

Fast Ethernet Consortium

Clause 24 100BASE-X MII PCS Test Suite Version 1.2

Technical Document



Last Updated: March 6, 2015

Fast Ethernet Consortium

***University of New Hampshire
InterOperability Laboratory***

121 Technology Drive, Suite 2

Durham, NH 03824

Phone: (603) 862-1529

Fax: (603) 862-0898

<http://www.iol.unh.edu/consortiums/fe>

MODIFICATIONS

- March 6, 2015, Version 1.2
 - Made various modifications, including modifications to procedure and observables.
- May 27, 2014, Version 1.1
 - Modified various procedures.
- February 28, 2014, Version 1.0 Initial Release
 - Based largely on UNH-IOL 100BASE-X PCS Test Suite Version 3.4

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The University of New Hampshire would like to acknowledge the efforts of the following individuals in the development of this test suite.

Adam Healey	University of New Hampshire
Stephen Kelsey	University of New Hampshire
Matthew Kilpeck	University of New Hampshire
Robert Noseworthy	University of New Hampshire
Peter Scruton	University of New Hampshire

INTRODUCTION

Overview

The University of New Hampshire's InterOperability Laboratory (IOL) is an institution designed to improve the interoperability of standards based products by providing an environment where a product can be tested against other implementations of a standard. This suite of tests is designed to determine if a product conforms to some of the specifications defined in Clause 24 of the IEEE 802.3-2012 Standard. Successful completion of all tests contained in this suite does not guarantee that the tested device will operate with other devices. However, combined with satisfactory operation in the IOL's interoperability test bed, these tests provide a reasonable level of confidence that the Device Under Test (DUT) will function properly in many Fast Ethernet environments.

Organization of Tests

The tests contained in this document are organized to simplify the identification of information related to a test and to facilitate in the actual testing process. Each test contains an identification section that describes the test and provides cross-reference information. The discussion section covers background information and specifies why the test is to be performed. Tests are grouped by similar functions and further organized by technology. Each test contains the following information:

Test Number

The Test Number associated with each test follows a simple grouping structure. Listed first is the Test Group Number followed by the test's number within the group. This allows for the addition of future tests to the appropriate groups of the test suite without requiring the renumbering of the subsequent tests.

Purpose

The purpose is a brief statement outlining what the test attempts to achieve. The test is written at the functional level.

References

The references section lists cross-references to the IEEE 802.3 standards and other documentation that might be helpful in understanding and evaluating the test and results.

Resource Requirements

The requirements section specifies the hardware, and test equipment that will be needed to perform the test. The items contained in this section are special test devices or other facilities, which may not be available on all devices.

Last Modification

This specifies the date of the last modification to this test.

The University of New Hampshire
InterOperability Laboratory

Discussion

The discussion covers the assumptions made in the design or implementation of the test as well as known limitations. Other items specific to the test are covered here.

Test Setup

The setup section describes the configuration of the test environment. Small changes in the configuration should be included in the test procedure.

Procedure

The procedure section of the test description contains the step-by-step instructions for carrying out the test. It provides a cookbook approach to testing, and may be interspersed with observable results.

Observable Results

The observable results section lists specific items that can be examined by the tester to verify that the DUT is operating properly. When multiple values are possible for an observable result, this section provides a short discussion on how to interpret them. The determination of a pass or fail for a certain test is often based on the successful (or unsuccessful) detection of a certain observable result.

Possible Problems

This section contains a description of known issues with the test procedure, which may affect test results in certain situations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MODIFICATIONS _____	2
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS _____	3
INTRODUCTION _____	4
TABLE OF CONTENTS _____	6
Test #24.1.1 – End-of-Stream Delimiter Test _____	7
Test #24.1.2 – Invalid Data Symbol Test _____	10
Test #24.1.3 – False Carrier Detect _____	12
ANNEX A (informative) Table of Definitions _____	14

The University of New Hampshire
InterOperability Laboratory

Test #24.1.1 – End-of-Stream Delimiter Test

Purpose: To verify that RX_DV and RX_ER are appropriately asserted and de-asserted during and immediately after different abnormal stream termination events.

References:

- IEEE 802.3 Standard, 2012 - sections 22.2.1.5, 24.2.4.4.4
 - Figure 24-11: Receive state diagram.

Resource Requirements:

- A testing station capable of transmitting arbitrary five-bit code groups as specified in clause 24 and sending these code groups using the signaling method described in clause 25 or clause 26.
- The capability to monitor the MII signaling of the DUT.

