IEEE P802.3br D2.4 Interspersing Express Traffic (IET) 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

CI 00 SC 0	Р	L	# 3	C/99 SC 99	9.1 F	°35 L40	0 # <u>8</u>
Grow, Robert	RMG Consulting	g		Scruton, Peter	Uni	versity of New Ham	
Comment Type TR	Comment Status X			Comment Type	T Comment Statu	is X	
Concur with D2.2 ballo	t comment #13.				uration of a 2000 byte fran		
SuggestedRemedy Per D2.2 ballot comme	nt #10			(additional 64 b would be 16.06	it times). So this would ma 4 uS.	ake the delay at 100) be 160.64 and for 1000
				SuggestedRemedy			
Proposed Response	Response Status O			"For example, the Mb/s link is 160	he duration of a 2000 octe .64 us and on a 1 Gb/s lin	t packet (including F k is 16.064 us."	Preamble and SFD) on a 100
C/ 00 SC 0 Grow, Robert	P RMG Consulting	L	# 2	Proposed Response	e Response Statu	s O	
Comment Type TR	Comment Status X			CI 99 SC 99	9.1 F	°35 L40	0 # 6
Concur with D2.2 ballo	t comment #31 first comment p	aragraph, and r	ecommendation to	Scruton, Peter	Uni	versity of New Ham	
withdraw or hibernate t	he project. I also disagree with	the rebutted to	that paint Thara has				
				Comment Type	T Comment Statu	is X	
been insufficient partic correct, do not break o	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, an	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc	re specifications are	21	T Comment Statue erbound on the additional .		
been insufficient partici correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc	re specifications are	"This is an uppe I don't see this a	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the	" upperbound should	
been insufficient partic correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa SuggestedRemedy	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, ar ation promised in the PAR has r	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc	re specifications are	"This is an uppe I don't see this a SFD and the tin	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the ne to transmit the IPG as th	" upperbound should hat would be the ext	tra delay if they were both
been insufficient partici correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa SuggestedRemedy Withdraw or hibernate	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, an ation promised in the PAR has r the project	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc	re specifications are	"This is an uppe I don't see this a SFD and the tin presented at the	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the ne to transmit the IPG as th	" upperbound should hat would be the ext	tra delay if they were both
been insufficient partici correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa SuggestedRemedy Withdraw or hibernate	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, ar ation promised in the PAR has r	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc	re specifications are	"This is an uppe I don't see this a SFD and the tin presented at the SuggestedRemedy	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the ne to transmit the IPG as th	" upperbound should hat would be the ext	
been insufficient partici correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa SuggestedRemedy Withdraw or hibernate	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, an ation promised in the PAR has r the project	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc	re specifications are	"This is an uppe I don't see this a SFD and the tim presented at the SuggestedRemedy Solution 1:	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the ne to transmit the IPG as th	" upperbound should hat would be the ext I be 16000 + 64 + 9	tra delay if they were both 6 = 16160 or 161.6uS at 100
been insufficient partic correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa SuggestedRemedy Withdraw or hibernate Proposed Response	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, an ation promised in the PAR has r the project <i>Response Status</i> O	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc	re specifications are	"This is an uppe I don't see this a SFD and the tim presented at the SuggestedRemedy Solution 1: This, along with	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the ne to transmit the IPG as t e same time. Which would	" upperbound should hat would be the ext I be 16000 + 64 + 9	tra delay if they were both 6 = 16160 or 161.6uS at 100
been insufficient partici correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa SuggestedRemedy Withdraw or hibernate Proposed Response	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, an ation promised in the PAR has r the project <i>Response Status</i> O	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc not been met.	re specifications are reptably restrict future	"This is an uppe I don't see this a SFD and the tin presented at the SuggestedRemedy Solution 1: This, along with Solution 2:	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the ne to transmit the IPG as t e same time. Which would	" upperbound should hat would be the ext be 16000 + 64 + 9 n IPG, provides an	tra delay if they were both 6 = 16160 or 161.6uS at 100 . "
