

=====  
*Global Document Comments*  
=====

**Ident:** NAJ-T3  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Throughout the StrawMan

**Comment:**

Aborting a frame at High Media Rate.

During the HSTRA Technical Meeting #2 in Oxford, it was decided to define an abort mechanism using the /H/H/ 100BASE-X symbols. In addition, it was decided \*not\* to standardise the second method of aborting, by transmitting an invalid FCS and setting the E bit. To quote from the official minutes:

[ <http://p8025.york.microvitec.co.uk/802.5/meetings/hstra/oct97/> ]

The abort sequence is /H/H/T/R/.

On receipt of this sequence, the frame is considered aborted. In addition, the reception of an invalid frame (code violation, invalid FCS) with the E bit set, the frame is ignored, and not counted as a line error.

Aborting a frame using an invalid FCS and the E bit set WILL NOT BE DEFINED IN THE STANDARD TODAY. However, if in the future, if the RMII cannot be modified to support the transmission of /H/H/T/R/ sequence, then the invalid FCS with the E bit set will be added to the standard.

However, the StrawMan defines both methods of aborting, using the FxASO option flag to decide which method to use. FPASO is a flag that was used to support DTR cut-through on existing chips that did not support classic aborting of frames. It was never meant to standardise the invalid FCS and E bit method of aborting frames.

**Resolution:**

Unless there is a valid technical reason for including the invalid FCS abort method (Committee discussion required), remove the method from the StrawMan.

=====  
**Clause 1 Comments**  
=====

**Ident:** SAV-E1  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 1, Page 1, Line 1

**Comment:**

ISO/IEC 8802-5:1997 will not exist.

**Resolution:**

Replace 1997 with 1998.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-Q1  
**Type:** Question  
**Location:** Clause 1.2, Page 1, Line 6

**Comment:**

Is it Media Independent Interface or Medium ...

**Resolution:**

=====  
**Clause 9.0 Comments**  
=====

**Ident:** NAJ-E1  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9, Page 9-3, Line 81 and Clause 9.8

**Comment:**

9.8 currently only describes 100Mbit/s. This line describes it as defining PHY/PMD for all High Media Rates. Clause 9.8 should describe all High Media Rates.

**Resolution:**

Modify 9.8 title to be "PHY/PMD Definitions for High Media Rate operation". Move the 100Mbit/s definitions into a new subclause 9.8.1.

-----  
**Ident:** SAV-E2  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.0, Page 9-3, Line 55

**Comment:**

Operating at 4 and 16 is not consistent with the rest of the Strawman.

**Resolution:**

add Mbit/s after 16.

-----  
**Ident:** SAV-E3  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.0, Page 9-3, Line 59

**Comment:**

Operating at 4 and 16 is not consistent with the rest of the Strawman.

**Resolution:**

add Mbit/s after 16.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E1  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.0, Page 9-3, Line 55

**Comment:**

"Protocol operating at 4 and 16 or ..." syntax is inconsistent with other sections.

**Resolution:**

Replace "Protocol operating at 4 and 16 or ..." syntax with "Protocol operating at 4 and 16 Mbit/s or ..." syntax.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E2  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.0, Page 9-3, Line 55

**Comment:**

Inconsistency in "TKP Access Protocol" syntax.

**Resolution:**

Replace "...and TKP Access Protocols operating at 4 and ..." with "...and the TKP Access Protocol operating at 4 and ..." to be consistent with other references on this page to "the TKP Access Protocol".

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E3

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.0, Page 9-3, Line 59

**Comment:**

"Protocol operating at 4 and 16 or ..." syntax is inconsistent with other sections.

**Resolution:**

Replace "Protocol operating at 4 and 16 or ..." syntax with "Protocol operating at 4 and 16 Mbit/s or ..." syntax.

-----  
**Ident:** SAV-E4

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.0, Page 9-3, Line 62

**Comment:**

Operating at 4 and 16 is not consistent with the rest of the Strawman.

**Resolution:**

add Mbit/s after 16.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E4

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.0, Page 9-3, Line 63

**Comment:**

Inconsistency in "TKP Access Protocol" syntax.

**Resolution:**

Replace "...and TKP Access Protocols operating at 4 and ..." with "...and the TKP Access Protocol operating at 4 and ..." to be consistent with other references on this page to "the TKP Access Protocol".

