

Cl 0 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # i-92
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

I concur with comment #33 against D2.2 "... This isn't "Conformance with the IEEE Std 802.3 MAC", "conformance with the MAC client interface" or "conform to the full duplex operating mode of the IEEE 802.3 MAC" as alleged in the 5C "Compatibility" response. It forces anyone with a MAC design to redesign it."

SuggestedRemedy

Implement response from either Comment #33 or #31 against D2.2

Response Response Status U

REJECT. The response to comment #33 during WG ballot of Draft 2.2 still applies: It isn't changing the MAC. It is holding off acceptance of the primitive from the MAC. There is no change to the MAC. We are consistent with the Compatibility response since we do not make any changes to the MAC. Other projects such as PAUSE, PFC and point-to-multipoint changed the control of access to the medium without changing the MAC.

IEEE 802.1Qbu is defining protocols for MAC Clients that expect this behavior. It doesn't require twice as many queues. IEEE 802.1Q already defines use of up to 8 traffic classes (e.g. queues) and such implementations are common.

This is an optional capability and doesn't force anyone to support it. Devices supporting the optional capability are fully interoperable with devices that don't support it.

Cl 0 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # i-90
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The terminology in the amendment does not match the agreed objectives for the project. See comment #13 against Draft 2.2 for additional details.

SuggestedRemedy

Update the terminology globally in the draft per the agreed objectives. See comment #13 against Draft 2.2 for details.

Response Response Status U

REJECT. The response to comment #13 during WG Ballot of Draft 2.2 still applies: The main complaint about the initial 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 99 SC 99.1 P 35 L 38 # i-93
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

It has been observed by others that options tend to become requirements in the market. There are numerous RFPs that require Ethernet features that are optional just because the option appears in the standard and it is easier to require all the bells and whistles than to pick and choose, especially if there is a slight chance that the feature will be needed "someday". This is overriding fear with this project; that it will become a required feature for all MACs creating in effect a Tax on Ethernet. It should be made clear that this feature should not be required of MACs not intended on the targeted application (automotive and similar applications).

SuggestedRemedy

Append to the para starting "Preemption capability is most useful at lower operating speeds" the following:
 "Therefore, Express Traffic features should not be implemented in very high speed MACs (e.g., at rate greater than 5 gaps). Furthermore Express Traffic can place a burden on lower speed MACs that do not need the advantages of the interspersed express traffic feature should only be included in MACs targeting applications (such as automotive and industrial) that receive significant benefits from this feature.

Response Response Status U

REJECT. Automotive and industrial were two markets that justified starting the work, but IEEE P802.1Qbu Preemption and IEEE P802.3br IET are useful for other markets as well. Other examples including pro-audio and video, building automation, smart grid, power generation and front haul networks.

The front haul network use case requires low enough latency and high bandwidth such that preemption provides for longer reach needs at 10 Gb/s. See: <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2016/cm-farkas-profiles-A-and-B-0316-v01.pdf>

Cl 99 SC 99.1.2 P 38 L 1 # i-27
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

There is no reason to separate receive direction into "EXPRESS FILTER" and "RECEIVE PROCESSING" blocks - multiple SDs can run inside of a single function block, with no issues at all

SuggestedRemedy

Merge "Express Filter" and "Receive Processing" into a single block "Receive Processing" and source all PLS_DATA.indication, PLS_DATA_VALID.indication, and PLS_SIGNAL.indication signals for pMAC and eMAC from there.
Align description accordingly

Response Response Status U

REJECT. Either way would be valid. It is a matter of what blocks to break things into for easier consumption by the reader and breaking apart the two blocks of receive functionality aids in that.

Cl 99 SC 99.3.4 P 41 L 36 # i-37
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type ER Comment Status R

When speaking about frag_count (variable) it should be written in lower case. When speaking about the field, it should be capitalized

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The frag_count field" to "The FRAG_COUNT field"

Response Response Status U

REJECT. There is no convention in IEEE 802.3 to do that. See for example the frame fields in Clause 3 and in Clause 79. They are upper case in the figures and lower case or initial caps when in text.