## Comments Received

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Comment Reference</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.13.1.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td># 570</td>
<td>Kabra, Lokesh</td>
<td>Synopsys Inc</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>PROPOSED REJECT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong> Delete “integer nanosecond portion of the”. Change “units of ns” to “units of integer nanoseconds”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Comment Reference</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.13.1.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td># 573</td>
<td>Kabra, Lokesh</td>
<td>Synopsys Inc</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent references; register 3.1.1813.13 is pointed to section 45.2.3.69a (register definition) while register 5.1.1813.13 is pointed to register field description sub-section (45.2.5.31.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong> Change “45.2.5.31.1” to “45.2.5.31” in line 49 &amp; line 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Comment Reference</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.175</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td># 574</td>
<td>Kabra, Lokesh</td>
<td>Synopsys Inc</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description of bits 1800.2 &amp; .3 indicate sub-ns resolution/units but description of bits 1800.1 &amp; 1800.0 does not indicate any units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong> Update &quot;delay ability&quot; to &quot;delay ability, in ns&quot; in 2nd column</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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
Redundant terms in sentence - "integer nanoseconds portion of the" and "in units of nanoseconds" 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

**Suggested Remedy**
Delete "integer nanosecond portion of the".
Change "units of nanoseconds" to "units of integer nanoseconds"
Applicable in in 41/42 also in next paragraph

**PROPOSED 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.

Change "both registers" to "both register bits";
Similar changes in 45.2.3.67.2, 45.2.5.28.1/2.

**PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**

"transmission and reception initiation times" is ambiguous. "Reception initiation" does not sound correct.

**Suggested Remedy**
Change this sentence to
"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,"

**PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**

Change this sentence to
"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,"

**PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**
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"

**Proposed Response**
- **Response Status**: W
- **PROPOSED 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".

**Proposed Response**
- **Response Status**: W
- **PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**

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.

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

**Proposed Response**
- **Response Status**: W
- **PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**

A positive value represents an addition to the mean/average 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/average of the maximum and minimum PCS transmit path data delay values given by the PCS transmit path data delay registers."

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

**Suggested Remedy**

Add a sentence that "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

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED 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:** D

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

**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."

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
**Comment Type**: Editorial consistency

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "transmit and receive path delays" to "transmit and receive path data delays"

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED 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