been insufficient partici correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa SuggestedRemedy Withdraw or hibernate Proposed Response Cl 30 SC 30.14.1.5 Scruton, Peter Comment Type E	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, an ation promised in the PAR has r the project <i>Response Status</i> O	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc not been met.	re specifications are reptably restrict future	"This is an uppe I don't see this a SFD and the tin presented at the SuggestedRemedy Solution 1: This, along with Solution 2:	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the ne to transmit the IPG as the same time. Which would the time associated for ar ith the delay calculation of	" upperbound should hat would be the exi be 16000 + 64 + 90 h IPG, provides an the previous senter	tra delay if they were both 6 = 16160 or 161.6uS at 100 . "
been insufficient partici correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa SuggestedRemedy Withdraw or hibernate Proposed Response Cl 30 SC 30.14.1.5 Scruton, Peter	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, an ation promised in the PAR has r the project <i>Response Status</i> O <i>P</i> 25 University of Ne	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc not been met.	re specifications are reptably restrict future	"This is an uppe I don't see this a SFD and the tin presented at the SuggestedRemedy Solution 1: This, along with Solution 2: or combine it wi	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the ne to transmit the IPG as the same time. Which would the time associated for ar the the delay calculation of	" upperbound should hat would be the exi be 16000 + 64 + 90 h IPG, provides an the previous senter	tra delay if they were both 6 = 16160 or 161.6uS at 100 . "
been insufficient partici correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa SuggestedRemedy Withdraw or hibernate Proposed Response Cl 30 SC 30.14.1.5 Scruton, Peter Comment Type E Excess period	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, an ation promised in the PAR has r the project <i>Response Status</i> O <i>P</i> 25 University of Ne	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc not been met. <i>L</i> 19 ew Ham	# 7	"This is an uppe I don't see this a SFD and the tin presented at the SuggestedRemedy Solution 1: This, along with Solution 2: or combine it wi	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the ne to transmit the IPG as the same time. Which would the time associated for ar the the delay calculation of	" upperbound should hat would be the exi be 16000 + 64 + 90 h IPG, provides an the previous senter	tra delay if they were both 6 = 16160 or 161.6uS at 100 . "
been insufficient partici correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa SuggestedRemedy Withdraw or hibernate Proposed Response C/ 30 SC 30.14.1.5 Scruton, Peter Comment Type E Excess period (unimportant and addit	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, an ation promised in the PAR has r the project <i>Response Status</i> O <i>P</i> 25 University of Ne <i>Comment Status</i> X	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc not been met. <i>L</i> 19 ew Ham	# 7	"This is an uppe I don't see this a SFD and the tin presented at the SuggestedRemedy Solution 1: This, along with Solution 2: or combine it wi	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the ne to transmit the IPG as the same time. Which would the time associated for ar the the delay calculation of	" upperbound should hat would be the exi be 16000 + 64 + 90 h IPG, provides an the previous senter	tra delay if they were both 6 = 16160 or 161.6uS at 100 . "
been insufficient partici correct, do not break o PHY options. Participa SuggestedRemedy Withdraw or hibernate Proposed Response Cl 30 SC 30.14.1.5 Scruton, Peter Comment Type E Excess period	ipation from experts in IEEE Sto ther portions of the standard, an ation promised in the PAR has r the project <i>Response Status</i> O <i>P</i> 25 University of Ne <i>Comment Status</i> X	d 802.3 to assur nd do not unacc not been met. <i>L</i> 19 ew Ham	# 7	"This is an uppe I don't see this a SFD and the tin presented at the SuggestedRemedy Solution 1: This, along with Solution 2: or combine it wi	erbound on the additional . as the upperbound as the ne to transmit the IPG as the same time. Which would the time associated for ar the the delay calculation of	" upperbound should hat would be the exi be 16000 + 64 + 90 h IPG, provides an the previous senter	tra delay if they were both 6 = 16160 or 161.6uS at 100 . "

