## Comments received

## IEEE P802.3bf D3.1 comments

C/00 SC 0 PO LO # 10	C/ 30 SC 30.13.1.1 P 20 L 23 # 3			
hompson, Geoffrey Independent	Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syst			
Comment Type TR Comment Status X I am going to have to add my weight to Mr Frazier's unsatisfied comment #35	Comment Type E Comment Status X Make 1.1800.1, 2.1800.1, 3.1800.1, 4.1800.1, 5.1800.1, and 6.1800.1 link to Clause 45			
Your response and the lack of of any specified tolerance leads one to inevitable conclusion there there is no accuracy requirement whatsoever for this reported measurement. That being the case, there is no way for a developer manufacturer of higher layer equipment to put a conformance burden on their supplier that lies within the standard. Further, there is no way for a design verification function within a suppliers operation to tell whether this function works as opposed to supplying a random number not at all associated with the	SuggestedRemedy         Add links (cross references) from the registers referenced in Clause 30 to Clause 45.         Proposed Response       Response Status         O			
event.	C/ 30         SC 30.13.1.3         P 20         L 46         # 7           Marris, Arthur         Cadence Design Syst			
SuggestedRemedy Put some numeric tolerance on this measurement so that functionality can be verified. If it	Comment Type TR Comment Status X			
requires that the vendor supply a fixed delay number to center the tolerance variance then that is acceptable. Proposed Response Response Status <b>O</b>	This is a pile on to comment 29 against draft 3.0. The most significant thing that 802.3bf is doing from the PHY implementers point of view and the system implementers point of view is defining how to report the transmit and receive latency through the PHY. This definition must be clear and unambigous.			
	SuggestedRemedy			
C/ 01     SC 1.4     P 14     L 7     # 8       Marris, Arthur     Cadence Design Syst	See my other comment on this.			
Comment Type <b>TR</b> Comment Status <b>X</b> This is a pile on to comment 28 against draft 3.0. TSSI should be properly defined here. Also the reference to 802.3-2008 is incorrect.	My view is that the value of the attribute is simply the sum of the delay through the PCS and the delay through the PMA/PMD. Any latency in the TSSI indication and extra delay between sublayers is irrelevant as all the 802.1AS system implementer cares about is the asymmetry between the transmit and receive latency.			
SuggestedRemedy Change to: Time Synchronization Service Interface (TSSI). The interface between the TimeSync client and the generic Reconciliation Sublayer to provide SFD indication. (See IEEE 802.3,	Mentioning XAUI without including SFI and XFI confuses matters as XAUI is a legacy MAC/PHY interconnect. The easiest way to get around this confusion is to focus on PCS and PMA latency. XAUI is really just a PCS/PMA combination.			
Clause 90.)	Proposed Response Response Status O			
Proposed Response Response Status <b>O</b>				
C/ 01     SC 1.4     P 14     L 7     #       Marris, Arthur     Cadence Design Syst				
Comment Type ER Comment Status X Clause 90 is not in 802.3-2008				
SuggestedRemedy Change reference to be just to IEEE std 802.3 Clause 90.				
Change reference to be just to TELE stu 602.5 Clause 90.				

