

CI 00 SC 0 P L # 1  
 KRING, JOE Individual

Comment Type G Comment Status R

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.

No information in the comment.

CI 36 SC 36.1.1 P 23 L 3 # 5  
 DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status R OOS reject

36.1.1 says "1000BASE-X. There are currently three embodiments within this family: 1000BASE-CX, 1000BASE-LX, and 1000BASE-SX." If P802.3ap progresses to be part of 802.3, this will no longer be correct.

SuggestedRemedy

Either revise 36 adequately or restate the bare-minimum fix: "34.1 Overview Insert the following after the second paragraph of 34.1: Gigabit Ethernet is also defined for operation over electrical backplanes via the 1000BASE-KX PHY. For additional information on Backplane Ethernet, refer to Clause 69." Review any similar issues at 10G. It might be appropriate to sort this out in maintenance, as there are further 1000BASE-X PHYs in EFM.

Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation

This change can be best addressed at next 802.3 revision. Also it may not be efficient to revise the base text every time a new PHY is added.

Moreover Clause 69 adequately describes that backplane Ethernet extends the family of 1000BASE-X, 10GBASE-X and 10GBASE-R to include backplane port types.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.12 P 45 L 3 # 6  
 DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A OOS pass to pub editor  
 Missing the usual anchor sentence to introduce the table.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert CI.45 style anchor sentence: "The assignment of bits in the Backplane Ethernet status register is shown in Table 45-155."

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation.

This comment will be passed to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7.12.2 P 45 L 33 # 7  
 DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A OOS pass to pub editor  
 When AN

SuggestedRemedy

When the AN

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation

This comment will be passed to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.

**Cl 48**    **SC 48.2.7**                      **P 49**            **L 11**            # **2**  
 BAUMER, HOWARD A                      Individual

**Comment Type ER**    **Comment Status R**  
 Implemented remedy is not the accepted remedy.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Put in the accepted remedy or at least end the first sentence with a ":" so the paragraph reads better.

**Response**                      **Response Status W**  
 REJECT.

During the preparation of draft D3.2 the editorial team found that the sentence (as per accepted remedy) had a grammatical error. Hence the editorial team revised the sentence to fix the error without changing the intent of the comment.

The sentence parses correctly as it is written.

**Cl 49**    **SC 49.2.16**                      **P 50**            **L 10**            # **3**  
 BAUMER, HOWARD A                      Individual

**Comment Type GR**    **Comment Status R**  
 The implemented remedy is not the accepted remedy.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Put in the accepted remedy or at least end the first sentence with a ":" so the paragraph reads better.

**Response**                      **Response Status W**  
 REJECT.

During the preparation of draft D3.2 the editorial team found that the sentence (as per accepted remedy) had a grammatical error. Hence the editorial team revised the sentence to fix the error without changing the intent of the comment.

The sentence parses correctly as it is written.

**Cl 69**    **SC 69.5**                                      **P 56**            **L 33**            # **8**  
 DAWE, PIERS J G                                      Individual

**Comment Type E**                      **Comment Status A**                      *OOS pass to pub editor*  
 Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement

**SuggestedRemedy**

Protocol implementation conformance statement. Similarly (but I/c protocol) on line 36. Other minor editorials: see file by email to editor(s)

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

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation

This comment regarding capitalization of "Protocol implementation conformance statement" will be passed to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.

Publication editor consider to change the capitalization to read as "Protocol implementation conformance statement" (lines 33 & 36).

See annotations file (dawe\_01\_0107.pdf) that highlights the editorial issues in the draft D3.2. The capitalization issues, spaces between number, units and use of "&" will be passed to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation after review by the editorial team.

802.3ap Editor to fix the Capacitor issue in Fig 71-2.

Cl 70 SC 70.1 P 57 L 8 # 9  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

There is no requirement to combine sublayers. PCSs and PMDs can be made and sold separately, and optical ones often are. Also, management is optional (except you have required some registers to make AN work - this isn't the AN clause). Trying too hard to attach shalls to the wish that all BP PHYs should support Cl.73 AN violates layering, and doesn't serve much purpose; the intent was clear enough in D3.1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

You could replace the sentence with this, modified and extended from Clause 59: "A PMD is connected to the 1000BASE-X PMA of Clause 36, and to the medium through the Clause 73 Auto-Negotiation sublayer and the MDI. A PMD is optionally combined with the management functions that may be accessible through the management interface defined in Clause 45 or by other means. Table 70-2 lists the sublayers used to make acomplete 1000BASE-KX PHY."

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The original intent is the implementation of Auto-Negotiation is mandatory for all backplane PHYs. This intent did not change from the previous draft.

This AN conformance requirement should be specified in an appropriate place in the 802.3ap standard. There were several comments in D3.1 to unambiguously specify this intent.

The 802.3ap ballot resolution committee discussed this issue extensively during the Nov 2006 plenary and decided that PMD clauses (Clauses 70, 71 and 72) are the right places to specify this conformance requirement. See D3.1 comment #5 for the accepted remedy.

Refer to the following excerpt from D3.1 comment #5 that provides the reasoning:

"The best place to put a requirement that applies to a port type is in the Clause that specifies that port type where implementers of the port type are most likely to see it. This also should get it listed as a requirement in the PICS for the PMD Clause..."

This is clearly stated as a requirement on the necessary components of a complete PHY, and doesn't interfere with the ability to make and sell PMDs as a component. Since we don't have separate PHY Clauses and the PMD Clause is for a particular PHY, requirements specific to a PHY type are put in the PMD Clause for that PHY. This is parallel to similar conformance requirements specified in some PMD clauses. For example refer to 53.1 in 802.3-2005 that requires the PMD to be combined with appropriate physical sublayers specified in Table 53-1 (also see corresponding PICS).

There is consensus in the ballot resolution committee to change the sentence to start with "When forming a complete PHY" instead of "In order to form a complete PHY". The BRC

considers this as non substantive change and agrees to pass it to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.

Publication editor consider to change the sentence to start with "When forming a complete PHY" instead of "In order to form a complete PHY". Similarly make the change to 71.1 and 72.1.

Cl 70 SC 70.1 P 57 L 26 # 11  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status R OOS reject

A PHY is not a physical layer. They differ by the RS.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete "(physical layer)" if you don't delete the whole table

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation. This text did not change from the earlier draft.

If the commenter desires to change this, it would be appropriate to propose a change that is consistent across clauses through the maintenance process (and next revision).

Cl 70 SC 70.1 P 57 L 35 # 10  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status R OOS reject

Don't talk about the detail of GMII in a PMD clause: the message of footnote a should have already been presented in the GMII clause. The PMD is not connected to the GMII and does not control it. The PMD is not responsible for the whole PHY: if you want to require or forbid certain combinations that could make a PHY, do it in Cl.69 not Cl.70.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete footnote a. Similarly in other clauses.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation. The footnote did not change from the earlier draft.

This is parallel to some of the clauses in (e.g. Clause 54) the base document.

If the commenter desires to change this, it would be appropriate to propose a change that is consistent across all clauses through the maintenance process (and next revision).

Cl 70 SC 70.10.3 P 69 L 22 # 14  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A

GMI Interface Interface - repetition

*SuggestedRemedy*

delete "Interface". This PICS is out of place in a PMD clause so should go, anyway. Similarly in 71, 72.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The repetition is not obvious due to the abbreviation.

This comment will be passed to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.

Publication editor consider to change "GMII interface" to read as "GMII", since the abbreviation GMII already includes the word interface in it" Similarly consider deleting the word "Interface" from PICS XGE in clauses 71 and 72.

Cl 70 SC 70.10.3 P 69 L 22 # 15  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

PMD cannot support GMII or not support it. PCS does that.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete this PICS. Similarly in 71, 72.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The PMD does not support GMII, however the requirement is that, in order to form a complete PHY the PMD is combined with the appropriate physical sublayers. The PICS specifies this requirement (This PICS/text is parallel to Clause 54 in base document 802.3-2005)

Add Yes[], No[] to the last (support) column. Ballot resolution committee recommends to pass this change to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.

Publication editor consider to add No[] in addition to Yes[] to the last (support) column. Similarly to PICS XGE in clauses 71 and 72.

Cl 70 SC 70.10.3 P 69 L 26 # 16  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Do not know what is meant by "Device", but PMD does not implement AN (formally), but is connected to it.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Device implements" to "PMD supports".

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

The PICS entry is for the table on the required Clauses so it is a requirement that AN be there - not just that the PMD supports AN. As AN is written, it doesn't require any support from the PMD (though there may be implementations considerations).

The use of "device" here is consistent with its use in other PICS requirements such as MD and SD (MD is another example of something that applies to a PHY specified in a PMD Clause). Device seems to be fairly broadly used in 802.3 when we don't want to be entirely specific to a sublayer.

Cl 70 SC 70.10.3 P 69 L 36 # 17  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status R OOS correction

I could not find anything in the clause to justify calling the Signal Detect an "Analog" Signal Detect. "its definition is beyond the scope of this specification."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete "Analog", and similarly in other clauses, e.g. 71.10.3

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation



CI 71 SC 71.3 P 74 L 3 # 21  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status R OOS reject

"The PCS associated with this PMD shall": this is the PMD clause, it doesn't control the PCS.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove this "shall" and its associated PICS from Cl.71. It could go in 48.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation

This PMD is combined with appropriate sublayers to form a complete PHY. This specifies the requirement for the PCS when used with this PMD to form a complete PHY. This information may be redundant, however does no harm.

CI 72 SC 72.1 P 92 L 8 # 22  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

There is no requirement to combine sublayers.

