

IEEE P802.3bw (D3,1) 100BASE-T1 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

CI 01 SC 1.4.394 P 21 L 8 # r01-1
 Healey, Adam Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

In IEEE P802.3/D3.1, "eight nanoseconds" has been changed to "8 ns".

SuggestedRemedy

Change the base text to align with the current draft of the IEEE 802.3 revision. Change the amended text to be consistent with the base text e.g., "fifteen nanoseconds" becomes "15 ns".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[1] Page 21, line 5 - change "eight nanoseconds" to "8 ns"

[2] Page 21, line 5 - change "fifteen nanoseconds" to "15 ns"

[3] Page 21, line 5 - change "thirty nanoseconds" to "30 ns"

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.10.a P 25 L 52 # r01-2
 Healey, Adam Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Something seems to have gone wrong with the subclause and table numbering. It seems that the inserted subclause should be 45.2.1.14a and the inserted table should be Table 45-17a. The instruction says to insert Table 45-16a but this should be Table 45-17a (assuming the table number is corrected).

SuggestedRemedy

Update the instruction, subclause, and table numbering to be consistent.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[1] Change editing instruction to "Insert 45.2.1.14a and Table 45-17a after 45.2.1.14 as follows:"

[2] Change subclause number and title to "45.2.1.14a BASE-T1 PMA/PMD extended ability register (1.18)"

[3] Change table number and title to "Table 45-17a PMA/PMD extended ability register bit definitions"

[4] Page 26, Line 3 - change "Table 45-17b" cross-reference to "Table 45-17a"

[5] Page 24, Line 16 - change "45.2.1.14b" cross-reference to "45.2.1.14a"

CI 96 SC 96.1 P 29 L 2 # r01-3
 Healey, Adam Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

In Figure 96-2, the righthand stack is labeled "LAN CSMA/CD LAYERS". Does 100BASE-T1 support half-duplex mode? If not, then CSMA/CD is not appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Since IEEE 802.3 is the "Standard for Ethernet", this discrepancy was resolved in the revision by labeling the stack as "ETHERNET LAYERS". Change the diagram accordingly.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "LAN CSMA/CD LAYERS" to "ETHERNET LAYERS"

CI 01 SC 1.4.392a P 21 L 39 # r01-4
 Healey, Adam Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

SYMB_1D is a parameter of a service interface primitive and it does not belong in the Definitions subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove SYMB_1D definition.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[1] Delete 1.4.392a SYMB_1D

[2] Add "The one-dimensional ternary symbols from PMA (See IEEE Std 802.3, 96.2.5.1 and 96.2.6.1) are transmitted and received using PAM3." to 96.2.3.1 Page 33 Line 44.

[3] Add "The one-dimensional ternary symbols from PMA (See IEEE Std 802.3, 96.2.5.1 and 96.2.6.1) are transmitted and received using PAM3." to 96.2.3.1 Page 34 Line 22

IEEE P802.3bw (D3,1) 100BASE-T1 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

CI 00 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # r01-5
 Turner, Michelle
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 This draft meets all editorial requirements.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 01 SC 1.4.193 P 20 L 10 # r01-6
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 The cross reference to subclause 96.3.2.4.5 in respect to the ESD seems to be incorrect as I can't find subclause 96.3.2.4.5. Potential references could be 96.3.3.2 'PCS Transmit state diagram' and 96.3.3.3.5 'Generation of ternary pair (TAn, TBn)', however in both cases the ESD is described in terms of symbols rather than code-groups, and I note the definition states '... the SSD consists of three code-groups ...'. A better subclause therefore may be 96.3.3.2.1 'Variables' as it defines the three ESD code-groups.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest 96.3.2.4.5 should read either 96.3.3.2 or 96.3.3.2.1.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change cross-reference "96.3.2.4.5" to "96.3.3.3.5"
 Note: 96.3.3.3.5 Generation of Ternary Pair (Tan, TBn)

CI 01 SC 1.4.390 P 20 L 50 # r01-7
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 The cross reference to subclause 96.3.2.4.5 in respect to the SSD seems to be incorrect as I can't find subclause 96.3.2.4.5. Potential references could be 96.3.3.2 'PCS Transmit state diagram' and 96.3.3.3.5 'Generation of ternary pair (TAn, TBn)', however in both cases the SSD is described in terms of symbols rather than code-groups, and I note the definition states '... the SSD consists of three code-groups ...'. A better subclause therefore may be 96.3.3.2.1 'Variables' as it defines the three SSD code-groups.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest 96.3.2.4.5 should read either 96.3.3.2, 96.3.3.3.5 or 96.3.3.2.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change cross-reference "96.3.2.4.5" to "96.3.3.3.5"
 Note: 96.3.3.3.5 Generation of Ternary Pair (Tan, TBn)

