

IEEE P802.3au D2.0 (IEEE P802.3-2005/Cor 1) DTE Power Isolation Corrigendum Comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # 2  
COORDINATION, EDITORIAL

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

At the time of submission to the IEEE-SASB, or just prior to publication, please provide the email addresses for each member of the Working group that worked on this corrigendum.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

The Working Group chair will provide a current list.

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P 10 L 14 # 5  
Grow, Robert

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Though we have three digits of subsections in 1.4, it might be better to eliminate "xxx" as a possible trigger to spam and virus filters.

SuggestedRemedy

Some recent published amendments use "1.4.x".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This comment will be passed to the publication editor.

Cl 01 SC 1.4.xxx P 10 L 14 # 3  
CAI, SEAN S Individual

Comment Type GR Comment Status R

The whole document is not yet complete.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

The comment is unresponsive as it does not ask for any specific change in the draft. After correspondence with the balloter, it has been clarified that the complaint is only about the "1.4.xxx" subclause numbering. This has been common practice for 802.3 amendments as the editing instruction makes the insertion point easy to find and very clear. As the editing instruction states, the insertions are in alphabetic order. This convention is used because of the number of active projects that are adding definitions to 1.4 (P802.3an, P802.3aq and P802.3as are all also currently in Sponsor ballot). Not being able to predict the order of amendment approval makes this convention both necessary and practical. The convention has also been approved by IEEE editorial staff (see superseded amendments IEEE Std 802.3ak-2004, IEEE Std 802.3ah-2004, IEEE Std 802.3af-2003, IEEE Std 802.3ae-2002, IEEE Std 802.3ad-2000, etc.)

Cl 25 SC 25 P 13 L 22 # 1  
HAWKINS, JOHN F Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The text "The resistance after the test shall be at least 2 MW, measured at 500 Vdc." Should read "The resistance after the test shall be at least 2 M<symbol for Ohm>, measured at 500 Vdc." Note to MyBallot tool folks: apparently the web-based interface for MyBallot can't handle such characters, and hence comments are troublesome...

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to: "The resistance after the test shall be at least 2 M<symbol for Ohm>, measured at 500 Vdc." where <symbol for Ohm> should be the appropriate font symbol for the Greek letter Omega -- as elsewhere in the document

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

The small BRC considered this correction to be non-substantive as identical text, using the correct font, occurs two other times in the document.

IEEE P802.3au D2.0 (IEEE P802.3-2005/Cor 1) DTE Power Isolation Corrigendum Comments

Cl 99 SC 99 P 1 L 10 # 4

Groq, Robert

Comment Type G Comment Status A

If a recirculation is required, it might be useful to update a few items in the front matter. If not, pass to the publication editor and WG Chair for consideration during publication preparation.

*SuggestedRemedy*

On cover page, consider change from Draft Corrigendum of" to "Draft Corrigendum to". Edit page 2 line 22, as this text isn't right with the corrigendum as it does not have a suffix. We probably should use an amendment for the suffix example. We could add that the corrigendum project was known within IEEE 802.3 as "au" but that probably isn't worth the possible complication to the idea. Page 2, line 24 needs to be updated for this and all projects (Is it "Section one", "Section One", or "SECTION ONE"? Update section descriptions per Piers Dawe agreed recommendations. Page 3, line 12 could be filled in for recirculation: "IEEE 802.3-2005/Cor1-20xx This corrigendum specifies corrections..." The WG Chair would appreciate recommendations from the BRC on appropriate text.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This comment will be passed to the publication editor.