Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** *MyBallot #* 13

COORDINATION, SCC14

Comment Type **GR** *Comment Status* **A**

At this point, I am not sure how well MyBallot does in sending all the needed information on to the intended recipients. Should you wish to contact me, please feel free to do so. My email address is j.frysinger@ieee.org (aliased to frysingerj@cofc.edu) James R. Frysinger, VIce Chair, SCC14

SuggestedRemedy

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** *MyBallot #* 12

COORDINATION, SCC14

Comment Type **GR** *Comment Status* **A**

This is a tough standard to format. I am impressed with how well it has been done.

SuggestedRemedy

None!

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Thank you.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** *MyBallot #* 8

COORDINATION, EDITORIAL

Comment Type **GR** *Comment Status* **A**

At the time of RevCom submittal, it will be requested that an electronic file for each graphic (ideally in TIFF, GIF, EPS, or WMF formats) be supplied.

SuggestedRemedy

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** *MyBallot #* 7

JAMES, DAVID V

Comment Type **GR** *Comment Status* **R**

Most previous comments recieved nonresponsive responses.

SuggestedRemedy

1) Incorporate all accepted changes, rather than defering these to IEEE editors, so that the authority of the Sponsor ballot is no preempted.
2) Accept all comments for which nontechnical responses were returned (number of users is irrelevant to editorial correctness).
3) Accept all comments with respect to inconsistencies; the history of the draft is not a good excuse for continuing/extending inconsistencies.
4) Open the document for comment in all areas, due to the large number of comment changes requested.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

All comment received during the initial ballot did received a response. This comment provides no new technical content on these comments.

---- BRC History ----

IEEE 802.3REVam comment resolution meeting:

Defer to Working Group. There was no objection.

IEEE 802.3 closing plenary meeting motions:

Per 802.3 motion to consider multiple response in a single motion this response was approved. [Y:61 N:1 A:15].

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** *MyBallot #* 19

LAW, DAVID J

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

Comments #1723, #1721, #1715 and #1786 from the initial Sponsor ballot were not implemented correct.

SuggestedRemedy

Implemented these comments correctly.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment MyBallot #88 was not implemented correctly, when the PICS item was deleted subsequent items auto-renumbered. Prevent this from happening so that renumbering does not take place.

Note: The comment numbers listed above realted to the Access Database record numbers rather than the MyBallot comment numbers. These are:

1723 -> MyBallot 121
1721 -> MyBallot 123
1715 -> MyBallot 129
1786 -> MyBallot 58

Cl **01** *SC* **1** *P* **1** *L* **1** *MyBallot #* 1

DINEEN, THOMAS J

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

Comment:
This comment is a re submission or pile on of the list of DVJ Myballot comments from D2.0 shown in the list below. I believe that they all have a common thread pertaining to the consistent use of a Standard Style Guide and constituent use of naming, logical, and nomenclature conventions. This re submission shall apply regardless of the current comment status or resolution.
The list of DVJ comments from D2.0 is shown below by My Ballot number:
160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 174, 175, 176, 177
178, 179, 180, 183, 182, 181, 184, 185, 169, 170, 172, 171
173, 186, 189, 188, 187, 190, 191, 194, 193, 196, 198, 199,
200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 210, 209, 211,
212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 218, 220, 219, 222, 221, 224, 223,
225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 232, 234, 237, 235, 248, 246, 247,
239, 238, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 250, 249, 251, 253,
252, 255, 254, 257, 260, 259, 256, 258, 261, 262, 263, 264
266, 265, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 276, 277,
278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289,
290, 292, 294, 298, 297, 296, 295, 299, 300, 301, 302, 305,
304, 306, 309, 308, 310, 345, 344, 348, 353.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggested Remedy:
1) Identify a Style Guide and Framemaker document template, probably the current IEEE style guide. Use the selected Style Guide for this and future IEEE 802.3 projects. I am not so concerned or dogmatic about which style guide is chosen. Probably for reasons of good IEEE citizenship and cooperation it would be wise to select the current version of the IEEE Style guide and IEEE Framemaker templates.

