



Fast Ethernet Consortium

Clause 24 PCS Conformance Test Suite v3.2 Report

UNH-IOL — 121 Technology Drive, Suite 2 — Durham, NH 03824 — +1-603-862-0090
Consortium Manager: Peter Scruton — pjs@iol.unh.edu — +1-603-862-0239

Joe Vendor
Company C
123 Main St.
Durham, NH 77332

January 15, 2005
Report Rev. 1.0

Enclosed are the results from the Clause 24 PCS Conformance testing performed on:

Device Under Test (DUT):	Company C SuperNIC 100
Hardware Version:	Rev. 23
Firmware Version:	234
Software Version:	N/A
Miscellaneous:	Windows 95 platform

The test suite referenced in this report is available at the UNH-IOL website:

ftp://ftp.iol.unh.edu/pub/ethernet/test_suites/CL24_PCS/PCS_version_3.2.pdf

No issues were uncovered during the testing process.

Testing Completed 01/15/2005

Review Completed 01/15/2005

John Q. Tester
johnqtester@iol.unh.edu

John Q. Reviewer
johnqreviewer@iol.unh.edu

Digital Signature Information

This document was created using an Adobe digital signature. A digital signature helps to ensure the authenticity of the document, but only in this digital format. For information on how to verify this document's integrity proceed to the following site:

<http://www.iol.unh.edu/certifyDoc>

If the document status still indicates "Validity of author NOT confirmed", then please contact the UNH-IOL to confirm the document's authenticity. To further validate the certificate integrity, Adobe 6.0 should report the following fingerprint information:

MD5 Fingerprint: DB27 087D 94C8 CB63 7679 50E1 2239 C564
SHA-1 Fingerprint: 5411 C271 9458 ECB2 F401 E0C9 0026 25C3 98D3 E8FE

Result Key

The following table contains possible results and their meanings:

Result	Interpretation
PASS	The Device Under Test (DUT) was observed to exhibit conformant behavior.
PASS with Comments	The DUT was observed to exhibit conformant behavior however an additional explanation of the situation is included, such as due to time limitations only a portion of the testing was performed.
FAIL	The DUT was observed to exhibit non-conformant behavior.
Warning	The DUT was observed to exhibit behavior that is not recommended.
Informative	Results are for informative purposes only and are not judged on a pass or fail basis.
Refer to Comments	From the observations, a valid pass or fail could not be determined. An additional explanation of the situation is included.
Not Applicable	The DUT does not support the technology required to perform these tests.
Not Available	Due to testing station or time limitations, the tests could not be performed.
Borderline	The observed values of the specified parameters are valid at one extreme, and invalid at the other.
Not Tested	Not tested due to the time constraints of the test period.

GROUP 1: Test Results

Test # and Label	Part(s)	Result(s)
24.1.1 – End of Stream Delimiter Test	a	PASS
	b	PASS
Expected Results and Procedural Comments		
<p>Purpose: To verify that RX_ER is asserted when there is no stream termination sequence, ESD (/T/R/), following the SSD.</p> <p>a. The DUT should not respond to the NO_ESD test frame. The reception of valid frames preceding and following the NO_ESD test frame separated by the minimum inter-frame gap should not be affected.</p> <p>b. The DUT should respond to each of the VALID_ESD test frames. The reception of valid frames preceding and following the VALID_ESD test frames separated by the minimum inter-frame gap should not be affected.</p> <p>c. The DUT should not respond to each of the INVALID_ESD test frames. The reception of valid frames preceding and following the INVALID_ESD test frames separated by the minimum inter-frame gap should not be affected</p>		
Comments on Test Results		
<p>Note: The statistics of the DUT report +1 “errors” for each invalid frame.</p>		

Test # and Label	Part(s)	Result(s)
24.1.2 – Invalid Data Symbol Test	a	PASS
	b	PASS
	c	PASS
Expected Results and Procedural Comments		
<p>Purpose: To verify that an error (RX_ER) is detected when an invalid data symbol is sent following the transmission of the SSD (/J/K).</p> <p>a. The DUT should not respond to frames with an invalid symbol.</p> <p>b. The reception of valid frames preceding and following the test frames separated by the minimum inter-frame gap should not be affected.</p> <p>c. The DUT should report the reception of an FCS error for each frame.</p>		
Comments on Test Results		
<p>Note: The statistics of the DUT report +1 “errors” for each invalid frame.</p>		

Test # and Label	Part(s)	Result(s)
24.1.3 – False Carrier Detect	a	PASS
	b	PASS
Expected Results and Procedural Comments		
<p>Purpose: To verify that the device under test (DUT) can detect false carrier events.</p> <p>a. The DUT should not reply to the Test Frame.</p> <p>b. The reception of valid frames preceding and following the test frame separated by the minimum inter-frame gap should not be affected.</p>		
Comments on Test Results		
None		



Annex A: Test Setup

Test Equipment

The following test equipment was used in performing Clause 24 PCS testing:

Testing Equipment	Brand and Version Information
PC Requirements	Windows 2000
Software	Symbgen software
Traffic Generator/Sniffer	Symbgen
Logic Analyzer	N/A
Tiger/GMII System	N/A

Test Configuration

The following configuration was used in performing Clause 24 PCS testing:

