Cl **00** *SC* *P* *L* # 31

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

This project has failed to live up to the level of participation that was advertised in the PAR: "5.1 Approximate number of people expected to be actively involved in the development of this project: 30"
and it would appear that its market projections as put forth in the BMP criterium were overly optimistic on a grand scale. This is show by the poor participation. It would appear that most of the current interest comes from a particular industrial sector which failed to follow 802.3 recommendations about 20 years ago and did not install 4-pair cabling. Participation by other sectors has been very poor. IF there ever will be a true market need for this standard, it should be developed with broad participation from the bodies who need it when their own need is sufficiently close that the affected parties will send participants who are in the midst of development. It is a bad idea to develop a standard before the market is read for it.

SuggestedRemedy

Withdraw the project at this time or hibernate it until more people who are willing to participate in its development show up in 802.3. Requalify it for Broad Market Potential at that time and modify the PAR if needed and it is still active.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 48

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

I don't approve of the way this project has been run, and how it has been reported to 802.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Terminate the project.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 13

Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

The terminology in the amendment does not match the agreed objectives for the project. The Call for Interest held in the March 2012 plenary for Frame Preemption was withdrawn after too much controversy over the characterization of the problem and solution. After a subsequent CFI, the first attempt to approve a PAR and objectives at the July 2013 plenary in Geneva failed due to inconsistency of the terminology with 802.3 (distinguished minimum latency traffic and "M-frames", "M-frames in the wild" were rejected. After rework in the York interim, a characterization as "interspersing express traffic" was developed, leading to the currently accepted objectives accepted in November 2013. The only place the accepted terminology appears in the draft is in the title and the name of the task force. The entire draft uses the terminology of the withdrawn CFI from March 2012

SuggestedRemedy

Update the terminology globally in the draft per the agreed objectives. In particular:
1.4.3 - change "preemptable Media Access Control" to "non-express Media Access Control" with an appropriate acronym
1.4.4 - change "preemptable traffic" to "non-express traffic"
Add IET to the acronyms defined in clause 1.
Occurrences of "preemptable" in clause 30 change to "non-express", objects such as "PreemptSupported", "PreemptEnabled", "PreemptActive" change to "IETSupported", "IETEnabled", "IETActive", etc.
Change "preemption capability" to "IET capability" globally in clause 79.
pMAC and PMAC not consistent in clause 79, but should change globally to neMAC (or whatever acronym is chosen for the non-express MAC).
Clause 99: preemptable MAC should be non-express MAC globally.
"MAC client supporting preemption" becomes "MAC client supporting IET" globally.
pMAC becomes neMAC (or chosen acronym) globally
"preemption is active" becomes "IET is active" globally
"enable preemption" becomes "enable IET" globally
"link partner supports preemption" becomes "link partner supports IET"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 2

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

The draft is not consistent on the version of IEEE Std 802.3 that it is amending.
Page 1 says "Amendment of IEEE Std 802.3™-2015"
Page 13 onwards say "Draft Amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2012"
Now that IEEE Std 802.3-2015 has been approved, change all references to the base standard to this.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all references to the base standard to "IEEE Std 802.3-2015"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **13** *L* **0** # 15

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

This amendment is against 2015 not 2012 edition & other header errors

SuggestedRemedy

Change heading in all clauses from:
"Draft Amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2012 ..."
"IEEE P802.3br Task Force name Task Force ..."
to
"Draft Amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2015 ..."
"IEEE P802.3br Interspersing Express Traffic Task Force ..."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **18** *L* **54** # 7

Tretter, Albert Siemens AG

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Page number at page 18 changes again to page 1

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the numbering.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4** *P* *L* # 3

Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

the abbreviation "MM" for merged MAC is used extensively within draft. 44 times to be exact.

The abbreviation is not listed in Clause 1.5.