2) Consistently apply the Style Guide and Framemaker template requirements to all clauses, pages, and lines of the draft.

3) For any naming, logical, graphical, table, state machine, or nomenclature conventions, including PICS tables not covered by the selected style guide develop, document, standardize (within 802.3) and publish a set of IEEE 802.3 conventions.

4) Consistently apply the IEEE 802.3 Conventions requirements to all clauses, pages, and lines of the draft.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

This comment provides no new technical content on these comments. Development of a IEEE 802.3 Style Guide is beyond the scope of this project.

---- BRC History ----

IEEE 802.3REVam comment resolution meeting:

Defer to Working Group. There was no objection.

IEEE 802.3 closing plenary meeting motions:

Editor recommendation:

REJECT.

This comment provides no new technical content on these comments. Development of a IEEE 802.3 Style Guide is beyond the scope of this project.

Alternative proposed response from David James:

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE

All items that have Accepted in Principle will be incorporated in the next recirculation rather than defer to the IEEE Editor.

MOTION
Move to accept the Editors recommendation.

M: M. McCormack
S: S. Muller

Y: 60
N: 2
A: 28

Cl **01** *SC* **1** *P* **1** *L* **1** *MyBallot #* 6

DINEEN, THOMAS J

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

This comment shall constitute a re submission or pile on to comment 1900 of D2.0 and the 1132 other comment instances that feature the same response. Yes you heard it right 1132 comment instances. I am gratified to see the committee has decided to defer to the Standards Board and its rules! However given the magnitude of the proposed changes, of 1132 instances, and the potential for the introduction of errors, possibly technical errors, I believe that there should be a recirculation ballot conducted after the IEEE editor has completed the editorial process. If as I suspect the rules and procedures will not accommodate an extra recirculation ballot, I would then propose that the 802.3 editors be requested to perform the editorial implementation of the 1132 comments in question, prior to the last recirculation ballot, such that the Sponsor Ballot Pool members shall have an sufficient opportunity to review and comment on the draft and its changes.

Response to comment 1900:
The IEEE P802.3REVam Task Force believes that this comment is one on editorial style, and does not affect the technical integrity of the standard. Editing does not take place during the balloting period. As pointed out in the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual subclause 5.4.3.2: "It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication." This editorial comment will be supplied to the Standards Project Editor.

SuggestedRemedy

Conduct a recirculation ballot after the implementation of the 1132 editorial comments in question.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

This comment provides no new technical content on these comments.

---- BRC History ----

IEEE 802.3REVam comment resolution meeting:

Defer to Working Group. There was no objection.

IEEE 802.3 closing plenary meeting motions:

Editors recommendation:

REJECT.

This comment provides no new technical content on these comments.

Alternative proposed response from David James:

ACCEPT IN PRINICIPLE

All items currently identified as in need of change will be incorporated in the efficient and least error prone method i.e. incorporated by the draft editor prior to the next recirculation.

Per 802.3 motion to consider multiple response in a single motion this response was approved. [Y:61 N:1 A:15].

Cl **01** *SC* **1** *P* **1** *L* **1** *MyBallot #* 3

DINEEN, THOMAS J

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

This is a submission of supporting material for my comment 1 of 03.02.
See attached text in the Proposed Change box.

SuggestedRemedy

Supporting material cut from the IEEE Standards Style Manual 2005 Edition located at http://standards.ieee.org/guides/style/2005Style.pdf

4.1 Editorial requirements for submission
The sponsor of an IEEE Standards project shall be responsible for providing the IEEE-SA Standards Board with a complete, technically accurate draft of the proposed standard that meets the requirements of this manual for content, style, and legibility. Any draft standard that initiates its ballot on or after 1 January 2005 shall use the IEEE templates available on the web (see 4.2.1). A cover letter or email also shall be submitted that states the software application/program (including version number) used to create the document, order of files on the disk, etc. (See 4.3 for further information on submittal to the IEEE-SA Standards Board.) If applicable, written permission for any copyrighted material (text, figures, or tables obtained from an outside source) used within a project shall be submitted to the IEEE-SA Standards Board as well (see 5.1). During the ballot invitation period prior to balloting, the sponsor is required to submit the draft and any relevant copyright permission letters to an IEEE Standards Project Editor for mandatory editorial coordination, which may include a legal review. Project Editors are also available for questions that arise as the draft is prepared.