CI 01 SC 1.4.390 P 20 L 46 # r01-8
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ
 The base text does not match the text in IEEE Std 802.3-2012 or IEEE 802.3bx, for some reason 'sosb' has been deleted from code-groups in relation to 100BASE-T4.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Restore the base text to that found in IEEE Std 802.3-2012 or IEEE 802.3bx, change the text '... three predefined code-groups ...' to read '... three predefined sosb code-groups ...'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bw (D3,1) 100BASE-T1 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 01 SC 1.4.87a P 21 L 29 # r01-9
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The cross reference to subclause 96.3.2.2.2 in respect to 4B/3B seems to be incorrect, I can't find subclause 96.3.2.2.2, and 4B/3B conversion is defined in subclause 96.3.3.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest 96.3.2.2.2 should read 96.3.3.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change cross-reference "96.3.2.2.2" to "96.3.3.1.2"

Note: 96.3.13.1.2 4B/3B conversion for MII data

Cl 01 SC 1.5 P 21 L 51 # r01-10
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The items are not in alphabetical order, for example DPI, EMC, DUT, RMS then LCL.

SuggestedRemedy

Place in in alphabetical order.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 96 SC 96.4 P 68 L 2 # r01-12
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Please use the same font as the rest of the figure for the text 'MANAGEMENT' in the uppermost box. Please also center align the text left-right an top-bottom.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 96 SC 96.4.5 P 70 L 43 # r01-13
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Subclause 96.4.4 'PHY Control function' states that '... PMA_CONFIG is pre-determined to be Master or Slave via management control during initialization ...'. I therefore I suggest that a similar statement, that 'management control', not just 'MANAGEMENT', be made in respect to link_control. I suggest similar changes for the description of the 'config' and the 'link_control' variables found in subclause 96.4.7.1 'State diagram variables' on page 58.

SuggestedRemedy

[1] Suggest that the text '... is used to set link_control to ENABLE through MANAGEMENT during ...' be changed to read 'is used to set link_control to ENABLE through management control during ...' on page 70, line 43.

[2] Suggest that the text 'The config parameter is set by MANAGEMENT and passed to the PMA and PCS.' be changed to read 'The config parameter is set by management and passed to the PMA and PCS.' on page 72, line 41.

[3] Suggest that the text 'This variable is generated by MANAGEMENT or set by default.' be changed to read ' This variable is generated by management or set by default.' on page 72, line 46.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bw (D3,1) 100BASE-T1 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 96 SC 96.1.2.2 P 32 L 52 # r01-14
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The second paragraph of this subclause doesn't seem to be related to State Diagram Timer specifications.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider moving the second paragraph of this subclause elsewhere.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment #r01-48.

The response to comment r01-48 is copied below for the convenience of the reader.

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Move

"The 100BASE-T1 PHY supports normal operation and link training operation. In training operation, the PCS ignores signals from MII and sends only the idle signals to the PMA until training process is complete (signaled by the link partner). The training process usually includes descrambler lock, timing acquisition, echo cancellation and equalizer convergence, etc." to the third paragraph of 96.3.3.2

Cl 96 SC 96.11.4.4 P 94 L 44 # r01-15
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

PICS item PFM5 is missing a 'Status' and 'Support' value, in addition the font used seems different from the other PICS items in this table.

SuggestedRemedy

- [1] Add 'M' to the 'Status' column.
- [2] Add 'Yes []' to the 'Support' column.
- [3] Check the font is the same as the rest of the table.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 96 SC 96.11.4.4 P 94 L 29 # r01-16
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

PICS item PMF1 should be updated to match the changes made to 96.4.1 in response to comment i-55.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest the 'Value/Comment' field be updated to read 'Conform to 40.4.2.1, optional low power mode referenced in 36.2.5.1.3 not supported.'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 96 SC 96.11.4.4 P 94 L 34 # r01-17
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

When a PICS has a predicate condition dependent on the support of an option, the 'Support' field should be 'Yes [] N/A []'. For example see item ES6 (page 100, line 42).