C/ 99 SC 99.1

IEEE P802.3br D2.4 Interspersing Express Traffic (IET) 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

The binary transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octed of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the Rame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.)	Comment Type E Comment Status X Statement: "0x55 (binary transmission order is 10101010 as IEEE 802.3-2012 subclause 3.1.1 states transmission order of a byte as LSB to MSB, but 0x55 in binary is not 10101010. (Irecognize this may be out of scope for this comment cycle, but it would appear to be an easy fix.) SuggestedRemedy change to something like: Dx55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status O CI 99 SC 99.3.6 P42 L23 # 12 Struton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octed the firme (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. SuggestedRemedy (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by:"	CI 99	SC 99	9.3.2	P	40	L 33	# 11	C/ 99	SC 99.4.3		P 43	L 20	# 13
Statement: "Dx55 (binary 101010)." The binary transmission order of a byte as LSB to MSB, but 0x55 in binary is not 10101010. (Out of scope. Easy fix, but reject as out of scope at your liesure should you choose.) Suggested/Remedy (I recognize this may be out of scope for this comment cycle, but it would appear to be an easy fix.) (Out of scope. Easy fix, but reject as out of scope at your liesure should you choose.) Suggested/Remedy (Change to something like: (Out of scope. Easy fix, but reject as out of scope at your liesure should you choose.) Stypested/Remedy (Change to something like: (Out of scope. Easy fix, but reject as out of scope at your liesure should you choose.) Stypested/Remedy (Change to something like: (Out of scope. Easy fix, but reject as out of scope at your liesure should you choose.) Stypested/Remedy (Change to something like: (Out of scope. Easy fix, but reject as out of scope at your liesure should you choose.) Stypested/Remedy (Change to something like: (Out of scope. Easy fix, but reject as out of scope at your liesure should you choose.) Stypested/Remedy (Durits of the transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). (Proposed Response Response Status O Stypested/Remedy (Durits its off the Scope of the Ham (Durits its off the frame from the first coted to the frame from the first byte of the MDATA field. (Durits its off the frame sent byte of the MDATA field.	Statematic "Ox55 (binary transmission order is 10101010 as IEEE 802.3-2012 subclause 3.1.1 states transmission order of a byte as LSB to MGB, but 0x55 in binary is not 10101010. (I recognize this may be out of scope for this comment cycle, but it would appear to be an easy fix.) missing period (U recognize this may be out of scope for this comment cycle, but it would appear to be an easy fix.) missing period Wiggested/Remedy change to something like: Ox55 (Which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). hoposed Response Response Status O Xing 99 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 Control Type Control Type Control Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet of the frame end generate member all octes transmitted in all revious fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted mADATA fields sent for this frame. I(u durattand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) Wiggested/Remedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by:" Heiler be able for this conternent is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.)	Scruton,	Peter		Univ	ersity of N	lew Ham		Scruton, F	Peter	ι	Jniversity of	New Ham	
 "0x55 (binary 10101010)." The binary transmission order is 10101010 as IEEE 602.3-2012 subclause 3.1.1 states transmission order of a byte as LSB to MSB, but 0x56 in binary is not 10101010. (I recognize this may be out of scope for this comment cycle, but it would appear to be an easy fix.) Suggested/Remedy change to something like: 0x55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status O Cf 99 SC 99.3.6 P42 L23 # [12] Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the GRC by the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) Suggested/Remedy 	"txt55 (binary 101010)." The binary transmission order is 10101010 as IEEE 802.3-2012 subclause 3.1.1 states transmission order of a byte as LSB to MSB, but 0x55 in binary is not 10101010. (Out of scope. Easy fix, but reject as out of scope at your liesure should you choose.) SuggestedRemedy (arcstand by the out of scope for this comment cycle, but it would appear to be an easy fix.) (Out of scope. Easy fix, but reject as out of scope at your liesure should you choose.) SuggestedRemedy (chard to scope at bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 Test states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on at transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on at transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on at transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on at transmitted in all previous fragments of the calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by:	Commen	Туре	E	Comment Status	5 X			Comment	Туре Е	Comment St	atus X		
