 and Clause 54"" with ""Clauses 48, 53 and 54""
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 44 SC 1.4.4 P 7 L 48 # 60
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E060
 Inserted reference for Clauses 53 and 54 are not required. 10GBASE-X is only specified in Clause 48, and not in Clauses 53 and 54.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove change and return the text to original form.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 The strikethru and underscore were incorrect. A reference to Clause 54 and 10GBASE-CX4 is added to keep consistency.

CI 44 SC 1.4.4 P 7 L 48 # 16
 Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E326
 Extra word.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to read ""...Clauses 48, 53 and 54...""
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #300

CI 44 SC 1.4.4 P 8 L 10 # 447
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E447
 ""Cu"" is an implementation choice. Silver plated steel wires could be compliant too.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace ""Cu"" with ""electrical"".
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 44 SC 3 P 9 L 26 # 391
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status R TR290
 A reader might assume that ""bit time"" referred to the signalling period (320 ps). We should make it clear that it doesn't.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add to 44.3: NOTE - ""Bit time"" refers to the duration of one bit as transferred to and from the MAC (approximately 100ps in this case).
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 See comment #290.

CI 44 SC 3 P 9 L 27 # 61
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E061
 Information was provided in Clause 44 to determine the cable delay. There is no equivalent equation (44-1) or table (Table 44-3) to reference.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Provide information to determine cable delay.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 Paragraph #2 of Clause 44.3 will be modified to:
 "Equation (44-1) specifies the calculation of bit time per meter of fiber or electrical cable based upon the parameter n, which represents the ratio of the speed of light in the fiber or electrical cable to the speed of light in a vacuum. The value of n should be available from the fiber or electrical cable manufacturer, but if no value is known then a conservative delay estimate can be calculated using a default value of n = 0.66. The speed of light in a vacuum is c = 3 x 10⁸ m/s. Table 44-3 can be used to convert fiber or electrical cable delay values specified relative to the speed of light or in nanoseconds per meter."

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 44 SC Table 44-1 P 8 L 5 # 301

Brown, Benjamin Independent

Comment Type E Comment Status R E301

Lines/boundaries missing from table

SuggestedRemedy

This applies to numerous tables throughout the draft. If a full list of the tables are necessary, I'll provide it in a comment against D4.1

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Do not see any missing lines, perhaps this is a screen resolution issue. Printed copies appear fine.

CI 44 SC Table 44-2 P 9 L 21 # 327

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E327

Inconsistent ordering of PMDs

SuggestedRemedy

Move CX4 PMD row below LX4 PMD row for consistency with all other table to which a CX4 row has been added.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 0 P 10 L 4 # 328

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E328

Font problem.

SuggestedRemedy

Incorrect font for Clause title.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 2.1.6.1 P 10 L 13 # 330

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A TR001

The second line of the paragraph needs to be edited for the new status bit (1.8.9).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read ""are advertised in bits 9 and 7 through 0"", marked with appropriate underscore of ""9 and "".

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #1

CI 45 SC 2.1.6.1 P 10 L 17 # 125

Martin, David Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A E125

Typo?

SuggestedRemedy

The term ""MMD"" is used twice in this line. Should it say ""PMD"", or is it simply an acronym I'm not familiar with?

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Acronym you're not familiar with. (MMD = MDIO Manageable Device see 44.1.4.3)

CI 45 SC 2.1.6.1 P 10 L 29 # 115

Jonathan Thatcher WWP

Comment Type E Comment Status A TR329

There is no insufficient reason to skip PHY types 1000 to 1011 in order to have this be 1100.

SuggestedRemedy

Just go in order and have this be 1000.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #329

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 45 SC 2.1.7.6 P 11 L 21 # 392
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR001
 Wrong bit
 SuggestedRemedy
 1.8.9 (twice)
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #1

CI 45 SC 2.1.7.6 P 11 L 21 # 393
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E393
 This doesn't make much sense: ""PMA/PMD is able to support a 10GBASE-CX4 PMA/PMD type."" It doesn't support, it must be - or comply - or perform as.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to something like ""... able to act as a 10GBASE-CX4 PMA/PMD."" or ""... able to comply to the 10GBASE-CX4 PMA/PMD type."" (twice).
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 Will keep description the same as existing.

CI 45 SC 2.1.7.6 P 11 L 21 # 126
 Martin, David Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR001
 Typo?
 SuggestedRemedy
 ""bit 1.8.4"" is mentioned twice in lines 21-22. Shouldn't it say ""bit 1.8.9""?
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #1

CI 45 SC 2.1.7.6 P 11 L 22 # 76
 Cravens, George Mindspeed
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR001
 PMD type bit is described in text as bit 1.8.4, but in the subclause header and in Table 45-8, it is shown as bit 1.8.9
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix text to call out bit 1.8.9 not 1.8.4
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #1

CI 45 SC 2.1.7.6 P 11 L 22-24 # 489
 Steve Dreyer Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR001
 This section has two references to bit 1.8.4 that should have been references to bit 1.8.9.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In section 45.2.1.7.6, change the two references to bit 1.8.4 to bit 1.8.9.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #1

CI 45 SC 2.1.7.6 P 11 L 22-24 # 501
 Steve Dreyer Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR001
 This section has two references to bit 1.8.4 that should have been references to bit 1.8.9.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In section 45.2.1.7.6, change the two references to bit 1.8.4 to bit 1.8.9.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #1

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 45 SC 2.1.8.5 P 174 L # 512

Peter Bradshaw

Comment Type E Comment Status A E512

3rd paragraph only specifies multiple wavelength PMDs. Also 45.2.1.9 as well.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to ".. wavelength or lane PMDs ..."

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Editor to do global search and replace in Clause 45.2.1

CI 48 SC 1 P 12 L 14 # 3

Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type E Comment Status A E003

The text ""PMD"" is missing

SuggestedRemedy

Change ""10GBASE-CX4 described"" to ""10GBASE-CX4 PMD described""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 48 SC 1 P 12 L 15 # 94

Dove, Daniel hp ProCurve Networki

Comment Type E Comment Status A E094

missing word

SuggestedRemedy

change ""CX4 described"" to ""CX4 PMD described""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 48 SC 1.2 P 12 L 35 # 65

Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A T286

In Figure 48-1, remove the CX4 portion of the diagram as it is not required.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the ""10GBASE-LX4"" to read ""10GBASE-LX4 or 10GBASE-CX4"".

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #286

CI 48 SC 1.2 P 12 L 38 # 4

Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type E Comment Status A T286

Figure 48-1 could be improved

SuggestedRemedy

Delete text ""To 10GBASE-X PHY"" Delete dashed line surrounding 10GBASE-CX4 Narrow the two boxes containing ""10GBASE-X PCS"" and ""10GBASE-X PMA"" Move 10GBASE-LX4 PMD box so that it aligns with the left hand sides of these boxes

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #286

CI 48 SC 1.3.3 P 13 L 1 # 109

Dallesasse, John Molex Incorporated

Comment Type E Comment Status A E109

Line 1 text ""10GBASE-X supports the PMD sublayer and MDI specified in Clause 53."" should be changed to ""10GBASE-X supports the PMD sublayer and MDI specified in Clauses 53 and 54.""