SuggestedRemedy

Update the 'Support' field for the PICS item PMF2 and PMF3 to read:

Yes []
 N/A []

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bw (D3,1) 100BASE-T1 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 96 SC 96.11.4.4 P94 L 41 # r01-18
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Item 5 of the response to comment i-56 added a new shall statement to subclause 96.4.5 which read 'Link Monitor operation, as shown in state diagram of Figure 96-30, shall be provided to support PHY Control.' however a PICS item was not added.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that a new PICS item be included as follows:

Item: PMF5 (renumber following items)
 Feature: Link Monitor function
 Subclause: 96.4.5
 Value/Comment: See Figure 96-30
 Status: M
 Support: Yes []

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 96 SC 96.11.4.5 P95 L 6 # r01-21
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Item PME1 states that '100BASE-T1 PHY shall comply with applicable local and national codes, or as agreed between customer and supplier ...'. yet the text in subclause 96.5.1 'EMC tests' which states 'A system integrating the 100BASE-T1 PHY shall comply with applicable local and national codes. In addition, the system may need to comply with more stringent requirements as agreed upon between customer and supplier ...'. I don't think the use of the 'or' statement is correct in the PICS item as the subclause states that the system shall comply with applicable local and national codes but that 'in addition' it may comply with more stringent requirements as agreed.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest the text be updated to just read "100BASE-T1 PHY shall comply with applicable local and national codes".

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Change
 "100BASE-T1 PHY shall comply with applicable local and national codes, or as agreed between customer and supplier, for the limitation of electromagnetic interference"
 to
 "100BASE-T1 PHY shall comply with applicable local and national codes"

Cl 96 SC 96.2.8.3 P39 L 54 # r01-23
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Subclause 96.2.8.3 'Effect of receipt' lists subclause 96.2.2 as one of a number of references, however subclause 96.2.2 is 'PMA service interface' which just lists the primitives, including this one, and seems a somewhat circular.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove 96.2.2 from the list of references.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 96 SC 96.3 P41 L 13 # r01-24
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The text states 'The PCS Transmit function is explained in 96.3.2 ...' however based on the response to comment i-63 subclause 96.3.2 'PCS Transmit' has been removed, and subclause 96.3.4 is now 'PCS Transmit'.

SuggestedRemedy

Update the reference to subclause 96.3.2 to be to subclause 96.3.4.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "96.3.2" cross-reference to "96.3.3"

Note: 96.3.3 PCS Transmit

Cl 96 SC 96.11.4.1 P92 L 3 # r01-25
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

I think the reference for item PCT1 should be to 96.3.4.2 'PCS Transmit state diagram' rather than to 96.3.4.2.1 'Variables'.

SuggestedRemedy

In the subclause column change '96.3.4.2.1' to read '96.3.4.2'.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "96.3.3.2.1" cross-reference to "96.3.3.2"

Note: 96.3.3.2 PCS Transmit State Diagram

IEEE P802.3bw (D3,1) 100BASE-T1 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

CI 96 SC 96.3.4.2.1 P 44 L 41 # r01-27
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest that '... is not multiple of three ..' should read '... is not a multiple of three ...' (line 41) and '... last nibble at MII RX domain ...' should read '... last nibble at the MII RX domain ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 96 SC 96.11.5 P 100 L 19 # r01-28
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Not sure what the 'Yes' in the 'Value/Comment' field for items ES1, ES3, ES4, ES5 and ES6 is meant to mean.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the 'Yes', the add new text as required or leave blank.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 96 SC 96.11.5 P 100 L 22 # r01-29
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Subclause 96.9.2 'Network Safety' states that 'In automotive applications, all 100BASE-T1 cabling shall be routed in way to provide maximum protection by the motor vehicle sheet metal and structural components, following SAE J1292, ISO 14229, and ISO 15764.'. Based on this item ES2 is not mandatory in all cases, but instead should be predicated on an automotive environment installation (AUTO, see 96.11.3).
 SuggestedRemedy
 [1] Change the 'Status' field to read: AUTO:M
 [2] Change the 'Support' field to read:
 Yes []
 N/A []
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 96 SC 96.11.5 P 100 L 19 # r01-32
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Subclause 96.9.1 'General Safety' states that 'All equipment subject to this clause shall conform to IEC 60950-1' yet the 'feature' field of PICS item ES1 reads 'Conformance to applicable sections of IEC 60950-1'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that 'Conformance to applicable sections of IEC 60950-1' be changed to read 'Conformance to IEC 60950-1'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 96 SC 96.11.5 P 100 L 39 # r01-33
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 PICS Item ES5 is missing text in its 'Status' and 'Support' fields.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add 'M' to the 'Status' field and 'Yes []' to the 'Support' field.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 96 SC 96.11.5 P 100 L 37 # r01-34
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 96.9.2.2 'Electromagnetic Compatibility' states that 'A system integrating the 100BASE-T1 PHY shall comply with all applicable local and national codes, or as agreed to between the customer and the supplier, for the limitation of electromagnetic interference.'. Based on this suggest that the PICS item ES4 has its 'Feature' field updated to reflect the option of an agreement between the customer and the supplier.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the text '... limitation of electromagnetic interference' to read '... limitation of electromagnetic interference, or as agreed to between the customer and the supplier'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bw (D3,1) 100BASE-T1 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

