Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 328
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

RE: D1.0 Comment #275
The response as it shows up in D2.0 does not satisfactorily addresses my concern expressed in my D1.0 Comment #275.
Clearly the draft has improved in this regard, but i find no max/min requirements within the standard as there clearly should be. (If there weren't any requirements, then there would be no need for this standard.) If the issue is that the requirements are only expressed externally in 802.1AS then that is improper from a layering standpoint and from the standpoint of layered implementations being fully specified within the layer standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Fully specify the required behavior of the required signalling within this document.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
This comment is a restatement of comment #275 D2.0, which was previously rejected and has already been re-circulated.
The requirements from 802.1AS for this project is that the min/max values are reported through the respective registers, though they are not bounded within 802.3bf. Within 802.3, each PHY already has its delay bounded, and 802.3bf, intended to work with different types of PHYs, will not introduce additional bounds in this regard.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 327
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R**

RE: D1.0 Comment #269
The response as it shows up in D2.0 does not satisfactorily addresses my concern expressed in my D1.0 Comment #269.
The rationale provided says that because this (poor) capitalization convention is used outside and we have occasion to use such terms then that is the reason we should adopt such poor conventions within our own standards for all of the terms that we create within our own standards. We can do better

SuggestedRemedy

Implement my original recommendation as expressed in D1.0 comment #269

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
This comment is a restatement of comment #269 D2.0, which was previously rejected and has already been re-circulated.
The comment resolution committee has given this comment due consideration during resolution of D2.0 comments and decided the existing acronym did not raise any concerns in terms of capitalization. MEC on D2.1 also returned no concerns from IEEE staff editor.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 325
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *motion approval*

RE: D1.0 Comment #274
The response as it shows up in D2.0 satisfactorily addresses my concern expressed in my D1.0 Comment #274

SuggestedRemedy

No further action required with respect to this comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 324
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *motion approval*

RE: D1.0 Comment #273
The response as it shows up in D2.0 satisfactorily addresses my concern expressed in my D1.0 Comment #273

SuggestedRemedy

No further action required with respect to this comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 322
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *motion approval*

RE: D1.0 Comment #270
The response as it shows up in D2.0 satisfactorily addresses my concern expressed in my D1.0 Comment #270

SuggestedRemedy

No further action required with respect to this comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 318
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

I don't understand why latency registers have been added for WIS, PCS, XAUI and TC.
* WIS is obsolete.
* XAUI is arguably obsolete with SFP+ being the 10G module interconnect of choice.
* TC is too slow to be relevant to 802.1AS.
* It adds needless complexity calling out the PCS latency separately as the only delay of interest is the total delay between the MII and MDI. This might as well be reported as a consolidated value in MMD 1 PMA/PMD.

Another problem with attempting to include XAUI in this way is that it will make it even more difficult to deal with SGMII and XFI which are out of scope of 802.3.

I think the simplest solution is to stick with reporting a consolidated PHY latency in MMD 1 as was done in draft 2.0.

SuggestedRemedy

Please consider reverting the PHY latency register definitions to how they were in draft 2.0.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Please see comment #208 against D2.0. The comment resolution committee believes that such replication of registers provides the best possible flexibility for equipment manufacturers and system designers to accomodate any combination of physical implementations.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **14** *L* # 315
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editing instructions*

Missing editing instructions.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert:
NOTE—The editing instructions contained in this amendment define how to merge the material contained therein into the existing base standard and its amendments to form the comprehensive standard.

The editing instructions are shown in bold italic. Four editing instructions are used: change, delete, insert, and replace. Change is used to make corrections in existing text or tables. The editing instruction specifies the location of the change and describes what is being changed by using strikethrough (to remove old material) and underscore (to add new material). Delete removes existing material. Insert adds new material without disturbing the existing material. Insertions may require renumbering. If so, renumbering instructions are given in the editing instruction. Replace is used to make changes in figures or equations by removing the existing figure or equation and replacing it with a new one. Editing instructions, change markings, and this NOTE will not be carried over into future editions because the changes will be incorporated into the base standard.