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E1

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9, Page 9-3, Line 77

**Comment:**

Bullets missing from 9.7 and 9.8

**Resolution:**  
-----

**Ident:** JLM-E2

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9, Page 9-3, Line 82

**Comment:**

I think this would be a good place to note that HMR has no TKP

**Resolution:**

Add: "The TKP Access Protocol is not specified for operation at the High Media Rate."

=====  
**Clause 9.1 Comments**  
=====

**Ident:** SAV-E5  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.1.1.1, Page 9.1-2, Line 43

**Comment:**

Should be a space between determine and an.

**Resolution:**

Fix it.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E3  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-2, Line 47

**Comment:**

"notations" should be "notation".

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E3  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 180

**Comment:**

The subclause talks about frame properties in terms of frame fields. A reference should be added to where these fields are defined.

**Resolution:**

Line 186 - Add reference to clause 3 and clause 10.  
Line 197 - Add reference to clause 13.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E6  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 200

**Comment:**

"B" is not defined here but is used in lines 222, 223. Other unchanged properties of a frame seem to be here.

**Resolution:**

Add "B".  
-----

**Ident:** NAJ-T2  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 208

**Comment:**

A High Media Rate frame has a minimum of 19 octets between SSD and ESD.

**Resolution:**

Change 18 to read 19.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-T1  
**Type:** minor technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 207

**Comment:**

"Is composed of only hexadecimal values". Is this original or copied?  
If original, I think it would be better to say what is not allowed,  
perhaps something that outlaws violations.

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T1  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 206, 207, 208 and 209

**Comment:**

ST and ET are not the correct field names at High Media Rate (see clause 13).

**Resolution:**

Change ST to be SSD.  
Change ET to be ESD.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E4  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 209

**Comment:**

To say that the end is delimited by something seems less clear to me  
than saying "ends with a valid ET". Is there a reason why this was  
not done? There is no difference in meaning between the two.

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-T2  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 206-209

**Comment:**

These lines refer to ST and ET which is incorrect. In particular, ET  
is not /T/R/ but our own frame status.

**Resolution:**

Refer to 13 and use SSD and ESD here instead.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E5  
**Type:** minor editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 218

**Comment:**

Space missing after "C".

**Resolution:**

**Ident:** NAJ-E2  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Cluase 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 222 and 223

**Comment:**

Property 'B' is not defined. Should be 'R'

**Resolution:**

Change 'B' to 'R' in both definitions.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-Q1  
**Type:** Question  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 222 and 223

**Question:**

For High Media Rates, property '-N' (Does not start with valid SSD) cannot be checked when using an MII interface. Should '-N' be removed from both FR\_WITH\_ERR definitions?

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-T3  
**Type:** technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-8, Line 236

**Comment:**

Review FR\_WITH\_ERR as Ken did not make the change.

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E7  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-8, Line 253, 255

**Comment:**

The media rate is best omitted from this text. FPASO=1 at High Media Rate is prohibited by 13.5.2.3.

**Resolution:**

Remove the "when" clauses at the beginning of a) and b). If desired, refer to 13.5.2.3 at the end of b).

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T4  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1.4.1, Line 401, state tables and cluase 13.

**Comment:**

Ivar's presentation on HSTR Speed Trade Up would modify this description, the state tables and cluase 13. The committee needs to decide if the scheme should be added.

**Resolution:**

Committee decision required.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T1



**Type:** Technical

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-13, Line 439

**Comment:**

PD subvector examination not detailed in 4/16 Mbit/s case.

The change to add "and PD" as a subvector value to be examined by the C-Port appears to be related to the Note on lines 453 and 454 which specifies that "The Station's PD subvector shall have a value of X'0001' (indicating Phantom Drive is supported) when operating at the 4 and 16 Mbit/s media rates)", but there is no indication in the bullet clause starting at line 444 that any examination of the PD subvector actually takes place. In the ensuing High Media Rate section there is a check for Phantom Drive being supported/not supported and resulting action. Not sure what the intent was here in including the "and PD" reference in the 4 and 16 Mbit/s section, but it is confusing to specify that the PD subvector is being examined in this context without providing some detail on the checking that is supposed to be taking place here.

**Resolution:**

Provide appropriate detail regarding PD subvector examination.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-T4

**Type:** minor technical

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-13 and 14, Line 445, 461

**Comment:**

The result X'0000' indicates the AP\_REQ value is not allowable, rather than not recognised. It may well be recognised by a port which is management-configured not to allow it.

