Cl **30**   *SC* **30.13.1.3**   *P* **19**   *L* **10**   # 570

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

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* **O**

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.13.1.7**   *P* **21**   *L* **2**   # 571

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Register bit not specified correctly

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.13.1.8**   *P* **21**   *L* **22**   # 572

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Register bit not specified correctly

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.13.1.14**   *P* **23**   *L* **49**   # 573

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

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* **O**

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.175**   *P* **27**   *L* **6**   # 574

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

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* **O**

Cl **45**   *SC* **45.2.1.176**   *P* **27**   *L* **33**   # 575

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

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* **O**

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

Cl **45**
SC **45.2.1.176**

Page 1 of 4
5/6/2022 8:03:28 AM

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.67.1** *P* **34** *L* **38** # 576

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

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* **O**

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.3.69a.1** *P* **38** *L* **32** # 577

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

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* **O**

Cl **90** *SC* **90.2** *P* **51** *L* **21** # 578

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

"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* **O**

Cl **90** *SC* **90.4** *P* **54** *L* **6** # 579

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

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* **O**

Cl **90** *SC* **90.4.1.2** *P* **54** *L* **52** # 580

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

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* **O**

Cl **90** *SC* **90.4.3.1.1** *P* **56** *L* **15** # 581

Kabra, Lokesh Synopsys Inc

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

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* **O**

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

Cl **90**
SC **90.4.3.1.1**

Page 2 of 4
5/6/2022 8:03:28 AM

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.3.1.1**   *P* **56**   *L* **21**   *#* 582

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

The operation to be done is not very clear. The positive value is to be added to the mean/average of the maximum & minium 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* **O**

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.3.2.1**   *P* **57**   *L* **14**   *#* 583

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **X**

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* **O**

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.3.2.1**   *P* **57**   *L* **21**   *#* 584

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

The operation to be done is not very clear. The positive value is to bereduced from the mean/average of the maximum & minium receivet 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* **O**

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.7**   *P* **64**   *L* **42**   *#* 585

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

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* **O**

Cl **Abstrac** *SC* **Abstract**   *P* **3**   *L* **3**   *#* 568

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

Editorial consistency

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **Abstrac**   Page 3 of 4
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **Abstract**   5/6/2022 8:03:28 AM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **Introdu**   *SC* **Introduction**   *P* **13**   *L* **24**   # 569

Kabra, Lokesh   Synopsys Inc

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

    Editorial consistency

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **Introdu**   Page 4 of 4
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **Introduction**   5/6/2022 8:03:28 AM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line