SuggestedRemedy

See above.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 48 SC 1.3.3 P 13 L 1 # 394

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A E109

Can higher layers support lower ones? Missing reference to 54.

SuggestedRemedy

Get rid of the sentence. Consider copying language from e.g. 34.1.2.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #109

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 48 SC 1.3.3 P 13 L 1 # 66
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E109
 Missing reference to Clause 54.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to read "... specified in Clause 53 and Clause 54."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #109

CI 48 SC 2.6.1.3 P 13 L 3 # 366
 Lynskey, Eric UNH-IOL
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E366
 This is against 48.2.6.1.3, on page 302 of 802.3ae-2002. The variable tx_lane<3:0> contains a reference to Clause 53.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add text to reference Clause 54. Change end of sentence to read "...as specified in Clause 53 or 54."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 48 SC 2.6.1.3 P 13 L 3 # 362
 Lynskey, Eric UNH-IOL
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E362
 This is against 48.2.6.1.3, on page 302 of 802.3ae-2002. The variable tx_lane<3:0> contains a reference to Clause 53.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add text to reference Clause 54. Change end of sentence to read "...as specified in Clause 53 or 54."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 48 SC 2.6.1.3 P 13 L 3 # 363
 Lynskey, Eric UNH-IOL
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E363
 This is against 48.2.6.1.3, on page 301 of 802.3ae-2002. The variable rx_lane<3:0> contains a reference to Clause 53.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add text to reference Clause 54. Change end of sentence to read "...as specified in Clause 53 or 54."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 48 SC 2.6.1.3 P 13 L 3 # 367
 Lynskey, Eric UNH-IOL
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E367
 This is against 48.2.6.1.3, on page 301 of 802.3ae-2002. The variable rx_lane<3:0> contains a reference to Clause 53.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add text to reference Clause 54. Change end of sentence to read "...as specified in Clause 53 or 54."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 48 SC 2.6.1.6 P 13 L 3 # 368
 Lynskey, Eric UNH-IOL
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E368
 This comment is against 48.2.6.1.6 on page 304 of 802.3ae-2002. The PMD_SIGNAL.indicate(signal_detect<3:0>) variable only references Clause 53.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add text to reference Clause 54. Change end of sentence to read "...as specified in Clause 53 or 54."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 48 SC 2.6.1.6 P 13 L 3 # 364
Lynskey, Eric UNH-IOL

Comment Type E Comment Status A E364

This comment is against 48.2.6.1.6 on page 304 of 802.3ae-2002. The PMD_SIGNAL.indicate(signal_detect<3:0>) variable only references Clause 53.

SuggestedRemedy

Add text to reference Clause 54. Change end of sentence to read "...as specified in Clause 53 or 54."

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 48 SC 3.1 P 13 L 3 # 365
Lynskey, Eric UNH-IOL

Comment Type E Comment Status A E365

This comment is against 48.3.1 on page 310 of 802.3ae-2002. The note here mentions Clause 47 and 53.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to ""jitter specifications of Clauses 47, 53, and 54.""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 48 SC 3.1 P 13 L 3 # 369
Lynskey, Eric UNH-IOL

Comment Type E Comment Status A E369

This comment is against 48.3.1 on page 310 of 802.3ae-2002. The note here mentions Clause 47 and 53.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to ""jitter specifications of Clauses 47, 53, and 54.""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 48 SC Figure 48-1 P 12 L 20 # 332
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A T286

There are a number of minor problems with this figure. This instruction should be ""Replace Figure 48-1 with:"" or alternative leave as ""Change"" and add what has changed below the instruction (see IEEE Std 802.3ae-2002, p. 16). The architectural Figure is not consistent for PCS clauses, but we don't need to invent a new one. (Clause 36 has a PCS--PMD stack for each PMD type, Clause 52 only has WAN and LAN stacks.) I recommend consistency within a speed of operation (e.g., more like Clause 52).

SuggestedRemedy

1. The background of the PCS and PMA boxes should be diagonal lines, not shading (probably a platform translation problem of FrameMaker). 2. Use the model of clause 52 and only have one stack, delete ""To 10GBASE-X PHY"", name at bottom becomes ""10GBASE-X"". (If the TF chooses two stacks, do it like clause 36.)

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #286

CI 54 SC 0 P 14 L 3 # 333
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E333

The EDITORIAL NOTE is not necessary since clause 54 is an addition.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete EDITORIAL NOTE (both paragraphs).

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 1 P 16 L 1 # 397
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A E397

Not IEEE reference model. This is a typo in 53.1; I think 52.1 has it right.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to ""ISO/IEC Open System Interconnection (OSI) reference model.""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 1 P 16 L 24 # 5
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type E Comment Status R TR287
Figure 54-1 tidy up

SuggestedRemedy
Move ""PMA = PHYSICAL MEDIUM ATTACHMENT"" so that it is above ""PMD = PHYSICAL MEDIUM DEPENDENT""

Proposed Response Response Status C
REJECT.

See comment #335

CI 54 SC 1 P 16 L 26 # 67
Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status R TR287
Minor editorial, but the columns listing the acronyms in Figure 54-1 should have 3 definitions each.

SuggestedRemedy
Fix as per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status C
REJECT.

See comment #335

CI 54 SC 1.1 P 16 L 31 # 335
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A TR287
With the exception of the ""-CX4"" instead of ""-LX4"" this subclause is identical to 53.1.1. It is neither necessary nor prudent to include this duplicate information.

SuggestedRemedy
Rewrite 54.1.1 to reference clause 53.1.1. ""The 10GBASE-CX4 PMD uses the same PMD interface as 10GBASE-LX4. The following PMD service primitives are defined in 53.1.1: PMD_UNITDATA.request PMD_UNITDATA.indicate PMD_SIGNAL.indicate"" Delete the 54.1.2 through 54.1.4.3.

Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 1.1 P 16 L 34 # 127
Martin, David Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A E127
Typo.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace ""and do not imply"" with ""and does not imply""

Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #335

CI 54 SC 1.1 P 16 L 34 # 398
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A E398
Grammar: ""The service interface ... do not imply""

SuggestedRemedy
Change to ""The service interface for this PMD is described in an abstract manner which does not imply ..."".

Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

See comment #335

CI 54 SC 1.1 P 16 L 34 # 375
Ewen, John JDS Uniphase

Comment Type E Comment Status A E375
Subject / verb mismatch

SuggestedRemedy
Replace: ... and do not imply ... with ... and does not imply ...

Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #335

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 1.1 P 16 L 35 # 6
Marris, Arthur Cadence
Comment Type E Comment Status A E006
grammar
SuggestedRemedy
Replace ""do"" with ""does""
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #335

CI 54 SC 1.1 P 16 L 35 # 77
Cravens, George Mindspeed
Comment Type E Comment Status A E077
Minor grammatical change: Current sentence: The service interface for this PMD is described in an abstract manner and do not imply any particular implementation. Change ""and do not"" to ""and does not""
SuggestedRemedy
Change second sentence to: The service interface for this PMD is described in an abstract manner and does not imply any particular implementation.
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #335

CI 54 SC 1.2 P 16 L 52 # 407
Dawe, Piers Agilent
Comment Type E Comment Status A E407
Syntax
SuggestedRemedy
Remove the space before ""('' here, in 54.1.3.1 and in 54.1.4.1.
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.
See comment #335

CI 54 SC 1.2.3 P 17 L 12 # 336
Grow, Robert Intel
Comment Type E Comment Status R TR287
Grammar problem.
SuggestedRemedy
Change ""stream"" to ""streams"".
Proposed Response Response Status C
REJECT.
See comment #335

CI 54 SC 1.3.2 P 17 L 30 # 7
Marris, Arthur Cadence
Comment Type E Comment Status R TR287
""stream"" should be plural
SuggestedRemedy
""The PMD continuously sends four parallel streams of bits to the PMA corresponding to the signals received from the MDI.""
Proposed Response Response Status C
REJECT.
See comment #335

CI 54 SC 1.3.2 P 17 L 30 # 337
Grow, Robert Intel
Comment Type E Comment Status R TR287
Grammar problem.
SuggestedRemedy
Change ""stream"" to ""streams"".
Proposed Response Response Status C
REJECT.
See comment #335

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 1.3.3 P 17 L 35 # 400
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status R TR287
 This subclause has no value: it says as much itself. There is no need for such unhelpful material.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete it, and 54.1.4.3.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 See comment #335

CI 54 SC 10.1.2 P 40 L 5 # 318
 Brown, Benjamin Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E318
 wrong tense
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace ""define"" with ""defined""
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #374

CI 54 SC 10.1.2 P 40 L 5 # 134
 Martin, David Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E134
 Typo
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace ""as define in 54.7.3.6"" with ""as defined in 54.7.3.6""
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #374

CI 54 SC 11 P 40 L 10 # 444
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E444
 Subclause title doesn't tell the whole story.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please change to ""Environmental and safety"".
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 Clauses 51.9, 52.10, 53.10, etc. all label this Clause title as "Environment Specifications".

CI 54 SC 11 P 40 L 13 # 87
 Cobb, Terry Avaya
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E087
 Is ISO/IEC 11801:1995 the correct reference for environmental requirements?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add correct reference.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Will change 54.11 to: "All equipment subject to this clause shall conform to the applicable requirements of 14.7."

CI 54 SC 11 P 40 L 15 # 445
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E445
 Do you want to recommend anything about labelling?
 SuggestedRemedy
 ?
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 No recommendation.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 12 P 40 L 16 # 38
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E038
 PICS should start on their own page.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert page break before 54-12.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 12.1 P 40 L 22 # 460
 Thaler, Pat Agilent Technologies
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E460
 Dan, I think you are being rather pessimistic here. I expect you can say IEEE Std 802.3ak-200x as we will probably get this approved before the end of 2009. :^)
 SuggestedRemedy
 There should be an editor's note that the appropriate year should be entered before publication. Otherwise, it might slip through and get published with this still saying 20xx.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Editor's note exists on first page of Clause 54, page 14

CI 54 SC 12.2.2 P 41 L 25 # 39
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E039
 Unnecessary period after ""Clause 54"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 Period is a remanent of framemaker cross-reference.

CI 54 SC 12.4 P 42 L 22 # 45
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E045
 Remove value/comment for TP1 and TP4 as information is redundant.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix as per comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 12.4 P 42 L 7 # 12
 Marris, Arthur Cadence
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E012
 Comment/value field empty
 SuggestedRemedy
 Put something in the comment/value field or delete this PICS item
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 Item to be deleted

CI 54 SC 12.4 P 42 L 9 # 446
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status R T041
 Asking if a PMD integrates Clause 46 XGMII seems a bit odd: it can never be directly attached (in terms of signal path) to one.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete MC1, tweak main text if necessary.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 See comment #41

CI 54 SC 12.4 P 43 L 41 # 46
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E046
 No[] not required for a mandatory PICS.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove No[].
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 12.4.1 P 43 L 43 # 358
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E358
 PF16 through PF18 are management functions.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move to MF, relable and renumber MF PICS items.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 PF16 is a mandatory function this PMD must have. PF16 status will be changed from "MD:M" to "M".
 See comment #412 for PF17 resolution
 PF18 is a mandatory function this PMD must have and therefore has to stay.

CI 54 SC 12.4.1 P 43 L 50 # 359
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E359
 The loopback function described in 54.6.9 is per an MDIO bit, therefore should be MD:M.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change Status to MD:M.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 The loopback function is mandatory, its control is optionally done through an MDIO register bit.

CI 54 SC 12.4.2 P 44 L 19 # 48
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E048
 Remove No[] from MF5.
 SuggestedRemedy
 As above.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #361

CI 54 SC 12.4.2 P 44 L 19 # 361
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E361
 Though basically copied from clause 53, these PICs items are not internally consistent or consistent with the style of other clauses. All management functions are dependent on MDIO. I found nothing in the text that indicates that any of the capabilities (e.g. lane by lane transmit disable) are optional.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete MF1, it is covered by *MD. Change all Status entries in MF PICS to MD:M Change all Support entries to Yes[], NA[].
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 12.4.2 P 44 L 22 # 49
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E049
 Remove NA[] from MF6.
 SuggestedRemedy
 As per above.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #361

CI 54 SC 12.4.2 P 44 L 25 # 50
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E050
 Remove No[] and NA[] from mandatory MF7.
 SuggestedRemedy
 As per above.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #361

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 12.4.2 P 44 L 28 # 51
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E051
 Add N/A[] to MF8, MF9 and MF10.
 SuggestedRemedy
 As per above.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #361

CI 54 SC 12.4.2 P 44 L 6 # 47
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E047
 Insert No[] value.
 SuggestedRemedy
 As per comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #361

CI 54 SC 12.4.3 P 45 L 28 # 52
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E052
 DS13 appears to have an extra carriage return in the Value/Comment field.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete so row format matches others.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 12.4.4 P 46 L 20 # 53
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E053
 RS8 appears to have an extra carriage return in the Value/Comment field.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete so row format matches others.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 12.4.5 P 46 L 29 # 54
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E054
 CA1 is optional; therefore, it requires a No[].
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a No[].
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 2 P 18 L 7.5 # 69
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status R TR287
 Capitalize the C for clause.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix as per comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 See comment #335

