



802.5v/D1.1 /: Comment Summary

	ED	TECH
A/C	52	0
DIS	0	6
Q	2	0

Total A/C Comments: 52
 Total DIS Comments: 6
 Total Q Comments: 2
 Total Comments: 60

	Total	To Be Closed
OPEN	0	0
ACCEPTED	40	0
MODIFIED	11	0
REJECTED	4	0
ANSWERED	2	0
WITHDRAWN	3	0

Comment IDs by Type. Bold IDs require closure.

A/C Comment IDs: EDTR-59 IMJ-01 IMJ-02 IMJ-03 EDTR-58 IMJ-04 KTW-02 KR-12 KR-13 JLM-01 KTW-03 SJH-02 JLM-02 SJH-03 JLM-03 JLM-04 KTW-04 JLM-05 JLM-06 JLM-07 JLM-08 JLM-09 JLM-14 JLM-10 KR-04 JLM-11 JLM-12 KR-05 JLM-13 KR-06 KR-07 KTW-01 JLM-15 KR-08 JLM-16 KR-09 EDTR-56 JLM-17 KR-10 EDTR-57 JLM-18 JLM-19 JLM-20 JLM-21 KR-15 JLM-22 JLM-26 JLM-27 JLM-28 JLM-23 JLM-24 JLM-25

DIS Comment IDs KR-01 KR-02 KR-03 EDTR-55 KR-11 KR-14

Q Comment IDs SJH-01 JLM-29



802.5v/D1.1 /: Comment Index

EDTR-55	14
EDTR-56	13
EDTR-57	13
EDTR-58	2
EDTR-59	1
IMJ-01	1
IMJ-02	1
IMJ-03	2
IMJ-04	2
JLM-01	5
JLM-02	5
JLM-03	6
JLM-04	6
JLM-05	7
JLM-06	7
JLM-07	8
JLM-08	8
JLM-09	9
JLM-10	9
JLM-11	10
JLM-12	10
JLM-13	11
JLM-14	9
JLM-15	12
JLM-16	12
JLM-17	13
JLM-18	15
JLM-19	15
JLM-20	15
JLM-21	15
JLM-22	16
JLM-23	17
JLM-24	17
JLM-25	17
JLM-26	16
JLM-27	16
JLM-28	17
JLM-29	17
KR-01	3
KR-02	4
KR-03	8
KR-04	10
KR-05	11
KR-06	11
KR-07	11

KR-08	-----	12
KR-09	-----	12
KR-10	-----	13
KR-11	-----	14
KR-12	-----	3
KR-13	-----	4
KR-14	-----	14
KR-15	-----	16
KTW-01	-----	12
KTW-02	-----	3
KTW-03	-----	5
KTW-04	-----	7
SJH-01	-----	4
SJH-02	-----	5
SJH-03	-----	6



802.5v/D1.1

/: Full Comment Report

Comment EDTR-59

Section A Line 106 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee Commenter Agrees? Editing Complete

Concern: Missing references for PSC-X & PSC-T.

Solution: Insert references.

Response: Done.

Rebuttal:

Comment IMJ-01

Section A Line 126 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee Commenter Agrees? Editing Complete

Concern: Item FPMRO_3.
Incorrect flag value.

Solution: Change "flag=2" to "flag=3"

Response: The number of the flag is 3, and verily, 3 shall be the number of the flag.

Rebuttal:

Comment IMJ-02

Section A Line 186 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee Commenter Agrees? Editing Complete

Concern: Unspecified reference in note.

Solution: 1) Remove last sentence in note (no information given).

2) Change "???" to "BASE-X".

Response: Check with ANF/KR that this is correct.
See IMJ-3 as well.

ANF Checked and agreed. Text in note now reads:

NOTES-

X.34: This style of insertion/bypass is not used at high media rate. Fibre insertion/bypass requirements at high media rate are dealt with by the 100BASE X and 1000BASE-X PICS items.

Rebuttal:

Comment IMJ-03

Section A **Line** 192 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Unspecified reference in note.

Solution: See IMJ-02

Response: See also IMJ-02. Text now reads:

NOTES-
X.35: This style of insertion/bypass is not used at high media rate. Fibre insertion/bypass requirements at high media rate are dealt with by the 100BASE X and 100BASE-X PICS items.

Rebuttal:

Comment EDTR-58

Section A **Line** 199 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Wrong references for M13d, M13e, M13f & M13g.

