Cl **00**　　*SC*　　　　　*P* **1**　　*L* **47**　　# 110
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**
Are there two different Managers, Standards Intellectual Property?

SuggestedRemedy
Change 'IEEE Standards Association' to 'IEEE Standards Activities Department'?

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There is one manager. Make title consistent.

Cl **00**　　*SC*　　　　　*P* **3**　　*L* **41**　　# 111
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**
Bad URL

SuggestedRemedy
Change 'ieee.interp' to 'ieee/interp '. Can the URLs be kept each on one line, please?

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**　　*SC*　　　　　*P* **4**　　*L* **2**　　# 113
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**
PICs

SuggestedRemedy
PICS

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**　　*SC*　　　　　*P* **4**　　*L* **18**　　# 112
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**
IEEE Standards Department or IEEE Standards Activities Department?

SuggestedRemedy
?

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Clarify

Cl **00**　　*SC*　　　　　*P* **8**　　*L* **23**　　# 114
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**
Published IEEE Std 802.3-2005 is available.

SuggestedRemedy
Base 802.3as on published IEEE Std 802.3-2005 not P802.3REVam/D2.2. Simplify this note.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**　　*SC* **00**　　　*P* **1**　　*L* **38**　　# 115
Law, David　　　　　　3com

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**
Update the copyright year in the text box.

SuggestedRemedy
See comment.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn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 **00**
SC **00**

Page 1 of 13
2/13/2006 2:44:31 PM

Cl **00**   *SC* **00**   *P* **2**   *L* **60**   # 116

Law, David   3com

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The copyright year needs to be updated to 2006 in the footer.

SuggestedRemedy

Please note that you don't need to change every FrameMaker file in the book file individually to do this. Instead change the date in one FrameMaker source file, open this file and open the book file.

Go to the book file, select all the files then:

File -> Import -> Formats
Got the 'Import from document' drop down list
Select the file with the updated date.
Hit deselect all
The hit the tick box for 'Page Layout' only
Then hit 'Import'

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **4.2.7.1**   *P* **25**   *L* **15**   # 77

Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Revisiting D2.2#22. Response says 'It is the intent of the project to encourage new implementations to support envelope frames, and to grandfather previous maximum frame sizes.' The point of that comment is that existing implementations can compliantly have maxima that are none of the three maxima under discussion; what we have to grandfather is a range of implementation-specific limits, not just three limits. In several places in clauses 3 and 4 this is made clear, e.g. 4.2.4.2.1a says 'The receiving CSMA/CD sublayer is not required to enforce the MAC frame size limit, but it is allowed to truncate MAC frames longer than maxPermittedFrameSize octets (see 4.4.2). This is the policy of 802.3-2005. Yet 4.2.7.1 (as modified) says 'maxPermittedFrameSize = maxBasicFrameSize or (maxBasicFrameSize + qTagPrefixSize) or maxEnvelopeFrameSize ; {in octets} and 30.3.1.1.37 (as modified) is similarly precise. These changes would have the effect of disqualifying perfectly reasonable MAC implementations that might have size limits of 1536 or 1920 (or 2048) octets yet still allowing grandfather MACs that can only cope with 1500 octets. Changing the rules in such an inconsistent and not technically justified way is not reasonable.

SuggestedRemedy

See D2.2 comment 22. Options are:
Have the Pascal variable maxPermittedFrameSize be the ACTUAL size limit of a particular implementation;
Have two Pascal variables;
or
Have maxPermittedFrameSize represent a class of size limits e.g. 1500 to 1503.
e.g. change:
'maxPermittedFrameSize = maxBasicFrameSize or (maxBasicFrameSize + qTagPrefixSize) or maxEnvelopeFrameSize ; {in octets} ' to:
'maxBasicFrameSize = ..; {in octets: at least maxBasicFrameSize and no more than maxEnvelopeFrameSize}' and can then add words saying that the 3 limits 1500, 1504, 2000 are preferred but 2000 is recommended anyway because...

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

There is no requirement to document the actual or implemented (non-standard) frame sizes. 802.3as indicates only the standard size.

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 **00**
SC **4.2.7.1**

Page 2 of 13
2/13/2006 2:44:47 PM

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.4**   *P* **10**   *L* **29**   # 118
Law, David   3com

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
There are 45 occurrences of the text 'Length/Type field' and only two occurrences that I can find of 'Length/Type', this is one of them.