**Resolution:**

Change "recognized" to "allowable" on these two lines.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E4

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-14, Line 457

**Comment:**

"; but, unlike 4 and 16 Mbit/s Media Rate support, no Repeat Path is supplied." is only true when FPRPTO=0.

**Resolution:**

Delete the phrase quoted above.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E5

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-14, Line 494

**Comment:**

Reference 13.x.x.x incomplete!

**Resolution:**

Should be 13.5.1.1.2

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T2

**Type:** Technical

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-14, Line 494

**Comment:**

Invalid reference "13.x.x.x".

**Resolution:**

Reference to "13.x.x.x" should be replaced with "13.5.1.1.2" which is the correct FSLMTO reference.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E8

**Type:** editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 503

**Comment:**

You can't set an action.

**Resolution:**

Replace the sentence with "This test is designated TXI\_TEST in the SOTs."

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E6

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 504

**Comment:**

Text 'define in 0 and ' contains a bad reference.

**Resolution:**

Fix it.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E9

**Type:** editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 504, 518

**Comment:**

Reference errors: text says "0".

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-E13

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1.6.1, Page 9.1-15, Lines 504,517

**Comment:**

Correct references from '0'

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E10

**Type:** editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15 etc., Line 518, 523, 531, etc.

**Comment:**

The word "frame" should not be capitalised, regardless of whether the text uses the word by itself (e.g., line 518) or a particular named MAC frame (e.g., line 523). This is a widespread error in the newer text.

**Resolution:**

Replace "Frame" with "frame".

-----

**Ident:** JLM-T5**Type:** technical**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 518**Comment:**

The text referring to the setting of the E bit cannot change the apply to the 4/16 Mbit/s case. That is, you can't change the base standard here.

**Resolution:**

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-E7**Type:** Editorial**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 520**Comment:**

Lobe Media Test for FSLMTO=1 does not use tokens.

**Resolution:**

Say so.

-----

**Ident:** DWW-T14**Type:** Technical**Location:** Clause 9.1.6.2, Page 9.1-15, Refs 523**Comment:**

New lobe test does not always return "the" lobe test frame.

**Resolution:**

Modify sentence to read:  
"to return a Lobe Media Test frame to the station for each LMT frame transmitted by the station which was received without error."  
or something like that!

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E11**Type:** editorial**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-16, Line 543**Comment:**

Repetitive text.

**Resolution:**

Delete "for this Frame".

-----

**Ident:** IPO-E5**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-16, Line 543

**Comment:**

Spelling error "assurred".

**Resolution:**

Replace with correct "assured" spelling.

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-E8

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-16, Line 555

**Comment:**

Text "1 Frame error" is imprecise.

**Resolution:**

Replace sentence with "The Station shall fail its Lobe Media Test if more than 1 frame sent out of the 1120 frames is either not received or is received with an error."

-----

**Ident:** RDL-E1

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-16, Line 564

**Comment:**

"but equivalent Frame." is not specific enough.

**Resolution:**

Replace above with "as defined in 9.7.2.1."

-----

**Ident:** DWW-T16

**Type:** Technical

**Location:** Clause 9.1.6.2.2, Page 9.1-16

**Comment:**

We need to state somewhere that FPRPTO=0 is not permitted for 16/4 operation as it would break existing stations...

**Resolution:**

-----

**Ident:** DWW-E15

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1.6.2.1, Page 9.1-16, Refs 545,548,555

**Comment:**

in lines 545,548 replace "the lobe" with "a lobe"  
in line 555 change "if more" to "if there is more"

**Resolution:**

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E12

**Type:** editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-19, Line 644

**Comment:**

Flags are not referred to with a capital F.

**Resolution:**

Repalce Flag with flag.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E9  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-23, Line 838

**Comment:**

Contains TBD text.

**Resolution:**

Determine it...

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-T6  
**Type:** technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-23, Line 838

**Comment:**

Text says TBD

**Resolution:**

Discuss

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T3  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-23, Line 838

**Comment:**

Missing action related text as indicated by <<action TBD>> comment.

**Resolution:**

Include text if needed and/or remove <<action TBD>> comment.

=====  
**Clause 9.2 Comments**  
=====

**Ident:** NAJ-T5  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clauses 9.2, 9.3 and 9.8

**Comment:**

Why do we have PS\_UNITDATA.request()? It was not used in classic or DTR, so why is it needed for HSTR?

