

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cy D3.1 10G+ Auto Task Force 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

CI **FM** SC **FM** P1 L33 # R1-20
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 *** Comment submitted with the file image.png attached ***
 You missed updating the copyright year here.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change 2022 to 2023. (Could be a FrameMaker variable problem.).
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **1** SC **1.4.407** P22 L15 # R1-9
 Zimmerman, George Cisco Systems, Inc.,CME Consulting,CommScope,M
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 Clause 149 is now in the draft, so the external reference should be an active cross reference
SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the external reference to clause 149 with an active cross reference to Clause 149
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **45** SC **45.2.1.244.1** P26 L34 # R1-7
 Zimmerman, George Cisco Systems, Inc.,CME Consulting,CommScope,M
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 45.2.1.244 is only about MultiGBASE-T1, so there is no need to call that out in the text, which reads very awkward and suggests the bits apply to other than MultiGBASE-T1. I am probably the source of the original text, so I apologize for the churn, but seeing how it finally ended up made me question the need... this occurs multiple times, this is the first instance.
SuggestedRemedy
 delete "for MultiGBASE-T1" at P26 L34, P26 L35, P26 L52, P26 L53, P27 L34, P27 L44, P27 L51.
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **45** SC **45.2.3.87.2** P28 L20 # R1-8
 Zimmerman, George Cisco Systems, Inc.,CME Consulting,CommScope,M
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 hi_rfer is actually defined in 149.3.7.2.2 (which is in the draft). 149.3.8.1 is a reference to the variable, but the definition is in the state diagram variables...
SuggestedRemedy
 replace external reference to 149.3.8.1 with cross-reference to 149.3.7.2.2
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **78** SC **78.1** P29 L15 # R1-10
 Zimmerman, George Cisco Systems, Inc.,CME Consulting,CommScope,M
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 No other entry to table 78-1 has a section referenced - only the clause. AND the header on the table says "Clause" not "Section" or "Subclause"
SuggestedRemedy
 Delete "and 165.3.8" from Clause entry in Table 78-1 on P29 L15
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **105** SC **105.5** P35 L30 # R1-11
 Zimmerman, George Cisco Systems, Inc.,CME Consulting,CommScope,M
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ
 Editing instruction has been modified to be "Change" although the row is inserted, there are other things shown (including that the row is multiple rows in other places) so the extra clarity would help in the editing instruction (for example, the footnotes are unchanged)
SuggestedRemedy
 Underline the new text in the table (25GBASE-T1 row & rows....)
Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Changed editing instructions to read "Insert a row in Table 105-3 (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cz-202x) for 25GBASE-T1 after 25GBASE-T (unchanged rows not shown)". No underline for the new text is then needed.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cy D3.1 10G+ Auto Task Force 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 149B SC 149B P132 L14 # R1-19
 Zimmerman, George Cisco Systems, Inc.,CME Consulting,CommScope,M
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Clause 149 is now in the draft, so the external reference should be an active cross reference
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the external reference to clause 149 with an active cross reference to Clause 149
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 165 SC 165 P38 L1 # R1-6
 Zimmerman, George Cisco Systems, Inc.,CME Consulting,CommScope,M
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 The preceding page with clause 149 is numbered page 36. This page is page 38. Is there a page 37? It looks like a numbering error...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Renumber pages so that clause 149 and 165 are continuously numbered without a gap.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 165 SC 165.3.2 P43 L42 # R1-14
 Zimmerman, George Cisco Systems, Inc.,CME Consulting,CommScope,M
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 This is now the first reference to PFC24. It needs to be expanded, and probably referenced to where it is better described. Clarity is improved if the expansion for PFC24 is also left where it is more fully described in 165.3.5.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "PFC24" to "partial frame count (PFC24, see 165.3.5).
 Leave the expansion in 165.3.5...
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Changed per suggested remedy but on pdf page 51 and not 43.

Cl 165 SC 165.7.1.3.3 P106 L6 # R1-4
 Zimmerman, George Cisco Systems, Inc.,CME Consulting,CommScope,M
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Equation 165-25 shouldn't be its own equation - it is part of 165-24.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Reformat so that 165-25 is part of 165-24.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.