CI 54 SC 3 P 18 L 11 # 408
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR401
 This subclause seems out of sequence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should it come in or just after 54.6.1?
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #401

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 3 P 18 L 13 # 289
 Frazier, Howard SW
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR401
 Missing word: ""PMD"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert ""PMD"" after 10GBASE-CX4 in the sentence starting at line 13 in the current draft.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #401

CI 54 SC 4 P 18 L 46 # 403
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status R TR290
 A reader might assume that ""bit time"" referred to the signalling period (320 ps). We should make it clear that it doesn't. This is a repeat of a comment against 44.3.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add: NOTE - ""Bit time"" refers to the duration of one bit as transferred to and from the MAC (100ps in this case).
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 See comment #290. Bit time is defined in Clause 1.4.50

CI 54 SC 5 P 19 L 31 # 404
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E338
 Might as well complete the table.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Include bit 1.8.9 in the table.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 See comment #338

CI 54 SC 5 P 19 L 5 # 338
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E338
 With the exception of the table references in the text, this subclause is identical to 53.3. It is neither necessary nor prudent to include this duplicate information.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change all references to ""Table 54-3"" to ""Table53-2"" and references to ""Table 54-4"" to ""Table 53-3"". Delete Tables 54-3 and 54-4. Search for references to 54.5 and replace as appropriate with 53.3.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This subclause changed to:
 "The 10GBASE-CX4 PMD uses the same MDIO function mapping as 10GBASE-LX4 as defined in Clause 53.3"

CI 54 SC 6.1 P 20 L Figure 54- # 466
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E466
 The "+" and "-" notations used here to designate the two signals comprising a differential pair differ from the notation used in Table 54-2 which uses "<p>" and "<n>". This or a similar inconsistency occurs in a number of places and needs to be uniformly addressed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Select and use consistent notation. I suggest the "+" and "-" notation.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

"<p>" and "<n>" will be used to match the style in Clause 47.

CI 54 SC 6.2 P 20 L 44 # 356
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A T292
 Though ""electrical"" is the most likely implementation approach for bit streams, it is implementers choice as to how the logic is implemented.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Line 44 -- delete ""electronic"" Line 52 -- delete ""electronic"" Page 43, PF5 -- delete ""electrical"" from the second line of Value
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #292

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 6.3 P 21 L 4 # 340
 Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A T409

The paragraph basically describes what happens on loopback.

SuggestedRemedy

Either move it to 54.6.9 or rewrite in terms of remote TX signals to local RX signals.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #409

CI 54 SC 6.4 P 21 L 32 # 468
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A E468

The unit "mVppd" appears to be used in Table 54-5 without definition. I infer that it means "milliVolts peak-peak differential".

SuggestedRemedy

Define the term or change the table so that "mVpp" can be used as is the case in Table 54-6.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Also change mVppd to mVpp differential in paragraphs above table.

CI 54 SC 6.4 P 21 L 42 # 412
 Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status R E412

There should be something in here about a compliant signal (both electrically and in coding), and a get out: behaviour unspecified in all other conditions.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Signal detect is only meant to detect the presence of a signal, not whether there is a CX4, compliant, coded signal.

CI 54 SC 6.4 P 21 L 42 # 411
 Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A E411

You want very rapid signal detect yet less rapid de-assert. Opposite to what I would expect.

SuggestedRemedy

Please explain.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Explanation: We want to know if there is a signal present as soon as possible so the link can be brought up as soon as possible. We do not want to drop the link for any random noise event.

CI 54 SC 6.7 P 22 L 12 # 128
 Martin, David Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A E128

Font.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct font size for ""absolute output voltage limits""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 6.8 P 22 L 24 # 129
 Martin, David Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A E129

Font.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct font size for ""absolute output voltage limits""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 6.8 P 22 L 29 # 71

Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status R E071

Missing the word "optional" in front of PMD_transmit_disable_n.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix as per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

PMD_transmit_disable_n is not optional.

CI 54 SC 6.9 P 22 L 34 # 20

Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E020

Wording is redundant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "as specified in this subclause".

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 6.9 P 22 L 35 # 89

Joergensen, Thomas Vitesse Semiconducto

Comment Type E Comment Status A E089

Loopback mode might be selected through either MDIO management or other means, so there should not be any reference to how loopback mode is selected in the subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the words "by setting the loopback control bit of 1.0.0"

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7 P 26 L 24 # 435

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status R TR297

Too many graphs. Other editorial.

SuggestedRemedy

Combine the three "return loss" graphs. Remove gratuitous trailing zeroes in y axes. Remove "E+0" in y axes. Remove grey borders. Start f axis below, not at, 100 MHz. Commas are forbidden in numbers. It would be nice to have shading to show which side of each mask is compliant. Figures are orphans; each needs a mention in the text.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Graphs stay and will be labeled informative and will be black & white, see comment #297

CI 54 SC 7.1 P 23 L 16 # 309

Brown, Benjamin Independent

Comment Type E Comment Status A E309

In "inter operability" 2 words?

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "inter operability" with "interoperability". This results in a hyphen at the end of this line. This comment also applies to 54.7.4.3, page 29, line 43

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.1 P 23 L 16 # 454

Thaler, Pat Agilent Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status A E454

When you have a two word adjective, it should be hyphenated. For instance, "low swing AC coupled differential interface" should be "low-swing AC-coupled differential interface". Another example is "peak to peak" in 54.7.3.4 which should be "peak-to-peak". By the way, it is not clear why the first sentence of this subclause says "differenti output amplitude" when describing the maximum while the next sentence describing the minimum for the same signal characteristic calls it "differential peak to peak output voltage". Both are obviously peak-to-peak voltages as the units are mVp-p. I suggest you use the same name for the characteristic in both sentences.