The binary transmitted in that mPacket would be the last octed of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. SuggestedRemedy Correct transmitted in that mPacket to its would be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Correct to its transmitted to its frame and generate mCRC based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octes transmitted must first first meand generate mCRC based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	The binary transmission order is 1010101 as IEEE 802.3-2012 subclause 3.1.1 states transmission order of a byte as LSB to MSB, but 0x55 in binary is not 10101010. (I recognize this may be out of scope for this comment cycle, but it would appear to be an easy fix.) Suggested/Remedy change to something like: 0x56 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status 0 CI 99 SC 99.3.6 P42 L23 # [2] Control Pter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on status frame, and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) Suggested/Remedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by:"			0101010))."				missi	ng period				
transmission order of a byte as LSB to MSB, but 0x55 in binary is not 10101010. (I recognize this may be out of scope for this comment cycle, but it would appear to be an easy fix.) SuggestedRemedy change to something like: 0x55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status 0 Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P42 L23 # 12 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted MDATA field. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	transmission order of a byte as LSB to MSB, but 0x55 in binary is not 10101010. (I recognize this may be out of scope for this comment cycle, but it would appear to be an easy fix.) SuggestedRemedy change to something like: 0 0x55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 Image: the content status X Image: the content status X Image: the content status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the cotte following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the frame and generate mCRC based on starting from the first byte of the frame and generate mCRC based on starting from the first frame and generate mCRC based on starting from the first frame and generate mCRC based on starting the should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "			,	,		902 2 2012 aub	alauraa 2.4.4 atataa	(Out o	of scope. Easy f	ix, but reject as ou	it of scope a	at your liesure sho	ould you choose.)
(I recognize this may be out of scope for this comment cycle, but it would appear to be an easy fix.) "Transmission of a verify packet is repeated if no response is received." SuggestedRemedy change to something like: 0 0x55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status 0 Cl 9 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first parent dignerate to the grament of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted mDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy SuggestedRemedy SuggestedRemedy SuggestedRemedy	(I recognize this may be out of scope for this comment cycle, but it would appear to be a easy fix.) "Transmission of a verify packet is repeated if no response is received." SuggestedRemedy change to something like: 0 Ox55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 # D Scruton, Peter University of New Ham D D D D Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first to be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Delieve the intention is to be the last octet of this frame and generate mCRC based on starting from the first byte of the frame and generate mCRC based on starting the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octes transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (Understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: " Here								00	2				
easy fix.) Proposed Response Response Status O SuggestedRemedy change to something like: 0x55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P42 L23 # 12 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Status X Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	reasy fix.) Proposed Response Response Status O Suggested/Remedy change to something like: Ox55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the MDATA field sent for this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted for this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted for this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted on the societs of the current MDATA field by: * SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: *	/l roc	ognizo thic	a may ba	out of agona for th	ia aamma	nt avala hut it v	rould appear to be ap			erify packet is rep	eated if no r	esponse is receiv	ved "
SuggestedRemedy Ox55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status O Response Status Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octed of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octest transmitted and previous fragments of this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	SuggestedRemedy change to something like: Ox55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 1010101, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The test states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted mort this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by."		0	s may be	out of scope for th	is comme	int cycle, but it w	ouid appear to be an						