**Resolution:**

Remove it, and use PS\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=) where appropriate.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E13  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-5, Line 66-161

**Comment:**

The new and edited flags have inconsistent capitalisation. To avoid Excessive Capitalisation Throughout the Document Which Looks Pretty Silly, the tradition is to avoid capitalisation of all the words of flags, counters, MAC frames, etc.

**Resolution:**

For example, FSASO should be "Flag, Station abort sequence option", FSLMTO should be "Flag, Station lobe media test option", CSLTF should be "Counter, lobe test frames".

This applies to at least the following: FSANO, FSASO, FSLMTO, FSPDO, CSLTF, CSRAT, FSRLMT, FSPDC, FSPDA, FSSLMT, TSLMTP, TSLMTR, TSRAP. Existing titles which should also be brought into line include: FPASO, FPTX\_LTH, FSOPO, SPV(AP\_MASK), SPV(PD), FIPTKPS, FIPTXIS, FTI, SUA, TSQHB.

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-E10  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-5, Line 71

**Comment:**

FSPDO is not longer an option flag.

**Resolution:**

Remove it.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E14  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-6 etc., Line 188

**Comment:**

See JLM-E10, capitalisation of "Frame".

**Resolution:**

Don't say "Frame", say "frame".

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E15  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-6, Line 191

**Comment:**

Incorrect use of English.

**Resolution:**

Change "used by the High Media Rate" to "used at the High Media Rate".

-----

**Ident:** IMJ-E1  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Page 9.2-7, line 246 and 251

**Comment:**

Missing flag type

**Resolution:**

Add to start of line: "Flag, "

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E16  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-7, Line 252

**Comment:**

It is the test itself that is successful, not the function.

**Resolution:**

Recommend changing "the Station detected a successful Lobe Media Test function" to "that the station's lobe media test was successful". If this is not acceptable, then just delete the word "function" and add "that" before "the station".

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E17  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-8, Line 256

**Comment:**

Word missing.

**Resolution:**

Add "that" before "the station's".

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E18  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-8, Line 260

**Comment:**

The word "Flag," has been erroneously added.

**Resolution:**

Change "Flag, Flag," to "Flag,".

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-E11

**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-8, Line 260

**Comment:**

Repeat word "Flag"

**Resolution:**

Remove it.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T4  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-9, Line 313

**Comment:**

Reference to "PS\_UNITDATA.request(TX symbol=Idle) see 9.8.1.4]..." is incorrect.

**Resolution:**

Refer to relevant section (9.8.1.3).

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T5  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-9, Line 331

**Comment:**

Reference to 9.8.1.6 is incorrect.  
Section 9.8.1.6 does not exist in the Strawman document.

**Resolution:**

Refer to relevant section 9.8.1.5 which contains the description of the PS\_Control.request primitive and its associated parameters.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E19  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-10, Line 364

**Comment:**

Change "described by 9.1.6" to "described in 9.1.6".

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E20  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-28, Line 468 AND SIMILAR

**Comment:**

"available refs" text is inappropriate for standard.

**Resolution:**

Either delete the line from the published standard, or change it to a more acceptable form such as "References XXX are not used in the SOTs".



-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E12  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-12, Line 452

**Comment:**

n8 parameter: Description column: Missing space after CSRAT.

**Resolution:**

Add it.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T6  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-12, Line 452

**Comment:**

(note 1) needs to be removed.

**Resolution:**

n7 parameter values should be in the range 1117 to 1123, to give the correct Annex P coverage.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E6  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-13, Line 455, Ref 3170

**Comment:**

Inconsistent usage of "<" and ">" around the "4 and 16 Mbit/s only" syntax.

**Resolution:**

Add missing "<" and ">" around the "4 and 16 Mbit/s only" syntax to ensure consistency with other 9.2-1 Station Join Station Operation Table entries.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T7  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-19, Ref 3190

**Comment:**

Actions missing state transition.

**Resolution:**

Add JS=SDAC to actions.

-----  
**Ident:** IMJ-T3  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Page 9.2-19, REF 3190

**Comment:**

JS do not change to SDAC when Lobe test success.

**Resolution:**

Add to Action: "JS=SDAC;"

-----  
**Ident:** IMJ-T4  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Page 9.2-19, REF 3190

**Comment:**  
INS\_REQ\_PDU is not repeated.

**Resolution:**  
Add to Action: "TSIP=R;"

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T17  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2-1, Page 9.2-19, Refs 3190

**Comment:**  
Action should cause entry to JS=SDAC.  
Also there is currently no guaranteed delivery of INS\_REQ frame for 100 Mbit/s operation.