SuggestedRemedy

Add abbreviation for Merged MAC in Clause 1.5.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4.339a** *P* **17** *L* **24** # 24

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Missing space

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to read: "layer (IEEE Std 802.3..."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4.340** *P* **22** *L* **39** # 6

Tretter, Albert Siemens AG

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Empty reference 1.4.340

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Reference or add approbriate text

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1** *SC* **1.5** *P* **17** *L* **35** # 50
Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Don't add abbreviations that only one clause uses.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete HRT, probably more.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **79** *SC* **79.3.7** *P* **28** *L* **32** # 51
Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

The "additional Ethernet capabilities" field is n octets long. n isn't specified. The first two octets of the field are defined, additional octets are reserved. Reserved octets shall not be transmitted. If fewer octet(s) are received than defined, the implementation shall act as if the additional octet(s) were received as zero.

So, whatever TLV information string length 4+n is transmitted, the receiver has to act as if it were 4+2, or 4+1, or 4+0. Is the idea that n allows for future expansion? If one TLV can follow another, how does the receiver know where to look for the next one if the TLV information string length is misleading? All the TLVs in the base Clause 79 that I saw seemed to be fixed length.

SuggestedRemedy

It would be simpler to commit to a fixed additional Ethernet capabilities length, 2 or 3 bytes.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **79** *SC* **79.4.2** *P* **29** *L* **34** # 32
Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Tidying up.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the middle column wider to fit its contents. Also Table 79-10, Table 99-1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **90** *SC* **90.4.3.1.1** *P* **32** *L* **19** # 1
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

90.5.1 is part of this amendment, so "90.5.1" should be a cross-reference (not forest green).

Same issue for "90.5.2" on line 40

SuggestedRemedy

Change "90.5.1" and "90.5.2" to be cross-references.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **90** *SC* **90.4.3.1.1** *P* **32** *L* **21** # 29
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

This addition of another variable seems unnecessarily complex. The bridge (or end station) is supposed to have port configuration information that knows this is a pMAC and therefore unsuitable for use in timed applications. Second, the indication should only take place upon the passage of a legacy SFD. The new SFD codings will not exert it.

SuggestedRemedy

Removed the new text.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **90** *SC* **90.4.3.2.1** *P* **32** *L* **43** # 30
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

New text is unnecessary

SuggestedRemedy

Remove new text.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **1** *P* **35** *L* **9** # 22

Szczepanek, Andre Inphi

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

RE "operating at 100 Mb/s or higher"

The byte orientated service interfaces detailed in this draft are incompatible with the 100MBps RS layer defined in Clause 22 which is nibble orientated.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "operating at 100 Mb/s or higher" to "operating at 1000 Mb/s or higher"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **3.2** *P* **40** *L* **31** # 21

Szczepanek, Andre Inphi

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

Wrong Figure Index - should be 99-4(a)/(b)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "99-3(a)" to "99-4(a)"
Change "99-3(b)" to "99-4(b)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **4.7.7** *P* **50** *L* **5** # 4

Lewis, Jon Dell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

In the state diagram shown in figure 99-5 many of the text elements in the flow diagram boxes are touching or almost touching the line above it making it much more difficult to read when zoomed out. This includes the following States:
INIT_TX_PROC
EXPRESS_TX
E_TX_COMPLETE
P_TX_COMPLETE

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the diagram to allow more room between the text and the state frame box.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **4.7.7** *P* **51** *L* **8** # 5

Lewis, Jon Dell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Several text entries in the state diagram 99-6 are difficult to read when zoomed out as the text seems to be too close to the state box line just above it. These include the following states
IDLE_RX_PROC
CHECK_FOR_START
REPLACE_SMD
BAD_FRAG
P_RECEIVE_DATA
CHECK_FRAG_CNT
INCREMENT_FRAG_CNT

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the state diagram to add more space between the text and the state box.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **90.4.3.1.1** *P* **32** *L* **22** # 14

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

"The MM parameter is mandatory when the MAC Merge sublayer (see Clause 99) is instantiated." seems to be a requirement statement but does not use proper wording (no "shall"). Same issue in 90.4.3.2.1. However the shall statement comes later in the draft (90.5.1).