0x55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status 0 Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by: The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame eant by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	0x55 (which would create a bit order transmission of 10101010, normal preamble). Proposed Response Response Status 0 Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham 12 Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous tragments of this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Suggeste	dRemedy	,					i ropoodu	Reeponee				
Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Image: Comment Type ER Comment Status X Comment Type ER Comment Status X Image: Comment Status X Image: Comment Status Sta	Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P 42 L 23 # 12 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Image: Comment Status X Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states:: The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:: The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "													
Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P42 L 23 # 12 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	Cl 99 SC 99.3.6 P42 L 23 # 12 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the ppMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in ADATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "		•				10101010, norr	nal preamble).						
Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous framents of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Proposed	Response	е	Response Status	0								
Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octes transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	Scruton, Peter University of New Ham Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "													
Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	Comment Type ER Comment Status X The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	~ ~												
The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	The text states: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the frame from the first octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "			9.3.6			-	# 12						
octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	octet of the frame (i.e., the octet following the SFD sent by the pMAC) to the last octet transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "			9.3.6			-	# 12						
transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	transmitted in that mPacket by:" The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Scruton, I	Peter		Univ	ersity of N	-	# [12						
The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	The last octet transmitted in the mPacket would be the last octet of the CRC. I believe the intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Scruton, I Comment	Peter <i>Type</i>	ER	Univ Comment Status	ersity of N S X	New Ham							
intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	intention is to be the last byte of the MDATA field. Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Scruton, I Comment The t octet	Peter <i>Type</i> ext states: of the fran	ER : " The m ⁱ me (i.e., tl	Univ <i>Comment Status</i> CRC shall be calcu he octet following t	ersity of N S X Iated on t	New Ham	frame from the first						
Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	Further the calculation of mCRC is based on starting from the first byte of the frame sent by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Scruton, I Comment The t octet trans	Peter <i>Type</i> ext states: of the fran mitted in th	ER : " The m me (i.e., tl hat mPac	Univ Comment Status CRC shall be calcu he octet following t cket by:"	ersity of N Xulated on t he SFD se	New Ham the octets of the ent by the pMAC	frame from the first C) to the last octet						
by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	by the pMAC. So it appears that the way it is written this would require the transmitter to remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Scruton, I Comment The t octet transi The la	Peter <i>Type</i> ext states: of the fran mitted in th ast octet tr	ER : " The mi me (i.e., th hat mPac ransmitte	Univ Comment Status CRC shall be calcu he octet following t cket by:" d in the mPacket w	rersity of N S X ulated on t he SFD se vould be th	New Ham the octets of the ent by the pMAC	frame from the first C) to the last octet						
remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	remember all octets transmitted in all previous fragments of this frame and generate mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Scruton, I Comment The t octet trans The la intent	Peter <i>Type</i> ext states: of the fran mitted in the ast octet tr ion is to be	ER : " The mi me (i.e., th hat mPac ransmitte be the last	Univ Comment Status CRC shall be calcu he octet following t cket by:" d in the mPacket w t byte of the MDAT.	rersity of N X ulated on t he SFD se would be th A field.	New Ham the octets of the ent by the pMAC he last octet of t	frame from the first C) to the last octet he CRC. I believe the						
mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy	mCRC based on all transmitted MDATA fields sent for this frame. (I understand this comment is out of scope, but the remedy should be easily implemented.) SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Scruton, I Comment The t octet trans The lintent	Peter <i>Type</i> ext states: of the fran mitted in th ast octet tr ion is to be er the calc	ER : " The mi me (i.e., th hat mPac ransmitte be the last culation o	Univ Comment Status CRC shall be calcu he octet following t cket by:" ed in the mPacket w t byte of the MDAT.	versity of N X ulated on t he SFD se vould be th A field. on starting	New Ham the octets of the ent by the pMAC he last octet of the p from the first by	frame from the first c) to the last octet he CRC. I believe the yte of the frame sent						
SuggestedRemedy	SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Scruton, I Comment The t octet trans The lintent Furth by the	Peter <i>Type</i> ext states: of the fran mitted in th ast octet tr ion is to be er the calc e pMAC. S	ER : " The mi me (i.e., th hat mPac ransmitte be the last culation o So it appe	Univ Comment Status CRC shall be calcu- he octet following t cket by:" Ind in the mPacket w t byte of the MDAT. of mCRC is based of ears that the way it	ersity of N X ulated on t he SFD se vould be th A field. on starting is written	New Ham the octets of the ent by the pMAC he last octet of the g from the first by this would requi	frame from the first C) to the last octet he CRC. I believe the yte of the frame sent re the transmitter to						
SuggestedRemedy	SuggestedRemedy Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Scruton, I Comment The t octet trans The l intent Furth by the reme	Peter <i>Type</i> ext states: of the fran mitted in th ast octet tr ion is to be er the calc e pMAC. S mber all of	ER : " The m me (i.e., th hat mPac ransmitte be the last culation o So it appendettes tran	Univ Comment Status CRC shall be calcu- he octet following t cket by:" ed in the mPacket w t byte of the MDAT. of mCRC is based of pars that the way it asmitted in all previo	ersity of N X ulated on t he SFD se vould be th A field. on starting is written to ous fragm	New Ham the octets of the ent by the pMAC he last octet of the from the first by this would requi- nents of this fram	frame from the first C) to the last octet he CRC. I believe the yte of the frame sent re the transmitter to						
	Adjust text to: "The mCRC shall be calculated on the octets of the current MDATA field by: "	Scruton, I Comment The t octet trans The l intent Furth by the reme mCR	Peter <i>Type</i> ext states: of the fran mitted in th ast octet tr ion is to be er the calc e pMAC. S mber all or C based o	ER : " The m me (i.e., th hat mPace ransmitte be the last culation o So it appe octets tran	Univ Comment Status CRC shall be calcu- he octet following t cket by:" ed in the mPacket w t byte of the MDAT. of mCRC is based of ears that the way it ismitted in all previous ismitted MDATA fie	ersity of N X ulated on t he SFD se would be th A field. on starting is written to ous fragm elds sent for	New Ham the octets of the ent by the pMAC he last octet of the from the first by this would requi ients of this frame.	frame from the first C) to the last octet he CRC. I believe the yte of the frame sent re the transmitter to he and generate						
	Proposed Response Response Status O	Scruton, I Comment The t octet transi The la intent Furth by the reme mCR (I und	Peter <i>Type</i> ext states: of the fran mitted in th ast octet tr ion is to be er the calc e pMAC. S mber all oc C based o lerstand th	ER : " The m me (i.e., th hat mPace ransmitte pe the last culation o So it appendentes tran on all tran his comm	Univ Comment Status CRC shall be calcu- he octet following t cket by:" ed in the mPacket w t byte of the MDAT. of mCRC is based of ears that the way it ismitted in all previous ismitted MDATA fie	ersity of N X ulated on t he SFD se would be th A field. on starting is written to ous fragm elds sent for	New Ham the octets of the ent by the pMAC he last octet of the from the first by this would requi ients of this frame.	frame from the first C) to the last octet he CRC. I believe the yte of the frame sent re the transmitter to he and generate						
Proposed Response Response Status O		Scruton, I Comment The t octet transi The li intent Furth by the reme mCR (I und Suggeste	Peter <i>Type</i> ext states: of the fran mitted in th ast octet tr ion is to be er the calc e pMAC. S mber all oc C based o lerstand th <i>dRemedy</i>	ER : " The min me (i.e., th hat mPac ransmitte be the last culation o So it appendent is transpondent his comm	Univ Comment Status CRC shall be calcu- he octet following t cket by:" d in the mPacket w t byte of the MDATA of mCRC is based of ears that the way it asmitted in all previous simitted MDATA fiele	ersity of N X ulated on t he SFD se would be th A field. on starting is written to ous fragm elds sent fo , but the re	New Ham the octets of the ent by the pMAC he last octet of the g from the first by this would requi- nents of this fram or this frame. emedy should b	frame from the first c) to the last octet he CRC. I believe the yte of the frame sent re the transmitter to he and generate e easily implemented.)						