Solution: Change references to:

13.9.1.5

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment IMJ-04

Section A **Line** 199 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Connector for 1000 Mbit/s twin-axial cable missing.

Solution: Reference to [802.3] 39.5.1 MDI connectors:
39.5.1.1 Style-1 connector (9-pin shielded D-subminiature)
39.5.1.2 Style-2 connector (8-pin twinax)

Response: Add to A.5 under STP&UTP:
"*TWX|Twin-axial cable attachment|9.8.2.4.1|0.4|Yes[]No[]"

Add to A.7.4.1 at end of table:
"M14a|Twin-axial media interface connector: 9-pin D subminiature
connector|[802.3] 39.5.1.1|PRED28:0.48|N/A[]Yes[]No[]"
Same for M14b "8-pin twinax" Same pred. Same O. ref to 39.5.1.2
PRED28 = TWX AND DR1000

NOTE that UTP (802.3ab operation) is not covered by the PICS either. Add appropriate entry in table.

A new entry in A.5 Major Capabilities has been added and the existing entry for UTP has been modified to differentiate between the 2 pair usage for 4/16/100 Mbit/s and the 4 pair usage for 1000 Mbit/s.

New entries have been added to A.7.4.1 for twin-axial and UTP 4 pair connectors and contact mappings.

There is no problem for fibre connectors.

Rebuttal:

Comment KTW-02

Section 1.0 **Line** 1 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: General problem through out document.

Initialize, initialization, etc are spelled using the UK spelling. For the standard, this must be corrected.

Solution: I have no objections to this spelling, but editors must make it clear to the IEEE Editors that this needs to be corrected.

Response: I agree that the spellings should follow the US convention and will try to correct as many English variants as possible. Note, however, that many English spellings arrived directly from the sources for 802.5t - for example "signalling" in Clause 14, draft 2.7. There are also a couple of genuine spelling mistakes dotted around. One assumes that these errors did not slip past the IEEE editors.

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-01

Section 1.5 **Line** 65 **Severity** DIS **Type** TECH **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: I think the term "PMC-XF" is confusing. In this case I think we should be closer to 802.3's terminology. ???-FX is widely recognized as meaning fibre media. Why confuse people more? Note that I do agree with the principle of an unique term.

Solution: Change "PMC-XF" to "PMC-FX".
(I will leave it up to the editor to find all cases and correct them if this comment is accepted)

Response: See response to KR-13

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-12

Section 1.5 **Line** 65 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: If KR-11 accepted, term PMC-LX needs to be added here

Solution: Add the following...
"PMC-LX: a PMC-XF that supports long haul optical fibre cabling."
(Note terms may change depending on resolution of KR-01)

Response: See response to KR-13

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-13

Section 1.5 **Line** 65 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: If KR-11 accepted, term PMC-SX needs to be added here

Solution: Add the following...
"PMC-SX: a PMC-XF that supports short haul optical fibre cabling."
(Note terms may change depending on resolution of KR-01)

Response: In response to KR-04, the terms PMC-X, PMC-XF and PMC-XT have been dropped and new descriptions introduced. In recognition of this, the definitions of PMC-XF in (pdf) line 65 and PMC-XT in (pdf) line 66 should be deleted and the following new definitions introduced:

"PMC-LX: PMC (long wavelegth laser) for 1000 Mbit/s over optical fibre cabling."

"PMC-SX: PMC (short wavelegth laser) for 1000 Mbit/s over optical fibre cabling."

"PMC-CX: PMC for 1000 Mbit/s over twin-axial copper cabling."

Appropriate changes have been made throughout the rest of the document including 9.8 and A.

Also, the spelling of "twin axial" in (pdf) line 63 has been changed to "twin-axial" to bring it into line with the rest of the document.

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-02

Section 1.5 **Line** 66 **Severity** DIS **Type** TECH **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: I think the term "PMC-XT" is confusing. In this case I think we should be closer to 802.3's terminology. ???-CX is widely recognized as meaning twinaxial copper cabling. Why confuse people more? Note that I do agree with the principle of an unique term. Also "XT" maybe confused with "TX" which implies a twisted pair media.

Solution: Change "PMC-XT" to "PMC-CX".
(I will leave it up to the editor to find all cases and correct them if this comment is accepted)

Response: See response to KR-13

Rebuttal:

Comment SJH-01

Section 9.0 **Line** 9 **Severity** Q **Type** ED **Status** ANSWERED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Is it appropriate to include editor's comments in Angle Brackets, such as this one, that explain the rationale behind particular changes? We don't do it consistently throughout the document.