CI 96 SC 96.11.4.5 P 98 L 30 # r01-41
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 There is one 'shall' statement in 96.5.6 'Transmitter peak differential output' that appear to be missing a PICS entry that applies to it.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add if required.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 [1]
 Feature: Transmit differential signal
 Subclause: 96.5.6
 Value/comment: Less than 2.2 V peak-to-peak when measured with 100 ohm termination
 Status: M
 Support: Yes []

CI 96 SC 96.11.4.5 P 96 L 29 # r01-42
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Subclause 96.5.3 'Test fixtures' states that 'The fixtures shown in Figure 96-31, Figure 96-32, and Figure 96-33, or their equivalents, are used in the stated respective tests for measuring the transmitter specifications.' however the 'Feature' filed of PICS item PME12 uses a 'shall' in place of the 'are'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 If this is not a mandatory requirement, consider deleting the PICS item.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 96 SC 96.6.1 P 84 L 35 # r01-46
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 Suggest 'In case both ...' be changed to read 'In the case where both ...' and that '... or SLAVE ...' be changed to read '... or both to be SLAVE ...'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 96 SC 96.5.3 P 78 L 6 # r01-47
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 The text in the Balun '... impedance of 100 W' should read '... impedance of 100 Ohm(use symbol)'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 96 SC 96.1.2.2 P 32 L 52 # r01-48
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ
 The second paragraph of subclause 96.1.2.2 'State Diagram Timer specifications' that starts 'The 100BASE-T1 PHY supports normal operation and link training operation ...' doesn't seem to relate to state diagram times, and instead to normal and training operation.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that this text be moved to the third paragraph of subclause 96.3.4.2 PCS 'Transmit state diagram'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Move
 "The 100BASE-T1 PHY supports normal operation and link training operation. In training operation, the PCS ignores signals from MII and sends only the idle signals to the PMA until training process is complete (signaled by the link partner). The training process usually includes descrambler lock, timing acquisition, echo cancellation and equalizer convergence, etc."
 to the third paragraph of 96.3.3.2

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.7 P 24 L 36 # r01-49
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ
 In both IEEE Std 802.3-2012 and in IEEE 802.3bx the 'PMA/PMD control 2 register (Register 1.7)' is subclause 45.2.1.6.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 45.2.1.7 to read 45.2.1.6.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bw (D3,1) 100BASE-T1 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 96 SC 96.1.1 P 31 L 40 # r01-50
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

I acknowledge that this comment is out of scope on this recirculation as it is on unchanged text, however in the first two paragraphs of this subclause, there different descriptions of the twisted-pair cabling supported by 100BASE-T1, 100BASE-TX and 1000BASE-T are used.

In respect to 100BASE-T1 the cabling is described as 'single balanced twisted-pair', in the case of 100BASE-TX the cabling is described as 'two pairs of a channel comprising unshielded copper cabling or better', in the case of 1000BASE-T the cabling is described as '4-pair balanced cabling system compliant with 40.7'.

Subclause 25.1 'Overview' of IEEE Std 802.3 states 'This clause specifies the 100BASE-X PMD (including MDI) and baseband medium for twisted-pair wiring, 100BASE-TX.' Based on this I'd suggest that a better description for 100BASE-TX would simply be 'two pairs of balanced twisted-pair'.

Subclause 40.1 'Overview' of IEEE Std 802.3 states ' The 1000BASE-T Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS), Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) and baseband medium specifications are intended for users who want 1000 Mb/s performance over Category 5 balanced twisted-pair cabling systems.'. Based on this I'd suggest a better description for 1000BASE-T would be 'four pairs of balanced twisted-pair'.

I also both paragraphs state that 100BASE-T1 operates over a single balanced twisted-pair channel which seems to be repetitively redundant.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest the first two paragraphs be replaced with 'The 100BASE-T1 PHY operates using full-duplex communications (using echo cancellation) over a single balanced twisted-pair. In contrast, the IEEE 802.3 100BASE-TX PHY, specified in Clause 25, operates on two pairs of balanced twisted-pair cabling. Like the 100BASE-TX PHY, this PHY uses ternary signaling and interfaces to the Clause 22 MII. The 1000BASE-T PHY is specified in Clause 40, and it operates over four pairs of balanced twisted-pair cabling.'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 96 SC 96.4.7.1 P 61 L 6 # r01-51
 Mcclellan, Brett Marvell Semiconducto

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

This sentence was added several drafts ago. "Note that when the PHY supports the optional EEE capability and signal_detect is FALSE, scr_status is set to NOT_OK." There is no other mention of support of EEE in the clause.

SuggestedRemedy

delete the sentence

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.