C/ 99 SC 99.4.3

IEEE P802.3br D2.4 Interspersing Express Traffic (IET) 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

C/ 99 SC 99.4.4 P 44 L 15 # 9 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham	Cl 99 SC 99.4.5 P 44 L 27 # 15 Scruton, Peter University of New Ham
Comment Type TR Comment Status X	Comment Type T Comment Status X
According to IEEE 802.3-2012 Subclause 22.2.4.1.8: "The behavior of the CRS signal is unspecified when the duplex mode bit 0.8 in the control register is set to a logic one, as described in 22.2.4.1.8, or when the Auto-Negotiation process selects a full duplex mode of operation."	Ambiguous: "If an mPacket containing an SMD-S is received when Receive processing was processir an incomplete preempted packet, Receive processing shall ensure that the MAC detects FrameCheckError in that frame."
This runs counter to the assertion on p44 L15 (99.4.4). Which is: "In full duplex operation, the PLS_CARRIER.indication primitive is not produced unless EEE (Clause 78) or Link Interruption (46.3.4) is supported."	Which frame does "that" refer to. In the state diagram this would refer to the previous partial.
	(I recognize this as out of scope)
As a result there may be PHYs that do cause the CRS signal assertion on reception in Full Duplex.	SuggestedRemedy
	Change to:
(I recognize this may be out of scope)	" MAC detects a FrameCheckError in the partially received frame."
SuggestedRemedy Add text to disallow the use of PHYs that will assert this signal for reasons other than the	Proposed Response Response Status O
transmit media is unavailable (EEE or other).	
Here in 99.4.4 suggest wording change to:	Cl 99 SC 99.4.5 P 44 L 33 # 14
"The use of preemption is only allowed in full duplex operation, and the	Scruton, Peter University of New Ham
PLS_CARRIER.indication primitive shall not be produced while preemption capability is enabled by a PHY conforming to this clause, unless EEE (Clause 78) or Link Interruption	Comment Type T Comment Status X
(46.3.4) is supported."	"Other techniques may be employed to respond to a received Error control character provided that the result is that the MAC sublayer behaves as though a FrameCheckError occurred in the received frame."
Proposed Response Response Status O	If this is referring to a PCS Coding error this layer should never see an Error control character. At least for 100BASE-TX for an error during frame reception the PCS should see a Code Group Error and flag RX_ER while RX_DV is still asserted and the RS underneath this layer should enforce this by handing something up that would ensure that the MAC would behave as though a FrameCheckError occurred.
	(This may be out of scope, but an easy fix)
	SuggestedRemedy
	Option A: Strike sentence.
	Option B: As it is talking about enforcing a sequencing order error, we could update sentence: "Other techniques may be employed to respond to this error provided that the result is the the MAC sublayer behaves as though a FrameCheckError occurred in the received frame

Dec 2015, D2.4 IEEE P802.3br D2.4 Interspersing Express Traffic (IET) 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

C/ 99 SC 99.4.7.1	P 45	L 43	# 16	Cl 99	SC 99.4.7.3		P 46	L 45	# 1
Scruton, Peter	University of I	New Ham		Hajduczer	nia, Marek		Bright House	Network	
Comment Type E "PLS_DATA.requst" sh	Comment Status X ould be PLS_DATA.request				51	Comment S was added in E		set then to TRUE	in Figure 99–5 in
(out of scope, but easy	fix)			Howe	ver, this variable	is never assigr	ied a default v	value, and it is nev	ver reset explicitly or
SuggestedRemedy					itly to FALSE.				
change "PLS_DATA.re	qust" to be "PLS_DATA.requ	est"		Suggeste			6 1 4 1		
Proposed Response	Response Status O			 sugge - in Fi	est what follows: gure 99–5, set pA	Allow to FALSE	in INIT_TX_F	PROC state	e reset to FALSE, I'd state (initial fragment
C/ 99 SC 99.4.7.2	P 45	L 50	# 4	has b anym		no need to ind	icate the inter	ntion to sent preer	mptable frame
Scruton, Peter	University of I Comment Status X	New Ham		,	,	alue could be a	dded to the de	efinition of variable	e, if needed.
saying binary and then "The binary value 0x55 "The binary value 0xD5 Also I'm not sure the or	"	s for pTX_DATA	and rRX_DATA.						
(I recognize this as out	of scope)								
SuggestedRemedy	. '								
Change these to be 8-b should be <0:7> or <7:0 go in as <0:7> and ther	bit vector data <7:0> or <0:7> 0> it looks like rTX_DATA an n it will get flipped? I know th I go 1 then 0101010 and SFE	d pRX_DATA flip e way it should b	os it so I think it wou be transmitted going						
So the remedy if rTX_D	OATA flips would be along the	e line of:							
the 8-bit vector <0:7> o the 8-bit vector <0:7> o									
l would also auggest al	arifying the bit ordering in rT>	(DATA and nR)	X DATA in the						