**Resolution:**  
Add JS=SDAC and TSIP=R to action.  
Condition 3104 on page 9.2-20 with FSMRO<2  
Add a new transition: TSIP=E & JS=SDAC & FSMRO>1 => TSIP=R; TXI\_INS\_REQ

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E13  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-21, Ref 3176

**Comment:**  
TSRAP=E is not a valid action.

**Resolution:**  
Should read TSRAP=R.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E7  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-21, Line 455, Ref 3176

**Comment:**  
Missing ">" after "<<Retransmit Remove Alert  
MAC Frame >".

**Resolution:**  
Add missing ">" after "<<Retransmit Remove Alert  
MAC Frame >" to ensure consistency with other  
9.2-1 Station Join Station Operation Table entries.

-----  
**Ident:** IMJ-E2  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Page 9.2-21, ref. 3176, Action

**Comment:**  
Typo

**Resolution:**

Change "TSRAP=E" to "TSRAP=R"

-----

**Ident:** DWW-T18  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2-1, Page 9.2-21, Refs 3176,3192

**Comment:**

What happens if station tries to execute a lobe test whilst it is transmitting Remove alert frames in the process of closing...? These transitions will not fire because of conditioning on JS=SJC

**Resolution:**

Should there be an equivalent state to BPW for a station which is closing?

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-E14  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-22, Ref 3122

**Comment:**

Closing parenthesis missing from actions.

**Resolution:**

Add it.

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-E15  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-23, Ref 3214

**Comment:**

Addition closing parenthesis in actions.

**Resolution:**

Remove it.

-----

**Ident:** IPO-E9  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-23, Line 455, Ref 3214

**Comment:**

Extraneous right parenthesis following "FSTI=1" line in ACTIONS/OUTPUTS.

**Resolution:**

Remove extraneous parenthesis following "FSTI=1" line in ACTIONS/OUTPUTS.

-----

**Ident:** IPO-E8  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-23, Line 455, Ref 3213

**Comment:**

Extraneous right parenthesis following "FSTI=1" line in ACTIONS/OUTPUTS.

**Resolution:**

Remove extraneous parenthesis following "FSTI=1"  
line in ACTIONS/OUTPUTS.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-Q2  
**Type:** Question  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-24, Ref 3210 and 3211  
Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-24, Ref 1202 and 1201

Question:

What are the values for CxBTX? How were they calculated? Should they  
not all be 0?

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T8  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-27, Ref lots...  
Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-26, Ref lots...

**Comment:**

Numbers in state transitions tables are in hexadecimal, except all the  
255s used with the error counters.

**Resolution:**

Change all occurrences of 255 to be FF in \*all\* state tables.

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T19  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2-3, Page 9.2-26, Refs 3317,3320

**Comment:**

Can you remove a station is phantom has not been raised? Condition actions  
on whether phantom is being used

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T20  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2-3, Page 9.2-26, Refs 3324

**Comment:**

CSTFQ is not relevant for 100Mbit/s operation.

**Resolution:**

Condition CSTFQ action on media rate

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T10  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-34, Ref 3801

**Comment:**

This is the entry point for LMT. FSLMTS and FSLMTF should be  
initialised here.

**Resolution:**

Add "FSLMTS=FSLMTF=0" to actions.

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-T9  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-34, Ref 3806, 3808, 3807.

**Comment:**

These are exit points from the LMT, which leave the functional address active.

**Resolution:**

Add "FA(LMT)=0" to actions of all 3 transitions.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E21  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-34, Line 478

**Comment:**

Extraneous words which are also wrong.

**Resolution:**

Delete "the option flag is equal to".

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E22  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-34, Line 480

**Comment:**

Period should be colon at end of line.

**Resolution:**

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-T11  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-35, Ref 3803

**Comment:**

FA(LMT)=0 is unnecessary, as it has not yet been enabled.

**Resolution:**

Remove "FA(LMT)=0" from actions.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E23  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-36, Line 491

**Comment:**

Typo.

**Resolution:**

"Event / Events/Conditions" should read "Event / Event & Conditions".

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E24  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-36, Line 493

**Comment:**

Inconsistent punctuation in the table.