Solution: Remove comment, or format it in accordance with similar comments in the state tables.

Response: Rip out this. Other, properly formatted with <<>>, will be removed before forwarding to LMSC. Ideally before the next draft is released.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-01

Section 9.2 **Line** 48 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: PDF formatting problem

Solution:

Response: Yes. This seems to happen every time. I will investigate.

Rebuttal:

Comment KTW-03

Section 9.2 **Line** 64 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: I did a search of 9.2 for FSANO. This Policy flag is not used in 9.2 except in 9.2.2 on page 9.2-5. Since it is not used by the 9.2 SOTs, it needs to be removed.

It is correctly defined in clauses 11 and 14.

Solution: Two solutions:

1. Remove FSANO definition - I like this best and it is the easiest to do with, in my opinion, nothing lost.
2. Completely define the option flag in 9.1 - Fairly big change that is not really needed because it is already defined in clause 14.

Response: Accepted solution 1.

Rebuttal:

Comment SJH-02

Section 9.2 **Line** 96 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** REJECTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Is it correct to reference 10.5.1.2 for the lower media rates when 14.5.1.2 specifies all media rates?
Cf line 181 where media rate flag is defined only by 14.5.1.1.4

Solution: Reference only 14.5.1.2.

Response: Slightly inconsistent but this draft only specifies operation at 1000 Mbit/s so we refer to clause 10 for 4 and 16 operation.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-02

Section 9.2 **Line** 178 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** REJECTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: LMT Testing Stage is tautologous

Solution: Recommend changing to "LMT"

Response: [This comment applies equally to 802.5t]
The phrase "LMT Testing Stage" is used so as to be distinct from "LMT Notification Stage". The flag FSLTFE is only set if an error occurs during the testing stage. A notification stage error does not set this flag.

Rebuttal:

Comment SJH-03

Section 9.2 **Line** 261 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Sentence doesn't make sense. Also, why are [] used instead of ()?

Solution: Clarify wording.

Response: Wording will be clarified. Inappropriate square brackets will be removed/changed.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-03

Section 9.2 **Line** 419 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Many transitions' comments end with double angle-brackets on a line by themselves. This looks silly. Not just 9.2.

Transitions 3145, 3171, 3114, 3157, 3181, 3314, 1004, 1070, 1016, 1208, are the ones I found.

Solution: Make the Closing >> appear on the same line as the end of the comment. Could it be as simple as globally replacing whitespace then >> with non-breakable-space then >>?

Response: Done, but since this minor editorial change affects all transitions in all tables I have not included it in the revision tracking.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-04

Section 9.3 **Line** 1 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Throughout 9.3, the page number has a formatting error. In "9.3-nn", the nn is in a larger font than the 9.3. Also, 9.2, 9.3, 14, AB and AC have these in bold where others don't.

Solution: Make these consistent. As Annex A was created with an IEEE style template, this implies that bold shouldn't be used for page numbers.

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment KTW-04

Section 9.3 **Line** 79 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: I did a search of 9.3 for FPANO. This Policy flag is not used in 9.3 except in 9.3.2 on page 9.3-6. Since it is not used by the 9.3 POTs, it needs to be removed.

It is correctly defined in clauses 11 and 14.

Solution: Two solutions:

1. Remove FPANO definition - I like this best and it is the easiest to do with, in my opinion, nothing lost.
2. Completely define the option flag in 9.1 - Fairly big change that is not really needed because it is already defined in clause 14.

Response: Accepted solution 1.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-05

Section 9.3 **Line** 145 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Extra space in "Flag , C-Port DTU..."

Solution: Remove extra space after Flag.

Response: Note this is a problem in 802.5t as well.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-06

Section 9.3 **Line** 363 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: This note (363-365) is an inappropriate historical reference.

Solution: Change it to an "Editor's note, to be removed before publication" and include the phrase "*802.5t error". T incorrectly uses PM & PS control.

Response: Format as an IEEE note as a new paragraph:
"Note ---- "

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-03

Section 9.3 **Line** 383 **Severity** DIS **Type** TECH **Status** REJECTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: page 9.3-25, table 9.3-1, REF 1147
Statement is incorrect since there is no phantom at 1000 Mbit/s and "High Media Rate" refers to speeds 100 Mbit/s and higher.

Solution: Restore to the way it was..."100 Mbit/s only when phantom is supported"

Response: The reason for this change was a comment against draft 1.0. The issue was that the text in transition 1147 said "100 Mbit/s only" but the transition itself tested FPMR>1 (ie high media rate). The reason for this test is that the state tables themselves are not policing the "no phantom at 1000 Mbit/s". It is the job of the policy variables to force the "no phantom at 1000 Mbit/s" condition

One could, at the moment, enable phantom support at 1000 Mbit/s just by changing a policy variable. I see no reason to "break" 1000 Mbit/s phantom support in one or two transitions for the sake of comment accuracy. Why bother having policy variables controlling phantom if you make every state transition gate on the media rate flag? We haven't changed other transitions dealing with phantom to gate on media rate, so why this one?

I think the comment "High media rate when phantom is supported" is accurate and clear and I would prefer not to change it (or the transition).

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-07

Section 9.3 **Line** 406 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Inappropriate bolding of angle-bracketed comments.
In PM_STATUS.indication (Insert=Detected) and (Insert=Not_detected)

Solution: Unbold these two comments.

Response: OK. This minor editorial change does not show up under revision tracking because Word is incapable of underlining the change.

EDITING COMPLETE FOR HILIGHTED PROBLEM.

WHAT ABOUT TRANSITION 1805? IF SO, THIS IS WRONG IN 802.5t.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-08

Section 9.3 **Line** 413 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Inappropriate bolding of angle-bracketed comments.
In INSERT, PM_CONTROL.request(Transmit_mode=XXX) (twice).

Solution: Remove bolding from these 3 comments.

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-09

Section 9.7 **Line** 4 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Missing spaces on lines 4, 5, 7 and 9.

Solution: Change "1000Mbit/s" to "1000 Mbit/s".
Change "100Mbit/s" to "100 Mbit/s".
5 changes.

Response: Erm. Well these changes have already been made in the previous draft, plus American spelling corrections.

Unfortunately the 9.7 source file is corrupt and so as soon as any changes are made, Word turns the diagram into "Error! Not a valid link!".

Since the changes to 9.7 were only editorial, I issued draft 1.1 without the changes as an interim solution.

I will investigate this Microsoft Word problem and hopefully fix the document in draft 1.2.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-14

Section 9.8 **Line** 1 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Footer says "Editors: Andrew Fierman".

Solution: Delete the "s" from "Editors" and attempt to re-integrate Andy's split personalities, possibly by use of the old "bottle in front of me" technique.

Response: We were amused.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-10

Section 9.8 **Line** 1 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Superfluous change bar next to draft validity date in header.

Solution: Remove on next draft if poss.

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-04

Section 9.8 **Line** 24 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Clarify the fact that there are in fact two fibre PMCs. Note that in this entire section PMC-XF (PMC-FX?) is referred to plurally.

Solution: add the word "collectively" between "hereafter" and "referred".
See also KR-11

Response: To try again to clarify all the PMC descriptions, the wording of the whole of (pdf) lines 24 to 31 has been changed to:

"The 1000 Mbit/s PMCs for optical fibre (hereafter referred to as PMC-LX and PMC-SX) and twin-axial cable (hereafter referred to as PMC-CX) media types are specified by incorporating the FibreChannel ANSI X3.230-1994 FC-PH physical and signaling interface specifications, and the associated 8B10B data coding method by reference, (hereafter [FC-PMD]) with the modifications in [802.3] 36.

The PMC-LX sublayer is analogous to the PMD sublayer type 1000BASE-LX of [802.3] 38.

The PMC-SX sublayer is analogous to the PMD sublayer type 1000BASE-SX of [802.3] 38.

The PMC-CX sublayer is analogous to the PMD sublayer type 1000BASE-CX of [802.3] 39 for twin-axial cable media types."

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-11

Section 9.8 **Line** 35 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** REJECTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Use of underlining for emphasis is not appropriate.

Solution: Just remove the underlining on "together with a new Reconciliation Sublayer (RS) which provides an interface to the MAC".

Response: No emphasis is present. The underlining is a change indication because this sentence has been added.

Note that this subclause has been edited by two different authors which is why there are two shades of change indications.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-12

Section 9.8 **Line** 40 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Inappropriate capitalisation in middle of sentence.

