Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # **45**
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**
    myBallot won't accept a long dash

SuggestedRemedy
    fix

Response   *Response Status* **C**
    REJECT.

    This comment is out of scope as it does not relate to the draft but instead the myBallot
    system.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   # **1**
Turner, Michelle

Comment Type **GR**   *Comment Status* **A**
    Figure 53.3 is tagged as informative (can this be removed) the title of the figure is
    example.......
    59.7.5 is also tagged as informative (can this be removed?)

SuggestedRemedy

Response   *Response Status* **W**
    ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

    Will delete 'informative' from Figure 53-3.

    The 'informative' labeling of 59.7.5 was a key part of reaching consensus in the original
    amendment development and due to this the consensus of the BRG is to keep this label.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **148**   *L* **12**   # **5**
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**
    As ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-A is obsolete and presumably not being updated, and as Annex A
    and the body of the standard gives its date as 1995

SuggestedRemedy
    If 1995 is the last version, give its date here

Response   *Response Status* **C**
    REJECT.

    Where it is acceptable to use the latest version the reference need not include the date.
    Now as noted in the comment, this standards is not being updated, additionally there was
    only ever one version. Based on this latest version can be used and the date need not be
    included.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **148**   *L* **19**   # **6**
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
    ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2-10 (draft 4, 2006); Transmission performance specifications for 4-
    pair 100 O augmented Category 6 cabling

SuggestedRemedy
    Is there a later draft, published version or IEC equivalent that can be used instead? If so,
    update.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
    ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

    IEEE Std 802.3an references both TIA and ISO/IEC standards. ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2-10
    has been approved and is planned to be published in April 2008.

    Hence, while this comment is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text, we will change
    the reference to read 'ANSI/TIA-568-B.2-10-2008; Transmission Performance
    Specifications for 4-pair 100 (Ohm symbol) Augmented Category 6 Cabling'. References
    elsewhere in the draft will also be updated.

    There is no ISO/IEC equivalent as the parameters for Augmented Cat 6 in TIA are different
    from ISO/IEC Augmented Class E.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **01**
SC **1.3**

Page 1 of 9
10/04/2008 19:54:43

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **148**   *L* **24**   # 7
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

ANSI/TIA-TSB-155 (draft 4, 2006); Additional guidelines for 4-pair 100 O Category 6 Cabling for 10GBASE-T Applications

SuggestedRemedy

Is there a later draft, published version or IEC equivalent that can be used instead? If so, update.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

While this comment is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text we will change to the published version.

The reference will be updated read 'TIA TSB-155; Guidelines for the Assessment and Mitigation of Installed Category 6 Cabling to Support 10GBASE-T, March 2007'. References elsewhere in the draft will also be updated text that states this document is proposed will be removed.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **150**   *L* **20**   # 8
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

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

D2.0 comment 78, resolved to "Update IEC reference to 61280-2-2 Ed. 2.0. Change references to OFSTP-4A to point to 61280-2-2". This is still listing Ed. 1, which is a worse reference than OFSTP-4A. Ed. 2 is dated 2005. However, as of early March, IEC 61280-2-2 Ed. 3 is to be published this month. I believe Ed. 3 is a more suitable reference than Ed. 2, as well as being current (I'll report at the meeting if this is not the case). See also D2.0 comment 9.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IEC 61280-2-2 (1998)" to "IEC 61280-2-2 (2008)"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Piers has confirmed that 2008 is the correct date to use. "IEC 61280-2-2 (1998)" will be changed to read "IEC 61280-2-2 (2008)".

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **153**   *L* **20**   # 11
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

D2.0 comment 55 resolution to "keep the date which will be updated to 2006".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "G.691, 2000" to "G.691, 2006". Why a comma while others have colons?

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

The date will be updated from 2000 to 2006. The title will also be corrected to read 'Optical interfaces for single-channel STM-64 and other SDH systems with optical amplifiers.'.