**Resolution:**

Either add periods or remove them.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-T7  
**Type:** technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-37, Line 497 (DA=MA)

**Comment:**

Use of undefined term "heirarchical address match".

**Resolution:**

Remove the reference to the undefined term (this is preferable), or define the term. One acceptable definition of the term would be like this: "A heirarchical address match is not specified in this standard and is referred to only for compatibility with old implementations."

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E25  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-37, Line 497 (FR)

**Comment:**

Table entries for FR would be better combined.

**Resolution:**

Remove text in angle brackets and new definition, and change the existing definition to "A frame is received which meets the frame receive criteria specified in 4.3.2 (4/16 Mbit/s operation only) or 9.1.1.6 (High Media Rate operation only)."

-----

**Ident:** JLM-T8  
**Type:** Question  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-38, Line 497 (FR\_TEST)

**Comment:**

I would just like the committee to think a moment about whether FR\_TEST requires a verified frame (fully parsed) or not.

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E16  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-39

**Comment:**

Entry "PS\_STATUS.indication(100M\_capable=no)" is no longer required.

**Resolution:**

Remove it.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T6  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-39, Line 496

**Comment:**

PS\_STATUS.indication(Link status=Asserted) meaning section contains invalid reference to section 9.8.1.5

**Resolution:**

Correct reference to refer to section 9.8.1.4

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T7  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-39, Line 496

**Comment:**

PS\_STATUS.indication(Link status=Not Asserted) meaning section contains invalid reference to section 9.8.1.5

**Resolution:**

Correct reference to refer to section 9.8.1.4

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E11  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-40, Line 497

**Comment:**

Grammatical error "deliver". Error shows up in the meaning sections for both the TSRAT=E & CSRAT<>0 and TSRAT=E & CSRAT=0 Event or Condition terms.

**Resolution:**

Correct to "delivery" in both cases.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E10  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-40, Line 497

**Comment:**

Spelling error "assurred". Error shows up in the meaning sections for both the TSRAT=E & CSRAT<>0 and TSRAT=E & CSRAT=0 Event or Condition terms.

**Resolution:**

Correct spelling to "assured" in both cases.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-T9  
**Type:** technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-40, Line 497 (TSLMTP=E...)

**Comment:**

The notation "timer<>E" is not defined.

This notation is very questionable. We have never required the specification of a situation where two timers, running concurrently, can expire at the same time with different effect than if one had expired and not the other. I think the concept is meaningless in the sense that time has no granularity in terms of the standard. If the protocol really depends on this then it's broken and should be re-stated in different terms.

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T8  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-42, Line 503

**Comment:**

Invalid references in "Meaning of this term sections" for both the PS\_UNITDATA.request(Tx Symbol=Data\_byte) and PS\_UNITDATA.request(Tx Symbol=Idle) Action or Output terms.

**Resolution:**

References to section 9.8.1.4 should be to section 9.8.1.3 which is relevant to the PS\_UNITDATA.request primitive.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E17  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-43

**Comment:**

Entry "TX\_ET" is no longer used.

**Resolution:**

Remove it.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T9  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-43, Line 503

**Comment:**

Invalid reference in "Meaning of this term section" for High Media Rate bullet item associated with the TX\_AB "Action or Output Term".

**Resolution:**

The "A Frame abort [PS\_CONTROL.request(Abort\_frame) as specified in 9.8.1.6]" reference should be corrected to refer to the relevant section 9.8.1.5.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T10  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-43, Line 503

**Comment:**

Invalid reference in "Meaning of this term section" for the TX\_ET "Action or Output Term".



**Resolution:**

Reference to section 9.8.1.4 should be changed to refer to section 9.8.1.3 which correctly describes the PS\_UNITDATA.request primitive.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E26**Type:** editorial**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2, Line 504 (FSTI=x)**Comment:**

It is unnecessary and inconsistent to duplicate the definition of flag FSTI here. The terms {flag}=0 and {flag}=1 are specified in the table at line 500.

**Resolution:****Ident:** JLM-T10**Type:** technical**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-43, Line 504 (TX\_ET)**Comment:**

The use of ET needs to be consistent between 9 and 13. There is an octet called ET which has the functionality of the old FS, and there is the ESD. If the ET meaning like FS is maintained, then TX\_ET should probably be changed to TX\_ESD. The question of whether ESD means End of Stream Delimiter or End of Sequence Delimiter also needs to be sorted out.