Solution: Change "There" to "there".

Response: Been there, done that.

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-05

Section 9.8 **Line** 48 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: PMC-X is not a defined term.

Solution: Change to "interfacing between a PSC-X and a PMC-XF or PMC-XT sublayer"
(Note terms may change depending on resolution of KR-01 and KR-02)

Response: Following on from the response to KR-04, the words have been changed to:

" ... for interfacing between the PSC-X and a PMC-CX, PMC-LX or PMC-SX sublayer
... "

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-13

Section 9.8 **Line** 54 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** WITHDRAWN

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Why is this Objectives paragraph in here? It might have been relevant in presentations describing what we intended to do, but this is the real thing and I think this para should be deleted.

Solution: Remove lines 54 through 64.

Response: This paragraph is the 1000 Mbit/s version of that which appears in 9.8.1.

If we remove it here ... it needs to come out of 802.5t

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-06

Section 9.8 **Line** 55 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** WITHDRAWN

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: The use of PHY by itself is unclear.

Solution: Replace "PHY" with "PSC-X, PMC-XF and PMC-XT"
(Note terms may change depending on resolution of KR-01 and KR-02)

Response: The term PHY is described in (pdf) lines 12 and 13 of 9.8.2.

Note that the form of words used here is the same as that used in 9.8.1.

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-07

Section 9.8 **Line** 57 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** WITHDRAWN

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: The use of PHY by itself is unclear.

Solution: Replace "PHY" with "PSC-T and PMC-T"

Response: See response to KR-06.

Rebuttal:

Comment KTW-01

Section 9.8 **Line** 158 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Table 9.8-7 is messed up. Address 0.15 is in table on page 9.8-5 and table on page 9.8-6.

Solution: I suspect that the table entry for address 0.15 is marked as a heading. Select row for address 0.15 and then click on table. Heading must not be marked.

Response: You are correct in your diagnosis. Note that Word's revision marking system cannot cope with this change so no change bars will appear for this editorial change.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-15

Section 9.8 **Line** 239 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Missing word. Same sort of thing in 266.

Solution: Insert "for" before "PSC-X".

Response: See response to KR-08.

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-08

Section 9.8 **Line** 239 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: deleted too much. Still need "for".

Solution: Restore "for" before "PSC-X"

Response: "for" restored. Patient doing well.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-16

Section 9.8 **Line** 253 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: The full-stop at the end of this sentence has floated off onto the next line.

Solution: Remove the space before it.

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-09

Section 9.8 **Line** 266 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: grammer error.

Solution: Add "for" before "PSC-T"

Response: Corrected grammar error.

Rebuttal:

Comment EDTR-56

Section 9.8 **Line** 279 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Description of crossover function for PMC-CX is unclear.

Solution: Add the following text after the words "cable plant":

 ", as specified in [802.3] 39.5.2, "

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-17

Section 9.8 **Line** 288 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: "Under 13.10" is badly worded.

Solution: Change to "in 13.10".

Response: See also KR-10 that suggests alternative wording for the whole sentence.

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-10

Section 9.8 **Line** 288 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Sentence is a little rough.

Solution: Change to
 "The PMC-XF is specified in 13.10."

Response: Accepting this comment and in recognition of the response to KR-04, the words in (pdf) lines 7 to 10 have been replaced by:

 "The two PMCs for fibre, PMC-LX and PMC-SX, are specified in 13.10."

Rebuttal:

Comment EDTR-57

Section 9.8 **Line** 291 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Need to point to the relevant sections of [802.3] here.

Solution: Add the following paragraph:

 The PMC for short haul copper connections is specified by [802.3] 40 Physical coding sublayer (PCS) and physical medium attachment (PMA) sublayer and baseband medium, type 1000BASE-T. This must be used only in conjunction with the PSC-T.

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment EDTR-55

Section 9.8 **Line** 296 **Severity** DIS **Type** TECH **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: The description of the crossover function in this paragraph is confusing.

Solution: Replaced first two sentences of paragraph with:

"The crossover function is implemented as described in [802.3] 40."

Response: Done.

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-11

Section 13.10 **Line** 7 **Severity** DIS **Type** TECH **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: We have introduced the concept of long haul (LX) and short haul(SX) fibre. I believe that in the spirit of PMC-XF we should add the terms for these fiber types.

Solution: Replace lines 7 thru 10 with...

