

Unsatisfied comments from 1st recirculation ballot

1st WG recirc

IEEE P802.3br/D2.1 IET 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

2015-July

Cl 00	SC 0	P 1	L 23	# 67
Hajduczenia, Marek		Bright House Network		
Comment Type	ER	Comment Status		A
<p>"This draft is an amendment of IEEE Std 802.3-2012" - it is incorrect. We have 802.3bx expected completion before you go into Sponsor Ballot and you should be keeping track against 802.3-201x (currently represented by 802.3bx) - that is what other open projects in ballots do.</p> <p><i>SuggestedRemedy</i> Change to "This draft is an amendment of IEEE Std 802.3-201x". Same changes needed in abstract and description of the amendment.</p> <p>Response Response Status W</p> <p>ACCEPT.</p>				
<hr/>				
Cl 00	SC 0	P 3	L 1	# 68
Hajduczenia, Marek		Bright House Network		
Comment Type	ER	Comment Status		A
<p>Front matter is not up to date!</p> <p><i>SuggestedRemedy</i> Apply the latest front matter (can be obtained from 802.3 Chief Editor). Further changes are also coming per last meeting of Maintenance Task Force in May 2015.</p> <p>Response Response Status W</p> <p>ACCEPT.</p>				
<hr/>				
Cl 01	SC 1.3	P 15	L 5	# 69
Hajduczenia, Marek		Bright House Network		
Comment Type	ER	Comment Status		A
<p>No normative definitions included in 1.3</p> <p><i>SuggestedRemedy</i> Remove - no need to carry on with subclause with no content</p> <p>Response Response Status W</p> <p>ACCEPT. Assume you meant references, not definitions.</p>				

Cl 01	SC 1.4	P 15	L 12	# 70
Hajduczenia, Marek		Bright House Network		
Comment Type	ER	Comment Status		A
<p>"1.4.0a express Media Access Control (eMAC):" - definition number is hoses. Please fix it. Definition of "express traffic:" should be placed in a separate line and have a heading number. Missing space in "The instance of a Media Access Control sublayer(IEEE"</p> <p><i>SuggestedRemedy</i> Per comment</p> <p>Response Response Status W</p> <p>ACCEPT.</p>				

Cl 30	SC 30.12.1.1.1	P 19	L 48	# 75
Hajduczenia, Marek		Bright House Network		
Comment Type	ER	Comment Status		R
<p>A block of text describing allocation of individual bits was removed, which I applaud. However, the replacement text is only a minor improvement towards better readability.</p> <p><i>SuggestedRemedy</i> Insert a table showing bit position and its meaning, rather than what is currently presented on page 20, lines 3-10. A table can be easily referenced, versus an inline list.</p> <p>Response Response Status W</p> <p>REJECT. This is part of the Managed Object descriptions which follow a defined syntax and therefore it can't have tables. (See also other similar lists in Clause 30 none of which have tables. E.g. 30.3.6.1.35, 30.3.6.1.37)</p>				



Comments that were accepted

SATISFIED

Voter accepted comment response

CI 30 SC 30.12.2.1.37 P 20 L 46 # 77
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

As indicated in the previous comment cycle, the current description "A 2-bit integer value used to indicate, in units of 64 octets, the minimum number of octets over 64 octets required in non-final fragments by the receiver on the given port associated with the local system." is probably understood by the Editor and a few people in the room.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest to reword to: "This 2-bit integer value indicates the minimum size of any non-final frame fragments supported by the receiver on the given port associated with the local System. This value is expressed in units of 64 octets, with the value of 0 representing the minimum fragment size of 64 octets."

Similar change to be applied to aLldpXdot3RemAddFragSize (30.12.3.1.31)

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

A 2-bit integer value used to indicate the minimum size of non-final fragments supported by the receiver on the given port associated with the local System. This value is expressed in units of 64 octets of additional fragment length. I.e., the minimum non-final fragment size is (aLldpXdot3LocAddFragSize + 1) x 64 octets.

CI 30 SC 30.14.1.3 P 22 L 51 # 78
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"This attribute maps to the variable pEnable (see 99.4.7.3)" - as far as I can tell, pEnable has two states (TRUE / FALSE) and not UNKNOWN (not set). Which of the variable states does "unknown" map?

Furthermore, pEnable seems to be reflecting the state of aMACMergeEnableTx attribute, at which time it is not clear what value it will have when the attribute is in "unknown" value.

SuggestedRemedy

Please clarify how "unknown" value is mapped into pEnable and what effect it has on the operation of the respective state diagrams. It "seems" it might be easier to just remove "unknown" and assume preemption is disabled by default until it is explicitly enabled for the given link

Similar observation applies to aMACMergeVerifyDisableTx, aMACMergeStatusTx, and others that map into boolean variables used later on in state diagrams

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Also make the same change to 30.14.1.4 aMACMergeVerifyDisableTx since it also sets a variable.

CI 79 SC 79.3.7.2 P 27 L 20 # 91
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

"Reserved for future standardization" was cleaned up per 802.3bx.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Reserved for future standardization" to "Reserved"
Similarly, in 79.5.11, change "bits reserved for future standardization" to "Reserved bits"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

CI 90 SC 90.0.1 P 30 L 3 # 92
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Wrong subclause number

SuggestedRemedy

Change "90.0.1" to "90.4.1" and make sure all following subclauses of levels 4 and 5 are numbered correctly.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

CI 90 SC 90.5.1 P 31 L 12 # 95
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Wrong editorial markup for text in lines 12-17: this text is all new and should be all underlined.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 90 **SC 90.5.2** **P 31** **L 23** # **94**
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network
Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**
 Wrong editorial markup: "When the MAC Merge sublayer is not instantiated, the TS_SFD_Detect_RX function and"
SuggestedRemedy
 Remove underline from text "the TS_SFD_Detect_RX function " - this text already exists in 90.5.2
Response **Response Status** **W**
 ACCEPT.

Cl 99 **SC 99.1** **P 33** **L 1** # **13**
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**
 Comment i-31 against the revision project 802.3bx D3.0 has modified the layer diagrams in clauses for 10G and above since they are all full duplex.
 The suggested remedy follows the changes made in response to comment i-31 to bring Figure 99-1 into line with the layer diagrams in Sections 4, 5, and 6
SuggestedRemedy
 At the top of Figure 99-1 change "LAN LAYERS" to "ETHERNET LAYERS" (still on two lines).
 In the title of Figure 99-1, change "the IEEE 802.3 Ethernet LAN model" to "the IEEE 802.3 Ethernet model"
Response **Response Status** **W**
 ACCEPT.

Cl 90 **SC 90.8.1** **P 32** **L 9** # **96**
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network
Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**
 Plenty of incorrect changes to PICS Support column in 90.8.1
SuggestedRemedy
 Remove "No []" in TS_TX, TS_RX, TS_T2, TS_T3, TS_R2, TS_R3 - these are mandatory items and not supporting them is NOT an option.
 The new item MM is marked up correctly.
Response **Response Status** **W**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Since they are conditionally mandatory - either mandatory when MM is not supported or when MM is supported, the Support column should have Y [] and N/A []. Change No to N/A in TS_TX, TS_RX, TS_T2, TS_T3, TS_R2, TS_R3.

Cl 99 **SC 99.1** **P 33** **L 21** # **99**
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network
Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**
 These two sentences just read wrong: "This clause also specifies a MAC Merge Service Interface (MMSI) providing a primitive that holds and resumes transmission of preemptable packets. The MMSI enables beginning preemption of a packet before express traffic is expected to minimize the latency for express traffic." - it is not clear what "hold a transmission" means and then the second sentence seems imply express traffic is expected to minimize latency ...
SuggestedRemedy
 Change the text to read "This clause also specifies a MAC Merge Service Interface (MMSI) providing a primitive that suspends or resumes transmission of preemptable traffic, minimizing the latency for express traffic."
Response **Response Status** **W**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 We had comments last time that asked us to consistently use "hold" when transmission of preemptable packets was suspended instead of using synonyms for hold. We resolved those comments by agreeing to always use hold.
 Change "suspend" in the proposed resolution to "hold"

Cl 99 **SC 4.7.7** **P 48** **L 17** # **164**
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A** **SATISFIED**
 Figure 99-4-Transmit Processing State Diagram
 "Isend_" s/b "Isend_v" in transition to START_PREAMBLE
SuggestedRemedy
 Change text to "Isend_v", because it is otherwise ambiguous.
Response **Response Status** **W**
 ACCEPT.

CI 99 **SC 99.1** **P 33** **L 27** # **98**
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type ER **Comment Status A**

The text in lines 27 - 38 belongs to definition of individual primitives and not the text of the introduction to the clause.

SuggestedRemedy
 MOve text in lines 27 - 38 to subclause describing MMSI (likely location 99.2.1 at the very end of subclause).

Response **Response Status W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This text is a general introduction to what the MAC Merge sublayer does. One paragraph covers operation when preemption capability is active and the other when it is inactive. However, it would be better to reduce the amount of detail on the MMSI service interface here.

The behavior of the primitives are fully defined in 99.2 and this text is not needed there.

Replace the first paragraph with:

When preemption capability is active, the MAC Merge sublayer allows frames provided over the express MAC service interface (express traffic) or the MMSI service primitives to interrupt transmission of preemptable frames provided over the preemptable MAC service interface (preemptable traffic).

At the start of the next paragraph, "When preemption is" will be replaced by "When preemption capability is".

CI 99 **SC 99.1** **P 35** **L 5** # **103**
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type TR **Comment Status A**

What is "M_P_HOLD.request" in Figure 99-3? The line from "MAC client supporting preemption" to "MAC Merge" is already correctly marked as "MM_CTL.request" below. It is the only location where it is used.

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove "M_P_HOLD.request" in Figure 99-3

Response **Response Status W**

ACCEPT. This was 802.1's name for the primitive but they are not using it anymore.

CI 99 **SC 99.1.2** **P 36** **L 39** # **108**
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type ER **Comment Status A**

There are two different Figure 99-2 instances in the document.

SuggestedRemedy
 Update figure numbering to auto-numbering and update all cross references in the document.

Response **Response Status W**

ACCEPT.

CI 99 **SC 99.3.1** **P 38** **L 33** # **110**
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type ER **Comment Status R**

"fragment counter octet (frag_count) following the SMD." - Figure 99-3 shows "FRAG_COUNT" and not "frag_count"

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "fragment counter octet (FRAG_COUNT) following the SMD."

Similar change is needed in 99.3.4, where lower case version is used and not consistent with Figure 99-3.

Also, change needed in Table 99-2, where "Frag_count" is used

Response **Response Status W**

REJECT. It is capitalized in the figure because the convention in similar 802.3 figures is to use upper case for these labels, not because that is the usual case for the field title.

See Figure 3-1 for example where Preamble, Destination Address, etc are all upper case in the figure but not in text.

Cl 99 SC 99.3.5 P 39 L 50 # 116
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

"The minimum size of the mData field is 60 octets." - it is not clear how it plays with the minimum fragment size of 64 bytes, which is defined in attributes defined in Clause 30 objects.

SuggestedRemedy

The minimum fragment size as defined in aLldpXdot3LocAddFragSize with this statement. What is the size of the fragment then? The size of mData field or something else altogether? it is not defined anywhere right now.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. The minimum mData field size is 60 octets because 60 octets plus an mCRC yields a 64 octet minimum fragment.

This is the minimum size - when aLldpXdot3LocAddFragSize is non-zero, this minimum doesn't occur in non-final fragments of a preempted packet but it still occurs in final fragments (and unpreempted minimum size packets).

The minimum size of an mpacket is defined by the minimum size of the mData field plus the packet format. The mData field is the only part that has a variable size. No other information is needed.

Cl 99 SC 99.4.7.4 P 46 L 23 # 140
Slavick, Jeff Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

In Figure 99-5 one of the exit paths out of the CHECK_FOR_START and CHECK_FOR_RESUME states is based on preamble, but the output of SMD_DECODE is Preamble (with a capital P)

SuggestedRemedy

Change SMD_DECODE to
P 0x55 - Preamble

in Figure 99-5 replace the 2 instances of preamble with P
in Figure 99-6 replace preamble with P

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.