SuggestedRemedy

Make this statement a factual statement. "When the MAC Merge sublayer (see Clause 99) is instantiated the MM parameter is included in the TX_TX.indication."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **35** *L* **10** # 52

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

The 5C "Broad Market Potential" response talks about automotive and industrial. According to other recent projects, that's 100 Mb/s and 1 Gb/s. Yet this says "at 100 Mb/s or higher". Changing the Ethernet MAC, as this project does, would be less unpalatable to the industry if it were restricted to the speeds (and preferably the PHY types) where it makes sense; for higher speeds, the time saving from preemption becomes smaller but the delay through cables doesn't, so it is less attractive. Judging by the very poor level of attendance and positive voting for this project, the industry isn't attracted anyway.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "at 100 Mb/s or higher" to "at 100 Mb/s or 1 Gb/s". Make this normative (yes I know people could mis-apply it anyway). Preferably, give an explicit list of applicable PHY types.
As a later project, 2.5 and 5GBASE-T should decide if this makes sense at either of their speeds and include it or not.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **35** *L* **22** # 33

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

"the MAC Merge sublayer may prevent the pMAC from starting transmission of preemptable traffic." So this proposed thing is clearly a new MAC, because it controls access to the medium. A new MAC client with roughly twice as many queues, management registers, everything, is needed to use it. This isn't "Conformance with the IEEE Std 802.3 MAC", "conformance with the MAC client interface" or "conform to the full-duplex operating mode of the IEEE 802.3 MAC" as alleged in the 5C "Compatibility" response. It forces anyone with a MAC design to redesign it.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise the 5C responses to reflect that this is a new or modified MAC, get a vote from 802.3 as to whether they want that;
or revise the draft so that it conforms to the 5C "Compatibility" response;
or terminate the project, like P802.3ar Congestion Management.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **35** *L* **24** # 18

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syst

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

The meaning of the word "holds" is ambiguous.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "stops" which is what the signal is actually doing, also insert the word "either" so the text reads:

"This clause also specifies a MAC Merge Service Interface (MMSI) providing a primitive that either stops or resumes transmission of preemptable traffic"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **35** *L* **30** # 19

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syst

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

It is not entirely clear what effect the MMSI service primitive has.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to:
"When preemption capability is active, the MAC Merge sublayer allows the MMSI service primitive to prevent transmission of frames over the preemptable MAC service interface and frames provided over the express MAC service interface (express traffic) to interrupt transmission of frames provided over the preemptable MAC service interface (preemptable traffic)."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **35** *L* **39** # 20

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syst

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Figure 99-1 does not mention the MMSI at all.

Also Figure 99-1 does not mention the eMAC and the pMAC.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider deleting the text "and the MMSI" on line 39 page 35.

In Figure 99-1 on page 36 line 9 change the two references to "MAC — MEDIA ACCESS CONTROL" to just "eMAC" and "pMAC".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **35** *L* **44** # 36

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Reconciliation sublayers: how many? I can see only one in the figure. If singular, it's a proper noun.

SuggestedRemedy

Per 1.4.354, Reconciliation Sublayer (capital S).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **35** *L* **46** # 26

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

The definition of "conjunction" [noun: the action or an instance of two or more events or things occurring at the same point in time or space.] doesn't really work here. Please redo the text.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest the following: "A MAC Control Sublayer associated with an eMAC or a pMAC shall not generate PAUSE when the associated MAC Merge sublayer is active."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **35** *L* **48** # 37