The PMC-XF is composed of the [802.3] PMA and one of the [802.3] fibre PMDs. The PMC-XF shall meet all requirements of either the 1000BASE-LX PMD (hereafter referred to as PMC-LX) or the 1000BASE-SX PMD (hereafter referred to as PMC-SX) defined within [802.3] 38 combined with the PMA defined within [802.3] 36, with the following exceptions. Where there is conflict between specifications in [802.3] and in this standard, those of this standard shall prevail.

(Note terms may change depending on resolution of KR-01)

Response: The wording here is wrong anyway because the PMC does not contain any part of the [802.3] PMA.

In recognition of the response to KR-04, the words in (pdf) lines 7 to 10 have been replaced by:

"The PMC-LX is composed of and shall meet all requirements of the 1000BASE-LX PMD defined within [802.3] 38 with the following exceptions.

The PMC-SX is composed of and shall meet all requirements of the 1000BASE-SX PMD defined within [802.3] 38 with the following exceptions.

Where there is conflict between specifications in [802.3] and in this standard, those of this standard shall prevail."

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-14

Section 13.10 **Line** 23 **Severity** DIS **Type** TECH **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: PMC-XT and PMC-T are defined to support full duplex transmission(see 9.8.2.4.1.1 and 9.8.2.4.3.1). PMC-XF must also include this clause.

Solution: Add the following...

"13.10.1.4 Full Duplex Capability

The physical layer device shall support Full Duplex transmission."

Response: Done.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-18

Section 14.0 **Line** 1 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: There is already a clause 14.

Solution: Change "Add Clause 14" to "Replace Clause 14 with the following". Oops, somehow, that's what the PDF says already, but not the word sources.

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-19

Section 14.2 **Line** 40 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Bad blank lines and a bad page break.

Solution: Remove blank lines 40, 41, 53, 54, 97, 115 and make it look nice throughout.

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-20

Section 14.5 **Line** 272 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: "Phy" is not a word.

Solution: Change "Phy" to "PHY" globally. I found lines 272, 325.

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-21

Section A.5 **Line** 106 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Table is too wide. It runs over the page width badly. Also A.6.5.3 line 126 and several other tables in this annex.

Solution: Fix.

Response: I will investigate width-reduction techniques for the more broad tables.

Rebuttal:

Comment KR-15

Section AC **Line** 210 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Forgot about Annex AB

Solution: Add the following
"AC.34 Annex AB Small Form Factor Optical Fibre Connectors

New annex added to give information on small form factor optical fibre connectors that might be used in PMC-XF implementations."

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-22

Section AC.1 **Line** 18 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: AC.1 heading wrong.

Solution: Change title of AC.1 to "1 Overview".

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-26

Section AC.17 **Line** 147 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Badly worded.

Solution: Suggest rewording to "... have had paragraphs added to document 1000 Mbit/s operation."

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-27

Section AC.28 **Line** 188 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee **Commenter Agrees?** **Editing Complete**

Concern: Missing full stop at end of line. Also line 205.

Solution: "operation."

Response: OK. Bullet points on lines 184, 185, 188 & 205 should all end with a full-stop, period.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-28

Section AC.29 Line 191 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee Commenter Agrees? Editing Complete

Concern: What's all this Higher Media Rates stuff? There is no such term.

Solution: Seek and destroy this term. Do you mean "at the High Media Rate"? That means 100 Mbit/s and above.

Response: I'll fix the High Media and lower media rate terms.

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-29

Section AC.29 Line 192 Severity Q Type ED Status ANSWERED

Highlight To Committee Commenter Agrees? Editing Complete

Concern: So what did FPANO do before? Did T say it should always be zero?

Solution: Yes. It is in 802.5t for future-proofing reasons.

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-23

Section AC.7 Line 50 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee Commenter Agrees? Editing Complete

Concern: "Phy" is not a word.

Solution: Change to "PHY" globally in AC. I found lines 50, 99, 101, 143, 145, 172, 173, 190, 191.

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-24

Section AC.8 Line 58 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee Commenter Agrees? Editing Complete

Concern: The From and To text both say "Data_octet".

Solution: They don't? Who's been hacking that PDF again?!
The second one should say Data_byte.

Response:

Rebuttal:

Comment JLM-25

Section AC.9 Line 69 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee Commenter Agrees? Editing Complete

Concern: Spurious dot in "Mbit./s".

Solution: Remove dot.

Response:

Rebuttal: