

Comments Received

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

CI 30 SC 30.13.1.3 P19 L10 # 570

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

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.

CI 30 SC 30.13.1.7 P21 L2 # 571

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Register bit not specified correctly

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 30 SC 30.13.1.8 P21 L22 # 572

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Register bit not specified correctly

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 30 SC 30.13.1.14 P23 L49 # 573

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "45.2.5.31.1" to "45.2.5.31" in line 49 & line 51

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.175 P27 L6 # 574

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comments Received

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

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.176 P27 L33 # 575

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

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.

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.67.1 P34 L38 # 576

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status D

3.1800.13 & 3.1800.12 are register fields and not registers.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "When both registers" to "When both bits" here and in 45.2.3.67.2, 45.2.5.28.1/2

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.69a.1 P38 L32 # 577

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Incorrect sentence construct. Whom does "they attempt to" refer to? i.e Who are "they" ?
Secondly, the term "writes to this bit is ignored" is ambiguous. It can mean "write operation is blocked & bit is not modified" and not that value of this bit has no impact, which I assume is the intention.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace this sentence with
"The value of this bit has no impact if the value corresponds to a capability that is not supported in register 3.1800".
Similar change in 45.2.5.31.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 90 SC 90.2 P51 L21 # 578

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

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 Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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 is received, as required to support various time synchronization protocols,"

Comments Received

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

CI 90 SC 90.4 P54 L6 # 579
 Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 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.
 SuggestedRemedy
 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.

CI 90 SC 90.4.1.2 P54 L52 # 580
 Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 The sentence starting with "Which packets are of interest..." is colloquial
 SuggestedRemedy
 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.
 Change to "The identification of specific protocol packets of interest is outside the scope of this standard".

CI 90 SC 90.4.3.1.1 P56 L15 # 581
 Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 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?
 SuggestedRemedy
 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
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED 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.

CI 90 SC 90.4.3.1.1 P56 L21 # 582
 Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 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 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.

Comments Received

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

CI 90 SC 90.4.3.2.1 P57 L14 # 583

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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?

SuggestedRemedy

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 Response Status W

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.

CI 90 SC 90.4.3.2.1 P57 L21 # 584

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

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.

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 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 Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 90 SC 90.7 P64 L42 # 585

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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.

CI Abstract SC Abstract P3 L3 # 568

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Editorial consistency

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

C/ **Introdu** SC **Introduction** P13 L24 # 569

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**

Editorial consistency

Suggested Remedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

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