

P802.3ae Draft 3.4 Comments

CI 44 SC 44.5 P 1678 L # 12
 Dawe, Piers Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Please stop table from flowing over page break.
 SuggestedRemedy
 General remedy may be in the Frame template.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 46 SC 46.4 P 278 L 40 # 9
 Vadim Shain NEC Electronics Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status R
 Update Table 46-6 related with Figure 46-10 (even it is just informative) to describe all parameters shown on the Figure.
 SuggestedRemedy
 To add the following row to the table:

SYMBOL	PARAMETER	MIN.	MAX.	UNITS
Voh_dc	DC output logic high	Vddq-0.4	-	V
Vol_dc	DC output logic low	-	-	V
Voh_ac	AC output logic high	Vddq-0.5	-	V
Vol_ac	AC output logic low	-	-	V

 Response Response Status C
 REJECT. This comment relates to text in the document that has no change indicated in it. This comment will be re-submitted by the editor in sponsor ballot.

CI 47 SC 3.4.5 P L # 16
 Gaither, Justin Xilinx
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Comment 99007 was accepted for resolution to resolve the Output Impedance specification. However, the input impedance should receive similar treatment.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the input impedance specification similar to the output impedance specification.
 Response Response Status Z

CI 47 SC 47.3.3.6 P 339 L 3839 # 99008
 Baumer, Howard Broadcom Corp.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R XAUI (D3.1) NC - Done
 The current transmit jitter specification allows for the near end random jitter to be as high as 8ps rms and the far end random jitter to be as high as 12.6ps rms. (Since the specification allows Dj=0 and Rj=Tj-Dj(actual) Rj can then equal Tj. For near end Rj=0.35UI=112ps pk-pk which is 8ps rms {112/14}. For the far end Rj=0.55UI=176ps pk-pk which is 12.6ps rms.) This puts an undue burden on the Receiver to be able to handle this large pure random jitter. A maximum random jitter should be specified.

SuggestedRemedy
 Add a maximum random jitter specification that is not based on the deterministic jitter and add the constraint that the sum of the Rj & Dj has to be less than the Tj. Second to last sentence (lines 38-39) modified to read: "The maximum peak to peak random jitter, defined as 14 * rms random jitter, shall be less than 0.22UI. The sum of the measured deterministic and measured peak to peak random jitter shall be less than the total jitter". Table 47-1 in subclause 47.3.3 on page 334 will need to be updated with the maximum random jitter.
 Response Response Status U
 REJECT. The working group desires further investigation of an appropriate RJ limit. The editor asks that the commentor determine an RJ limit acceptable to the working group and then resubmitted this comment.
 As of November 15, 2001, the commentor has provided no new information during the last 5 months justifying a need for a change, and the committee is satisfied with the current specifications.

CI 47 SC 47.3.4.5 P 342 L 2937 # 99009
 Baumer, Howard Broadcom Corp.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R XAUI (D3.1) NC - Done
 There is no specific random jitter specified for the receiver jitter tolerance. This results in the same problem illustrated in my comment #99008.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following sentence to subclause 47.3.4.5 between the sentence on specifying Dj and the sentence specifying Tj: "The maximum peak to peak random jitter, defined as 14 * rms random jitter, shall be less than 0.22UI."
 Response Response Status U
 REJECT. See response to #99008.

P802.3ae Draft 3.4 Comments

CI 48 SC Annex 48B P 337 L 32 # 18
 Bulent Tusray Tality Corporation
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 "teseting"
 SuggestedRemedy
 "testing"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 48B SC 48B.2.1 P 341 L 10 # 20
 Lindsay, Tom Stratos Lightwave
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Wrong word.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "expected" with "specified high frequency value".
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 48B SC 48B.2.1 P 341 L 54 # 24
 Lindsay, Tom Stratos Lightwave
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Poor grammar.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the word "stage".
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 48B SC 48B.3.1.3.1 P 343 L 2 # 25
 Lindsay, Tom Stratos Lightwave
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Missing word.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "the" to the beginning of the line.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 48B SC 48B.3.2.1 P 343 L 34 # 26
 Lindsay, Tom Stratos Lightwave
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Clarify internal PLL options.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Last sentence in paragraph should be "Some TIA models have integrated Golden PLL and/or high-pass filtering algorithms."
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Changed to read:
 " some TIA models have integrated Golden PLL or high-pass filtering algorithms." "OR" grammatically includes an "AND".

