

Unsatisfied Comments

IEEE P802.3cx D2.0 ITSA Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 90 SC 90.4.4.1.2 P49 L11 # 179

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

AM insertion, CWM insertion and Idle/insert delete are the typical reasons for a change in delay but not the only one.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the second sentence from:

TX_num_unit_change indicates the change in the Tx PHY's path data delay due to AM insertion, CWM insertion, and/or Idle rate adaptation insertion/removal for the corresponding Tx xMII word.

To:

TX_num_unit_change indicates the change in the Tx PHY's transmit path data delay for the corresponding Tx xMII word, possible reasons for the adjustment are AM insertion, CWM insertion, and/or Idle rate adaptation insertion/removal.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

The intent is to report data delay only due to AM insertion, CWM insertion, and/or Idle rate adaptation insertion/removal at this time. Any future functions causing data delay variation would require an update to TimeSync.

Cl 90 SC 90.5.1 P50 L35 # 167

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The service primitive interface supplies the communication path between sub-layers. It does not need to include programming of how the INDICATION is generated, that is done based upon the detect_function which causes the event to occur. So there is no need to modify 90.4.3.1.1 and 90.4.3.2.1. To provide support of selecting when INDICATION occurs, either coincident with the SFD or the FIRST_CHAR after the SFD, you just need to manipulate when the detect cause the INDICATION event to occur. So only 90.5.1 and 90.5.2 need to be adjusted to provide text for when the DETECT will cause INDICATION to occur to allow for both options. Note the detect_function monitors only for Start of Frame Delimiter and then delays (or doesn't) the INDICATION based upon the MDIO config field.

SuggestedRemedy

Revert 90.4.3.1.1 and 90.4.3.2.1 to be same as 802.3dc (existing Cl90 definition).

Update all references of TS_MTP_Detetct* back to TS_SDF_Detect*

Update the following two sub-clauses to be as follows

90.5.1 TS_SFD_Detect_TX function

The TS_SFD_Detect_TX function observes the xMII transmit signals.

There are two possible points in the message where TS_SFD_Detect_TX will cause TS_TX.indication to be generated. The selection of which location is used, the beginning of the Start of Frame Delimiter (SFD, see 3.1.1 and 3.2.2, SMD-E and SMD-S, see 99.3.3) or the beginning of the first symbol after the SFD, is based upon the setting of Message Timestamp Point (MTP) (see 45.2.4.68a).

When the MAC Merge sublayer is not instantiated the TS_SFD_Detect_TX function detects the occurrence of the SFD in compliance with the specifications of the given type of instantiated xMII. For each SFD that is detected on the transmit signals of the xMII the TS_TX.indication service primitive shall be generated (SFD=DETECTED) across the TSSI at the configured MTP.

When the MAC Merge sublayer is instantiated the TS_SFD_Detect_TX function detects the occurrence of the SMD-E and SMD-S in compliance with the specifications of the given type of instantiated xMII. For each SMD-E that is detected on the transmit signals of the xMII the TS_TX.indication service primitive shall be generated (SFD=DETECTED, MM=EMAC) across the TSSI at the configured MTP.

For each SMD-S that is detected on the transmit signals of the xMII the TS_TX.indication service primitive shall be generated (SFD=DETECTED, MM=PMAC) across the TSSI at the configured MTP.

90.5.2 TS_SFD_Detect_RX function

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 90

SC 90.5.1

Page 1 of 4

2/17/2022 12:24:16 PM

Unsatisfied Comments

IEEE P802.3cx D2.0 ITSA Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

<i>Cl</i> 90A	<i>SC</i> 90A	<i>P</i> 62	<i>L</i> 39	<i>#</i> 235
----------------------	----------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------

Ran, Adee

Cisco

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

Table footnote g applies to 1G, 2.5G, and 5G, which do not have any FEC function, and to 200G and 400G where the FEC is part of the PCS functions. The footnote does not make sense for these rates.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify the footnote text or delete it.

Response *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #144 for 1G FEC.

In note "g", remove the statement "and not to the PCS function".

2.5G and 5G use LDPC(1723,2048) FEC. See subclause 126.1.3.1 of 802.3-2018. 200G and 400G FEC performs the lane distribution. There is no error in the notes or in the table on this matter.

No changes to draft needed.

Unsatisfied Comments

IEEE P802.3cx D2.2 ITSA Task Force 2nd Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Cl 90 SC 90.4.3.1.1 P52 L21 # 450

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A BT

"number of bits of <...> delay"

Delay has units of time, so this should be "bit times" (bit time or BT has a definition 1.4.160).

Also in the descriptions of TX_NUM_UNIT_CHANGE (90.5.3) and RX_NUM_UNIT_CHANGE (90.5.4).

SuggestedRemedy

Change "the number of bits of dynamic transmit path data delay" to "the dynamic transmit data path delay in bit times (BT)".

Apply a similar change in 90.5.3 and 90.5.4.

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to "the number of xMII bit times that will be dynamically inserted or removed in the transmit path"

For the receive path, make a similar change to the text to read "the number of xMII bit times that were dynamically inserted or removed in the receive path"

Cl 90A SC 90A.3 P66 L39 # 461

Ran, Adeo Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Footnote e discusses FEC for Ethernet rates 5G and 2.5G. FEC exists in 2.5GBASE-T/T1 and 5GBASE-T/T1, but the T1 PHYs have no PCS lane distribution, and there are also PHYs for these rates that do not include FEC at all (2.5GBASE-KX, 5GBASE-KR). The footnote seems to be relevant only for 2.5GBASE-T and 5GBASE-T.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "For these rates" to "For 2.5GBASE-T or 5GBASE-T".

Consider adding "for other PHYs at these speeds there is no PCS lane distribution/merging".

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "For these rates" to "For PHYs including FEC".