



P D BRADSHAW

[Help](#) [My Info](#) [Report a Bug](#) [Logout](#)[MyBallot Control Panel](#) >> [Manage MyBallot Activity](#) >> [Ballot Comments](#) >> **Comment Detail**

P802.3-REVam Information technology -- Telecommunications and information exchange between systems -- Local and metropolitan area networks -- specific requirements Part 3: Carrier Sense Multiple Access with Collision Detection (CSMA/CD) Access Method and Physical Layer Specifications

#108 comment # 1736

Date: 01/12/2005**Must be satisfied:** No**Category:** Technical**Page:** 125**Sub-clause:** 45.4.1**Line #:** 25

Comment: The IOL specification on line 29 calls for >4 mA at a VI of 0.2V, while the VOL specification on line 25 calls for a VOL of <0.2V at an IOL of 100 uA. It is not clear what VI means here (and I cannot find a clue in Clause 22, specifically 22.4.3), but it would seem to mean VOL. In this case the specification on line 29 exceeds (and so supercedes) that on line 25.

Proposed One of the following:-

- Change:**
1. Make clear how "VI" differs from "VOL"
 2. Change VI to VOL in line 29 (and to VOH in line 27)
 3. Perform Item 2. and also remove line 25.

Resolution Status: Principle

Resolution ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Detail: We will implement option 2.

[Return to the Ballot Comments](#)[back to top](#)

Copyright © 2004-2005 IEEE
myballot@ieee.org



P D BRADSHAW

[Help](#) [My Info](#) [Report a Bug](#) [Logout](#)[MyBallot Control Panel](#) >> [Manage MyBallot Activity](#) >> [Ballot Comments](#) >> **Comment Detail**

P802.3-REVam Information technology -- Telecommunications and information exchange between systems -- Local and metropolitan area networks -- specific requirements Part 3: Carrier Sense Multiple Access with Collision Detection (CSMA/CD) Access Method and Physical Layer Specifications

Date: 01/11/2005

#93 comment #1751

Must be satisfied: No**Category:** Technical**Page:** 393**Sub-clause:** 53.15.4.3**Comment:** (This piece of section four has no line numbers).

MR6 & MR7 do not quite conform to Maintenance requests 1110 and 1111 respectively. The requests called for "the transmit path" and "the receive path", while the revision has "any" instead of "the". There is only one path in either case. The origin subclauses use "any ... lane", which makes sense, since there are four lanes in each path.

Proposed Either: fix according to the original requests, using "the" instead of "any".**Change:** OR: replace the "path" with "lane"

My preference is the latter. Since the original requests were submitted by me, the original requestor will be happy with either resolution.

Resolution Status: Principle**Resolution** ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**Detail:** The word "path" will be replaced with "lane".[Return to the Ballot Comments](#)[back to top](#)

Copyright © 2004-2005 IEEE
myballot@ieee.org