Last Modification: March 6, 2015

Discussion: Following detection of the SSD, the signal RX_DV is asserted. The RX_ER signal is asserted upon decoding any symbol following the SSD, which is not either, a valid data symbol or a defined stream termination sequence. Simultaneous assertion of RX_DV and RX_ER should cause the Reconciliation sublayer to force the MAC to detect a FrameCheckError. Refer to subclause 22.2.1.5 and Figure 24-11: Receive state diagram. The DUT is sent a valid packet with the ESD (/T/R/) removed. The DUT is also sent packets with an invalid ESD placed at the end of the packet. These two circumstances should cause RX_ER to occur while RX_DV is asserted. The other case involves testing where a valid ESD terminates the packet and is followed by one additional non-idle code group before idle resumes. This case is tested for each of the 31 non-idle code groups. Following the valid ESD, RX_DV should be de-asserted. Twenty-two of these final 5-bit code groups transmitted immediately after the ESD and before idle should cause RX_ER to be asserted, while nine other 5-bit code groups should not cause this to occur. The nine 5-bit code groups that should not cause RX_ER to be asserted are: 00111, 01111, 10011, 10111, 11001, 11011, 11100, 11101, and 11110.

Test Setup: Connect the MDI of the device under test (DUT) to the testing station (transmit to receive, receive to transmit) with the appropriate medium (i.e. balanced copper, multi-mode fiber, etc.). Appropriately attach a device capable of monitoring the MII signaling to the DUT.

Procedure:

Test Packet Definitions:

- **Part A Test Packet Group:** The test packet is comprised of an SSD, remaining preamble, SFD, a valid test frame with a proper 32-bit CRC value in the FCS

The University of New Hampshire
InterOperability Laboratory

field, but no ESD (/T/R/). (Simply transitioning to idle (/I/) following the FCS field.)

- **Part B Test Packet Group:** The test packets are comprised of an SSD, a valid test packet with proper checksums and 32-bit CRC values, a valid ESD (/T/R/) and an additional code group immediately following the packet. This is repeated to include each non-idle code group for a total of 31 packets.
- **Part C Test Packet Group:** The test packets are comprised of an SSD, remaining preamble, SFD, a valid test frame with a proper 32-bit CRC value in the FCS field, and an invalid ESD. The 62 different invalid ESDs to send are a /T/ followed by all code groups, except /R/, (creating 31 different pairings) and all code groups, except /T/, followed by an /R/ (creating the remaining 31 pairings). Each packet with these invalid ESDs should cause RX_ER to be asserted while RX_DV remains asserted.

1. The testing station is instructed to transmit a valid packet to the DUT.
2. After approximately a minimum interPacketGap the testing station is instructed to transmit the first frame in **Part A Test Packet Group** to the DUT.
3. After approximately a minimum interPacketGap the testing station then transmits another valid packet.
4. Steps 2 and 3 are repeated for each defined test packet in the Test Packet Group.^{*1}
5. The MII signaling of the DUT is observed.
6. The observed results for steps 1 – 5 using **Part A Test Packet Group** should match observable result a. Steps 1 - 5 are repeated for all packets in **Part B Test Packet Group** (observable result b). Steps 1 – 5 are again repeated for all packets in **Part C Test Packet Group** (observable result c).

NOTE 1: This step is not applicable to **Part A Test Packet Group**, as there is only one test packet in this group.

Observable Results:

- a)
 - a1) RX_ER should be asserted while RX_DV should remain asserted for the first idle code group upon reception of rx_bits[9:0] = IDLES.
 - a2) All idle code groups after the first should not flag RX_ER and RX_DV.
 - a3) The reception of a valid packet after the test packet should not cause the DUT to assert RX_ER. RX_DV should be appropriately asserted during the reception and RXD[3:0] should also be set appropriately.
- b)
 - b1) Following the ESD, RX_DV should be not asserted.