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

"Preemption capability is only enabled after". So, not what? disabled? enhanced? verified?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Preemption capability is enabled only after".
Check the other "only"s in the draft: change
The frag_count field is only present in mPackets with SMD-C. to
The frag_count field is present only in mPackets with SMD-C.
Change
preemption only occurs if at least 60 octets
to
preemption occurs only if at least 60 octets
(this one might be better expressed in the negative).
Change
The PLS_CARRIER.indication primitive is only produced during
to
The PLS_CARRIER.indication primitive is produced only during
(this one would be better re-ordered; see another comment).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **35** *L* **48** # 44

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

This says "Preemption capability is only enabled after it has been determined that the link partner supports it (see 99.4.2)" and 99.4.2 says "The preemption capability is enabled in the transmit direction only if it is determined that the link partner supports the preemption capability", but 99.4.3 says "Verification may be disabled", which it seems breaks the promises made in 99.1 and 99.4.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Either do what you said you would do, or don't claim you are doing it and explain how to safely use this thing without verification.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **35** *L* **49** # 39

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

I expected to find something about compatibility; what happens if one connects this new thing, which is a new MAC apart from the name, to a link partner with a regular 802.3 MAC? Will it work? Will it bring a network down? 99.4 talks about "device that does not support preemption or that has preemption disabled" but that could contain a MAC Merge sublayer and 2 MACs; what about one that doesn't?

SuggestedRemedy

Assure us of compatibility and interoperability (or terminate the project).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **36** *L* **1** # 34

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Tidying up.

SuggestedRemedy

ETHERNET LAYERS can go on one line.
This and OSI REFERENCE MODEL LAYERS are headings at the same level so should be opposite each other.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1** *P* **36** *L* **22** # 35

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

What does "Media Independent Interfaces for implementations" mean?

SuggestedRemedy

Change "for the Media Independent Interfaces for implementations of 100 Mb/s..." to "for media independent interfaces at 100 Mb/s..."?

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.1.1** *P* **36** *L* **33** # 38

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Section 6 uses "relationship to" 18 times and "relationship with" once (in Time Sync). Here we have "99.1.1 Relationship with other IEEE standards".

SuggestedRemedy

To match the base spec, a sentence on the previous page, and the figure title just above, change "with" to "to".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.2.2** *P* **39** *L* **5** # 27

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

I see no need for this primitive. If the merge function is enabled and a frame is presented to the eMAC for transmission then it should be transmitted ASAP and any necessary preemption should take place without any further control needed.
Any hold-off function needed on the pMAC side can take place at the transmit buffer in the bridge.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove sub-clause 99.22

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.2.2.1.3** *P* **39** *L* **34** # 55

Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Comment #40 against D2.1 was only partly implemented. "MAC Merge" here should be "the MAC Merge sublayer".

Also in 99.3, line 93, "MAC Merge sublayer" should be "the MAC Merge sublayer".

The latter appears in several places.

SuggestedRemedy

Please go over the draft and verify that "MAC Merge" includes "sublayer" where necessary, and has the proper articles - it is difficult to make this kind of change in a PDF reader.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.3.3** *P* **40** *L* **37** # 23

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Changing delimiters means that all media side test equipment for this (small market) technology will have to have a hardware change from legacy equipment. If a scheme were used that kept the legacy delimiter, then legacy and current main market test equipment could be used in IET applications with only a software change

SuggestedRemedy

Use a scheme that doesn't require a new frame delimiter or delimiters. Using the established delimiter will at least provide hardware compatibility with broad market test equipment both in manufacturing and in the user field.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.3.3** *P* **40** *L* **37** # 28

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

I am pretty unhappy with the entire approach of having multiple new values of the start frame/packet delimiter. To my knowledge there has been no investigation of the error robustness of such a scheme, especially one with multiple values. At the time of the initial approval there was significant discourse and investigation of the error robustness of the SFD. One of the results of that discussion was to require additional error checking on a per packet basis by the addition of a length field.

