Proposed Response  

The overview and the draft indicate that clause 149 operates over a single balanced pair of conductors. As in other standards, this may include either cabling or a backplane link segment. However, in several portions of the link segment specification, the requirements are written so that ONLY a separate cabling link segment can be used. This is in conflict with the overview and purpose. A slight adjustment to the wording, and a conditional on the PICS will make it clear that requirements such as coupling attenuation and shielding attenuation are only intended to apply to cabling link segments.

Suggested Remedy

Page 167 line 10: At 149.7, change the last sentence of the first paragraph from "The term link segment used in this clause refers to a single shielded balanced pair of conductors operating in full duplex." to "The term link segment used in this clause refers to a single balanced pair of conductors (cable or backplane) operating in full duplex."; Page 171 line 31: at 149.7.1.4, change the first sentence from "when tested using the IEC 62153-4-7 triaxial tube in tube method as specified in Annex 149A, the MultiGBASE-T1 link segment shall meet the coupling attenuation values" to "when tested using the IEC 62153-4-7 triaxial tube in tube method as specified in Annex 149A, where shielded balanced pair cabling is used, the MultiGBASE-T1 link segment shall meet the coupling attenuation values"; Page 174 line 36: Change the first sentence of 149.8.1 from "The mechanical interface to the shielded balanced cabling" to "Where shielded balanced pair cabling is used, the mechanical interface to the shielded balanced cabling"; Page 179 line 10, 149.11.3, insert row for "INS" after row for "EEE", reading "INS | Installation / cabling | 149.7 | Items marked with INS include installation practices and cabling specifications applicable when the link segment is balanced pair cabling, and not applicable to backplane link segments | O | Yes | No | ["<cr>"]"; on page 193 line 12, Change status of row for LSC5 to "M:INS".

Proposed Response  

The variable "mr_rx_message" does not exist. Its name should be "mr_rx_lp_message".

Suggested Remedy

Within Table 149-9, on line 32, 34, 37, and 39, replace "mr_rx_message" by "mr_rx_lp_message".

Proposed Response  

The register bit mappings for OAM status messages are inconsistent with the definition given in Figure 149-25 (line 30 and line 34 on page 142).

Suggested Remedy