functions on 99.4.7.4.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

C/ 99 SC 99.4.7.3

IEEE P802.3br D2.4 Interspersing Express Traffic (IET) 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

CI 99 S Scruton, Peter	SC 99.4.7.7	P 50 University of	L 1 New Ham	# 10	<i>CI</i> 99 Scruton, I		99.4.7.7	P 52 University of	L 1 New Ham	# 5
Comment Type Figure 99-5		Comment Status X			<i>Commen</i> Figur	<i>Type</i> 99-7	т	Comment Status X		

As PLS_Carrier.indication could be produced in EEE or Link Interruption perhaps it may be advisable to have an additional entrance condition in the START_PREAMBLE, and the transition from RESUME_WAIT into RESUME_PREAMBLE to also be And-ed with PLS_Carrier.indication=CARRIER_OFF.

This way if a Preemptable packet arrives while the media is unavailable the decision as to whether to send this frame will not be made until after the media is available. This way if the media is unavailable the (an Express Frame may be available at that time).

Related to this if EEE is allowed (looks to currently be the case) then LP_IDLE.request shall not be set to ASSERT when frames need to be transmitted and also 802.3-2012 subclause 22.7.2:

"The operation of LPI in the PHY requires that the MAC does not send valid data for a time after LPI has been de-asserted as governed by resolved Transmit Tw_sys defined in 78.4.2.3.

This wake up time is enforced by the transmit LPI state diagram and the rules mapping CARRIER_SENSE.indication defined in 22.2.1.3. The implementation shall conform to the behavior described by the transmit LPI state diagram shown in Figure 22-23."

SuggestedRemedy

Solution A: Specifically allow EEE: Add signal LP_IDLE.request into Figures 99-2 and 99-3. Add necessary states and transitions to Figure 99-5 to accomplish: - Allow asserting LP_IDLE.request, but when traffic is to be sent deassert and timeout before transmit.

Solution B:

A statement requiring that if EEE is enabled ensure that LP_IDLE.request remains Deasserted.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

States: RCV_V and RCV_R

These both have pRX_DV(False) calls. This looks to be done with the intention that if there is a V or an R saying that any continuation of a preempted frame would be wrong. I don't think the R would imply that, as 99.4 would seem to indicate that it should always be ready to accept.

It is strange that these have the affect of altering the states typically used in figure 99-6.

If the intention is to discard in this case it could be done with an additional state transition in Figure 99-6.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove those pRX_DV(False) calls in Figure 99-7 states RCV_V and RCV_R.

If it is desired to discard when the remote side does V add a transition in Figure 99-6 from CHECK_FOR_RESUME to ASSEMBLY_ERROR on condition V (because entering ASSEMBLY_ERROR increments a statistic see 30.14.1.8 counter for Assembly errors it may or may not be desireable to count this as an assembly error, if not then this may be a new state with the DISCARD function inside and then a transition on !rRxDV to IDLE_RX_PROC).

Proposed Response Response Status 0

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

CI 99 SC 99.4.7.7 Page 5 of 5 09.12.2015 00:57:11