The colon is used in other references where it is part of the designation, in this case there isn't a colon in the designation.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **153**   *L* **23**   # 12
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

D2.0 comment 54 resolution to "keep the date which will be updated to 2006".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "G.957, 1999" to "G.957, 2006".

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **01**
SC **1.3**

Page 2 of 9
10/04/2008 19:54:43

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **153**   *L* **3**   *#* 9
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

"ISO/IEC 11801 Edition 2.1 (draft); Information technology--Generic cabling for customer premises. Draft document number ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25 N 755" IEC web site says ISO/IEC 11801 am1 Ed. 2.0 (is this the same as Ed. 2.1?) forecast publication date: 2008-03.

SuggestedRemedy

If the published version is acceptable, change to "ISO/IEC 11801:2008, Information technology--Generic cabling for customer premises.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This amendment has now been approved (Feb 2008) and final text has been forwarded to IEC for publication in the coming months.

While this comment is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text we will update the reference to read 'ISO/IEC 11801:2002/Amendment 1:2008 Information technology-Generic cabling for customer premises.'

Will also updated ISO/IEC 24750 reference to read 'ISO/IEC TR 24750:2007 Information technology -- Assessment and mitigation of installed balanced cabling channels in order to support of 10GBASE-T'.

References elsewhere in the draft to these two documents will also be updated as well as removing the note that states they under development.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **153**   *L* **3**   *#* 10
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

If ISO/IEC standards are known and found by their edition/amendment numbers, should we give these as well as dates?

SuggestedRemedy

For ISO/IEC standards in 1.3 that we modify or consider modifying, insert edition/amendment numbers

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See comment #9.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.4.358**   *P* **177**   *L* **47**   *#* 46
Thompson, Geoff

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

The definition of TLV calls for a standard wide registration of the type value used in TLVs. The location of the "standard-wide" registration table is not obvious. Please fix this

SuggestedRemedy

Add a pointer to the definition that shows where the table currently resides (editorial change)
For the future, as it is obvious that this mechanism is going to find wider use in the standard move it out of its very application specific location to a Normative Annex

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

WII change the text ' . . . within the protocols defined in this standard.' to read ' . . . within the protocols defined in this standard (see IEEE 802.3, 57.5.2 and 57.5.3).'.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.4.358**   *P* **177**   *L* **50**   *#* 13
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

"The type value is locally defined and needs to be unique within the protocols defined in this standard." What does local mean? What defines a protocol? How unique? Will this definition go to IEEE 100, if so is "this standard" appropriate? Should there be reference(s) to specific (sub)clauses?

SuggestedRemedy

Rework the sentence quoted. Add: "(See: IEEE 802.3, l.m.n.)

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In this case a protocol is defined by IEEE Std 802.3 and locally defined means that the meaning of the Type value is dependant on the protocol in which it is being used.

For example for a LLDPDU a TLV type of 0x01 is Chassis ID TLV (see IEEE Std 802.1AB Figure 9-4), for a Information OAMPDU a TLV type of 0x01 is a Local Information TLV (see Table 57-6) and for a Event Notification OAMPDU a TLV type of 0x01 is a Errored Symbol Period Event TLV (see Table 57-12).

There is therefore no one table that can be referenced however a reference to the subclauses where the two current uses of TLVs in IEEE Std 802.3 will be added to this definition. This reference will also be in the format (See: IEEE 802.3, l.m.n.) as suggested. See comment #46 for the actual text.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **01**
SC **1.4.358**

Page 3 of 9
10/04/2008 19:54:43

Cl **22**   *SC* **22.2.4.2**   *P* **30**   *L* **14**   # 14
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
Thanks for correcting "Latching High"

SuggestedRemedy
But see 40.5.1.1 p200 line 53 "Latch High", also in 45.2.7.11.
And 45.2.1.15 p34 line 31 "Latches High"
Use one form consistently and correct the remaining gratuitous capital Hs.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

While this comment is out of scope, as it relates to unchanged text, we will make the editorial change to use "Latching high" throughout since this is related to a comment recived during the initial ballot.

