

IEEE P802.3bz D1.1 2.5G/5GBASE-T 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 125 SC 125.1.2 P 69 L 18 # 20
 Jones, Peter Cisco
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 "125.1.2 Relationship of 2.5 Gigabit and 5 Gigabit Ethernet to the ISO OSI reference model" says "2.5 Gigabit and 5 Gigabit Ethernet couples the IEEE 802.3 MAC to a family of 2.5 Gb/s and 100 Gb/s Physical Layers."
 SuggestedRemedy
 replace 100Gb/s by 5Gb/s
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.6.1 P 161 L 54 # 22
 Jones, Peter Cisco
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 In "126.6.1 Support for Auto-Negotiation", we only list two items. 10GBASE-T includes the following, why did we leave them out for 3bz??
 c) To determine whether the local PHY performs PMA training pattern reset.
 d) To determine whether the local PHY supports the EEE capability.
 e) To determine whether the local PHY supports the fast retrain capability.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following if needed.
 c) To determine whether the local PHY performs PMA training pattern reset.
 d) To determine whether the local PHY supports the EEE capability.
 e) To determine whether the local PHY supports the fast retrain capability
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 No changes to the draft -
 c) PMA training pattern reset has been deleted
 d) & d) are now exchanged in infocfields during startup

Cl 46 SC 5 P 300 L # 28
 Bains, Amrik Cisco System
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 46.5 XGMII electrical characteristics
 Says:
 "The electrical characteristics of the XGMII are specified such that the XGMII can be applied within a variety of 10 Gb/s equipment types" but not 2.5G/5G
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "2.5Gb/s, 5Gb/s"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.10.4b P 51 L 25 # 33
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 section "4b" should be "4d"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change section number as in comment, change editing instruction that "a through c are added in 802.3bq".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 28 SC 28.5.3 P 27 L 44 # 35
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Reference to clause 1.4 is unuseful. Refer to 1.4.278a
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Align with BQ out of this meeting - cross reference likely to change to .277b

IEEE P802.3bz D1.1 2.5G/5GBASE-T 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 30 SC 30.3.2.1.2 P 30 L 2 # 36
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Editing instruction is insert - no underline
 Also on:
 30.3.2.1.3 (P30 L15)
 30.6.1.1.5 (P32 L50)
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1 P 34 L 20 # 37
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Cross references to 45.2.1.70-77 should be active, not external cross references
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change cross references as in comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7.14c P 56 L 37 # 39
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Hanging ".."
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete ".."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.5.3.3 P 59 L 32 # 40
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Delete Table Title
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.3.2 P 29 L 42 # 42
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 Typo: PHYdevicePHYdevice managed object
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change PHYdevicePHYdevice to PHYdevice
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.1 P 35 L 11 # 44
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 5 Gb/s should be underlined as editing instruction is 'change'
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.65.1 P 39 L 30 # 45
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 add in 45.2.1.65.1 and 45.2.1.65.2 to the draft, and insert cross references to clause 126 for 2.5G/5GBASE-T.
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bz D1.1 2.5G/5GBASE-T 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 126.5 SC 126.5.2.1 P 155 L 41 # 60
Moffitt, Bryan CommScope
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
S should be identified here
SuggestedRemedy
as stated
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.
S is defined for the clause up front and used throughout.

Cl 126.7 SC 126.7.2.1 P 168 L 26 # 67
Moffitt, Bryan CommScope
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
the word using is missing
SuggestedRemedy
shall meet the values determined using Equation (126–11). Do this before the other equations as well.
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126.5 SC 126.5.3.2 P 156 L 49 # 61
Moffitt, Bryan CommScope
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
SFDR should be identified
SuggestedRemedy
The Spurious-Free Dynamic Range (SFDR) of the transmitter
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.
SFDR is defined in Clause 1.5 for 802.3

Cl 126.5 SC 126.5.3.4 P 159 L 10 # 77
Moffitt, Bryan CommScope
Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
graph shows two different peak power levels but the equations do not differentiate. Also the vertical axis label needs fixing.
SuggestedRemedy
correct one or the other
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.
Peak power level in equation IS different, because of log10(S) term.
Vertical axis label is clear.

Cl 126.5 SC 126.5.3.4 P 158 L 6 # 62
Moffitt, Bryan CommScope
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
The equation should be labeled
SuggestedRemedy
as stated
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.
The equation is labled, at line 18.

Cl 126.7 SC 126.7.2.4.2 P 170 L 42 # 89
Moffitt, Bryan CommScope
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
should be MDNEXT floor
SuggestedRemedy
change to MDNEXT
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bz D1.1 2.5G/5GBASE-T 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 00 SC 0 P 1 L 1 # 100
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Please provide the option of using the new comment spreadsheet at the URL
 <http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG_tools/spreadsheet/802d3_TFR_WGB_comments.xls> in future
 Task Force reviews.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. No change required in draft

CI 1 SC 1.4.74b P 22 L 43 # 101
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Typo, missing space after subclause number.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that the text '1.4.74b5GBASE-T' be changed to read '1.4.74b 5GBASE-T'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 1 SC 1.4.76 P 22 L 45 # 102
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 Based on the changes to subclause 1.1.3.2 and Clause 46 in this draft suggest that the
 definition in IEEE Std 802.3-2015 subclause 1.4.76 '10 Gigabit Media Independent Interface
 (XGMII)' be updated to match.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a new change to subclause 1.4 as follows (HTML markup used to indicate font):

 <I>Change the definition for Gigabit Media Independent Interface (XGMII) as follows:</I>
 1.4.76 10 Gigabit Media Independent Interface (XGMII): The interface between the
 Reconciliation Sublayer (RS) and the Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) for <U> 2.5 Gb/s,
 5Gb/s, and <U>10 Gb/s operation. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 46.)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 1 SC 1.4.278a P 23 L 17 # 105
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Typo, additional full stop in standard designation.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that the text 'IEEE Std. 802.3' be changed to read 'IEEE Std 802.3'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 125 SC 125.1.3 P 70 L 26 # 106
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 'XGMII' is defined as the '10 Gigabit Media Independent Interface' in IEEE Std 802.3-2015
 subclause 1.4.76.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest the text '10 Gb/s MEDIA INDEPENDENT INTERFACE' be changed to read '10
 GIGABIT MEDIA INDEPENDENT INTERFACE' at the following locations:
 [1] Page 70, line 26.
 [2] Page 76, line 24.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 125 SC 125.2.1 P 71 L 43 # 107
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest that the term 'payload rates' be replaced with 'data rate' as used in subclause 46.3.1.1
 and 46.3.2.1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that text '... clock scaled to their respective payload rates.' be changed to read '... clock
 scaled to their respective data rates.'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bz D1.1 2.5G/5GBASE-T 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 126 SC 126.1 P 75 L 18 # 109
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest '... in this document. This clause also specifies ...' should be changed to read '... in this clause. This clause also specifies ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.1.2 P 76 L 20 # 111
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 The solid line from the bottom of the PHYSICAL layer to the top of the MEDIUM should be dotted as are the two other similar lines.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.1.3.3 P 82 L 4 # 116
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 This subclause states that support for the EEE capability is advertised '... during the PMA_PBO_Exch state.'
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either add a cross reference to the Figure 126-26 'PHY Control state diagram' or, since this is introduction text, change the text '... during the PMA_PBO_Exch state.' To read '... during link startup.'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 change the text '... during the PMA_PBO_Exch state.' To read '... during link startup.'

