Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* *#* 24

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

I concur with Geoff Thompson's Comment #31 from Draft 2.2. The PAR states
participation in THIS TASK FORCE of about 30 persons.
In reviewing the minutes of the past meetings here is what I observe:
Bonita Spring 3 + 2 part time
Waikoloa   5 (4 of 5 sessions or more) + 5 (2 of 5 sessions or less)
Pittsburgh   3 (4 of 5 sessions or more) + 1 (3 of 5 sessions) + 7 (2 of 5 sessions or less)
Berlin   3 (2 of 2 sessions) + 1 (1 of 2 sessions)
Atlanta   6 (3 of 3 sessions for all)
San Antonio   10 (2 of 2 sessions for all)
Ottawa   14 (7 for 1 of 2 sessions)
San Diego   14 (4 for 1 of 3 sessions)
Norfolk   13 (4 for 1 of 2 sessions)
Beijing   7 (for 1 of 1 half-day session)
Indian Wells 13 (3 for 1 of 3 sessions)

From this data I can only conclude that at no meetings did TF attendance reach even 1/2
the approximate number stated in the PAR.

SuggestedRemedy

Per original comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* *#* 23

Remein, Duane Huawei

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

I concur with comment #13 from Draft 2.2 by Steve Trowbridge. The terminology of the
draft needs to be updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT. This is a pile-on to a comment from the prior ballot. The previous response still
applies. It is copied below.

REJECT.

The main complaint about the intiial CFI was that it presumed a solution and that should be
decided after the project is created.

After the project was created, preemption was chosen as part of the solution for
interspersing express traffic. The suggested name changes would not aid the reader in
understanding the material. There is no reason to obfuscate the selected mechanism.

The project meets the agreed objectives.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** *#* 7

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

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

This is a pile on to comment #13 against D2.2

SuggestedRemedy

Please implement comment #13 against D2.2

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT. This is a pile-on to a comment from the prior ballot. The previous response still
applies. It is copied below.

REJECT.

The main complaint about the intiial CFI was that it presumed a solution and that should be
decided after the project is created.
After the project was created, preemption was chosen as part of the solution for
interspersing express traffic. The suggested name changes would not aid the reader in
understanding the material. There is no reason to obfuscate the selected mechanism.

The project meets the agreed objectives.

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 1 of 8
11/12/2015 9:29:12 AM

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4.209**   *P* **25**   *L* **1**   # 35

Kong, Samuel   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**

change the word "pause" to "PAUSE"

SuggestedRemedy

change the word "pause" to "PAUSE"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT. No lower case PAUSE in the draft 2.3. Subclause does not exist and page reference doesn't match. Was this comment intended for another draft?

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.2.3**   *P* **19**   *L* **1**   # 36

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

Commenter recognizes this is out of scope for this recirculation. Figure 30-3 is missing external crossreferences on all blocks.

SuggestedRemedy

Show all sections in figure as 'forest green' marked with tag 'external'.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.2.5**   *P* **21**   *L* **1**   # 15

Gardner, Andrew   Linear Technology

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

Table 30-9 title needs 'continued'

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT. Out of scope.
Also, these documents are professionally edited. The table may not split in the final version.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.14.1.13**   *P* **26**   *L* **51**   # 16

Gardner, Andrew   Linear Technology

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

Suggest adding page break before 30.14.1.13 for better continuity

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT. Out of scope.
Also, these documents are professionally edited.

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.7.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **44**   # 22

Remein, Duane   Huawei

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

Wording: "if more octets are received that were defined"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "that" to "then" so the statement reads:
"if more octets are received than were defined

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT. Out of scope.

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 **79**
SC **79.3.7.1**

Page 2 of 8
11/12/2015 9:29:12 AM

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.7.2**   *P* **28**   *L* **52**   *#* 4

Hajduczenia, Marek   Bright House Network

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

Unnecessary optionality "the Additional Ethernet Capabilities TLV should be sent in an LLDPDU addressed to the Nearest Bridge group address (see IEEE 802.1Q)." - if we intend for interoperabilty, we need to leave as few "should" statements as possible and nail down all options down.
Additionally, there is no viable option presented (what address is to be used when the Nearest Bridge group is not used)

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "the Additional Ethernet Capabilities TLV shall be sent in an LLDPDU addressed to the Nearest Bridge group address (see IEEE 802.1Q)."
Update PICS as needed

Response   *Response Status* **U**

REJECT. The reason it is a should is that users configure what TLVs to send in an LLDP frame. The usage rules are not a requirement on an implementation. All usage rules in Clause 79 have "should" rather than "shall" for that reason.

