Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 13

Trowbridge, Steve   Alcatel-Lucent

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

The terminology in the amendment does not match the agreed objectives for the project. The Call for Interest held in the March 2012 plenary for Frame Preemption was withdrawn after too much controversy over the characterization of the problem and solution. After a subsequent CFI, the first attempt to approve a PAR and objectives at the July 2013 plenary in Geneva failed due to inconsistency of the terminology with 802.3 (distinguished minimum latency traffic and "M-frames", "M-frames in the wild" were rejected. After rework in the York interim, a characterization as "interspersing express traffic" was developed, leading to the currently accepted objectives accepted in November 2013. The only place the accepted terminology appears in the draft is in the title and the name of the task force. The entire draft uses the terminology of the withdrawn CFI from March 2012

SuggestedRemedy

Update the terminology globally in the draft per the agreed objectives. In particular:
1.4.3 - change "preemptable Media Access Control" to "non-express Media Access Control" with an appropriate acronym
1.4.4 - change "preemptable traffic" to "non-express traffic"
Add IET to the acronyms defined in clause 1.
Occurrences of "preemptable" in clause 30 change to "non-express", objects such as "PreemptSupported", "PreemptEnabled", "PreemptActive" change to "IETSupported", "IETEnabled", "IETActive", etc.
Change "preemption capability" to "IET capability" globally in clause 79.
pMAC and PMAC not consistent in clause 79, but should change globally to neMAC (or whatever acronym is chosen for the non-express MAC).
Clause 99: preemptable MAC should be non-express MAC globally.
"MAC client supporting preemption" becomes "MAC client supporting IET" globally.
pMAC becomes neMAC (or chosen acronym) globally
"preemption is active" becomes "IET is active" globally
"enable preemption" becomes "enable IET" globally
"link partner supports preemption" becomes "link partner supports IET"

Response   *Response Status* **U**

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 **99**   *SC* **99.1**   *P* **35**   *L* **22**   # 33

Dawe, Piers   Mellanox

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

"the MAC Merge sublayer may prevent the pMAC from starting transmission of preemptable traffic." So this proposed thing is clearly a new MAC, because it controls access to the medium. A new MAC client with roughly twice as many queues, management registers, everything, is needed to use it. 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

Revise the 5C responses to reflect that this is a new or modified MAC, get a vote from 802.3 as to whether they want that;
or revise the draft so that it conforms to the 5C "Compatibility" response;
or terminate the project, like P802.3ar Congestion Management.

Response   *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Replace with "the MAC Merge sublayer may prevent the start of transmission of frames from the pMAC"

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.

Unsatisfied comments remaining from 2nd WG ballot at the end of D2.4 recirculation

---

TYPE: TR/technical required   ER/editorial required   GR/general required   T/technical   E/editorial   G/general   *Cl* **99**   Page 1 of 1
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched   A/accepted   R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied   Z/withdrawn   *SC* **99.1**   12/15/2015 10:26:56 A
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

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.

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.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **79**   Page 1 of 1
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **79.3.7.2**   11/12/2015 9:24:26 AM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 3

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

  Concur with D2.2 ballot comment #13.

SuggestedRemedy

  Per D2.2 ballot comment #13

Response   *Response Status* **W**

  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*   *L*   # 2

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

  Concur with D2.2 ballot comment #31 first comment paragraph, and recommendation to
  withdraw or hibernate the project. I also disagree with the rebuttal to that point. There has
  been insufficient participation from experts in IEEE Std 802.3 to assure specifications are
  correct, do not break other portions of the standard, and do not unacceptably restrict future
  PHY options. Participation promised in the PAR has not been met.

SuggestedRemedy

  Withdraw or hibernate the project

Response   *Response Status* **W**

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

  REJECT. The market projections in the Broad Market Potential based on the automotive
  and industrial environments continue to be accurate. In fact, there is interest in additional
  markets such as carrier backhaul and professional audio video.

  We have active participation in joint meetings from IEEE 802.1 TSN (a group of more than
  30) which has a companion project (IEEE P802.1Qbu Frame Preemption) dependent on
  this project. Also, about 30 people have participated by commenting on ballots.

  The interest in operating on fewer pairs and at lower speeds in the automotive and
  industrial market is driven by the need to reduce weight and power consumption.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **00**   Page 1 of 1
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **0**   12/14/2015 10:30:10 A
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line