Cl 126 SC 126.3.6.4 P 120 L 8 # 118
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 There seem to be three different formats used for when comparing T_TYPE(tx_raw) to a set of possible values On line 8 there is the example where the options are in brackets: 'T_TYPE(tx_raw) = (E + D + LI +T)'; on line 10 there is an example where they are not: 'T_TYPE(tx_raw) = C + LI!'; and on line 16 the brackets are around the whole equation: 'T(T_TYPE(tx_raw) = C+LI!)'. Suggest that the first example, where the options are listed in brackets where there is more than one, be used. And strictly speaking shouldn't these actually use the 'Indicates membership' character '?' rather than the '=' character. If so the first example 'T_TYPE(tx_raw) = (E + D + LI +T)' would read 'T_TYPE(tx_raw) ? {E, D, LI, T}'.

SuggestedRemedy
 Please use a consistent format when comparing T_TYPE(tx_raw) and R_TYPE(rx_coded) to a set of possible values.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.4.2.4 P 129 L 35 # 119
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest that 'PMA Receive contains the ...' should read 'The PMA Receive function contains the ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.4.2.4 P 129 L 39 # 120
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest that '... shall allow LFER of less than ...' should read '... shall allow a LFER of less than ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Insert "an" to read:
 '...shall allow an LFER of less than...'

IEEE P802.3bz D1.1 2.5G/5GBASE-T 2nd Task Force review comments

CI 126 SC 126.4.5.1 P 142 L 26 # 122
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest that '... PMA Link Monitor and ...' should read '... PMA Link Monitor state diagram and ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 126 SC 126.3.2.2.5 P 96 L 4 # 130
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest the left word be marked 'First transfer' and the right word be marked 'Second transfer' as is done in Figure 126-7 'PCS Receive bit ordering'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 126 SC 126.4.6.1 P 147 L 8 # 123
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Make the state box wide enough to fit the state name inside.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 126 SC 126.3.2.2.5 P 97 L 12 # 132
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest the subscripts be removed from D0 through D2 as subscripts aren't used elsewhere in the figure.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Chnage the subscripts D0 through D2 to be normal text.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 126 SC 126.3.2.2.5 P 96 L 4 # 128
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 On the left 32 bit word, the arrow for TXD<0> is pointing to the wrong bit position.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that the arrow point to leftmost bit of the byte.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 126 SC 126.3.2.2.6 P 98 L 22 # 134
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Typo.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that 'XGMII encodes ...' be changed to read 'The XGMII encodes ...'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 126 SC 126.3.2.2.5 P 96 L 4 # 129
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 On the right 32 bit word, the arrow for TXD<31> is pointing to the wrong bit position.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that the arrow point to rightmost bit of the byte.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bz D1.1 2.5G/5GBASE-T 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 126 SC 126.3.2.2.6 P 98 L 26 # 135
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Close brackets without open brackets.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that '... into a 7-bit C code).' be changed to read '... into a 7-bit C code.'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.3.2.2.11 P 100 L 39 # 136
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest that '... octet of TxD ...' should read '... octet of TXD ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.3.2.2.11 P 100 L 39 # 137
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest that '... TXD<0:7> and RXD<0:7>).' should read '... TXD<7:0> and RXD<7:0>.'
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.3.2.2.15 P 101 L 26 # 138
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest that the actual title of the state diagram be used, and a cross reference added.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that the text '... as specified in the transmit process state diagram.' be changed to read '... as specified in the PCS 64B/65B Transmit state diagram (see Figure 126-14 and 126-15).'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 28 SC 28.3.1 P 27 L 8 # 141
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 The change to subclause 28.3.1 'State diagram variables' states that '2.5GigT' represents that the 2.5GBASE-T therefore the variables link_control and link_status would be designated 'link_control_2.5GigT' and 'link_status_2.5GigT' respectively for 2.5GBASE-T. the note for Figure 126-29 'Link Monitor state diagram' however states that 'The variables link_control and link_status are designated as link_control_2p5GigT and link_status_2p5GigT, respectively for 2.5GBASE-T'. Suggest that '2p5GigT' be used consistently to represent 2.5GBASE-T and therefore change the seven instances of '2.5GigT' to read '2p5GigT'.

SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that:
 [1] The text '... rows for 2.5GigT and ..' be changed to read '... rows for 2p5GigT and ...' (page 27, line 8).
 [2] The text '2.5GigT;' be changed to read '2p5GigT;' (page 27, line 10).
 [3] The text '... assert link_status_2.5GigT=FAIL for ...' be changed to read '... assert link_status_2p5GigT=FAIL for ...' (page 165, line 50).
 [4] The text '... link_status_2.5GigT (2.5GBASE-T) or ...' be changed to read '... link_status_2p5GigT (2.5GBASE-T) or ...' (page 166, line 36).
 [5] The text '... detected, link_status_2.5GigT (2.5GBASE-T) or ...' be changed to read '... detected, link_status_2p5GigT (2.5GBASE-T) or ...' (page 166, line 41).
 [6] The text '... 28.3.1 (e.g., link_status_2.5GigT ...' be changed to read '... 28.3.1 (e.g., link_status_2p5GigT ...' (page 199, line 30).
 [7] The text '2.5GigT represents that the 2.5GBASE-T ...' be changed to read '2p5GigT represents that the 2.5GBASE-T ...' (page 199, line 31).

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Implement proposed remedy
 Editor additionally to check the draft for all instances of 2.5GigT and replace to 2p5GigT

Cl 30 SC 30.3.2.1.2 P 29 L 43 # 144
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Not sure why the entries for '2.5GBASE-T' and '5GBASE-T' are being added after the last entry for aPhyType and aPhyTypeList.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that the text '... after the last entry:' be changed to read '... alphabetically:' for 30.3.2.1.2 aPhyType and 30.3.2.1.3 aPhyTypeList.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 (there was no reason, just needed to specify somewhere)

IEEE P802.3bz D1.1 2.5G/5GBASE-T 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.24 P 32 L 3 # 145
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 While this is subclause 30.5.1.1.24, the change instruction reference 30.5.1.1.25. Also suggest change text rewording.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest '... Change 30.5.1.1.25 aLDFastRetrainCount include ...' to read '... Change text of 30.5.1.1.24 aLDFastRetrainCount to include ...'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.24 P 32 L 3 # 146
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 The attributes 'aLDFastRetrainCount' and 'aLPFastRetrainCount' are not part of the '10GBASE-T Operating Margin package (conditional)' but instead are part of the 'Energy-Efficient Ethernet (optional)' package, see IEEE Std 802.3-2015 Table 30-1e.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the editing instruction '... (as part of the MultiGBASE-T operating package) ...' to read '... (as part of the 'Energy-Efficient Ethernet package)...' for subclause 30.5.1.1.24 and 30.5.1.1.25. If the intent was to move these attributes, provide editing instructions for table 30-1e.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change editing instruction. No intent to move the attributes, do not add edit to Table 30-1e.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.25 P 32 L 19 # 147
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 While this is subclause 30.5.1.1.25, the change instruction reference 30.5.1.1.24. Also suggest change text rewording.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest '... Change 30.5.1.1.24 aLPFastRetrainCount include ...' to read '... Change the text of 30.5.1.1.25 aLPFastRetrainCount to include ...'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.6.1.1.5 P 32 L 51 # 148
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Not sure why the entries for '2.5GBASE-T' and '5GBASE-T' are being added after the last entry for aAutoNegLocalTechnologyAbility.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that the text '... after the last entry:' be changed to read '... alphabetically:'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 4 SC 4.4.2 P 25 L 5 # 149
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 The IEEE P802.3by amendment, which is likely to publish before this draft, is also modifying this note which should be recorded in the editing instructions. In addition the text, as changed by IEEE P802.3by should be shown to ensure that they are not 'backed out' by this amendment.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that
 [1] The text '... in Table 4-2 as shown:' be changed to read '... in Table 4-2 (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3by-201X) as shown:'.
 [2] The column heading '40 Gb/s and 100 Gb/s' be changed to read '25 Gb/s, 40 Gb/s, and 100 Gb/s'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bz D1.1 2.5G/5GBASE-T 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 4 SC 4.4.2 P 25 L 41 # 150
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The IEEE P802.3by amendment, which is likely to publish before this draft, is also modifying this note which should be recorded in the editing instructions. In addition the text, as changed by IEEE P802.3by should be shown to ensure that they are not 'backed out' by this amendment.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that

- [1] The text 'Change Note 4 as follows:' be changed to read 'Change Note 4 (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3by-201X) as follows:'.
- [2] The text '... 5Gb/s, and 10 Gb/s operation, the ...' be changed to read '... 5Gb/s, 10 Gb/s and 25 Gb/s operation, the ...'.
- [3] The text '... at the XGMII receive signals ...' be changed to read '... at the XGMII or 25GMII receive signals ...'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.13.1 P 46 L 43 # 151
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

This change states that '... This bit is a reflection of the PCS_status variable defined in ... in 126.3.6.1 for 2.5GBASE-T and 5GBASE-T ...'. I can't find mention of PCS_status variable in subclause 126.3.6.1 'State diagram conventions', nor in 126.3.6.2.2 'Variables'. the nearest mention I could find was in subclause 126.3.6.3 'Messages' however this just states 'Indicates whether the PCS is in a fully operational state. (See 126.3.7.1.)'. Based on this suggest the reference should be to 126.3.7.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest the text '... in 126.3.6.1 for 2.5GBASE-T and 5GBASE-T ...' be changed to read ... in 126.3.7.1 for 2.5GBASE-T and 5GBASE-T ...'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 78 SC 78.1 P 67 L 6 # 153
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Subclause 78.1 is also being modified by IEEE P802.3by, IEEE P802.3bp and IEEE P802.3bq.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that '... into Table 78-1 with ...' be changed to read '... into Table 78-1 (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3by-201X, IEEE Std 802.3bq-201X and TBD) with ...'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl FM SC FM P 9 L 1 # 154
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Please update the frontmatter to the latest version found at <http://ieee802.org/3/tools/frameaker/P802_3xx_D0p1_version_2p5.zip>.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.1.5 P 82 L 46 # 155
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Not sure what a 'logical XGMII' is. Shouldn't implementations be compatible at the XGMII, if implemented.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest the text '... at the MDI and at a logical XGMII, if implemented.' be changed to read '... at the MDI and at the XGMII, if implemented.'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bz D1.1 2.5G/5GBASE-T 2nd Task Force review comments

Cl 126 SC 126.3.2.2 P 94 L 3 # 161
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The Transmit state diagram is in Figure 126–14 and 126–15.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that:

[1] The text '... Transmit state diagram in Figure 126–14 and ...' to read '... Transmit state diagram in Figures 126–14 and 126–15, and ...'.

[2] The Value/Comment field for PICS item PCT1 be changed to read 'See Figures 126–14 and 126–15'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.3.2.2 P 94 L 7 # 162
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Suggest that the actual title of the state diagram be used.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the text '... in the transmit process state diagram that ...' be changed to read '... in the PCS 64B/65B Transmit state diagram that ...'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.3.2.3 P 104 L 52 # 165
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Correct the cross reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the text '... in Figure 126–16 ...' be changed to read '... in Figure 126–16 and Figure 126–17 ...'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.3.2.3 P 105 L 21 # 167
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Suggest the text '... by setting the parameter scr_status to OK.' be changed to read '... by setting the scr_status parameter of the PMA_SCRSTATUS.request primitive to OK.'

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 126 SC 126.3.6.2.2 P 114 L 8 # 168
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterp

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Subclause 126.1.6 'Conventions in this clause' states that 'The notation used in the state diagrams follows the conventions of 21.5.' and IEEE Std 802.3 Table 21–1 'State diagram operators' defines 'Equals (a test of equality)' as '='.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the four instances of '==' to read '='.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.