CI 48B SC Figure 48B-4 P 343 L # 27
 Lindsay, Tom Stratos Lightwave
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Figure does not maintain differential balance.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that DATA be shown as differential (bold line with DATA and -DATA labeling) all the way to the TIA input, with a tap to the Golden PLL. This offers no implementation details, but at least it does not steer the tester astray. I have done this with 2 hybrid couplers, but I doubt we want to show that much detail??
 Response Response Status Z

CI 49 SC Figures 49-12 and 49-1 P 368 and 369 L 44-47 # 10
 Pat Thaler Agilent
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Also applies to page 369 line 45-47. These editor's notes were change bar substitutes for the figures in draft 3.2 and should have been deleted after that ballot.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete these two editor's notes before sending to sponsor ballot unless that causes a problem with sending the draft to sponsor ballot. I don't think it should since I expect that the other change bars will be deleted and these notes are just textual change bars.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

P802.3ae Draft 3.4 Comments

CI 50 SC 50.6.4.2 P 407 L 36 # 17
 Alexander, Thomas PMC-Sierra, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Value/Comment fields of PICS items WT10 and WT11 do not match the normative values for K1 and K2 that are specified in the clause text (50.3.2.2). This was an editorial oversight that occurred when the default values assigned to the K1/K2 octets were changed to all-zeros. This is not a technical change in the draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Set to 00000001 binary" and "Set to 00010 binary" to "Set to 00000000 binary" and "Set to 00000 binary".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 52 SC P L # 21
 Lindsay, Tom Stratos Lightwave

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The primary specification tables list Wavelength (range), yet other notes, tables, and figures refer to center wavelength.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Center" to Wavelength (range) in the primary tables (52-7, 52-9, 52-12, 52-14, 52-17, 52-18). Editor should check for other instances. Editor should also check for consistent spelling. I found at least one instance of "centre".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 52 SC 52.14.2.1 P 472 L 11 # 6
 Doug Coleman Corning Cable System

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In agreement with SMF total connector and splice loss, it is not necessary to specify a maximum individual connector loss for MMF. As long as the 1.5 dB total connector and splice loss is met, it isn't necessary to specify maximum individual connector insertion loss values.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "with a maximum insertion loss of 0.75 dB.."

Response Response Status Z

CI 52 SC 52.14.2.1 P 472 L 16 # 5
 Doug Coleman Corning Cable System

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It is not appropriate to indicate a total connector and spliceloss for lengths greater than 30 km since they are engineered lengths. Engineer lengths imply total fiber, connector and splice loss can be defined by the enduser/designer to ensure compliance to the 11 dB total channel loss.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "and 1 dB for 40km".

Response Response Status Z

CI 52 SC 52.15.3 P 475 L 30 # 13
 Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Obviously, these delay constraints don't apply to the cabling.

SuggestedRemedy

Not "M" but mandatory if not INS, (or mandatory if any of SR-EW). Same goes for 52.15.4.9 and 52.15.4.10. Use ! for negation. See CI.21 for syntax, 36.7.4.5 for an example.

Response Response Status C

REJECT. Delay constraints are specified in 52.2 and refer to the roundtrip delay through the PMA and PMD including up to 2m of fiber. This is a mandatory requirement.