The University of New Hampshire
InterOperability Laboratory

- b2) RX_ER should be asserted while RX_DV should remain not asserted upon the reception of any of the test packets containing one of the 22 code groups, as specified in the discussion. RXD[3:0] should also be set to 1110 while RX_ER is asserted.
 - b3) RX_DV and RX_ER should remain not asserted for the reception of the other 9 test packets containing each of the other 9 code groups (00111, 01111, 10011, 10111, 11001, 11011, 11100, 11101, and 11110) following the ESD.
 - b4) The reception of a valid packet after the test packet should not cause the DUT to assert RX_ER. RX_DV should be appropriately asserted during the reception and RXD[3:0] should also be set appropriately.
- c)
- c1) RX_ER should be asserted while RX_DV remains asserted for each point in the invalid ESD test packets corresponding to when rx_bits[9:5] indicates a non-data code group. For the cases where both code groups of the invalid ESD are non-data this should result in two consecutive assertions of RX_ER while RX_DV remains asserted. For the case where only one is a non-data code group RX_ER should only be asserted corresponding to that code group and de-asserted for the other, while RX_DV remains asserted for both.
 - c2) Following the packet RX_DV and RX_ER should both be simultaneously asserted for one additional code group worth of time corresponding to the first occurrence of rx_bits[9:0]=IDLES.
 - c3) The reception of a valid packet after the test packet should not cause the DUT to assert RX_ER. RX_DV should be appropriately asserted during the reception and RXD[3:0] should also be set appropriately.

Possible Problems: None.

The University of New Hampshire
InterOperability Laboratory

Test #24.1.2 – Invalid Data Symbol Test

Purpose: To verify that an error (RX_ER) is detected when an invalid data symbol is sent following the transmission of the SSD (/J/K/)

References:

- IEEE 802.3 Standard, 2012 - sections 4.2.4.1.2, 4.2.4.1.3, 24.2.4.4.3, 24.2.2.1.7 and 22.2.1.5

Resource Requirements:

- A testing station capable of transmitting arbitrary five-bit code groups as specified in clause 24 and sending these code groups using the signaling method described in clause 25 or clause 26.
- The capability to monitor the MII signaling of the DUT.

Last Modification: June 25, 2014

Discussion: Following detection of the SSD, the signal RX_DV is asserted. The RX_ER signal is asserted upon decoding any symbol following the SSD which is not either a valid data symbol or a defined stream termination sequence. Simultaneous assertion of RX_DV and RX_ER will cause the Reconciliation sublayer to force the MAC to detect a FrameCheckError. Refer to subclause 22.2.1.5 and Figure 24-11: Receive state diagram. In this test, all valid data symbols will be replaced with all combinations of the invalid symbols. This is done to ensure that when an invalid symbol is detected, RX_ER is asserted rather than arbitrarily replacing the invalid symbols with valid data symbols.

Test Setup: Connect the MDI of the device under test (DUT) to the testing station (transmit to receive, receive to transmit) with the appropriate medium (i.e. balanced copper, multi-mode fiber, etc.). Appropriately attach a device capable of monitoring the MII signaling to the DUT.

Procedure:

Test Packet Description:

In this test, the testing station transmits a valid 64-byte test packet with a data field containing all valid data symbols (0 thru F) followed by all data symbols (F thru 0). This creates a packet that has each of the 16 data symbols in both possible positions within a byte (32 possibilities). Each of these data symbols is individually replaced with each of the 5-bit non-data code groups: 00000 (/P/), 00001, 00010, 00011, 00100 (/H/), 00101, 00110, 00111 (/R/), 01000, 01100, 01101 (/T/), 10000, 10001 (/K/), 11000 (/J/), 11001, and 11111 (/I/). Thus, 512 different invalid packets are tested.

The University of New Hampshire
InterOperability Laboratory

1. The testing station is instructed to transmit a valid packet to the DUT.
2. After approximately a minimum interPacketGap the testing station is instructed to transmit a test packet to the DUT.
3. After approximately a minimum interPacketGap the testing station then transmits another valid packet.
4. Steps 2 and 3 are repeated for each of the remaining defined test packets in the Test Packet Description.
5. The MII signaling of the DUT is observed.

Observable Results:

- a. RX_DV should be asserted throughout the reception of the test packet.
- b. The DUT should assert RX_ER corresponding to when the non-data code group is in position rx_bits[9:5] in the test packet.
- c. RX_ER should be not asserted for the remaining portion of the packet.
- d. RXD[3:0] should be set as appropriate for the remaining portion of the packet.
- e. The reception of a valid packet after the test packet should not cause the DUT to assert RX_ER. RX_DV should be appropriately asserted during the reception and RXD[3:0] should also be set appropriately.

Possible Problems: None.