Also review the preamble to see if there is anything else missing or not compatible with the current style manual.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Current draft was subject to review by the IEEE staff editor as part of the MEC (Mandatory Editorial Coordination) process and no problems were found, in either clarity of the editorial instructions or other aspects of the draft.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **15** *L* **7** # 326

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *motion approval*

RE: D1.0 Comment #271
The response as it shows up in D2.0 only partially addresses my concern expressed in my D1.0 Comment #271

SuggestedRemedy

Please update the referenced draft version of P802.1AS to D7.5
Add (or move from the front of cl.90) the update upon publication to a footnote to the normative references clause (1.3).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
1. update reference to 802.1AS in 1.3
2. move the editorial note from page 35, line 3 to subclause 1.3

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1** *P* **23** *L* **5** # 316

Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editing instructions*

Change editing instruction from 'modify' to 'change'

SuggestedRemedy

Change editing instruction from 'modify' to 'change' here and also on pages 24, 26, 28, 30, 32 and anywhere else relevant.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See #315

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.99a** *P* **23** *L* **42** # 319

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

in Table 45–65e, Bit 1.1800.0:
"receive path data delay in registers 1.1801 through 1.1804" should be "receive path data delay in registers 1.1805 through 1.1808"
The equivalent mistake appears in:
Table 45–81a
Table 45–115c
Table 45–114a
Table 45–121a
Table 45–132a

SuggestedRemedy

In the bottom row of Table 45-65e
change "registers 1.1801 through 1.1804" to "registers 1.1805 through 1.1808"
Make an equivalent change in:
Table 45–81a
Table 45–115c
Table 45–114a
Table 45–121a
Table 45–132a

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Also change the subclause numbering from 45.2.1.99a, 45.2.1.99b, 45.2.1.99c to 45.2.1.100, 45.2.1.101, 45.2.1.102, respectively. There is the same issue for:
45.2.1.99a
45.2.1.99b
45.2.1.99c
45.2.2.19a
45.2.2.19b
45.2.2.19c
45.2.3.39a
45.2.3.39b
45.2.3.39c
45.2.4.9a
45.2.4.9b
45.2.4.9c
45.2.5.9a
45.2.5.9b
45.2.5.9c
45.2.6.13a
Since we are adding subclauses at the end of the given subclauses in 802.3 base text, there is no need to use the a/b/c letters at the end of the subclause numbers.
45.2.6.13b
45.2.6.13c

Cl **90** *SC* **90.4.1.1** *P* **36** *L* **12** # 323

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *motion approval*

RE: D1.0 Comment #272
The response as it shows up in D2.0 satisfactorily addresses my concern expressed in my D1.0 Comment #272

SuggestedRemedy

No further action required with respect to this comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **90** *SC* **90.6** *P* **39** *L* **29** # 321

Giannakopoulos, Dimitrios Applied Micro

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *motion approval*

Managment should be Management

SuggestedRemedy

Replace Managment with Management

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **90** *SC* **90.6** *P* **39** *L* **44** # 320

Giannakopoulos, Dimitrios Applied Micro

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *motion approval*

Text "value of the series of transmit path data delay registers" is in description of receive path.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "value of the series of transmit path data delay registers" with "value of the series of receive path data delay registers"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Scrub the draft for any potential locations of the same problem.

Cl **93** *SC* **93.4.3.1.1** *P* **37** *L* **28** # 317

Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

This is a pile on to comment 243 against draft 2.0. Also see the agreed resolution to comment 31 against draft 0.21 which was never implemented:
http://www.ieee802.org/3/bf/comments/Files/D0.21/3bf_1003_comments_final.pdf

"The SFD parameter can take only one possible value, DETECTED." does not make sense.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
"The SFD parameter takes the value of either DETECTED or NOT DETECTED."

make the same change in 90.4.3.2.1

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Please note that comment #243 was AIP in D2.0. Additionally, see the resolution to comment #230 against D2.0.
We need to settle on one definition here once and for all, and it was the understanding of the comment resolution committee that the primitive is only generated when the SFD is detected. Otherwise, nothing is generated. In that case, we do not need to generate the primitive to indicate the lack of SFD.