SuggestedRemedy

Check for unhyphenated adjectives and correct. Also, make the wording of 54.7.3.4 more consistant.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 7.2 P 23 L 23 # 305
 Brown, Benjamin Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E305
 Wrong word usage
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "is comprised of" with "comprises"
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.2 P 23 L 25 # 21
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A T082
 Bad wording.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove "approximately". Scan specification for other occurrences.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #82

CI 54 SC 7.2 P 23 L 25 # 455
 Thaler, Pat Agilent Technologies
 Comment Type E Comment Status A T082
 This is admittedly a picky comment re: "standard twinaxial cables" There is no standard for the cables called out in 54.8. If there is a cable standard that satisfies the requirements of 54.8, then it should at least be called out in a note. If there is not and you simply mean "common", then please delete "standard" as it is confusing to use this casual sense of the word in a standard.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #82

CI 54 SC 7.2 P 23 L 25 # 74
 Alan Flatman LAN Technologies
 Comment Type E Comment Status A T082
 cannot say "up to approximately 15m"
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete "approximately"
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #82

CI 54 SC 7.3 P 24 L 11 # 415
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E415
 Standard terminology
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Baud rate tolerance" with "Signaling speed (range)" here and in 54.7.3.3 (twice), replace "Baud period" there with "unit interval". Also for receiver, 54.7.4.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.3.1 P 24 L 37 # 344
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E344
 Awkward language.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change first line to read: "The test fixture of Figure 54-3, or its functional equivalent, ..."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.3.1 P 24 L 38 # 22
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E022
 Use caps for abbreviation.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "pcb" to "PCB".
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #386

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 7.3.4 P 25 L 33 # 75
 Alan Flatman LAN Technologies
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E075
 Title "Amplitude and Swing" duplicates same meaning
 SuggestedRemedy
 rename "Output Amplitude"
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.3.4 P 25 L 39 # 296
 Frazier, Howard SW
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E296
 D.C. vs DC. Both appear in the same sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Use DC, not D.C.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 Will also search entire text and make all consistant

CI 54 SC 7.3.4 P 25 L Figure 54- # 470
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E470
 The designations "<N>" and "<P>" for the two signals comprising a differential pair are inconsistent with the designations used elsewhere in the Clause 54.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Select and use consistent notation. I suggest the "+" and "-" notation.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 <p> and <n> adopted

CI 54 SC 7.3.5 P 26 L 10 # 86
 Cobb, Terry Avaya
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR297
 In the past this is usually a table.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move the return loss to a table. This would need to be changed throughout the document. In addition the picture should not be included. It is best not to show a requirement with both a picture and equation or table. As in a previous comment, the table is generally used for specifying the requirement. It also makes the PIC easier.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

All graphic pictures will be labeled informative, see comment #297

CI 54 SC 7.3.5 P 26 L 24 # 24
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status R TR297
 Figure 54-5, -6, -7, -9, -10, -11, and -12 appear to be imported graphics. These graphics need to be in editable FrameMaker format.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Eliminate imported graphics.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 IEEE Standards Style Manual Section 16 allows for imported graphics. Files for each graphic will be maintained per Section 16. See comment #297

CI 54 SC 7.3.5 P 26 L 3 # 88
 Joergensen, Thomas Vitesse Semiconducto
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E088
 It is not the output impedance of the driver, but the output impedance of the total circuit including PCB and connector.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the word ""driver"" to ""output"" in line 3
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 "driver" canged to "transmitter" throught document

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 7.3.5 P 26 L 4 # 83
Cobb, Terry Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status A E083
Correct text.

SuggestedRemedy

Use ""shall be greater than or equal to"" (note: this needs to be changed throughtout the document) and on the following line change output impedance to return loss.

Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.3.5 P 26 L 6 # 502
Steve Dreyer Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E502
Looks like missing period at end of line 6.

SuggestedRemedy

Add period to end of line 6.

Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.3.5 P 26 L 6 # 490
Steve Dreyer Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E490
Looks like missing period at end of line 6.

SuggestedRemedy

Add period to end of line 6.

Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.3.5 P 26 L 9 # 23
Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E023
Equation format is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Apply the ""Equation"" format to each equation. Numbering should be ""(54-1)"" and should have no ""Eq."" and no ""a"" or ""b"". Apply to all equations in the specification.

Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.3.5 P 28 L 38 # 118
Jonathan Thatcher WWP

Comment Type E Comment Status A E118
Remove the note to the editors note box below. IEEE has no permanent means to ensure availability of this file.

SuggestedRemedy

Put note in editors box, which will be removed "prior to publication." Or, fix the IEEE process and rules so that we have permanent, managed repository for such files.

Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Removed note.

CI 54 SC 7.3.6 P 26 L 53 # 25
Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E025
Leading in text for list should be on the same page as the list.

SuggestedRemedy
Fix as per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.3.6 P 27 L 1 # 26
Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E026
Numbered list does not appear to be an IEEE numbered list.

SuggestedRemedy
Apply IEEE format to the numbered list.

Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 7.3.6 P 27 L 13 # 377
Ewen, John JDS Uniphase

Comment Type E Comment Status R E377

Definition of Vnorm and Normalized Waveform include factors of 2 and 0.5 that cancel. This seems redundant.

SuggestedRemedy

Define Vnorm and Normalized Waveform as: $V_{norm} = (V_{lowp} - V_{lowm})$ Normalized Waveform = (Original Waveform - Voff) / Vnorm

Proposed Response REJECT. Response Status C

The factor of 0.5 represents the nominal pre-emphasis value chosen by the study group. This number can change from other comments to this draft and might therefore change here.

CI 54 SC 7.3.6 P 27 L 19 # 421
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A TR418

Don't use figures for normative specs.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace ""defined in Figure 54-6 and the piece-wise linear interpolation between the points in Table 54-7."" with ""defined in piece-wise linear format by Table 54-7 and illustrated by Figure 54-6.""

Proposed Response ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Response Status C

See comment #418

CI 54 SC 7.3.6 P 27 L 3 # 420
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A E420

""continuous baud""?

SuggestedRemedy

successive unit intervals?

Proposed Response ACCEPT. Response Status C

CI 54 SC 7.3.6 P 27 L 3 # 419
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A E419

The two levels are not called +1 and -1

SuggestedRemedy

1 and 0, or one and zero.

Proposed Response ACCEPT. Response Status C

CI 54 SC 7.3.6 P 27 L 45 # 422
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status R TR418

The pattern is 10 UI or 3200 ps long. The table and figure should extend over the same range.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete last row of table, truncate figure at 3200 ps or continue template to chosen end of time axis.

Proposed Response REJECT. Response Status C

See comment #418

CI 54 SC 7.3.6 P 28 L Table 54-7 # 471
Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A E471

The table contains 4 sets of duplicated number pairs whose purpose is unclear and that do not seem to be needed.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the duplicate upper limit number pairs for 283 and 709 ps and the duplicate lower limit number pairs for 1883 and 2309 ps.

Proposed Response ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Response Status C

Will pare down duplicated numbers to pairs to indicate a straight line.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 7.3.7 P 28 L 47 # 307
 Brown, Benjamin Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E307
 Wrong tense
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace ""increase"" with ""increased""
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Last sentence deleted.

CI 54 SC 7.3.8 P 28 L 47 # 130
 Martin, David Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E130
 Typo
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace ""and increase EMI"" with ""and increased EMI""
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Last sentence deleted.