4.2.1 Draft development
All IEEE drafts shall be developed using an IEEE-approved document template available from the IEEE Standards World Wide Web site <http://standards.ieee.org/resources/development/writing/templates.html>. The drafts should contain a front matter and main text, and follow the style outlined in this manual. The draft should be numbered consecutively, starting with the title page i of the front matter and page 1 of the main text. The front matter shall contain the title of the standard (see 9.1), draft copyright statements (see 4.2.2), an abstract and keywords (see 9.2), and an introduction that includes a list of the working group members and a statement describing the type of ballot conducted (see 9.3). Working groups are encouraged to consult with an IEEE Standards Project Editor if there are any questions concerning electronic tools used to develop IEEE drafts. (See Annex B for an example draft standard.)

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

The 2005 Style manual is still in preview and therefore not final. The citations would not be applicable anyway since the ballot was initiated in 2004.

---- BRC History ----

IEEE 802.3REVam comment resolution meeting:

Defer to Working Group. There was no objection.

IEEE 802.3 closing plenary meeting motions:

Per 802.3 motion to consider multiple response in a single motion this response was approved. [Y:61 N:1 A:15].

Cl **01** *SC* **1** *P* **1** *L* **1** *MyBallot #* 5

DINEEN, THOMAS J

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

This comment shall constitute a re submission or pile on to the following list of D2.0 comments:
298, 303, 353, 168, 167, 195, 197, 211, 315, 313, 657, 790, 678, 211, 237, 255, 266, 267, 315, 313, 486, 655, 790, 1031.

I am submitting this comment, in this form, out of a concern for what I see as a deeply troubling trend where the committee generates what I feel are inappropriate or bad faith responses to otherwise valid technical comments. Below I have provided for brevity, via cut and paste, a sampling of these troubling responses which I have labeled responses one through four. These responses have a common theme that I would characterize as Ethernet Political Rhetoric which has logically nothing to do with the submitted technical comment. Please note that much of this rhetoric to many observers in some contexts may be considered to be true, but is never the less content which I feel constitutes an inappropriate response to an otherwise valid technical comment. Specifically the exhibited draft responses fail to directly address the comment and the specific technical issues the comment addresses. Furthermore I would suggest that responses of the type exhibited below are in fact an insult to the comment authors that in good faith expended significant effort to review the draft, write, and submit comments.

I would suggest that the following procedure should be used for resolution of technical comments.
First the committee should determine if the submitted comment is indeed in their collective opinion a valid technical concern. If the comment is determined to be invalid then some form of reject would be in order. If the committee determines that the comment represents a valid technical concern then the committee would be obligated to devise and implement a technical change to the draft, independent of the level of effort required. Specifically the draft responses shall be required to directly address the comment and the specific technical issues that the comment addresses.

Response 1:
The standard is in wide use with many interoperable implementations, and the current style has not been a detriment to interoperable implementation. Signal and state names have been used in many different design systems and there is no reason to favor the syntax requirements of a single programming language (i.e., C). The variable/signal naming is consistent with the state machine formats described within the standard (see Clause 1.2.1). Also, the committee has an obligation to both past and current users of the standard. In this case, the signal and state names are likely to have been used in product documentation, and a change would be a disservice to users of the current standard.

Response 2:
The 0x prefix has not caused problems in the industry and the committee believes that the risk of introducing errors in attempting the recommended change is not justified by the perceived benefit.

Response 3:

The ability of hundreds of implementors to independently build interoperable MACs with hundreds of millions of installed product demonstrates that the representation used is not a problem.