SuggestedRemedy

Use a scheme that doesn't require a new frame delimiter or delimiters. Using the established delimiter will at least provide equivalent performance to current implementa tions.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.3.3** *P* **41** *L* **18** # 25

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Through line 22
I don't understand why these values are shown, or at least shown this way in the table. As I understand it, these situations should never occur.

SuggestedRemedy

If that is the case, the values should be marked as "error" or "reserved".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.3.6** *P* **42** *L* **27** # 40

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

This says "XORing the calculated 32 bits with 0x0000 FFFF". In the terminology of 3.2.9, is the left-most or first bit from an 0 or from an F?

SuggestedRemedy

Please specify explicitly.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.4** *P* **42** *L* **30** # 41

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

MAC Merge Sublayer Operation

SuggestedRemedy

MAC Merge sublayer operation

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.4.1** *P* **42** *L* **40** # 42

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

MAC Merge sublayer passes through the packets presented by the pMAC and eMAC without alteration

SuggestedRemedy

the packets presented by the pMAC and eMAC pass through the MAC Merge sublayer without alteration
or
the MAC Merge sublayer passes the packets presented by the pMAC and eMAC through without alteration

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.4.1** *P* **42** *L* **41** # 16

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

"If both the eMAC and pMAC have a packet ready to transmit and no packet is being transmitted, the eMAC packet is transmitted." Presumable this is the behavior when the remote MAC does not support preemption yet this behavior is different from the most common MAC where there is a one to one relationship between the MAC and PHY and could result is problems when the remote does not support preemption. The statement implies the MAC Merge layer acts as a strict priority scheduler when disabled (eMAC frames always preferred over pMAC frames). If the remote MAC only has one MAC (and thus only on DA) and not two, frames from either the pMAC or the eMAC will be dropped at the remote station. Even if the remote MAC does support 2 MAC addresses frames could arrive the remote MAC out of order.

SuggestedRemedy

Recommend when link partner does not support preemption that either the pMAC or eMAC be disabled instead.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.4.3** *P* **43** *L* **12** # 43

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Blank line.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.4.4** *P* **43** *L* **53** # 53

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Shouldn't there be some text mentioning the frame count feature here, as there is for Receive Processing?

SuggestedRemedy

Add some text mentioning the frame count feature.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.4.4** *P* **44** *L* **10** # 46

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Link Interruption - what?

SuggestedRemedy

Please provide a cross-reference. I could not find a statement of which PHYs use this.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.4.4** *P* **44** *L* **10** # 45

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

The PLS_CARRIER.indication primitive is only produced during full duplex operation when EEE or Link Interruption is supported.

SuggestedRemedy

In full duplex operation, the PLS_CARRIER.indication primitive is not produced unless EEE or Link Interruption is supported.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.4.7.1** *P* **45** *L* **37** # 54

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

This says "PLS service interface between MAC Merge sublayer and PLS" but 6, Physical Signaling (PLS) service specifications, says "This clause specifies the services provided by the PLS sublayer to the MAC sublayer for 1 Mb/s and 10 Mb/s implementations of this standard" which are invalid speeds for MAC Merge.

SuggestedRemedy

PLS service interface between MAC Merge sublayer and RS?

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **99** *SC* **99.5** *P* **54** *L* **1** # 17

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

A quick scan of Cl 99 revels 18 "shall" statement but there are only 15 PICS statements. These should be aligned

SuggestedRemedy

Either reduce the "shall" statements or add PICS statements so every requirement is listed in the PICS.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **999** *SC* **999** *P* **2** *L* **3** # 47

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

The abstract isn't a suitable place for advertising material.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "Adoption of Ethernet into new market areas such as automotive, industrial automation, transportation (aircraft, railway and heavy trucks) has generated a need to converge low latency and best effort traffic streams." As they appear nowhere else in the draft, delete "automotive" and "industrial" from the list of keywords.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **999** *SC* **999** *P* **12** *L* **7** # 49

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

and associated annexes includes

SuggestedRemedy

and associated annexes include

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**