CI 54 SC 7.3.8 P 28 L 51 # 371
 Healey, Adam Agere Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E371
 Should have a reference the test methodology, 54.10.1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add sentence, ""Transmit jitter test requirements are specified in section 54.10.1.""
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.3.8 P 29 L 4 # 348
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR298
 Obsolete Editor's Note.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the note.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #298

CI 54 SC 7.3.8 P 29 L 4 # 73
 Plunkett, Timothy NSWCCD
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR298
 Editor's note is not outdated
 SuggestedRemedy
 Editor's note should be updated or removed.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #298

CI 54 SC 7.3.8 P 29 L 4 # 17
 Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR298
 This editor's note should have been removed, shouldn't it?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove editor's note if transmit jitter allocation was resolved in Dallas.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #298

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 7.3.8 P 29 L 4 # 114
 Say-Otun, Sabit Next Level Communic
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR298
 Editor's note still references March 2003 meeting
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete edirof's note
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #298

CI 54 SC 7.3.8 P 29 L 4 # 27
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR298
 Editor's note should be resolved.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove editor's note.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #298

CI 54 SC 7.3.8 P 29 L 4 # 98
 Dove, Daniel hp ProCurve Networki
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR298
 Editorial note appears obsolete.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove editorial note
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #298

CI 54 SC 7.3.8 P 29 L 4 # 131
 Martin, David Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR298
 Editor's Note
 SuggestedRemedy
 The March 2003 plenary has come and gone. Shouldn't this note be removed by now?
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #298

CI 54 SC 7.4 P 29 L 12 # 85
 Cobb, Terry Avaya
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E085
 Tables are generally used for requirements and the text that follows points to the table. I found this throughout the document.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct usage in the document to the practice that we have used in the past.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 Will add wording to indicate this table is informative.

CI 54 SC 7.4 P 29 L 25 (Table # 472
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E472
 The value of minimum differential return loss in the table does not reflect the frequency dependence specified in 54.7.4.5 and is therefore misleading.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either show the frequency dependence in the table or removed the parameter from the table.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Will make it the same format as the transmitter return loss in table 54-6.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 7.4.1 P 29 L 33-34 # 473
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A E473
 The wording less than precise.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence to "The receiver shall operate with a BER of better than 10⁻¹² when receiving a compliant transmit signal, as defined in 54.7.3, through a compliant channel as defined in 54.8."

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.4.1 P 29 L 35 # 28
 Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E028
 Extra space between "in" and "54.8."

SuggestedRemedy

Remove extra space.

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.4.2 P 29 L 38 # 474
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A E474
 The requirement is poorly stated.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence to "A 10GBASE-CX4 receiver shall comply with the requirements of 54.7.4.1 for any Baud rate in the range 3.125 GBd +/- 100 ppm."

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.4.2 P 29 L 39 # 29
 Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E029
 Different font type for +/-100 ppm.

SuggestedRemedy

Change font to match previous text.

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.4.3 P 29 L 43 # 99
 Dove, Daniel hp ProCurve Networki

Comment Type E Comment Status A E099
 typo

SuggestedRemedy

add a hyphen between "inter" and "operability".

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will use "interoperability" throughout the document.

CI 54 SC 7.4.3 P 29 L 43 # 132
 Martin, David Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A E099
 Typo

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "for maximum inter operability" with "for maximum interoperability"

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

See Comment #99

CI 54 SC 7.4.3 P 29 L 43 # 30
 Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E099
 Extra space between "inter" and "operability".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to be "interoperability".

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

See comment #99

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 7.4.3 P 29 L 48 # 31
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E031
 Note is not in IEEE Note format.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to be in IEEE Note format.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.4.4 P 30 L 4-5 # 475
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E475
 The second sentence could be clearer.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the second sentence to "Note that these may be greater than the 1600 mVpp maximum differential amplitude specified in 54.7.3.3 due to the actual transmitter output and receiver input impedances."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 7.4.4 P 30 L 7-8 # 476
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E476
 The sentence makes little sense as stated and the use of the word "height" seems inappropriate. I infer that the intent was to say that input impedance of a receiver can cause the minimum signal into a receiver to differ from that measured when the receiver is replaced with a 100 Ohm test load.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the sentence beginning in line 7 to "The input impedance of a receiver can cause the minimum signal into a receiver to differ from that measured when the receiver is replaced with a 100 Ohm test load."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 The 4th sentence will be changed to "... the minimum specified value due to ..."

CI 54 SC 7.4.5 P 30 L 16 # 91
 Joergensen, Thomas Vitesse Semiconducto
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E091
 The word ""driver"" should be replaced with ""receiver"". In the next sentence the text still refers to the output impedance and not the input impedance.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace line 16 and 17 with: ""...and any off-chip components related to the receiver. This input impedance requirement applies to all valid input levels...""

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #349

CI 54 SC 7.4.5 P 30 L 17 # 503
 Steve Dreyer Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E503
 Looks like missing period at end of line 17.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add period to end of line 17.

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #349

CI 54 SC 7.4.5 P 30 L 17 # 491
 Steve Dreyer Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E491
 Looks like missing period at end of line 17.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add period to end of line 17.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 See comment #349

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 7.4.5 P 30 L 46 # 349
 Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A TR427

This section is unnecessarily redundant with the transmit section. For maintenance of the document it is better to specify in one location and reference. It isn't clear that the impedance specifications of the transmitter and receiver are identical after being transmitted through a conformant channel (including the cabling).

SuggestedRemedy

Replace section and Figure 54-7 with: "The receiver shall accept a signal generated by a transmitter meeting the output impedance requirements of 54.7.3.5 over a compliant channel (including cable assembly)."

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #427

CI 54 SC 7.4.6 P 31 L 32 # 311
 Brown, Benjamin Independent

Comment Type E Comment Status A E311

wrong comma placement

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "54.7.3.8 with any compliant transmit signal, as defined in 54.7.3 through" with "54.7.3.8, with any compliant transmit signal as defined in 54.7.3, through"

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #374

CI 54 SC 7.4.6 P 31-32 L 1 # 504
 Steve Dreyer Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E504

Graphic for Figure 54-8 is on one page, title for that figure is on the next page, that is confusing.

SuggestedRemedy

Put title and graphic for Figure 54-8 on same page.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

See comment #374

CI 54 SC 7.4.6 P 31-32 L 1 # 492
 Steve Dreyer Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E492

Graphic for Figure 54-8 is on one page, title for that figure is on the next page, that is confusing.

SuggestedRemedy

Put title and graphic for Figure 54-8 on same page.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

See comment #374

CI 54 SC 8 P 32 L 16 (Table # 478
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A TR386

"PCBs" is rather non description of this item.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "CBs" to "printed circuit board traces" or "PCB traces".

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #386

CI 54 SC 8 P 32 L 17 # 429
 Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A TR386

Table 54-9 needs an indication of how much random jitter is added by the cable assembly. Surely it's not zero?

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #386

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 8 P 32 L 25 # 479
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A TR386
 The meaning of "eye height" in note "d" is unclear.

SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify the note or remove the phrase "eye height" from the note.

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #386

CI 54 SC 8 P 32 L 30 # 33
 Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E033
 Table 54-10 has improper line weighting.