Response 4:
The standard is in wide use with many interoperable implementations, and the current style has not been a detriment to interoperable implementation. Message names have been used in many different design systems.

SuggestedRemedy

Resolve all technical comments using the following procedure: First the committee should determine if the submitted comment is indeed in their collective opinion a valid technical concern. If the comment is determined to be invalid then some form of reject would be in order. If the committee determines that the comment represents a valid technical concern then the committee would be obligated to devise and implement a technical change to the draft, independent of the level of effort required. Specifically the draft responses shall be required to directly address the comment and the specific technical issues that the comment addresses.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

It outside the scope of this project to define process. The requirements for comment resolution are covered in the IEEE-SA operation manual with addition information in the Standards Companion.

---- BRC History ----

IEEE 802.3REVam comment resolution meeting:

Defer to Working Group. There was no objection.

IEEE 802.3 closing plenary meeting motions:

Editor recommendation:

REJECT.

It outside the scope of this project to define process. The requirements for comment resolution are covered in the IEEE-SA operation manual with addition information in the Standards Companion.

Alternative proposed response from David James:

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE

The portion of all resolution comments which does not specifically address the technical and editorial correction be removed.

MOTION

Move to accept the Editor recommendation for IEEE P802.3REVam D2.1 comment #5.

M: McCormack
S: H Barrass

Y: 56
N: 3
A: 17

Cl **03** *SC* **3.2.8 part 1** *P* **52** *L* **26** *MyBallot #* 9

COORDINATION, SCC14

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

This equation and the following text uses quantity symbols. Quantity symbols should be slanted, to distinguish them from mathematical and unit symbols (which are upright).

SuggestedRemedy

Set quantity symbols in slanted typeface throughout the document.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will work with SCC14 to incorporate changes as agreed.

This does not apply to MIB, state machine or code where other conventions apply.

---ooo000ooo---

During this work the following additional issues were brought to our attention by James Frysinger of SCC14. It seems that they were submitted into MyBallot but did not make it through the MyBallot system, probably due to MyBallot's inability to cope with symbols. The following individuals were include in the discussions of these additional issues:

James Frysinger (SCC14)

Bruce Barrow (SCC14)
John Scott (SCC14)

Brad Booth
David Cunningham
Piers Dawe
Wael William Diab
Chris DiMinico
Alan Flatman
Bob Grow
Paul Kolesar
David Law
Steve Swanson
Pat Thaler

---ooo000ooo---

PAGE: 35
SUB_CLAUSE: 1.4.299
LINE: 35

COMMENT:
The phrase "Laser noise in dB/Hz with XdB optical return loss" is not understood. What is XdB? Is that meant to represent some quantity X measured in decibels? If so, the formatting is incorrect. Quantities do not have unit symbols indicated.

PROPOSED CHANGE:
If that was the intent, I suggest "X in decibels" as the proper way to write this out.

RESPONSE:
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE

As stated in sublcause 1.4.299, XdB represents optical return loss. X is substituted by a number, to be found by reading the clause(s) where the parameter is used an amount; e.g. RIN_12_OMA, RIN_20_OMA (I have used underscore to indicate subscript). X is not the quantity itself. We have inherited this syntax from Fibre Channel. As the commenter expects, dB is
decibels.

Make the x in RINxOMA subscript. Insert space between X and dB. Change X to x.

SCC14 Response after discssion

On the matter of XdB, I think that Pat had a rather good handle on what I was trying to get at. I like his suggestion of separating the 'x' from the 'dB' with a space, which one does between number and unit. Personally, I would now consider the 'x' a dimensionless quantity and I would slant it if I were doing the writing. (Or, I would do as I suggested before by writing it as 'x in dB'.) However, asking for that would be pretty fine tweaking on my part; I think this august group does not need my direction on that particular mote.

