CI **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 23

Remein, Duane   Huawei

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

I concur with comment #13 from Draft 2.2 by Steve Trowbridge. The terminology of the draft needs to be updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 24

Remein, Duane   Huawei

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

I concur with Geoff Thompson's Comment #31 from Draft 2.2. The PAR states participation in THIS TASK FORCE of about 30 persons.
In reviewing the minutes of the past meetings here is what I observe:
Bonita Spring 3 + 2 part time
Waikoloa   5 (4 of 5 sessions or more) + 5 (2 of 5 sessions or less)
Pittsburgh   3 (4 of 5 sessions or more) + 1 (3 of 5 sessions) + 7 (2 of 5 sessions or less)
Berlin   3 (2 of 2 sessions) + 1 (1 of 2 sessions)
Atlanta   6 (3 of 3 sessions for all)
San Antonio 10 (2 of 2 sessions for all)
Ottawa   14 (7 for 1 of 2 sessions)
San Diego   14 (4 for 1 of 3 sessions)
Norfolk   13 (4 for 1 of 2 sessions)
Beijing   7 (for 1 of 1 half-day session)
Indian Wells 13 (3 for 1 of 3 sessions)

From this data I can only conclude that at no meetings did TF attendance reach even 1/2 the approximate number stated in the PAR.

SuggestedRemedy

Per original comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* (

Hajduczenia, Marek   Bright House Networks

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

This is a pile on to comment #13 against D2.2

SuggestedRemedy

Please implement comment #13 against D2.2

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **1**   *SC* **1.4.209**   *P* **25**   *L*

Kong, Samuel   Marvell

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

change the word "pause" to "PAUSE"

SuggestedRemedy

change the word "pause" to "PAUSE"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **30**   *SC* **30.2.3**   *P* **19**   *L*

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting

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

Commenter recognizes this is out of scope for this recirculation
crossreferences on all blocks.

SuggestedRemedy

Show all sections in figure as 'forest green' marked with tag 'ext

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **30**   *SC* **30.2.5**   *P* **21**   *L*

Gardner, Andrew   Linear Technology

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

CI **30**   *SC* **30.14.1.13**   *P* **26**   *L* **51**   # 16

Gardner, Andrew   Linear Technology

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

Suggest adding page break before 30.14.1.13 for better continuity

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **79**   *SC* **79.3.7.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **44**   # 22

Remein, Duane   Huawei

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

Wording: "if more octets are received that were defined"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "that" to "then" so the statement reads:
"if more octets are received than were defined

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **79**   *SC* **79.3.7.2**   *P* **28**   *L* **52**   # 4

Hajduczenia, Marek   Bright House Networks

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

Unnecessary optionality "the Additional Ethernet Capabilities TLV should be sent in an LLDPDU
addressed to the Nearest Bridge group address (see IEEE 802.1Q)." - if we intend for
interoperabilty, we need to leave as few "should" statements as possible and nail down all options
down.
Additionally, there is no viable option presented (what address is to be used when the Nearest
Bridge group is not used)

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "the Additional Ethernet Capabilities TLV shall be sent in an LLDPDU addressed to
the Nearest Bridge group address (see IEEE 802.1Q)."
Update PICS as needed

CI **79**   *SC* **79.3.7.2**   *P* **28**   *L* 5

Hajduczenia, Marek   Bright House Networks

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

Incorrect reference to 802.1Q

SuggestedRemedy

Is "IEEE 802.1Q" and should be "IEEE Std 802.1Q"
There are multiple locations in the draft where such a change is
modified in D2.1)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **90**   *SC* **90.4.3.1.1**   *P* **32**   *L*

Tretter, Albert   Siemens AG

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

In clause the description the text is underlined. It is not clear why
clauses at page 33 and 34.

SuggestedRemedy

Either explain why underlined or remove it

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **35**   *L*

Remein, Duane   Huawei

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

This wording is clumsy and can easily be improved.
"the MAC Merge sublayer may prevent the start of transmission

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
"the MAC Merge sublayer may prevent the start of packet transm

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.3.3**   *P* **40**   *L* **46**   # 27

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syste

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

The text "additional fragment counter" suggests that the counter is counting additional fragments which is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text from:

"and includes an additional fragment counter octet (frag_count) following the SMD"

To:

"and following the SMD has an additional octet for the fragment count (frag_count)"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.3.3**   *P* **41**   *L* **29**   # 2

Belitz, Tobias   Renesas

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

For an MII Interface which is a nibble based interface, there is the possibility to detect an SMD-E instead of an SMD-C3.

This is due to the sequence of nibbles provided by the PHY interface. For instance: 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'hD – 4'hA ...

Inside of the MAC every nibble a octet check is done. Due to the nibble stream the SFD 8'hD5 will come always before the SMD-C3 value 8'hAD is noticed hence all SMD-C3 frames are recognized as SMD-E frames. (A presentation is created to exemplify the issue IEEE_802.3br_wrong_SFD_detection.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy

The problem is the "D" inside of the SMD-C3 octet 8'hAD, hence we propose to use a encoding different than 0x?D.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.3.3**   *P* **41**   *L*

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syste

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

You cannot use an SMD encoding of 0xAD with a 100Mbps nibb number of nibbles on the receive interface the D in 0xAD will loo SMD-E.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 0xAD to something else.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.3.4**   *P* **41**   *L*

Kong, Samuel   Marvell

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

The frag_count of the initial fragment is '0' as described in this s and 99-6 the frag_count of the first continuing fragment is '0'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the frag_count description to match Fig.99-5 and 99-6