Cl **28**   *SC* **28.2.4.1.3**   *P* **235**   *L* **25**   # 15
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
extended Next Page

SuggestedRemedy
Extended Next Page (because it's the first word in the cell)

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

While this comment is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text we will make the editorial change to correct 'extended' to 'Extended'.

Cl **28**   *SC* **28.3.4**   *P* **253**   *L* **4**   # 16
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**
Figure 28-16 is in unnecessarily small 6 point type

SuggestedRemedy
Change to 8 point. Figure 28-19 could probably be changed to 7 point.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

This comment is out of scope as it doesn't related to changed text.

Further, the BRC believes the risk of introducing errors during a redraw of this figure with 8 point font is too high compared to any benefit it will provide.

Cl **34**   *SC* **34.1.2**   *P* **2**   *L* **46**   # 17
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**
In deleting this text we have lost the mention of 1000BASE-KX, and don't mention 1000BASE-LX10 or 1000BASE-BX10, nor 1000BASE-PX10 and 1000BASE-PX20. Yet the sentence at line 53 "...each Physical Layer device are shown in the following table" states that the table is a complete set of all the Physical Layer devices in the context, which is "Introduction to 1000 Mb/s baseband network". This is not correct.

SuggestedRemedy
Insert rows into the "following table" for 1000BASE-BX10, 1000BASE-LX10, 1000BASE-PX10, 1000BASE-PX20 and 1000BASE-KX. Put the rows in the same order as in 30.5.1.1.2 aMAUType.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete the table and remove references to it.

Cl **34**   *SC* **34.1.2**   *P* **2**   *L* **53**   # 18
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
Change "Specifications unique to the physical operation of each Physical Layer device are shown in the following
table:" to

SuggestedRemedy
The 1000 Mb/s Physical Layer types are listed in the following table:

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This text, and the related table, has now been deleted, see comment #17.

Cl **35**   *SC* **35**   *P* **7**   *L*   # 19
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
Page 7 should be

SuggestedRemedy
Page 5

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **35**
SC **35**

Page 4 of 9
10/04/2008 19:54:43

Cl **36**   *SC* **36.1.2**   *P* **35**   *L* **32**   # 20
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **R**
There's no point revising old objectives if we don't get it right. 1000BASE-LX10, 1000BASE-BX10 and 1000BASE-PX10 are rated for 10 km, and 1000BASE-PX20 is rated for 20 km. 1000BASE-PX10 and 1000BASE-PX20 don't usually (but could) preserve full duplex behaviour of underlying PMD channels. There's nothing in the PCS or PMA that enforces these limits.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "5 km" to "10 km", change "5000 m" to " 10 km". Or "multiple kilometers".

Response   *Response Status* **U**
REJECT.

Support for a network extent of 5km was indeed the objective for the 1000BASE-X project (IEEE P802.3z) which is what this subclause is recording.

Support for 10km, provided by 1000BASE-LX10, 1000BASE-BX10 and 1000BASE-PX10 and for 20km, provided by 1000BASE-PX20, was added by the subsequent Ethernet in the First Mile (EFM) project (IEEE P802.3ah).

These EFM objectives are covered in subclause 59.1.1 which states 'c) 1000BASE-X up to 10km over SM fiber' and 60.1.1 which states 'b) 1000 Mb/s up to 10 km on one single-mode fiber supporting a fiber split ratio of 1:16.' and 'c) 1000 Mb/s up to 20 km on one single-mode fiber supporting a fiber split ratio of 1:16.'.