*SuggestedRemedy*

See comments against 70.1

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment #9

CI 72 SC 72.10.4.1 P 122 L 9 # 26  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type TR Comment Status R OOS

Not the PMD's problem

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove this PICS from Cl.72

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation

See response to comment #23

CI 72 SC 72.10.4.4 P 126 L 6 # 27  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Meets the requirements as specified in 72.6.10.4.2

*SuggestedRemedy*

Meets the requirements of 72.6.10.4.2? Or leave the cell blank.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This comment will be passed to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.

Publication editor to consider replacing the text "as specified in" with the word "of"

CI 72 SC 72.3 P 93 L 13 # 23  
DAWE, PIERS J G Individual

Comment Type TR Comment Status R OOS reject

"The PCS associated with this PMD shall": this is the PMD clause, it doesn't control the PCS.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove this "shall" and its associated PICS from Cl.72. It could go in 49.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation

This PMD is combined with appropriate sublayers to form a complete PHY. This specifies the requirement for the PCS when used with this PMD to form a complete PHY. This information may be redundant, however does no harm.

CI 72 SC 72.6.10.2.2 P 97 L 38 # 24  
 DAWE, PIERS J G Individual  
 Comment Type T Comment Status A OOS reject  
 baud - slang  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proper term is UI. Change "baud" to UI, twice.  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.  
 Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation  
 Change "baud" to "UI" in two instances (lines 35 & 36)

CI 72 SC 72.6.10.2.3.1 P 98 L 38 # 4  
 DAWE, PIERS J G Individual  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A OOS pass to pub editor  
 it's  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 its Also line 52 in 72.6.10.2.3.2  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation.  
 This comment will be passed to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.  
 Publication editor to consider fixing the grammatical error, change "it's" to "its" (three occurrences lines 38, 48 and 52).

CI 72 SC 72.6.10.3.2 P 104 L 6 # 25  
 DAWE, PIERS J G Individual  
 Comment Type T Comment Status R OOS correction  
 "The value of max\_wait\_timer shall be 500 ms +/- 1%." I hope the value is allowed to change! I'm using +/- because the proper symbol was not accepted.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Could say "starting value", but better to follow style of other timers: "The max\_wait\_timer shall expire 500 ms +/- 1% after being started or restarted." Similarly for wait\_timer.  
 Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation.

CI 73 SC 73.10.1 P 145 L 18 # 30  
 DAWE, PIERS J G Individual  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R OOS reject  
 Messy terminology: this clause uses "logic one" and logic zero" a lot, "logical one" and "logical zero" also, and sometimes just "one" or "zero".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Clean it up: best to follow Clause 45, change every "logic one" or "logical one" to "one", change every "logic zero" or "logical zero" to "zero".  
 Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation.  
 The terminology, "logic zero", "logic one", "logical one" and logical zero", has been used in many places in 802.3-2005 base document. This clause inherited this terminology from the base document. This terminology is used in many places and did not change from the previous draft.  
 To make it consistent, it is appropriate to address this during the revision to base document.

**Cl 73**    **SC 73.10.2**    **P 151**    **L 29**    # **31**  
DAWE, PIERS J G    Individual

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status A**  
Should not use hyphen to represent a range

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change "500-510 ms" to "500 ms to 510 ms". Several other examples, also in PICS.

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

It is unlikely that a reader will misinterpret the range, however it is a possible improvement.

This comment will be passed to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.

**Cl 73**    **SC 73.3**    **P 131**    **L 53**    # **28**  
DAWE, PIERS J G    Individual

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status A**    **OOS correction**  
What is this sentence trying to say? Is it talking about the TDI of 28.2.6 or another one?

**SuggestedRemedy**

Please clarify

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

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation.

It implies the Technology-Dependent Interface defined for this Clause 73 (See 73.9).

A reference to it may provide better clarity.

No one in the Ballot resolution committee considers this to be a substantive change.  
Hence it is decided to pass it to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.

Publication editor, consider to add a reference "(See 73.9)" to end of the sentence that refers to Technology- Dependent Interface (two occurrences, pages 131 and 139).

Publication editor, also consider to update the inconsistent capitalization for TDI in the PICS (three occurrences, pages 23,49 and 50).

**Cl 73**    **SC 73.7.6**    **P 140**    **L 46**    # **29**  
DAWE, PIERS J G    Individual

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status R**    **OOS reject**  
A rash claim: "This will ensure there are no interoperability issues when..."

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change to "This allows interoperation when...?"

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

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation

Though the suggested text is a possible improvement, the intent is clear for the current text as it is written.

**Cl 74**    **SC 74.11.5**    **P 188**    **L 48**    # **33**  
DAWE, PIERS J G    Individual

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status A**    **OOS pass to pub editor**  
possible

**SuggestedRemedy**

possible

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

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation.

This comment will be passed to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.

---

*Cl* 74      *SC* 74.7.4.4.1      *P* 176      *L* 9      # 32  
DAWE, PIERS J G      Individual      *OOS pass to pub editor*

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

Multiplication on x 32

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Multiplication by x 32 ?

*Response*      *Response Status*    **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Out of scope for D3.2 recirculation.

This comment will be passed to the publication editor for consideration during publication preparation.