SuggestedRemedy
 Fix line weights.

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8 P 32 L 37 # 434
 Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status R E434
 The crosstalk material needs a diagram.

SuggestedRemedy
 Add a diagram illustrating the different forms of crosstalk and reflection.

Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.

This is tutorial and is not consistent with other IEEE.

CI 54 SC 8 P 32 L 46 # 133
 Martin, David Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A E133
 Capital letter

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace ""of the Jumper cable"" with ""of the jumper cable""

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Jumper cable will be replaced with cable assembly

CI 54 SC 8 P 32 L 5 # 8
 Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type E Comment Status A E008
 Delete the redundant word ""approximately""

SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the redundant word ""approximately""

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8 P 32 L 5 # 32
 Booth, Brad Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E032
 Remove the word ""approximately"".

SuggestedRemedy
 Fix as per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8 P 32 L 7 # 428
 Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A E428
 ""intended as a point-to-point interface of up to approximately 15 m between integrated circuits"" - NOT. You use PCB to connect ICs. Twinax cable, between boxes!

SuggestedRemedy
 ""between ports"".

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will use "between network ports".

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 8 P 32 L na # 505
 Steve Dreyer Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E505
 Table 54-10 has inconsistent line widths
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make Table 54-10 line widths consistent.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8 P 32 L na # 493
 Steve Dreyer Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E493
 Table 54-10 has inconsistent line widths
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make Table 54-10 line widths consistent.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.2 P 33 L 11 # 480
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E480
 It appears that "connector" at the end of the sentence should be plural.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "connector" to "connectors".
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.2 P 33 L 38 # 121
 Jonathan Thatcher WWP
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E121
 Figure 54.-9 is informative.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "(Informative)" to the title of the figure.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.3 P 34 L 15 # 482
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E482
 It appears that "connector" at the end of the sentence should be plural.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "connector" to "connectors".
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.3 P 34 L 42 # 122
 Jonathan Thatcher WWP
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E122
 Figure 54-10 is informative.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "(Informative)" to the title of the figure.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.3 P 34 L 6 # 313
 Brown, Benjamin Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E313
 For commonality with ""2.0 GHz"..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace ""1000 MHz"" with ""1.0 GHz"" both here and on line 14.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Will change all "GHz" to their equivalent "MHz".

CI 54 SC 8.4 P 36 L 26 # 123
 Jonathan Thatcher WWP
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E123
 Figure 54.-11 is informative.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "(Informative)" to the title of the figure.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 8.4.1 P 34 L 49 # 11
Marris, Arthur Cadence
Comment Type E Comment Status A E011
Unnecessary "the"
SuggestedRemedy
Reword "between the any of the four transmit channels" to "between any of the four transmit channels"
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.4.1 P 34 L 49 # 483
Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.
Comment Type E Comment Status A E483
Extra "the".
SuggestedRemedy
Delete "the" from the phrase "loss between the any of the four transmit channels".
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.4.1 P 34 L 50 # 314
Brown, Benjamin Independent
Comment Type E Comment Status A E314
wrong word
SuggestedRemedy
"bit error rate" should be "bit error ratio" but replacing it with "BER" would match 54.8.5.1
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.4.1 P 34 L 51 # 507
Steve Dreyer Intel
Comment Type E Comment Status A E507
Missing colon after "at least".
SuggestedRemedy
Add colon.
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.4.1 P 34 L 51 # 495
Steve Dreyer Intel
Comment Type E Comment Status A E495
Missing colon after "at least".
SuggestedRemedy
Add colon.
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.4.1 P 35 L 6 # 312
Brown, Benjamin Independent
Comment Type E Comment Status A E312
no comma needed
SuggestedRemedy
Remove the comma at the end of this line. This comment also applies ti 54.8.5.1, page 37, line 1
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.4.2 P 35 L 28 # 81
Cobb, Terry Avaya
Comment Type E Comment Status A E081
MDNEXT is not a sum of the magnitudes.
SuggestedRemedy
Change to a power sum.
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.4.2 P 35 L 37-38 # 494
Steve Dreyer Intel
Comment Type E Comment Status A E494
Lines 37-38 seem confusing, maybe there is some formatting problem. Same issue in section 54.8.5.2.1.
SuggestedRemedy
Fix formatting problem.
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 8.4.2 P 35 L 37-38 # 506
 Steve Dreyer Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E506
 Lines 37-38 seem confusing, maybe there is some formatting problem. Same issue in section 54.8.5.2.1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix formatting problem.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.4.2 P 35 L 51 # 508
 Steve Dreyer Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E508
 Missing colon after "at least".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add colon.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.4.2 P 35 L 51 # 496
 Steve Dreyer Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E496
 Missing colon after "at least".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add colon.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.5.1 P 36 L 36 # 509
 Steve Dreyer Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E509
 Missing colon after "defined as".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add colon
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.5.1 P 36 L 36 # 497
 Steve Dreyer Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E497
 Missing colon after "defined as".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add colon
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.5.1 P 36 L 48 # 19
 Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E019
 This line, introducing an equation, ends with a colon. Most of the preceding lines introducing equations did not.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Choose one punctuation and harmonize clause.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Will end with ":"

CI 54 SC 8.5.2 P 37 L 6 # 439
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E439
 If I've understood this right, this paragraph can be cleaned up.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace first two sentences with: "Since four duplex channels are used to transfer data between PMDs, the FEXT that is coupled into a data carrying channel will be from the three other channels in the same direction."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Will use
 "Since four channels are used to transfer data between PMDs, the FEXT that is coupled into a data carrying channel will be from the three other channels in the same direction"

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 8.5.2.1 P 37 L 21 # 440
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E370
 Editorials
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the subclause heading: there is no 54.8.5.2.1 to keep it company. In equation, change PSELFEXT to MSELFEXT.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #370

CI 54 SC 8.5.2.1 P 37 L 21 # 370
 Healey, Adam Agere Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E370
 PSELFEXT is not cited as a cable performance requirement. The intent of this section appears to be to show how MSELFEXT is to be computed. Also the note below equation 54.10 states that NL(f)_i is the FEXT loss for pair combination i, but this should read ELFEXT loss (or the attenuation term needs to be factored into Equation 54.10).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move contents of 54.8.5.2.1 to 54.8.5.2 and remove subsection. Change PSELFEXT to MSELFEXT and NL(f)_i to EL(f)_i in equation 54.10 and modify note to read that "EL(f)_i is the ELFEXT loss at frequency f for pair combination i"
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 Will make consistant with other 802.3 standards (e.g. 1000BASE-T).