**Resolution:****Ident:** JLM-E27**Type:** editorial**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-43, Line 504 (TX\_SFS(...))**Comment:**

Change "AC field's priority and reservation values as specified" to "AC field's priority and reservation values shall be as specified". Remove the "a" before zero and one - this usage is unnecessary. Actually the notation used in the definition of TXI\_BN is preferable.

**Resolution:****Ident:** IPO-T11**Type:** Technical**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-43, Line 503**Comment:**

Invalid reference in "Meaning of this term section" for the TX\_SFS(P=value;R=value) "Action or Output Term".

**Resolution:**

Under the "High Media Rate" bullet item, the reference to section 9.8.1.4 should be changed to refer to section 9.8.1.3 which correctly describes the PS\_UNITDATA.request primitive.

=====  
**Clause 9.3 Comments**  
=====

**Ident:** DWW-T26  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page lots, Refs lots

**Comment:**

Did we not agree that the port should send remove-alert frames when it closes?

**Resolution:**

Either add transitions required or modify clause 13

-----

**Ident:** DWW-T23  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-1, Refs 1108

**Comment:**

I am concerned that a port can only enter PREG after link status is up and a management action is taken. This means that after a port has tried to enter PREG when link status was not present, it is likely that link status could come up, a station attempt to register, fail and close before the management action has taken place.

Would it not be better for the management action (Connect) to cause the port to enter a state where it waits for link status prior to entering PREG? This would avoid the problem outlined above from happening.

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E18  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-6, Line 91

**Comment:**

TPRAP is missing.

**Resolution:**

Add it.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E28  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-6, Line 84-94

**Comment:**

See JLM-E13. When these definitions were created by copying from the station ones, they were incorrectly over-capitalised. This isn't German, folks, it's English. Not All Nouns Have To Have Capital Letters.

**Resolution:**

Change, for example, "Flag, C-Port AC Repeat Path Option" to "Flag, C-Port AC repeat path option". Do this for all entries in the line range.

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-T12  
**Type:** Technical

**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-10, Line 194

**Comment:**

"or the High Media Rate PS\_STATUS.indication(Link\_status..." is incomplete. The flag FPRF should also be cleared on receipt of a LMTN MAC frame, when SPD=2. See NAJ-T13 for more details of transition changes required.

**Resolution:**

Fix text to read "... or the High Media Rate PS\_STATUS.indication(Link\_status=Not\_asserted) signal occurs when the Station is using phantom, or the receipt of the LMTN MAC frame when the Station is not using phantom as follows"

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T14  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, State tables

**Comment:**

RMV\_ALRT mechanism has not been added to the C-Port.

**Resolution:**

Add it.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E12  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-6, Line 89

**Comment:**

Inconsistent syntax related to "CPBTX = Counter".

**Resolution:**

"CPBTX = Counter, Byte Transmitted" should be changed to "CPBTX = Counter, C-Port Bytes Transmitted" to be consistent with Line 107 (Page 9-3.7) usage.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E13  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-10, Line 201

**Comment:**

Inconsistent syntax for "If flag FPRF..".

**Resolution:**

Replace "If flag FPRF is 1..." syntax with "If flag FPRF is a 1.." to be consistent with previous "If flag FPRF is a 0..." text or vice versa.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E19  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-15, Ref 1108

**Comment:**

Semicolon missing from actions, after FPTXC=1.

**Resolution:**

Add it.

-----

**Ident:** DWW-T22**Type:** Technical**Location:** Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-15, Refs 1108, 1024(9.3-22), 1214(9.3-23)  
& lots others**Comment:**

Setting of RPT is conditioned on FPRPTO in 1214. Is it necessary to do the conditioning every time it is set as well. Whatever the answer, currently the use is not consistent - cf 1108 & 1024

**Resolution:****Ident:** IPO-Q1**Type:** Question**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-16, Line 356, Ref 1109**Comment:**

In Action/Outputs section of REF 1109 in the following sentence: "<<Prepare for Station's LMT by providing either a PHY repeat path (FPRTO=1)..", there is no reference to FPRTO in the abbreviations/notations section for 9.3 - is this intended to be FPRPTO?

**Resolution:**

Please resolve "FPRTO" issue in this section.

-----

**Ident:** DWW-T24**Type:** Technical**Location:** Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-17, Refs 1033**Comment:**

should this be conditioned on FPINSLE=1?

**Resolution:****Ident:** DWW-T25**Type:** Technical**Location:** Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-18 & 9.3-21, