

Cl 61 SC 61.1.4.1.1 P321 L 35-38 # 14
 Shimon Muller Sun Microsystems, Inc

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

This note was inserted into draft 2.1 as a way of providing support for MAC-PHY Rate Matching in implementations that use a full duplex only MAC. However, at this point this note does more harm than good for the following reasons:

It refers to functionality that has not been defined anywhere. Neither clause 4 nor any of the new clauses specify how IFS stretching can be accomplished in a MAC that operates at 100Mb/s. The only specification for IFS stretching in clause 4 is defined for 10Gb/s operation, which is also the only speed that is allowed to use this mechanism. Also, it is not trivial to extrapolate from the existing clause 4 definition how IFS stretching can be made to work for a 100Mb/s MAC without any further guidance to the implementor.

I therefore believe that in that respect this draft is technically flawed. Either provide a complete definition for IFS stretching at 100Mb/s, or drop this functionality completely. During the previous recirculation ballot I tried to do the former. However, since my comment (#68) was rejected, the next best thing is to do the latter.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this note and all the other references to full duplex MAC operation for EFM copper.

Proposed Response Response Status **U**

REJECT.

This is informative text and is factually correct. The note makes an observation to provide some guidance to implementers, but does not state any requirements. No interoperability issue arises as a result of the inclusion of this note. While further tutorial information could be provided, as suggested by the balloter in comment #68 made against draft 2.1, the exclusion of such tutorial material does not render the draft incorrect or incomplete. Removing the observation provided by this note would not enhance the draft.

The comment does not require recirculation for the following reasons:

- 1) It was submitted by a balloter who voted ""Disapprove"" on the previous ballot, thus the balloter's vote does not change.
- 2) The comment references comment #68 from the previous ballot, which was submitted by the same balloter, and rejected. It can therefore be considered a ""pile on"" to the balloter's own comment.
- 3) The comment is made against text which did not change between D2.1 and D2.2 (i.e. did not change in the recirculated draft).