CI 54 SC 8.5.2.1 P 37 L 21 # 315
 Brown, Benjamin Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E370
 According to the second paragraph in Clause 11 of the IEEE style manual: "Clauses and subclauses shall be divided into further subclauses only when there is to be more than one subclause. In other words, clauses and subclauses should not be broken down into further subclauses if another subclause of the same level does not exist. For example, Clause 1 shall not have a subclause 1.1 unless there is also a subclause 1.2."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the header for this subclause and combine with 54.8.5.2 Same comment applies to 54.9.1.1 & 54.10.1
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #370

CI 54 SC 8.5.2.1 P 37 L 33 # 316
 Brown, Benjamin Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E316
 While I hardly can even follow this discussion, it seems to me that the definition of NL(f)_i is wrong...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "FEXT" with "ELFEXT"
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.6 P 38 L 30 # 35
 Booth, Brad Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E035
 I believe that the "class" should be "Class".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix as per comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC 8.6 P 38 L 30 # 441
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E441
 What does this mean: "The cable assembly shall provide class 2 or better shielding in accordance with IEC 61196-1."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please give the reader a one-sentence summary so that he can decide if he needs to buy IEC 61196-1. Add IEC 61196-1 to list of references and give its title.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 This is specified in the exact same manner as 1000BASE-CX is in Clause 39.4.2. IEC 61196-1 is already referenced in Clause 1.3

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC 9.1.1 P 39 L 6 (Figure # 485)
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E485
 I think the title of the figure should be "plug" not "connector".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "connector" to "plug" in the title of the figure.
 Proposed Response REJECT. Response Status C

CI 54 SC 9.2 P 39 L 27-35 (Fig # 486)
 Bill Quackenbush Cisco Systems, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E486
 Inconsistent designators "+", "-", "<P>" and "<N>" are used to designate the two signals that comprise a differential pair.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the designations consistent and consistent with the rest of the text.
 Proposed Response ACCEPT. Response Status C
 <p> & <n> notation used throughout.

CI 54 SC 9.2 P 39 L 33 # 389
 Beck, Michael Alcatel Bell nv
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E389
 Figure 54-15: The signal names in the explanatory note are different from the signal names shown in the figure.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make figure conform with notation in Table 54-2: Replace SLn+, SLn-, DLn+, DLn- with SLi<P>, SLi<N>, DLi<P> and DLi<N>, respectively. Explain meaning of DLi<P> and DLi<N>.
 Proposed Response ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Response Status C
 <p> & <n> notation used throughout.

CI 54 SC all P 0 L 0 # 96
 Dove, Daniel hp ProCurve Networki
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E096
 The term ""driver"" is used throughout the document to describe the term ""transmitter"". I believe this is not the correct term.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Do a document check and replace ""driver"" with ""transmitter"".
 Proposed Response ACCEPT. Response Status C

CI 54 SC Figure 54-1 P 16 L 18 # 334
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E334
 Fill problem (probably a FrameMaker platform independence problem).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the background in the PMD and MDI box to diagonal lines (prints as shaded).
 Proposed Response ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Response Status C
 Is correct in framemaker files, printing / pdf translation problem.

CI 54 SC Figure 54-10—Cable a P 34 L 18 # 106
 Carlson, Steve HSD
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E106
 Figure 54-10—Cable assembly return loss contains color.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See previous comments on this subject.
 Proposed Response ACCEPT. Response Status C

CI 54 SC Figure 54-11 P 36 L 26 # 383
 Thompson, Geoff Nortel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E383
 Remove color information. (also 54-12) Final publication will be in black and white.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response ACCEPT. Response Status C

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

Cl 54 SC Figure 54-11—Cable a P 36 L 2 # 107
 Carlson, Steve HSD
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E107
 Figure 54-11—Cable assembly NEXT / MDNEXT loss contains color
 SuggestedRemedy
 See previous comments on this subject.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 54 SC Figure 54-12—Cable a P 38 L 2 # 108
 Carlson, Steve HSD
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E108
 Figure 54-12—Cable assembly ELFEXT / MDELFFEXT loss contains color.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Convert to grey-scale.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 54 SC Figure 54-13 P 39 L 1 # 317
 Brown, Benjamin Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status R TR037
 This figure is not referenced in the text
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either add a reference to this figure or remove it. Same comment applies to Figure 54-14.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 See comment #37. Figures will be labeled as informative.

Cl 54 SC Figure 54-2 P 20 L 31 # 339
 Grow, Robert Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status A E339
 SIGNAL_DETECT arrow should connect to the box above it.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move the arrow
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 54 SC Figure 54-5 P 26 L 24 # 306
 Brown, Benjamin Independent
 Comment Type E Comment Status R E306
 Why does this figure have all the dashed lines in it? They don't appear to add anything to the figure.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove all the dashed lines from the figure. Same comment applies to Figure 54-7.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT.

Gradicule lines make graphs easier to read.

Cl 54 SC Figure 54-5 P 26 L 24 # 102
 Carlson, Steve HSD
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR297
 Table 54-5 Transmit differential output return loss contains color (dark blue) in the graph. IEEE 802 standards are printed in black-and-white only.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change dark blue color in graph to black.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

all graphs will be labeled informative and be black & white, see comment #297

Cl 54 SC Figure 54-6—Normaliz P 27 L # 103
 Carlson, Steve HSD
 Comment Type E Comment Status A TR297
 Figure 54-6—Normalized transmit template as measured at MDI using Figure 54-3 contains color. IEEE 802 standards are in black and white.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change colors to gray scale.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 all graphical figures will be in black & white, see comment #297

P802.3ak Draft 4.0 Comments

CI 54 SC Figure 54-7—Receiver P 31 L 2 # 104
 Carlson, Steve HSD

Comment Type E Comment Status A E104

Figure 54-7—Receiver differential input return loss is in color. IEEE 802 standards are black-and-white.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace dark blue colour with black in the graph.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

all graphic figures will be black & white

CI 54 SC Figure 54-8 P 32 L 1 # 310
 Brown, Benjamin Independent

Comment Type E Comment Status A E310

Figure title needs to stay with its figure

SuggestedRemedy

Move the figure title to the bottom of page 31 (or the figure to the top of page 32) so the figure and the title are together.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC Figure 54-9—Cable as P 33 L 15 # 105
 Carlson, Steve HSD

Comment Type E Comment Status A E105

Figure 54-9—Cable assembly insertion loss contains color.

SuggestedRemedy

See previous comments on this subject.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

All figures and tables will be B&W

CI 54 SC Table 54-10 P 32 L 28 # 18
 Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type E Comment Status A E018

Table borders for column #2 are messed up.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix borders.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC Table 54-10 P 32 L 31 # 350
 Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E350

Bad formatting.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the borders on the Table so that outside border and bottom border of Table header is the bold line and others are the fine line.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 54 SC Table 54-8 P 24 L 11 # 343
 Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A E415

Inconsistent table format with Table 54-8.

SuggestedRemedy

Either change both to Baud Rate and tolerance on a single line per Table 54-6 or change 54-6 to the two line format of Table 54-8.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

See comment #415 and will use multi-line format in both