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.3.6**   *P* **42**   *L*

Kong, Samuel   Marvell

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

Add a note for further clarification for mCRC

SuggestedRemedy

The mCRC value is same as inverting the last 2 bytes of CRC.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**	*SC* **99.3.6**	*P* **42**	*L* **29**	#	19

Remein, Duane   Huawei

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

Note appears to be using an incorrect paragraph tag

SuggestedRemedy

Change to Note (Time New Roman, 9pt)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**	*SC* **99.3.6**	*P* **42**	*L* **29**	#	37

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting

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

"NOTE—0x0000 is XORed with two octets that contain the higher order coefficients of the CRC and 0xFFFF is XORed

with the two octets that contain the lower order coefficients of the CRC." - the first part of this statement is meaningless. XOR'ing 0x0000 with something is doing NOTHING. It leaves the reader scratching his/her head as to what was meant.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the first sentence of the note, so that it reads:
"0xFFFF is XORed with the two octets that contain the lower order coefficients of the CRC."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**	*SC* **99.3.6**	*P* **43**	*L* **29**	#	6

Hajduczenia, Marek   Bright House Networks

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

Inconsistent format of hex numbers: 0x0000 FFFF, 0x0000 …

SuggestedRemedy

Please use the separation with "-" every two hex symbols - this makes reading much simpler.
Change (for example): 0x0000 to 0x00-00; 0x0000 FFFF to 0x00-00-FF-FF

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**	*SC* **99.4.2**	*P* **42**	*L* 5	

Tretter, Albert   Siemens AG

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

"...if it is determined that the link partner s ..."
=> I assume the word "supports" is missing

SuggestedRemedy

Proposal: The preemption capability is enabled in the transmit di
the link partner supports the preemption capability.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**	*SC* **99.4.2**	*P* **42**	*L* 5

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syste

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

Typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"partner s"
To:
"partner supports"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**	*SC* **99.4.3**	*P* **43**	*L*

Remein, Duane   Huawei

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

Here you state that verification may be disabled yet on page 36 li
capability is enabled only after it has been determined that the lin
These statements seem to be self contradictory.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide normative language for when verification can be disable

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.4.4**   *P* **44**   *L* **8**   # 21

Remein, Duane   Huawei

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

Transmit s/b lower case in the following:
"When preemption capability is active, Transmit processing"

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.4.7.3**   *P* **47**   *L* **7**   # 13

Gardner, Andrew   Linear Technology

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

Missing period at end of sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.4.7.3**   *P* **47**   *L* **30**   # 14

Gardner, Andrew   Linear Technology

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

Missing period at end of sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.4.7.4**   *P* **49**   *L*

Belitz, Tobias   Renesas

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

Under certain circumstances during verification of the preempti
preemptable frame is starting with SFD (0xD5) and continued w
Preemptable frame has to starts when the link verification is not
transmission the link Verification is successful completed which
preemption. This would cause to send an incorrect frame on the
exemplify the issue (IEEE_802.3br_SMDS_Encoding.pdf).

SuggestedRemedy

The origin of the problem is the pActive variable, the definition sh
circumstances it could not change its state (FALSE -> TRUE) v
ongoing.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.4.7.7**   *P* **51**   *L*

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syste

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

The value of the "pActive" and "preempt" variable can change du
state. This means the transmit state machine can cause fragmen
0xD5.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider only allowing the pActive variable to change in the IDL

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99**   *SC* **99.4.8**   *P* **53**   *L*

Gardner, Andrew   Linear Technology

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

There is an instance of must in subclause 99.4.8 that pertains to
sensitive data.

CI **99**	*SC* **Table 99-1**	*P* **41**	*L* **3, 11**	# 31

Kong, Samuel   Marvell

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

For MII mode, a packet containing Preambles followed by 0xD and 0xA can be decoded as either SMD-E or SMD-C3 depending on the even or odd numbers of Preamble nibbles

SuggestedRemedy

Use a different encoded value for SMD-C3 other than 0xAD

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

CI **99,1**	*SC* **99,1**	*P* **35**	*L* **39**	# 5

Hajduczenia, Marek   Bright House Networks

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

The text which was added in D2.1 could use some technical improvement.
"Preemption capability is most useful at lower operating speeds. The duration of a maximum size frame (2000 octets) on a 100 Mb/s link is 160 us and on a 1 Gb/s link is 16 us. This is an upper bound on the additional delay before a MAC Client can send an Express frame when preemption capability is not used. At higher operating speeds the additional delay gets smaller in proportion to the speed."

The frame length for specific speeds it just an example, and should be marked as such. Second, the maximum frame size should be referenced through link to Clause 3 and not explicitly stated (can be changed over time).
The statement "This is an upper bound on the additional delay before a MAC Client can send an Express frame when preemption capability is not used." is out of place.
2000 byte frame is also not correct - it is 2000 byte packet.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the statement "This is an upper bound on the additional delay before a MAC Client can send an Express frame when preemption capability is not used.".
Change "The duration of a maximum size frame (2000 octets) on a 100 Mb/s link is 160 us and on a 1 Gb/s link is 16 us" to read "For example, the duration of a maximum size packet (see 3.2.7) on a 100 Mb/s link is 160 us and on a 1 Gb/s link is 16 us"
Change "At higher operating speeds the additional delay gets smaller in proportion to the speed." to "At higher operating speed.s this additional delay gets smaller in proportion to the link speed.

CI **99,1**	*SC* **99,1**	*P* **36**	*L*

Kong, Samuel   Marvell

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

Add a note for further clarification for PAUSE

SuggestedRemedy

Add "(see IEEE 802.3 Annex 31B)" right after "PAUSE"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**