SuggestedRemedy
Suggest the text 'Length/Type' be changed to 'Length/Type field'.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.4**   *P* **10**   *L* **32**   # 117
Law, David   3com

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Isn't 2005 the latest revision of 802.1Q?

SuggestedRemedy
Suggest the text 'IEEE 802.1Q-2003' should read 'IEEE Std 802.1Q-2005'.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

802.3-2005 is approved by IEEE-SA but unpublished. So which do we reference?

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.4**   *P* **10**   *L* **42**   # 80
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
'that may indicate additional encapsulation information': as we say the extra space should not be used for payload, is there any alternative?

SuggestedRemedy
Can 'may indicate' be changed to 'indicates'?

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.

The size and length of the encapsulation cannot be definitively detemined from the contents of the first Length/Type field. Thus 'may indicate'.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.4.127**   *P* **10**   *L* **29**   # 78
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Just for the record: base doc includes 'Length Field, '.

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Modify to show accurate chagnes from 802.3-2005

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.4.343**   *P* **10**   *L* **32**   # 79
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**
This definition is wrong because 3.5 Elements of the Tagged MAC Frame does not appear in 802.3 any more, per this draft. There is to be just one Length/Type field in scope, in a fixed position.

SuggestedRemedy
1.4.343 Q-tagged frame: A MAC frame with a single 4 octet tag (see IEEE 802.1Q-2003, IEEE 802.3-2005) in the Length/Type field and the first two octets of the MAC client data field, and that has a maximum length of 1522 octets.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

1.4.343 Q-tagged frame: A MAC frame with a single 4 octet tag (see IEEE 802.1Q-2003, IEEE 802.3-2005) in the Length/Type field, the original Length/Type field moved to the first two octets of the MAC client data field, and that has a maximum length of 1522 octets.

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 **01**
SC **1.4.343**

Page 3 of 13
2/13/2006 2:44:47 PM

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.2.1**   *P* **17**   *L* **46**   *#* 125

Geoff Thompson

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Please reverse out the change of capitalization that has been put in on the drafts
for this field name and each of the other field names for the following reason.
1) The field labels are the proper names for each of the fields
Proper names should be capitalized
2) The change is unnecessary and will only confuse those who are used to the
distinguished form that has been in use for over 20 years.
3) The change is unnecessary to accomplish the scope of the PAR.
4) The change is likely to produce additional style inconsistency across the .3 standard.
5) This issue was addressed and the change was rejected in P802.3-REVam

(I have no objection to replacing "frame check sequence" with "FCS")

SuggestedRemedy

Please reverse out the change of capitalization that has been put in on the drafts

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The capitliazation changes have been done to maintain self consistency within the opened
clauses.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.2.6**   *P* **19**   *L* **38**   *#* 124

Geoff Thompson

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

(Since this is unaltered text, you might consider this to be a service to humanity.
On the other hand, this paragraph is in your draft.)
The note refers to: "Clause 12 of IEEE Std 802a-2003 (an amendment to IEEE Std 802)"
My copy of 802a-2003 has only 2 clauses. (Although I would guess that it is not numbered
correctly for integration with IEEE Std 802 at the next revision.)

SuggestedRemedy

Change to (I suspect): "Clause 2 of IEEE Std 802a-2003 (an amendment to IEEE Std 802)"
Check for correctness

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.2.7**   *P* **20**   *L* **7**   *#* 68

Daines, Kevin   World Wide Packets

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Bullet a) does not have a period while both b) and d) do.

SuggestedRemedy

Add period after bullet a)
or
alternatively, remove period from b) and c)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **03**
SC **3.2.7**

Page 4 of 13
2/13/2006 2:44:47 PM

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.2.7**   *P* **20**   *L* **0**   # `123`

Yong Kim   Broadcom

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Clarification of my unresolved TR from D2.1, Comment # 20201.

802.1 requested a solution to 802.3 on ever-increasing encapsulation that upper layers use over 802.3 network. The minimum has been met, and then some.
802.1ad + 4 bytes
802.1AE + 32 bytes (and +32 for provider side) 802.1ah + 4 bytes provider backbone PPP + MPLS + others = ~ 20 bytes
----
S. Total min. 60, max 92
MACSec Caveat - 160 (instead of 32), diff of 128 bytes Caveat Total min. 188, max 220 bytes.