Interoperability is addressed by the shall in the last paragraph of 99.4.2. That ensures that preemption capability is only enabled if the TLV is sent in a frame with the correct address. If the TLV is sent to any other address, the preemption capability information in it will be ignored.

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.7.2**   *P* **28**   *L* **53**   *#* 3

Hajduczenia, Marek   Bright House Network

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **A**

Incorrect reference to 802.1Q

SuggestedRemedy

Is "IEEE 802.1Q" and should be "IEEE Std 802.1Q"
There are multiple locations in the draft where such a change is needed (some outside of text modified in D2.1)

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **90**   *SC* **90.4.3.1.1**   *P* **32**   *L* **22**   *#* 26

Tretter, Albert   Siemens AG

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

In clause the description the text is underlined. It is not clear why? This is also the case at other clauses at page 33 and 34.

SuggestedRemedy

Either explain why underlined or remove it

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT. It is explained. See the note on editing instructions on page 16. When the editing instruction is "change," the change to the text is shown by underlining new text and strike through of deleted text.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **35**   *L* **22**   *#* 18

Remein, Duane   Huawei

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **A**

This wording is clumsy and can easily be improved.
"the MAC Merge sublayer may prevent the start of transmission of packets from the pMAC."

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
"the MAC Merge sublayer may prevent the start of packet transmission from the pMAC."

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Use

the MAC Merge sublayer may prevent starting the transmission of preemptable traffic.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.3.3**   *P* **40**   *L* **46**   *#* 27

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syst

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

The text "additional fragment counter" suggests that the counter is counting additional fragments which is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text from:
"and includes an additional fragment counter octet (frag_count) following the SMD"

To:
"and following the SMD has an additional octet for the fragment count (frag_count)"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT. Out of scope

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **99**   Page 3 of 8
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **99.3.3**   11/12/2015 9:29:12 AM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.3.3**   *P* **41**   *L* **29**   # 2

Belitz, Tobias   Renesas

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **A**

For an MII Interface which is a nibble based interface, there is the possibility to detect an SMD-E instead of an SMD-C3.
This is due to the sequence of nibbles provided by the PHY interface. For instance: 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'h5 – 4'hD – 4'hA ... Inside of the MAC every nibble a octet check is done. Due to the nibble stream the SFD 8'hD5 will come always before the SMD-C3 value 8'hAD is noticed hence all SMD-C3 frames are recognized as SMD-E frames. (A presentation is created to exemplify the issue IEEE_802.3br_wrong_SFD_detection.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy

The problem is the "D" inside of the SMD-C3 octet 8'hAD, hence we propose to use a encoding different than 0x?D.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT. Use 0x2A instead of 0xAD

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.3.3**   *P* **41**   *L* **30**   # 29

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syst

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **A**

You cannot use an SMD encoding of 0xAD with a 100Mbps nibble interface. If you have an odd number of nibbles on the receive interface the D in 0xAD will look like 0xD5 and be decoded as an SMD-E.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 0xAD to something else.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT. Use 0x2A instead of 0xAD

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.3.4**   *P* **41**   *L* **4**   # 32

Kong, Samuel   Marvell

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**

The frag_count of the initial fragment is '0' as described in this section where as in Figures 99-5 and 99-6 the frag_count of the first continuing fragment is '0'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the frag_count description to match Fig.99-5 and 99-6

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. In 99.3.4, change the text to:
"The frag_count is a modulo-4 counter that increments for each continuation fragment of the preemptable packet. The frag_count protects against mPacket reassembly errors by enabling detection of the loss of up to 3 packet fragments.

The frag_count field is present only in mPackets with SMD-C. The frag_count is zero in the first continuation fragment of each preemptable packet.

The valid values of frag_count values are shown in Table 99–2."

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.3.6**   *P* **42**   *L* **4**   # 33

Kong, Samuel   Marvell

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **R**

Add a note for further clarification for mCRC

SuggestedRemedy

The mCRC value is same as inverting the last 2 bytes of CRC.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT. The existing text is clear and we already have a clarifying note

---

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **99**   Page 4 of 8
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **99.3.6**   11/12/2015 9:29:12 AM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **99**　　　*SC* **99.3.6**　　　　　*P* **42**　　　*L* **29**　　　# 37
Zimmerman, George　　　　　　　CME Consulting

Comment Type **T**　　　*Comment Status* **R**

"NOTE—0x0000 is XORed with two octets that contain the higher order coefficients of the CRC and 0xFFFF is XORed
with the two octets that contain the lower order coefficients of the CRC." - the first part of this statement is meaningless. XOR'ing 0x0000 with something is doing NOTHING. It leaves the reader scratching his/her head as to what was meant.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the first sentence of the note, so that it reads:
"0xFFFF is XORed with the two octets that contain the lower order coefficients of the CRC."

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

REJECT. 0x0000 FFFF is XORed with the whole CRC (so yes, the two high order octets are unchanged and the low order octets are flipped). The note was added to make it absolutely clear which half gets the 0000 and which gets the FFFF.

Also, the Clause 4 CRC is XORed with all 1's so not flipping some of the bits is what is different.

Cl **99**　　　*SC* **99.3.6**　　　　　*P* **42**　　　*L* **29**　　　# 19
Remein, Duane　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type **ER**　　　*Comment Status* **D**

Note appears to be using an incorrect paragraph tag

SuggestedRemedy

Change to Note (Time New Roman, 9pt)

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **99**　　　*SC* **99.3.6**　　　　　*P* **43**　　　*L* **29**　　　# 6
Hajduczenia, Marek　　　　　　Bright House Network

Comment Type **E**　　　*Comment Status* **R**

Inconsistent format of hex numbers: 0x0000 FFFF, 0x0000 …

SuggestedRemedy

Please use the separation with "-" every two hex symbols - this makes reading much simpler.
Change (for example): 0x0000 to 0x00-00; 0x0000 FFFF to 0x00-00-FF-FF

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

REJECT. The format is consistent always using 0x to indicate a hex number as defined in 1.2.5 Hexadecimal Notation. Checking Section 4, 5 and 6 of IEEE 802.3, none of them use hyphens as separaters in hex numbers. There were objections to using hypens as ranges because they can be misunderstood as minus signs and that would apply here too.

The space could be removed in 0x0000 FFFF to make it 0x0000FFFF, but the space makes it easier to read and 0x0000 FFFF is unchanged text and out of scope.

Cl **99**　　　*SC* **99.4.2**　　　　　*P* **42**　　　*L* **52**　　　# 25
Tretter, Albert　　　　　　　Siemens AG

Comment Type **E**　　　*Comment Status* **A**

"...if it is determined that the link partner s ..."
=> I assume the word "supports" is missing

SuggestedRemedy

Proposal: The preemption capability is enabled in the transmit direction only if it is determined that the link partner supports the preemption capability.

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **99**　　　*SC* **99.4.2**　　　　　*P* **42**　　　*L* **53**　　　# 28
Marris, Arthur　　　　　　　Cadence Design Syst

Comment Type **ER**　　　*Comment Status* **A**

Typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"partner s"
To:
"partner supports"

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 **99**
SC **99.4.2**

Page 5 of 8
11/12/2015 9:29:12 AM

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.4.3**   *P* **43**   *L* **16**   # 20
Remein, Duane   Huawei

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Here you state that verification may be disabled yet on page 36 line 35 you state that "Preemption capability is enabled only after it has been determined that the link partner supports it (see 99.4.2)."
These statements seem to be self contratictory.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide normative language for when verification can be disabled.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

It isn't contradictory. The LLDP TLV exchange determines that the link partner supports preemption capability and it can't be disabled.

Verification is a further check. We provide guidance on when it can be disabled. Since disabling it is something done by the user, not the implementation, normative language doesn't make sense.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.4.4**   *P* **44**   *L* **8**   # 21
Remein, Duane   Huawei

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**

Transmit s/b lower case in the following:
"When preemption capability is active, Transmit processing"

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.4.7.3**   *P* **47**   *L* **7**   # 13
Gardner, Andrew   Linear Technology

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**

Missing period at end of sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.4.7.3**   *P* **47**   *L* **30**   # 14
Gardner, Andrew   Linear Technology

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **A**

Missing period at end of sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.4.7.4**   *P* **49**   *L* **14**   # 1
Belitz, Tobias   Renesas

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **A**

Under certain circumstances during verification of the preemption capability it could happen that a preemptable frame is starting with SFD (0xD5) and continued with SMD-C. For this case the Preemptable frame has to starts when the link verification is not completed. During frame transmission the link Verification is successful completed which could cause the frame preemption. This would cause to send an incorrect frame on the bus. A presentation is created to exemplify the issue (IEEE_802.3br_SMDS_Encoding.pdf).

SuggestedRemedy

The origin of the problem is the pActive variable, the definition should change that under all circumstances it could not change its state (FALSE -> TRUE) when a preemptable frame is ongoing.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See 30

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 **99**
SC **99.4.7.4**

Page 6 of 8
11/12/2015 9:29:12 AM

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.4.7.7**   *P* **51**   *L* **31**   # 30

Marris, Arthur   Cadence Design Syst

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

The value of the "pActive" and "preempt" variable can change during the PREEMPTABLE_TX state. This means the transmit state machine can cause fragmentation of a frame with an SMD of 0xD5.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider only allowing the pActive variable to change in the IDLE_TX_PROC state.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Also could happen if pActive changes state while transmitting a frame with verification disabled.

The simplest fix would be to create an additional varible to capture the state of pActive when a frame starts: pAllow.

In state SEND_SMD_S, add:
pAllow <= pActive as the first action.
In the definition of preempt and SMDS_ENCODE, replace pActive with pAllow.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99.4.8**   *P* **53**   *L* **42**   # 17

Gardner, Andrew   Linear Technology

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**

There is an instance of must in subclause 99.4.8 that pertains to predictable operation of time sensitive data.

SuggestedRemedy

The IEEE convention is to use shall instead of must when a specification is mandatory. Consider using shall intstead of must.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT. Out of scope. Also, this is not intended as a mandatory requirement. It is a statement explaining why delay constraints are important. It is describing an unavoidable situation.

The actual delay constraints have "shall"s.

The existing text is the same as used in other delay constraints subclauses (e.g. 69.3, 70.4, 71.4)

Cl **99**   *SC* **Table 99-1**   *P* **41**   *L* **3, 11**   # 31

Kong, Samuel   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

For MII mode, a packet containing Preambles followed by 0xD and 0xA can be decoded as either SMD-E or SMD-C3 depending on the even or odd numbers of Preamble nibbles

SuggestedRemedy

Use a different encoded value for SMD-C3 other than 0xAD

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Use 0x2A instead of 0xAD

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **99**   Page 7 of 8
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **Table 99-1**   11/12/2015 9:29:12 AM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **99,1**	*SC* **99,1**	*P* **35**	*L* **39**	# 5

Hajduczenia, Marek   Bright House Network

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **A**

The text which was added in D2.1 could use some technical improvement.
"Preemption capability is most useful at lower operating speeds. The duration of a maximum size frame (2000 octets) on a 100 Mb/s link is 160 us and on a 1 Gb/s link is 16 us. This is an upper bound on the additional delay before a MAC Client can send an Express frame when preemption capability is not used. At higher operating speeds the additional delay gets smaller in proportion to the speed."

The frame length for specific speeds it just an example, and should be marked as such. Second, the maximum frame size should be referenced through link to Clause 3 and not explicitly stated (can be changed over time).
The statement "This is an upper bound on the additional delay before a MAC Client can send an Express frame when preemption capability is not used." is out of place.
2000 byte frame is also not correct - it is 2000 byte packet.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the statement "This is an upper bound on the additional delay before a MAC Client can send an Express frame when preemption capability is not used.".
Change "The duration of a maximum size frame (2000 octets) on a 100 Mb/s link is 160 us and on a 1 Gb/s link is 16 us" to read "For example, the duration of a maximum size packet (see 3.2.7) on a 100 Mb/s link is 160 us and on a 1 Gb/s link is 16 us"
Change "At higher operating speeds the additional delay gets smaller in proportion to the speed." to "At higher operating speed,s this additional delay gets smaller in proportion to the link speed, limiting advantages of the preemption mechanism."

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The statement about upper bound is correct and part of explaining that the expresss packet latency saved by preemption decreases as speed increases.

If maximum packet size changes in the future, the suggested statement that the duration of a maximum size packet takes a specific time would become untrue. E.g. if maximum packet size was increased to 4000 octets, it would become 320 us. If we want an example that isn't impacted by changes in maximum packet size, then it "maximum size" should be deleted.

Use,
"For example, the duration of a 2000 octet packet on a 100 Mb/s link is 160 us and on a 1 Gb/s link is 16 us. This is an upper bound on the additional delay before a MAC Client can send an Express frame when preemption capability is not used. At higher operating speeds, this additional delay gets smaller in proportion to the link speed, reducing the advantage of the preemption mechanism."

Cl **99,1**	*SC* **99,1**	*P* **36**	*L* **29**	# 34

Kong, Samuel   Marvell

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **A**

Add a note for further clarification for PAUSE

SuggestedRemedy

Add "(see IEEE 802.3 Annex 31B)" right after "PAUSE"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Since we become part of IEEE 802.3, we say "(see Annex 31B)"

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* **99,1**   Page 8 of 8
                    SC **99,1**   11/12/2015 9:29:12 AM