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

C/ 30 SC 30.13.1.3 Page 1 of 2 07/02/2011 17:07:55

## Comments received

## IEEE P802.3bf D3.1 comments

C/         30         SC         30.13.1.3         P 20           Marris, Arthur         Cadence	<i>L</i> <b>46</b> Design Syst	# 1	C/ <b>45</b> SC <b>45.2.4</b> Marris, Arthur	P 113 Cadence Des	<i>L</i> ign Syst	# 5
Comment Type ER Comment Status X The following does not make sense:			<i>Comment Type</i> <b>TR</b> Title of Table 45-108 i	Comment Status X s incorrect		
If a Clause 45 MDIO Interface to PMA/PMD, WI present, then the value stored in this attribute and delay values, accounts for the sum of the values	counts for maximum	n transmit path data	SuggestedRemedy Change title to:			
sublayers (for each MMD, in case of multiple ins	tances):		Table 45-108PHY X	S registers		
SuggestedRemedy Reword to:			Proposed Response	Response Status <b>O</b>		
If a Clause 45 MDIO Interface to PMA/PMD, WI			C/ 90 SC 90.1	P 35	L <b>6</b>	# 9
present, then the value stored in this attribute is registers in the instantiated sublayer:	the sum of the value	es of the following	Thompson, Geoffrey	Independent		
fan DMA (DMD) na mintana 4 4004 and 4 4000			Comment Type E	Comment Status X		
<ul> <li> for PMA/PMD: registers 1.1801 and 1.1802,</li> <li> for WIS: registers 2.1801 and 2.1802,</li> <li> for PCS: registers 3.1801 and 3.1802,</li> <li> for PHY XS: registers 4.1801 and 4.1802,</li> <li> FOT PHY XS: registers 4.1801 and 4.1802,</li> </ul>			(Not classified DISAP I would expect the foll	PROVE because it is not new owing text to be easily proved hat requires knowledge of pac	false: "The TSS	
for WIS: registers 2.1801 and 2.1802, for PCS: registers 3.1801 and 3.1802, for PHY XS: registers 4.1801 and 4.1802, for DTE XS: registers 5.1801 and 5.1802,			(Not classified DISAP I would expect the foll	PROVE because it is not new owing text to be easily proved	false: "The TSS	
for WIS: registers 2.1801 and 2.1802, for PCS: registers 3.1801 and 3.1802, for PHY XS: registers 4.1801 and 4.1802,	and 30.13.1.6		(Not classified DISAP I would expect the foll support any protocol t SuggestedRemedy I would suggest text th	PROVE because it is not new owing text to be easily proved	false: "The TSS ket egress and rhaps: "The TSS	ingress time." SI can be used to
for WIS: registers 2.1801 and 2.1802, for PCS: registers 3.1801 and 3.1802, for PHY XS: registers 4.1801 and 4.1802, for DTE XS: registers 5.1801 and 5.1802, for TC: registers 6.1801 and 6.1802. and make similar change in 30.13.1.4, 30.13.1.5	and 30.13.1.6		(Not classified DISAP I would expect the foll support any protocol t SuggestedRemedy I would suggest text th	PROVE because it is not new owing text to be easily proved hat requires knowledge of pac	false: "The TSS ket egress and rhaps: "The TSS	ingress time." SI can be used to
for WIS: registers 2.1801 and 2.1802, for PCS: registers 3.1801 and 3.1802, for PHY XS: registers 4.1801 and 4.1802, for DTE XS: registers 5.1801 and 5.1802, for TC: registers 6.1801 and 6.1802. and make similar change in 30.13.1.4, 30.13.1.4 Proposed Response Response Status 0 Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.40 P27	and 30.13.1.6 <i>L</i> <b>17</b> Design Syst	# [4]	(Not classified DISAP I would expect the foll support any protocol t SuggestedRemedy I would suggest text th support protocols that	PROVE because it is not new owing text to be easily proved hat requires knowledge of pac nat is not so presumptious, pe require knowledge of packet	false: "The TSS ket egress and rhaps: "The TS egress and ingr <i>L</i> 14	ingress time." SI can be used to
for WIS: registers 2.1801 and 2.1802, for PCS: registers 3.1801 and 3.1802, for PHY XS: registers 4.1801 and 4.1802, for DTE XS: registers 5.1801 and 5.1802, for TC: registers 6.1801 and 6.1802. and make similar change in 30.13.1.4, 30.13.1.4 Proposed Response Response Status <b>0</b> Cl <b>45</b> SC <b>45.2.3.40</b> P <b>27</b> Marris, Arthur Cadence	L 17	# [4]	(Not classified DISAP I would expect the foll support any protocol t SuggestedRemedy I would suggest text th support protocols that Proposed Response	PROVE because it is not new owing text to be easily proved hat requires knowledge of pace nat is not so presumptious, per require knowledge of packet <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b>	false: "The TSS ket egress and rhaps: "The TS egress and ingr <i>L</i> 14	ingress time." SI can be used to ess time."
for WIS: registers 2.1801 and 2.1802, for PCS: registers 3.1801 and 3.1802, for PHY XS: registers 4.1801 and 4.1802, for DTE XS: registers 5.1801 and 5.1802, for TC: registers 6.1801 and 6.1802. and make similar change in 30.13.1.4, 30.13.1.4 Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.40 P 27 Marris, Arthur Cadence Comment Type E Comment Status X Cahnge Table 45-115cc to Table 45-115c	L 17	# [4]	(Not classified DISAP I would expect the foll support any protocol t SuggestedRemedy I would suggest text th support protocols that Proposed Response Cl 90 SC 90.5 Marris, Arthur Comment Type E grammar	PROVE because it is not new owing text to be easily proved hat requires knowledge of pace nat is not so presumptious, pe require knowledge of packet <i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b> <i>P</i> <b>38</b> Cadence Des	false: "The TSS sket egress and rhaps: "The TS egress and ingr <i>L</i> 14 sign Syst	ingress time." SI can be used to ess time."
for WIS: registers 2.1801 and 2.1802, for PCS: registers 3.1801 and 3.1802, for PHY XS: registers 4.1801 and 4.1802, for DTE XS: registers 5.1801 and 5.1802, for TC: registers 6.1801 and 6.1802. and make similar change in 30.13.1.4, 30.13.1.9 Proposed Response Response Status O Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.40 P 27 Marris, Arthur Cadence Comment Type E Comment Status X Cahnge Table 45-115cc to Table 45-115c SuggestedRemedy	L 17	# [ <u>4</u>	(Not classified DISAP I would expect the foll support any protocol t SuggestedRemedy I would suggest text th support protocols that Proposed Response Cl 90 SC 90.5 Marris, Arthur Comment Type E grammar	PROVE because it is not new owing text to be easily proved hat requires knowledge of pace nat is not so presumptious, per require knowledge of packet Response Status <b>O</b> P 38 Cadence Des Comment Status <b>X</b>	false: "The TSS sket egress and rhaps: "The TS egress and ingr <i>L</i> 14 sign Syst	ingress time." SI can be used to ess time."
for WIS: registers 2.1801 and 2.1802, for PCS: registers 3.1801 and 3.1802, for PHY XS: registers 4.1801 and 4.1802, for DTE XS: registers 5.1801 and 5.1802, for TC: registers 6.1801 and 6.1802. and make similar change in 30.13.1.4, 30.13.1.4 Proposed Response Response Status <b>O</b> C/ 45 SC 45.2.3.40 P 27 Marris, Arthur Cadence Comment Type <b>E</b> Comment Status <b>X</b>	L 17	# [4]	(Not classified DISAP I would expect the foll support any protocol t SuggestedRemedy I would suggest text th support protocols that Proposed Response Cl 90 SC 90.5 Marris, Arthur Comment Type E grammar "used to interface MA SuggestedRemedy change to:	PROVE because it is not new owing text to be easily proved hat requires knowledge of pace nat is not so presumptious, per require knowledge of packet Response Status <b>O</b> P 38 Cadence Des Comment Status <b>X</b>	false: "The TSS sket egress and rhaps: "The TS egress and ingr <i>L</i> 14 sign Syst	ingress time." SI can be used to ess time."

CI 90 SC 90.5