1522+220 = 1720 << 1800 bytes which is where you have high probability
that CSMA/CD network would pass these larger frames with +/- 3 bit FIFOs. This meet the objectives:
- 802.1 minimum expansion request
- Minimal impact to existing networks and standard, etc.

I *have not* seen any *technical* justification why ~2K is a good new frame size but people prefer it. I like to invite technical justification why it ought to be different than this ~1800 byte #.

Supporting Document 1

/1/files/public/docs2005/liaison-dot3as-joint-0501.pdf
Objectives (Pg 3)
1)Preserve the IEEE 802.3 MAC data service interface 2)Preserve the basic frame format 3)Maintain the maximum data field length (1500 octets) 4)Increase the maximum frame size exclusively for optional prefix and suffix fields in envelope frames 5)Redefine the Tagged frame format as an envelope frame format 6)At a minimum, support:
  a)IEEE 802.1Q Virtual Bridged LANs
  b)IEEE 802.1ad Provider Bridges
  c)IEEE 802.1AE MACsec
  d)ITU-T SG15 Ethernet transport encapsulations 7)Investigate and define the largest maximum frame size with minimal impact to existing networks and standards And Straw Polls (Pg 4)

Supporting Document 2

/3/minutes/mar04/0304_IEEE802_1_report.pdf (Pgs 3 & 4) TOPIC 1: Frame Size Expansion Requirements (as currently known)
* MACSec Secure Frame Format - 24
octets (point to point), 32 octets (shared medium)
* Provider Bridge TAG - 4 octets

* Total possible for mandatory secure cipher suite:
32 (Customer security) plus
32 (Provider security) plus
4 (Provider TAG)

Caveats:
* Possible use of cipher suites to meet Federal
requirements - 64 octets
* Larger cipher blocks for greater security -
160 octets
* Requests for larger Provider TAG and duplicate FCS (yet to be resolved)

SuggestedRemedy

Same as before "Change the N to 1857 or N to 1808 (reasonable longword boundary and allow for the same 48 octet private and/or internal header)."

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

A study was performed, there was discussion and then the TF and now WG has agreed on 2000. There has been agreement on 2000 for over one year.

No new maximum frame size larger than 1518 can be guaranteed to work on repeaters. Also, 802.1 suggested 802.3 make the new maximum as large as possible (< 2048) so as to minimize the chance of a yet another "frame expansion" project. The choice of 2000 satisfies this request.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.2.9**   *P* **20**   *L* **49**   # `119`

Law, David   3com

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

There are 45 occurrences of the text 'Length/Type field' and only two occurrences that I can find of 'Length/Type', this is one of them.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest the text 'Length/Type' be changed to 'Length/Type field'.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **03**   Page 5 of 13
SC **3.2.9**   2/13/2006 2:44:47 PM

Cl **03**   *SC* **Fig3-3**   *P* **21**   *L* **33**   # 126

Geoff Thompson   Nortel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

My earlier comment on keeping this figure has been satisfied by 802.1

SuggestedRemedy

Already handled

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04**   *SC* **4.2.11**   *P*   *L*   # 128

Pat Thaler

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

For 20232, the comment was accepted in principle but the problem wasn't fixed at all. The state diagrams continue to be labeled MAC transmit and MAC receive when they aren't describing the operation of the MAC transmit and the MAC receive functions. They are diagrams for MAC client transmit interface and the MAC client receive interface. There is text that says that but the state machine name is inaccurate and misleading.

SuggestedRemedy

Please add "client" and "interface" to their names.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04**   *SC* **4.2.7.1**   *P* **25**   *L* **39**   # 69

Daines, Kevin   World Wide Packets

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The insertion of ""MAC"" on line 38 caused ""bit"" to wrap on line 39. It is awkward since bit almost appears as if it is another type defintion.

SuggestedRemedy

Reformat descriptive text in braces so ""bit"" doesn't appear as it does in D2.3.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04**   *SC* **4.2.7.1**   *P* **26**   *L* **21**   # 81

Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

Mention of Initialize procedure, which appears to be 4.2.7.5, deleted. Also twice in 4.2.7.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Reinstate 4.2.7.5?

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

4.2.7.5 is no longer deleted.