Cl **38**   *SC* **38.6.4**   *P* **116**   *L* **33**   # 21
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**
Don't need to give the date for ANSI X3.230-1994 at second mention in the same paragraph. Nor the first time, as the date is given in 1.3 and Annex A. As FC-PH is obsolete, we should be considering changing the reference to FC-PI-2 at some stage.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete "-1994" twice

Response   *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

The comment is out of scope as it relates to uncanged text.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2**   *P* **13**   *L* **36**   # 22
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
Font size

SuggestedRemedy

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

While this comment is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text we will make the editorial change to correct this.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.16**   *P* **35**   *L* **16**   # 23
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**
Non Roll-over should be Non roll-over Also in 45.2.3.12, 45.2.3.25, 45.2.3.26... 45.2.8.4...

SuggestedRemedy
Global search and replace

Response   *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

The comment is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.77**   *P* **67**   *L* **30**   # 24
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
Unwanted dash after "54"

SuggestedRemedy

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

While this comment is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text we will make the editorial change to correct this.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **45**
SC **45.2.1.77**

Page 5 of 9
10/04/2008 19:54:43

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.79**   *P* **70**   *L* **1**   # 25

Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

Table 45-55.

SuggestedRemedy

Table 45-56

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

While this comment is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text we will make the editorial change to correct this.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.82**   *P* **73**   *L* **2**   # 26

Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

Lacks a sentence to introduce Table 45-59

SuggestedRemedy

Add the sentence

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.82.1**   *P* **73**   *L* **20**   # 27

Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

Unwanted page break?

SuggestedRemedy

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

This editorial change will be made. But please note this draft will be professionally edited prior to publication.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.83**   *P* **74**   *L* **2**   # 28

Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

Lacks a sentence to introduce Table 45-60

SuggestedRemedy

Add the sentence

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This comment is not related to changed text.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.83.1**   *P* **74**   *L* **36**   # 29

Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

Blank line or different formatting. Also lines 43, 51 and more

SuggestedRemedy

Fix

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

This editorial change will be made. But please note this draft will be professionally edited prior to publication.

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.3**   *P* **94**   *L* **1**   # 30

Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

Table broken over two pages is hard to use

SuggestedRemedy

If Table 45-82 will fit on one page, keep it together. If it won't, start 45.2.3.1 on p94

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

This editorial change will be made. But please note this draft will be professionally edited prior to publication.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **45**
SC **45.2.3**

Page 6 of 9
10/04/2008 19:54:43

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.3.19**　　　　*P* **110**　　　*L* **27**　　　# 31

Dawe, Piers J G　　　　　　　　　　　Individual

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**

Something wrong with the order here. Table 45-98 could be before the heading for 45.2.3.20.

SuggestedRemedy

Put the anchor for Table 45-98 in the right place?

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

This editorial change will be made. But please note this draft will be professionally edited prior to publication.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.3.20**　　　　*P* **111**　　　*L* **1**　　　# 32

Dawe, Piers J G　　　　　　　　　　　Individual

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**

The assignment ... are shown

SuggestedRemedy

is shown

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

While this comment is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text we will make the editorial change to correct this.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.7.2**　　　　*P* **138**　　　*L* **28**　　　# 33

Dawe, Piers J G　　　　　　　　　　　Individual

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **R**

Table width, hard returns in row 7.1.9

SuggestedRemedy

Take out the hard returns, make the table full width, resize columns to contents

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The table is already full width.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.7.6**　　　　*P* **141**　　　*L*　　　# 34

Dawe, Piers J G　　　　　　　　　　　Individual

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **R**

Table 45-136 is not mentioned. Nor Table 45-137 or 45-138.

SuggestedRemedy

Mention the tables in the text

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The comment is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text.

Cl **45**　　*SC* **45.2.7.6**　　　　*P* **141**　　　*L* **46**　　　# 35

Dawe, Piers J G　　　　　　　　　　　Individual

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**

Sentence on next page can be here. Notes to Table 45-138 on wrong page.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

This editorial change will be made. But please note this draft will be professionally edited prior to publication.