The University of New Hampshire
InterOperability Laboratory

Test #24.1.3 – False Carrier Detect

Purpose: To verify that the device under test can detect false carrier events.

References:

- IEEE 802.3 Standard, 2012 – sections 22.2.2.7, 22.2.2.8, 22.2.2.10, Table 22-2, sections 24.2.2.1.4, 24.2.4.4.2, 24.3.4.3, and figure 24-14.

Resource Requirements:

- A testing station capable of transmitting arbitrary five-bit code groups as specified in clause 24 and sending these code groups using the signaling method described in clause 25 or clause 26.
- The capability to monitor the MII signaling of the DUT.

Last Modification: June 25, 2014

Discussion: After channel activity is detected, the Receive process first aligns the incoming code-bits on code-group boundaries for subsequent data decoding. This is achieved by scanning the rx_bits vector for a SSD (/J/K/). Detection of the SSD causes the Receive process to enter the START OF STREAM J state.

Well-formed streams contain SSD (/J/K/) in place of the first 8 preamble bits. In the event that something else is sensed immediately following the detection of carrier, a False Carrier Indication is signaled to the MII by asserting the RX_ER and setting RXD to 1110 while RX_DV remains deasserted.

Test Setup: Connect the MDI of the device under test (DUT) to the testing station (transmit to receive, receive to transmit) with the appropriate medium (i.e. balanced copper, multi-mode fiber, etc.). Appropriately attach a device capable of monitoring the MII signaling to the DUT.

Procedure:

1. Let bad_ssd be a vector of 10 code-bits and let bad_ssd[0] be fixed at ZERO. Initialize bad_ssd[9:1] to the code-bit pattern “111111101”. Command the testing station to transmit a valid packet. Approximately one minimum interPacketGap later the testing station should send bad_ssd (most significant bit first) followed by the remainder of a valid test packet (excluding the SSD). Another approximately one minimum interPacketGap later another valid packet should be transmitted.
2. Shift bad_ssd[9:1] left one code-bit, discarding the carry bit and set bad_ssd[1] to ONE. Approximately one minimum interPacketGap after the previous transmission the testing station should send bad_ssd followed by the remainder of a valid test packet (excluding the SSD). Approximately one minimum interPacketGap later transmit another valid packet.

The University of New Hampshire
InterOperability Laboratory

3. Repeat step 2 until bad_ssd[9:2] contains the pattern “01111 111”, which is the last one sent.
4. Set bad_ssd[9:5] to the /J/ code group and set bad_ssd[4:0] to the code-bit pattern “00000”. Command the testing station to send bad_ssd followed by the remainder of a valid packet (excluding the SSD). Approximately one minimum interPacketGap later transmit another valid packet.
5. Increment bad_ssd[4:0]. Approximately one minimum interPacketGap after the previous transmission the testing station should send bad_ssd followed by the remainder of a valid packet (excluding the SSD). Approximately one minimum interPacketGap later transmit another valid packet.
6. Repeat step 5 until bad_ssd[4:0] exceeds “11111”. Skip the iteration in which bad_ssd[4:0] equals “10001” as this is the /K/ code-group (this makes bad_ssd[9:0] /J/K/, the valid start of stream delimiter).

Observable Results:

- a. The DUT should assert RX_ER upon the reception of an invalid SSD. RXD[3:0] should be set to 1110. RX_DV should remain de-asserted.
- b. The reception of a valid packet after the test packet should not cause the DUT to assert RX_ER. RX_DV should be appropriately asserted during the reception and RXD[3:0] should also be set appropriately.

Possible Problems: None.

ANNEX A (informative) Table of Definitions

(informative)

Table of Acronym Definitions

8802-3	ISO/IEC 8802-3 (IEEE Std 802.3)
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
CRC	cyclic redundancy check
DTE	data terminal equipment
DUT	Device Under Test
ESD	End-of-Stream delimiter
FCS	frame check sequence
IPG	interPacketGap
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
LAN	local area network
LLC	logical link control
MAC	medium access control
MDI	medium dependent interface
MII	media independent interface
PCS	physical coding sublayer
PHY	Physical Layer entity
PMA	physical medium attachment
PMD	physical medium dependent
RS	reconciliation sublayer
RX_DV	An MII Signal (see IEEE 802.3 section 22.2.2.6)
RX_ER	An MII Signal (see IEEE 802.3 section 22.2.2.8)
SFD	start-of-frame delimiter
SSD	Start-of-Stream Delimiter