Cl **04**   *SC* **4.2.7.1**   *P* **25**   *L* **39**   # 127

Geoff Thompson

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Line wrap error

SuggestedRemedy

Move "bit" to the next line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04**   *SC* **4.2.9**   *P* **28**   *L* **42**   # 70

Daines, Kevin   World Wide Packets

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Wrong punctuation.

SuggestedRemedy

Change ""status code;"" to ""status code.""

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **04**
SC **4.2.9**

Page 6 of 13
2/13/2006 2:44:47 PM

Cl **04**　　　*SC* **4.2.9**　　　　　　*P* **28**　　　*L* **45**　　　# 82
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　Avago Technologies

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status*　**D**
This sentence 'The frameTooLong error indicates that a frame was received...' could mean an error for each frame received, or a flag that latches high even if good frames are received after the bad.

SuggestedRemedy
Change to 'The frameTooLong error indicates that the last frame received had a frameSize beyond...

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04**　　　*SC* **4.2.9**　　　　　　*P* **29**　　　*L* **20**　　　# 71
Daines, Kevin　　　　　　　　　World Wide Packets

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**
Missing punctuation.

SuggestedRemedy
Change ""maxPermittedFrameSize"" to ""maxPermittedFrameSize.""

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04**　　　*SC* **4.2.9**　　　　　　*P* **30**　　　*L* **2**　　　# 120
Law, David　　　　　　　　　3com

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**
Typo.

SuggestedRemedy
Suggest '.. and minTypeValue. the behavior ..' should read'.. and minTypeValue the behavior ..', that is remove the spurious full stop.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04**　　　*SC* **4.3.2**　　　　　　*P* **30**　　　*L* **29**　　　# 83
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　Avago Technologies

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**
Because there's a replacement 4.3.2 later

SuggestedRemedy
Change Delete ... Insert to Replace...

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will use the appropriate term

Cl **04**　　　*SC* **4.3.2.1.1**　　　　*P* **32**　　　*L* **34**　　　# 84
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　Avago Technologies

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status*　**D**
This term 'data payload field' is new to Clause 4 and is defined differently to Clause 31 where it does not include the lengthOrType field.

SuggestedRemedy
Find another term, or describe in terms of separate lengthOrType and data fields, here and in 3.1.2.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

describe in terms of separate lengthOrType and data fields, here and in 3.1.2.

Cl **04**　　　*SC* **4.3.2.1.1**　　　　*P* **32**　　　*L* **38**　　　# 85
Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　Avago Technologies

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**
case

SuggestedRemedy
Change Status to status

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **04**
SC **4.3.2.1.1**

Page 7 of 13
2/13/2006 2:44:47 PM

Cl **04** *SC* **4.3.2.2.1** *P* **33** *L* **40** # 89
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Is fcsPresent set by the MAC sublayer or by the MAC client?

SuggestedRemedy
?

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.

By the MAC, so it is correct.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.3.3** *P* **34** *L* **39** # 86
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Table titles usually go above their tables?

SuggestedRemedy
Put titles for tables 4-1 and 4-2 above their tables.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.4.2** *P* **35** *L* **52** # 87
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
MAC Parameters

SuggestedRemedy
MAC parameters

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.4.2** *P* **36** *L* **20** # 88
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
clause 9

SuggestedRemedy
Clause 9

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04A** *SC* **4A.2.7.1** *P* **38** *L* **26** # 72
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The insertion of ""MAC"" on line 25 caused ""bit"" to wrap on line 26. It is awkward since bit almost appears as if it is another type defintion.

SuggestedRemedy
Reformat descriptive text in braces so ""bit"" doesn't appear as it does in D2.3.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04A** *SC* **4A.2.7.1** *P* **38** *L* **53** # 75
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
TransmitStatus, as defined, is incorrect. Per 802.3-2005/4A.3.2, TransmitStatus also contains transmitDisabled as a parameter.

SuggestedRemedy
Change ""TransmitStatus = (transmitOK, excessiveCollisionError, lateCollisionErrorStatus);""

to

""TransmitStatus = (transmitDisabled, transmitOK, excessiveCollisionError, lateCollisionErrorStatus);""

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **04A** Page 8 of 13
SC **4A.2.7.1** 2/13/2006 2:44:48 PM

Cl **04A**   *SC* **4A.2.7.1**   *P* **39**   *L* **1**   # 76
Daines, Kevin   World Wide Packets

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**
ReceiveStatus, as defined, is incorrect. Per 802.3-2005/4A.3.2, ReceiveStatus also
contains receiveDisabled and frameTooLong as parameters.

SuggestedRemedy
Change ""ReceiveStatus = (receiveOK, lengthError, frameCheckError, alignmentError);""

to

""ReceiveStatus = (receiveDisabled, receiveOK, frameTooLong, frameCheckError,
lengthError, alignmentError);""

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **04A**   *SC* **4A.2.9**   *P* **40**   *L* **54**   # 67
Daines, Kevin   World Wide Packets

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Missing punctuation.

SuggestedRemedy
Change ""maxPermittedSize"" to ""maxPermittedSize.""

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.3.1.1.23**   *P* **52**   *L* **13**   # 121
Law, David   3com

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**
In 30.3.1.1.23 the description 'maximum allowed MAC client data size for a basic frame' is
used to define a size, in 30.3.1.1.24 the number '1500' is simply used and in 30.3.1.1.25 a
Clause 4 Pascal variable 'maxPermittedFrameSize' is used, without reference to where it is
defined I would not.

SuggestedRemedy
Use one of the three methods fro defining size consistently, I would suggest actually using
the Clause 4 Pascal definitions, with a cross-reference to where they are defined.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.3.1.1.23**   *P* **52**   *L* **13**   # 91
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
30.3.1.1.23 speaks of 'the maximum allowed MAC client data size for a basic frame' while
30.3.1.1.24 speaks of '1500'.

SuggestedRemedy
If these are the same, can the terminology be more consistent?

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 121

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.3.1.1.24**   *P* **52**   *L* **34**   # 92
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Bad line feed

SuggestedRemedy
Can the whole NOTE be indented as one paragraph?

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.3.1.1.25**   *P* **52**   *L* **46**   # 93
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
exceedmaxPermittedFrameSize

SuggestedRemedy
exceed space maxPermittedFrameSize (and put maxPermittedFrameSize into the default
10 point)

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **30**
SC **30.3.1.1.25**

Page 9 of 13
2/13/2006 2:44:48 PM

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.3.1.1.37**   *P* **53**   *L* **19**   # 94
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
This new subclause would tie any MAC implementation's aFramesTooLong counter's frame-size limit to one of three values, while the MAC is clearly per 4.2.4.2.1a allowed to choose its own limit. (Note D2.2#22, unsatisfied.) It seems messy and misleading to have a MAC reject frames at one limit while counting them as too long at a different limit. So this clause is too restrictive.

SuggestedRemedy
Change BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS: from 'This indicates the MAC frame length at which the aFramesTooLong counter is incremented.' to 'This indicates the MAC frame length at or above which the aFramesTooLong counter is incremented.' Or change aMaxFrameLength from an ENUMERATED VALUE to a number.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.

The restriction is intended.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.3.5**   *P* **50**   *L* **16**   # 90
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
30.3.5

SuggestedRemedy
30.2.5

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.3.5**   *P* **51**   *L* **40**   # 122
Law, David   3com

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
Table 30-1a shows the aMaxFrameLength counter as being added to the optional Recommended package however the changes to Annex 30A (page 54, line 44) show this counter being added to the Mandatory Package.

SuggestedRemedy
Please correct either the changes to Table 30-1a or to Annex 30A.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to the optional package.

Cl **31**   *SC* **31.3**   *P* **59**   *L* **25**   # 95
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**
In the context of Clause 31, MA_CONTROL.indication and MA_CONTROL.request aren't optional.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete '(optional)', twice.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31**   *SC* **31.3**   *P* **59**   *L* **50**   # 96
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**
MA_DATA.request

SuggestedRemedy
MCF:MA_DATA.request

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31**   *SC* **31.3.2.4**   *P* **61**   *L* **29**   # 97
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**
'The

SuggestedRemedy
The

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **31**
SC **31.3.2.4**

Page 10 of 13
2/13/2006 2:44:48 PM

Cl **31**   *SC* **31.5.1**   *P* **62**   *L* **2**   # 98

Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

MA_DATA.indication

SuggestedRemedy

Change this one to MCF:MA_DATA.indication, in bullets a,b, c and e below to MAC:MA_DATA.indication

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31**   *SC* **31.5.1**   *P* **62**   *L* **11**   # 99

Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

Does the receive function or primitive control fcsParamPresent (as here), or does the MAC (per 4.3.2.2.1) or (seems more reasonable) the MAC client or maybe management?