CI 52 SC 52.5 P 442 L 14 # 1
 Doug Coleman Corning Cable System

Comment Type E Comment Status A

400 MHz km is expressed incorrectly

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a dot between MHz and km.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.3ae Draft 3.4 Comments

CI 52 SC 52.6 P 448 L # 14

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Tables 52-14 and 52-15 are in the wrong subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Box their ears and send them home! But if doing so would cause unwarranted revision marks (blue text), can leave it to next time. For the future, consult chief editor about how to stop tables floating away.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 52 SC 52.9.11.2 P 465 L 2125 # 15

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Dead links

SuggestedRemedy

Make the following into links:
 a) 50.3.8;
 c) Table 52-9, Table 52-14, Table 52-18
 Thanks!

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 52 SC 52.9.11.2 P 465 L 31 # 11

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Sentence without end

SuggestedRemedy

I think point f) should end with . rather than ; Maybe point e) should end "DCD; and"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT. Ended bullet f) with a period.

CI 52 SC Figure 52-13 P 464 L # 19

Lindsay, Tom Stratos Lightwave

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Missing some arrows, etc.

SuggestedRemedy

In the stress conditioning box, add an input arrow to the coaxial cable block and an output arrow from the filter block. I prefer these arrows extend slightly beyond the borders of the box. In the signal characterization measurement box, extend the input arrow slightly beyond the border of the box.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 52 SC Table 52-10 P 445 L 11 # 23

Lindsay, Tom Stratos Lightwave

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The row named "Allocation for Penalties" actually includes margin.

SuggestedRemedy

Change row name to "Allocation for penalties and margin". This comment also applies to Table 52-15, page 448, line 39, and Table 52-19, page 451, line 11.

Response Response Status Z

CI 52 SC Table 52-10 P 445 L 5 # 4

Doug Coleman Corning Cable System

Comment Type E Comment Status R

2000 MHz-km is not identified as a laser bandwidth.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a footnote that each stated bandwidth is OFL BW with the exception that 2000 MHz-km is a laser BW value.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

P802.3ae Draft 3.4 Comments

CI 52 SC Table 52-6 P 442 L 23 # 2
Doug Coleman Corning Cable System
Comment Type E Comment Status A
MHz km is expressed incorrectly
SuggestedRemedy
Insert a dot between MHz and km.
Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 52 SC Table 52-6 P 442 L 30 # 3
Doug Coleman Corning Cable System
Comment Type E Comment Status R
2000 MHz-km is not identified as a laser bandwidth.
SuggestedRemedy
Insert a footnote that each stated bandwidth is OFL BW with the exception that 2000 MHz-km is a laser BW value.
Response Response Status C
REJECT.

CI 52 SC Table 52-9 P 444 L 45 # 22
Lindsay, Tom Stratos Lightwave
Comment Type E Comment Status A
I do not understand the intention of the 1st footnote. We often associate "tolerate" with errors. Is this referring to damage?
SuggestedRemedy
Please clarify whether this intention is to avoid damage or errors. This comment also applies to Table 52-14, page 448, line 21.
Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Add " ,without damage," after "tolerate" for tables 52-9 and 52-14.

CI 53 SC 53.14.2.1 P 510 L 39 # 8
Doug Coleman Corning Cable System
Comment Type T Comment Status D
In agreement with SMF total connector and splice loss, it is not necessary to specify a maximum individual connector loss for MMF. As long as the 1.5 dB total connector and splice loss is met, it isn't necessary to specify maximum individual connector insertion loss values.
SuggestedRemedy
Delete "with a maximum insertion loss of 0.75 dB..
Response Response Status Z

CI 53 SC Table 53-9 P 492 L 17 # 7
Doug Coleman Corning Cable System
Comment Type T Comment Status D
Current text implies both MMF and SMF connectors and splices are allocated a total 1.5 dB total loss. SMF connectors and splices are allocated 2.0 dB as discussed in 53.14.2.1, line 43, page 510.
SuggestedRemedy
Insert text that SMF is allocated 2.0 dB total connector and splice loss.
Response Response Status Z