---ooo000ooo---

PAGE: 537
SUB_CLAUSE: D.4.2
LINE: 1

COMMENT:
The constructions "62.5/125 µm" and "" are improper. Indications of values comprise a number multiplied by a quantity. In symbolic form numerals and unit symbols are used. Math operators are not used.

PROPOSED CHANGE:
If these are meant to indicate the fractions 62.5/125 and 50/125 then they should be put in decimal form: 0.5 µm and 0.4 µm, respectively. If these are meant to indicate a range of values, then those range limits should be individually stated: "62.5 µm to 125 µm" and "50 µm to 125 µm". The entire document should be checked for this. [Note, this cell includes non-breaking spaces between numerals and unit symbols.]

RESPONSE:

Multimode fibers are generally referred to by their core diameter/cladding diameter - the reason is that at one time there were different core diameters and different cladding

diameters, for example 50/125, 62.5/125, 100/140 (the first number being the core diameter and the second being the cladding diameter). Today, most telecom grade fibers all have a 125um cladding diameter.

The text noting the optical fiber requirements in ISO/IEC 11801 states:

"a) Optical fibre requirements

The optical fibre shall be multimode, graded-index optical fibre waveguide with nominal 50/125 µm or 62,5/125 µm core/cladding diameter and numerical aperture complying with A1a or A1b optical fibre as defined in IEC 60793-2-10."

So, it is not a fraction nor a range of values but is intended to reflect two values, one for the core and one for the cladding. The construction 62.5/125 µm properly represents usage in ISO/IEC 11801 as well as in common industry practice and is therefore not improper.

SCC14 Response after discssion

Please change the 'Must be satisfied?' column for my comment on '62.5/125 µm' to 'no' and then consider that comment merely an observation about the way this construction struck me as a cold reader. After reading the responses you made, I trust the group to do the right thing on this matter, even if it turns out to be doing nothing.

---ooo000ooo---

PAGE: 232
SUB_CLAUSE: 28.1.4.1
LINE: 10

COMMENT:
Constructions such as "16 ± 8 ms" are literally incorrect; one cannot add or subtract two terms with different dimensions.

PROPOSED CHANGE:
I suggest placing the proper unit symbols after each value: "16 ms ± 8 ms". Or, one could write "(16 ± 8) ms". This could be done in several places throughout the document.

RESPONSE:
ACCEPT

---ooo000ooo---

PAGE: 44
SUB_CLAUSE: 45.2.1.38.4
LINE: 7

COMMENT:
The apparent unit symbol "dBm" is used. This is not a unit recognized by the SI.

PROPOSED CHANGE:
If the "m" is meant to indicate the reference value, that should be given in the quantity description and not in the value indication. Se IEEE/ASTM SI 10-2002 and IEEE Std 260.1-2004 Annex A for properly dealing with level indications. This occurs elsewhere in the document.

RESPONSE:
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE
The unit dBm is very common in multiple areas of engineering. As it is not an SI unit, add a definition in 1.4 as follows:

dBm: Decibels referenced to 1.0 mW.

---ooo000ooo---

PAGE: 52
SUB_CLAUSE: Table 45-41
LINE: 7

COMMENT:
The phrase "Data Rate = 64n kb/s" mixes a quantity with a number, which can be done here since n has no units. But the n should be in slanted typeface since it is a variable (quantity).

PROPOSED CHANGE:
Slant the n. Similar constructions elsewhere need to have this done, as well.

RESPONSE:
ACCEPT

Cl **14** *SC* **14.1.1.3 part 1** *P* **318** *L* **21** *MyBallot #* 10

COORDINATION, SCC14

Comment Type **GR** *Comment Status* **A**

The statement of wire size is elegantly done!

SuggestedRemedy

None!

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Thanks.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.11.2.1** *P* **420** *L* **30** *MyBallot #* 2

BECK, MICHAEL A

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

ITU-T Study Group 15 are adding an EFM-style packet mode (64/65-octet encapsulation) to their xDSL PHYs. They will be needing something to manage it too, and they are currently looking at Clauses 30 and 45 of IEEE Std 802.3. In doing this, they noticed that there is no Clause 30 object to count the TC-CRC errors -- we would need an extra object in the PME capablity for that purpose. It seems that it has been overlooked, as we do have a coding violations counter in the PME capability. (See also comments #33/D1.1 and #1/D2.0.)

