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IEEE P802.3cx D2.4 ITSA Task Force 4th Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Cl 30 SC 30.13.1.3 P19 L10 # 570
Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status R
The definition has redundant terms. "the integer nanosecond portion of the" in the beginning and the "expressed in units of ns" convey the same information. This comment and proposed change also applies to similar text in 30.13.1.4 - 1.6

Suggested Remedy
Delete "integer nanosecond portion of the".
Change "units of ns" to "units of integer nanoseconds"

Response Response Status C
REJECT.

The "redundancy" was added deliberately for consistent wording for ns and sub-ns portion attributes. The current structure was used to highlight that there are up to two portions to each type of delay object, an "integer nanosecond portion" and a "sub-nanosecond portion". Since those terms are not sufficient for defining the resolution, it was also necessary to include the units for each object.

No changes needed.

Cl 30 SC 30.13.1.7 P21 L2 # 571
Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
Register bit not specified correctly

Suggested Remedy
Change all "1803" to "1800.3" in the 6 sub-bullets

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.13.1.8 P21 L22 # 572
Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
Register bit not specified correctly

Suggested Remedy
Change all "1802" to "1800.2" in the 6 sub-bullets

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.13.1.14 P23 L49 # 573
Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status A
Inconsistent references; register 3.1813.13 is pointed to section 45.2.3.69a (register definition) while register 5.1813.13 is pointed to register field description sub-section (45.2.5.31.1)

Suggested Remedy
Change "45.2.5.31.1" to "45.2.5.31.1" in line 49 & line 51

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.175 P27 L6 # 574
Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status A
Description of bits 1800.2 & .3 indicate sub-ns resolution/units but description of bits 1800.1 & 1800.0 does not indicate any units
Same comment applies to Table 45-230, 45-293, 45-336, 45-361, & 45-375

Suggested Remedy
Update "delay ability" to "delay ability, in ns" in 2nd column
Update "delay in" to "delay with ns resolution in" 3rd column for both bit fields

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.176</td>
<td>P27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabra, Lokesh</td>
<td>Synopsys Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundant terms in sentence - &quot;integer nanoseconds portion of the&quot; and &quot;in units of nanoseconds&quot; convey the same information; Same comment applies in multiple/similar sections/sentences 45.2.1.177, 45.2.2.21/22, 45.2.3.68/69, 45.2.4.29/30, 45.2.5.29/30, 45.2.6.15/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete &quot;integer nanosecond portion of the&quot;. Change &quot;units of nanoseconds&quot; to &quot;units of integer nanoseconds&quot; Applicable in sections 41/42 also in next paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The &quot;redundancy&quot; was added deliberately for consistent wording for ns and sub-ns portion attributes. The current structure was used to highlight that there are up to two portions to each type of delay object, an &quot;integer nanosecond portion&quot; and a &quot;sub-nanosecond portion&quot;. Since those terms are not sufficient for defining the resolution, it was also necessary to include the units for each object. No changes needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.3.67.1</td>
<td>P34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabra, Lokesh</td>
<td>Synopsys Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1800.13 &amp; 3.1800.12 are register fields and not registers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change &quot;both registers&quot; to &quot;both register bits&quot;; Similar changes in 45.2.3.67.2, 45.2.5.28.1/2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The &quot;transmission and reception initiation times&quot; is ambiguous. &quot;Reception initiation&quot; does not sound correct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change this sentence to &quot;The goal of this clause is to provide an accurate indication of the time at which all the packets are transmitted or received, as required to support various time synchronization protocols.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change this sentence to &quot;The goal of this clause is to provide an accurate indication of the time at which any packet is transmitted or received, as required to support various time synchronization protocols,&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The service primitives between MAC Client and MAC Control and between MAC Control & MAC are not differentiated. They are both MA_DATA.request & MA_DATA.indication.

**Suggested Remedy**
Add prefix of "MCF: " & "MAC:" as given in Figure 31-2 in Clause 31. Change "MAC service interface" to "MAC Client service interface"

**REJECT.**
The context is clear, i.e., which layers the given primitive originates from or is delivered to.

---

The sentence starting with "Which packets are of interest… " is colloquial

**Suggested Remedy**
Change to "The identification of specific protocol packets of interest, is beyond the scope of this standard".

**ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**
Change to "The identification of specific protocol packets of interest is outside the scope of this standard".

---

When DDMP=FIRST_SYMBOL, TS_TX.indication will be given for all fragments including Continuation frames (SMD-C) to PMAC. But when DDMP=SFD, TS_TX.indication is not given for SMD-C as per the description in this paragraph/line. Should we not make the TS_TX.indication behavior consistent in both modes?

**Suggested Remedy**
Add a sentence that "When DDMP=FIRST_SYMBOL, the TS_TX.indication is not generated for continuation fragments with SMD-C". OR change "an SMD-S value has been detected" to "either a SMD-S or SMD-C value has been detected" in line 15.

Similar change in 90.5.1 paragraph 2

**ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**
Add the sentence "When DDMP=FIRST_SYMBOL, the TS_TX.indication is not generated for continuation fragments in a new paragraph that follows the paragraph that starts with "The MM parameter is mandatory…”

Add similar sentence/paragraph at the end of 90.5.1.

---

The service primitives between MAC Client and MAC Control and between MAC Control & MAC are not differentiated. They are both MA_DATA.request & MA_DATA.indication.

**Suggested Remedy**
Add prefix of "MCF: " & "MAC:" as given in Figure 31-2 in Clause 31. Change "MAC service interface" to "MAC Client service interface"

**REJECT.**
The context is clear, i.e., which layers the given primitive originates from or is delivered to.

---

The sentence starting with "Which packets are of interest… " is colloquial

**Suggested Remedy**
Change to "The identification of specific protocol packets of interest, is beyond the scope of this standard".

**ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**
Change to "The identification of specific protocol packets of interest is outside the scope of this standard".

---

When DDMP=FIRST_SYMBOL, TS_TX.indication will be given for all fragments including Continuation frames (SMD-C) to PMAC. But when DDMP=SFD, TS_TX.indication is not given for SMD-C as per the description in this paragraph/line. Should we not make the TS_TX.indication behavior consistent in both modes?

**Suggested Remedy**
Add a sentence that "When DDMP=FIRST_SYMBOL, the TS_TX.indication is not generated for continuation fragments with SMD-C". OR change "an SMD-S value has been detected" to "either a SMD-S or SMD-C value has been detected" in line 15.

Similar change in 90.5.1 paragraph 2

**ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**
Add the sentence "When DDMP=FIRST_SYMBOL, the TS_TX.indication is not generated for continuation fragments in a new paragraph that follows the paragraph that starts with "The MM parameter is mandatory…”

Add similar sentence/paragraph at the end of 90.5.1.
The operation to be done is not very clear. The positive value is to be added to the mean/average of the maximum & minimum transmit path data delay given in the corresponding registers.

Same comment for reduction/negative value operation

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence that start with "A positive value …" to
"A positive value represents an addition to the mean/average of the maximum and minimum PCS transmit path data delay registers (see 45.2.3.68). A negative value represents a reduction from the mean/average of the maximum and minimum PCS transmit path data delay values given by the PCS transmit path data delay registers."

Response

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the sentence that start with
"A positive value …" to
"A positive value represents an addition to the mean of the maximum and minimum PCS transmit path data delay values given by the PCS transmit path data delay registers (see 45.2.3.68). A negative value represents a reduction from the mean of the maximum and minimum PCS transmit path data delay values given by the PCS transmit path data delay registers."

Response

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

When DDMP=FIRST_SYMBOL, the TS_RX.indication is not generated for continuation fragments with SMD-C. OR change "an SMD-S value has been detected" to "either a SMD-S or SMD-C value has been detected" in line 15.

Similar change in 90.5.2 paragraph 2

Response

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add the sentence "When DDMP=FIRST_SYMBOL, the TS_RX.indication is not generated for continuation fragments" in a new paragraph that follows the paragraph that starts with "The MM parameter is mandatory..."

Add similar sentence/paragraph at the end of 90.5.2.
Comment Type: E  Comment Status: A

The operation to be done is not very clear. The positive value is to be reduced from the mean/average of the maximum & minimum received path data delay given in the corresponding registers.

Same comment for reduction/negative value operation

Suggested Remedy
Change the sentence that start with "A positive value ..." to
"A positive value represents an addition to the mean/average of the maximum and minimum PCS receive path data delay values given by the PCS receive path data delay registers (see 45.2.3.69). A negative value represents a reduction from the mean/average of the maximum and minimum PCS receive path data delay values given by the PCS receive path data delay registers."

Response  Response Status: C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the sentence that start with "A positive value ...
" to
"A positive value represents an addition to the mean of the maximum and minimum PCS receive path data delay values given by the PCS receive path data delay registers (see 45.2.3.69). A negative value represents a reduction from the mean of the maximum and minimum PCS receive path data delay values given by the PCS receive path data delay registers."

Response  Response Status: C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changes per comment + in the following locations:
• Page 3 line 4
• Page 13 line 25
• Page 63 line 34
• Page 63 line 43
• Page 64 line 9
• Page 64 line 15

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: A

The paragraph starting with "The obtained data delay ..." looks to be a different font size/format.

Suggested Remedy
Update formatting of this paragraph to be consistent with the rest of document.

Response  Response Status: C
REJECT.

Formatting is consistent already. The commenter is comparing the format of a NOTE with the text of the body - they are intended to be different styles.