Cl **53**　　*SC* **53.8.1.1**　　　　*P* **398**　　　*L* **23**　　　# 36

Dawe, Piers J G　　　　　　　　　　　Individual

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **A**

As noted in D2.0 comment 57, wrong table

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Table 53-14" to Table 53-12"

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER:　Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **53**
SC **53.8.1.1**

Page 7 of 9
10/04/2008 19:54:43

Cl **55**   *SC* **55.4.2.5.14**   *P* **500**   *L* **19**   # 37
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
Slient

SuggestedRemedy
SILENT

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **55**   *SC* **55.4.2.5.14**   *P* **500**   *L* **20**   # 38
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
state diagram state diagram

SuggestedRemedy
One is enough

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **55**   *SC* **55.4.2.5.14**   *P* **500**   *L* **26**   # 40
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**
Layout

SuggestedRemedy
Make the table full width and resize columns to contents. Justify left?

Response   *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

The table already near full width for the column and expanding it to full width wont allow the columns to be wide enough for the content. Please also note this draft will be professionally edited prior to publication.

Cl **55**   *SC* **55.4.2.5.14**   *P* **500**   *L* **30**   # 39
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**
Silent

SuggestedRemedy
SILENT (twice)

Response   *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **55**   *SC* **55.5.4.1**   *P* **516**   *L* **52**   # 41
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**
I thought the idea of the BER objective was to deliver $<=10^{-12}$ to the upper layers. That's $10^{-12}*800*8 = 6.4*10^{-9}$ frame error rate for 800 byte frames. If there is error multiplication the PMA has to do better (and if FEC used, can do worse).

SuggestedRemedy
If the error multiplication is worth 1.5, change 9.6 (formerly 6.4) to 4.2, here and in 55.5.4.5.

Response   *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

The measurement specified is at the output of the PCS after any error multiplication.

Cl **55**   *SC* **55.5.4.5**   *P* **518**   *L* **6**   # 42
Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**
If error multiplication is believed to be worth 1.5

SuggestedRemedy
Change "BER less than 10^{-12}" to "BER less than 6.6×10^{-13}"

Response   *Response Status* **C**
REJECT.

See comment #41.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **55**
SC **55.5.4.5**

Page 8 of 9
10/04/2008 19:54:43

Cl **55**   *SC* **55.6.1.2**   *P* **519**   *L* **38**   # 43

Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

Base and next pages

SuggestedRemedy

base and next pages

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

While this comment is out of scope as it relates to unchanged text we will make the editorial change to correct this.

Cl **70**   *SC* **70.3**   *P* **385**   *L* **37**   # 44

Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

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

As noted before, this sentence in a PMD clause purports to place a requirement on a PCS, which obviously it can't. That requirement is already placed by 36.2.5.2.7. Doing this right does not go against P802.3ap's wish to make this primitive mandatory, only their plan to implement the requirement twice over, badly. This is not settled text; it has been criticised at every ballot.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "shall support" to "must support". Also in 71.3, 72.3. Delete 71.10.4.1 and 72.10.4.1 (the equivalent in Clause 70 has gone since D1.1).

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.

This is restatement of a previous comment. See comment #12 from the initial ballot.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99**   *P* **2**   *L* **6**   # 2

Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

coxial

SuggestedRemedy

coaxial

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99**   *P* **4**   *L* **21**   # 4

Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

"IEEE Std 1802.3"-2001provides conformance test information for 10BASE-T." But isn't this to be withdrawn? Is it withdrawn?

SuggestedRemedy

If withdrawn, delete the paragraph and heading. If not, change "2001provides " to "2001, provides ".

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99**   *P* **4**   *L* **29**   # 3

Dawe, Piers J G   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

URL doesn't work because of the hyphen

SuggestedRemedy

Fix, e.g. by keeping the whole URL on one line (two instances on this page)

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **99**
SC **99**

Page 9 of 9
10/04/2008 19:54:43