SuggestedRemedy

Add an object to count the TC- CRC errors in the PME capability. It should reference the variable TC_ crc_ error in subclause 61.3.3. 8 and the associated "10P/ 2B TC CRC error register" (6.24.15:0) in subclause
45.2.6. 11.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add the following new attribute:

30.11.2.1.10 aTCCRCErrors

ATTRIBUTE
APPROPRIATE SYNTAX:
Generalized nonresettable counter. This counter has a maximum
increment rate of 19 230 counts per second for 10 Mb/s
implementations.
BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS:
A count of TC-CRC errors. Increment the counter by one for each
TC-CRC error detected by the 64/65-octet receive function (see
61.3.3.3 and Figure 61-19).;
If a Clause 45 MDIO Interface to the PCS is present, then this
attribute will map to the TC CRC error register (see 45.2.6.11).;

Add aTCCRCErrors attribute to table 30-5 in the oPME managed object class.

In Annex 30A add to oPME MANAGED OBJECT CLASS

aTCCRCErrors GET;

and

aTCCRCErrors ATTRIBUTE
DERIVED FROM aCMCounter;
MATCHES FOR EQUALITY, ORDERING;
BEHAVIOUR bTCCRCErrors;
REGISTERED AS {iso(1) std(0) iso8802(8802) csma(3) csmacdmgt(30) attribute(7)
tcCRCErrors(
???)};

bTCCRCErrors BEHAVIOUR
DEFINED AS See 'BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS' in 30.11.2.1.10;

A registration arc will have to be allocated from the database for this new attribute.

Cl **40** *SC* **40.1.3 part 3** *P* **149** *L* **49** *MyBallot #* 11

COORDINATION, SCC14

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

The unit megabaud is incorrectly symbolized as Mbaud.

SuggestedRemedy

The symbol for baud, given in IEEE Std 260.1-2004, is Bd so the symbol used should be MBd.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.4.1** *P* **125** *L* **25** *MyBallot #* 14

BRADSHAW, P D

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

My comment (ballot # 108, comment # 1736) re 45.4.1 is listed as "ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE", implement option 2, which was to replace VI to VOL in line 29, and to VOH in line 27.

However, these edits do NOT appear in D2p1_part4.

SuggestedRemedy

Perform edits.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **45A** *SC* **45A.3, 45A.4** *P* **438** *L* **0** *MyBallot #* 15

BRADSHAW, P D

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

This comment was rejected since the Annex is "informative". However, in that case it should not use phrases such as "is required" and "must have knowledge" where implementations can be performed differently and work just as well. My original remedy included this option, and I think it is at least confusing, since "must" is a close synonym for "shall", which would clearly be unacceptable.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "protocol aware" on lme 1 of 45A.3 and line 40 of 45A.4 by "protocol aware or bi-directional". Also perform the same change in Figure 45A-3 and 45A-4.

Replace "the device must have knowledge" by "the device may need to have knowledge" in line 7 of 45A.3 and line 44 of 45A.4

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In annex 45A.3 replace the 1st sentence with:

If Clause 22 PHYs are to be attached to a Clause 45 MDIO interface, then voltage translation device is required. One possible solution is a protocol aware voltage translation device.

In annex 45A.4 replace the 1st sentence with:

If Clause 45 MMDs are to be attached to a Clause 22 MII management interface, then voltage translation device is required. One possible solution is a protocol aware voltage translation device.

Cl **53** *SC* **53.15.4.3** *P* **393** *L* **38** *MyBallot #* 18

BRADSHAW, P D

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

Re Ballot # 93, comment # 1751, listed ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The word "path" will be replaced with "lane".

The edits do not appear in D2p1_part4 on lines 387 & 41

SuggestedRemedy

perform edits

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.