

IEEE P802.3aq D3.2 Ethernet Comments

CI 51 SC 51.1 P 306 L # 4
LINDSAY, THOMAS A Individual

Comment Type ER Comment Status R

This comment applies to IEEE Std 802.3-2005, Section Four, clause 51.10.4.4. Delay constraint values are documented in clauses 44, 52, and 68. Clause 51 needs to be updated to be consistent with these other clauses. Further, since these other clauses already specific delay constraints, there is no need to repeat the values here.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the value in the table with "transmit and receive including PMD and fiber shall be no more than the appropriate delay constraints specified in Clause 52.2 or Clause 68.2."

Response Response Status W

REJECT. OUT OF SCOPE

This comment is not made against new D3.2 text and is therefore out of scope.

The commenter may wish to submit a maintenance request to change Clause 51 as suggested.

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE

This comment is not made against new D3.2 text and is therefore out of scope. However, given that clause 51 will need to be coordinated with clause 68, that the edit is straightforward, that there is time for one more recirculation, that the risk of future comments on this edit are low and to avoid maintenance:

Change entry in the table to read:
"Meets the requirements of the respective PMD clause."

CI 51 SC 51.3 P 292 L # 3
LINDSAY, THOMAS A Individual

Comment Type ER Comment Status R

This comment applies to IEEE Std 802.3-2005, Section Four, clause 51.3.3. Delay constraint values are documented in clauses 44, 52, and 68. Clause 51 needs to be updated to be consistent with these other clauses. Further, since these other clauses already specific delay constraints, there is no need to repeat the values here.

SuggestedRemedy

In the last paragraph of this clause, change the 2nd to last line to "&shall be no more than the appropriate delay constraints specified in Clause 52.2 or Clause 68.2."

Response Response Status W

REJECT. OUT OF SCOPE

This comment is not made against new D3.2 text and is therefore out of scope.

The commenter may wish to submit a maintenance request to change Clause 51 as suggested.

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE
See response to comment 6.

IEEE P802.3aq D3.2 Ethernet Comments

CI 51 SC 51.3 P 292 L 2 # 2
LINDSAY, THOMAS A Individual

Comment Type ER Comment Status R

This comment applies to IEEE Std 802.3-2005, Section Four, clause 51.3. The sentence should include the needs of clause 68.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "&is required to meet the jitter specifications of Clause 52 or Clause 68."

Response Response Status W

REJECT. OUT OF SCOPE

This comment is not made against new D3.2 text and is therefore out of scope.

The commenter may wish to submit a maintenance request to change Clause 51 as suggested.

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE

This comment is not made against new D3.2 text and is therefore out of scope. However, given that clause 51 will need to be coordinated with clause 68, that the edit is straightforward, that there is time for one more recirculation, that the risk of future comments on this edit are low and to avoid maintenance:

change to "of the respective PMD clause."

CI 51 SC 51.3.3 P L # 6
LAW, DAVID J Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status R

Subclause 51.3.3 of IEEE Std 802.3 states that 'Predictable operation of the MAC Control PAUSE operation (Clause 31, Annex 31B) demands that there be an upper bound on the propagation delays through the network. This implies that MAC, MAC Control sublayer, and PHY implementers will conform to certain delay maxima, and that network planners and administrators conform to constraints regarding the cable topology and concatenation of devices. The sum of transmit and receive delay constraints for the serial PMA/PMD sublayer shall be no more than 512 BT. The serial PMA/PMD sublayer includes the serial PMA, the serial PMD, and two meters of fiber.'. Unfortunate the penultimate sentence states a delay constraint that is directly in conflict with subclause 68.2 'Delay constraints' of the IEEE P802.3aq 10GBASE-LRM draft. I suspect this was missed as subclause 44.3, which has been updated by IEEE P802.3aq, only references subclause 52.2.

SuggestedRemedy

The specification of the same constrain in both subclause 51.3.3 and 52.2 is I guess a classic case of why not to specify the same value in two places but actually cab be used to our advantage. I believe that we can simply fix this be changing the penultimate sentence of subclause 51.3.3 from: The sum of transmit and receive delay constraints for the serial PMA/PMD sublayer shall be no more than 512 BT. to read: The sum of transmit and receive delay constraints for the serial PMA/PMD sublayer shall meet the requirements as specified in the respective PMD clause. I note however that this comment is out of scope as none of Clause 51 is included in IEEE P802.3aq and if ruled such I am happy to submit a maintenance request to fix subclause 51.3.3 during the next maintenance revision/amendment project

Response Response Status C

REJECT. OUT OF SCOPE

This comment is not made against new D3.2 text and is therefore out of scope - as noted by the commenter.

The commenter may wish to submit a maintenance request, as he has indicated his willingness to do.

ACCEPT

This comment is not made against new D3.2 text and is therefore out of scope. However, given that clause 51 will need to be coordinated with clause 68, that the edit is straightforward, that there is time for one more recirculation, that the risk of future comments on this edit are low and to avoid maintenance:

change to "shall meet the requirements as specified in the respective PMD clause."

IEEE P802.3aq D3.2 Ethernet Comments

CI 68 SC 68.5 P 31 L 16 # 5
LINDSAY, THOMAS A Individual

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

This comment applies to the non-change-bar draft D3.2 of clause 68, Table 68-3 in clause 68.5.1. This is a pile-on to comment 31 on D3.1. I still believe TWDP should be increased. Polls in a previous ballot showed belief that there is residual budget and we should use it to increase yields.

SuggestedRemedy

This remedy requires increased Tx OMA if TWDP is greater than 4.7 dB. For line 16, change value to "max(-5.5, -9.2+TWDP)". For line 31, change value to 5.0 dB. Figure 68-5 requires a change - this change to the figure was previously submitted to the editor during D3.1 comments.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. OUT OF SCOPE

This comment is out of scope because:

- 1) As the commenter notes, this comment is not made against new D3.2 text;
- 2) The commenter references rejected comment 31 on D3.1 which was, itself, a "pile-on" comment, referencing rejected comment 113 on Draft 3.0 (a comment from this commenter);
- 3) Previous time consuming considerations of this type of suggestion have failed to achieve the required majority;
- 4) Neither the comment nor the suggested remedy present any new evidence;
- 5) At this late stage in the standardisation process, neither the comment nor the suggested remedy point out a specification flaw that must be fixed for proper operation of the PMD.

CI 68 SC 68.6 P 38 L 53 # 1
SWENSON, NORMAN L Individual

Comment Type ER Comment Status R

This comment applies to the non-change bar draft D3.2 of clause 68, Subclause 6.6.2. The copyright release statement might be interpreted as granting patent rights that the IEEE does not own, as opposed to just the right to reproduce the code.

SuggestedRemedy

Recommend that IEEE Staff review the release statement and revise as necessary to make clear that it is granting only the right to reproduce the code and that it is not a release or license of patent rights.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. OUT OF SCOPE

As the commenter has indicated, this comment is not made against new D3.2 text and is therefore out of scope.

The text is in a footnote and therefore is not part of the standard. It also relates to the copyrights that the IEEE holds over the text. Hence, as well as being out of scope, it is the responsibility of the IEEE-SA staff, along with advice from legal council if required, to decide what exactly the text should state. This can be addressed during preparation for publication.

The commenter is thanked for raising this point, and the editor will ensure that the comment is passed on to the IEEE-SA staff.