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite bullet d if necessary.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

It is as written.

Cl **31**   *SC* **64.1.3**   *P* **80**   *L* **6**   # 100

Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Two primitives in 7 point

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 8 point like the others. Thank you!

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31B**   *SC* **31B.3.1**   *P* **66**   *L* **39**   # 101

Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Two thirds of this sentence is unchanged.

SuggestedRemedy

Show the first part as changed (strikeout/underline) but the remainder as unchanged (plain text).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31B**   *SC* **31B.3.1**   *P* **66**   *L* **46**   # 103

Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

MA_DATA.request

SuggestedRemedy

MCF:MA_DATA.request. Similarly below.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31B**   *SC* **31B.3.1**   *P* **66**   *L* **47**   # 102

Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

Per 31B.1: The PAUSE operation cannot be used to inhibit transmission of MAC Control frames.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'MAC frames' back to 'data frames', here and in 31B.3.7.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **31B**
SC **31B.3.1**

Page 11 of 13
2/13/2006 2:44:48 PM

Cl **31B**   *SC* **31B.3.1**   *P* **67**   *L* **7**   # 104
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**
If The frame_check_sequence is omitted per bullet e, how does bullet i work: 'The
frame_check_sequence is set equal to the frame_check_sequence parameter of the
MAC:MA_DATA.request primitive.' Also, should be MCF:MA_DATA.request.

SuggestedRemedy
If you just mean it's set to null (so that the MAC generates the FCS), say so.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

It is null

Cl **31B**   *SC* **31B.3.2**   *P* **67**   *L* **17**   # 105
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
State machine

SuggestedRemedy
state machine. Also in 31B.3.2.2 below.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31B**   *SC* **31B.3.2.2**   *P* **67**   *L* **32**   # 106
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
Network Management

SuggestedRemedy
network management

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31B**   *SC* **31B.3.2.6**   *P* **69**   *L* **3**   # 107
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
State Diagram

SuggestedRemedy
state diagram (per 802.3-2005). Also state machine in 31B.3.4.2.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **31B**   *SC* **31B.3.4.2**   *P* **71**   *L* **26**   # 108
Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
false should be on a line directly below true, indented to match. See 802.3-2005.

SuggestedRemedy
per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 **31B**
SC **31B.3.4.2**

Page 12 of 13
2/13/2006 2:44:48 PM

Cl **43B**   *SC* **43B.2**   *P* **73**   *L* **34**   # 66

Daines, Kevin   World Wide Packets

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

I'm not sure if bullet c) is correct. What is the ""normal length range"" referenced in 4.4.2?

4.4.2 contains the MAC parameters table listing maxBasicFrameSize and maxEnvelopeFrameSize.

Since bullet c) references the ""MAC client data"" perhaps it should refer to maxBasicDataSize.

The associated PICS entry SP2 (43B.6.2.3) is also flawed. The value/comment field says ""Normal IEEE 802.3 frame size range (see 4.4.2).""

SuggestedRemedy

Change bullet c) to read: ""The MAC client data generated by any of these protocols shall be no larger than maxBasicDataSize (see 4.2.7.1). It is recommended that the maximum length for a frame by limited to 128 octets.""

Change SP2 (43B.6.2.3) to read:
SP2 | Data field | 43B.2 | No larger than maxBasicDataSize (see 4.2.7.1) | M | Yes[]

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **43B**   *SC* **43B.2**   *P* **73**   *L* **39**   # 109

Dawe, Piers   Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

maximum.The (bug in base document)

SuggestedRemedy

maximum. space The

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **57**   *SC* **Table 57-9**   *P* **75**   *L* **46**   # 73

Daines, Kevin   World Wide Packets

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Extra period.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove extra period from end of sentence.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **64**   *SC* **Figure 64-3**   *P* **80**   *L* **23**   # 74

Daines, Kevin   World Wide Packets

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

One instance of MA_DATA.request does not have a prefix. Is this unambiguous because it is an internal interface?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Missed it. It is internal and would be another prefix, or leave it as is…

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 **64**
SC **Figure 64-3**

Page 13 of 13
2/13/2006 2:44:48 PM