



# P802.17 D0.1, Section 3

## Comment Resolution Summary

### March 2002

Clause 7: MAC Physical Interface

Annex B: Transmit Clock Synchronization

Annex C: Ethernet Reconciliation Sublayers

Annex D: SONET/SDH Reconciliation Sublayers



# Summary

- Overall: 48 comments received against D0.1 Section 3
  - 40 technical and 8 editorial
  - All technical comments reviewed and resolved
- Clause 7 (MAC Physical Interface)
  - 8 technical
- Annex B (Transmit Clock Synchronization)
  - 5 technical, 1 editorial
- Annex C (Ethernet Reconciliation Sublayers)
  - 10 technical, 5 editorial
- Annex D (SONET/SDH Reconciliation Sublayers)
  - 17 technical, 2 editorial



# Big-ticket items

- Comment #3: Accepted a comment to replace all text in Clause 7 with the replacement text specified in the March 2002 presentation titled “cls7\_proposal.pdf” with minor modifications recommended by the group
- Comment #33: Remove two paragraphs of the existing Clause 7 text and forward the text and comment to the Clause 11 editor for review and possible inclusion in that clause



## Big-ticket items (cont'd)

- Comment #222: Rejected a comment to replace all text in Annex B (Transmit Clock Synchronization), but request that the commenter revise and resubmit the comment against the next draft. Among the concerns not fully addressed by the existing comment:
  - Is Transmit Clock Synchronization a MAC or RS function?
  - Does this function exist in a synchronous network implementation?
  - How is the MAC made aware of PHY speeds, or does it not need this info?
  - Comment refers to idle symbols, but some PHYs use Idle frames or periods.
  - Does this function interact with byte-stuffing in HDLC-like framing?
  - Is this function in any way related to fairness or transit buffer configuration?
  - Is 200 ppm the correct clock tolerance?



## Big-ticket items (cont'd)

- Comment #8: Accepted a comment to allow the editors to make broad updates to Annex D, including:
  - Eliminate “TBD” subclauses
  - Revise “SPI” interfaces with OIF references (if possible) or eliminate all references to OIF and SPI (if needed, editor-in-chief to advise).
  - Update Annex D for consistency with Clause 7 and Annex C.
- Comment #608: Rejected a comment to create new C2 codepoints for SONET/SDH scrambling on/off for RPR (working group cannot do this), but editors to work with commenter and make recommendations to the Chair if necessary.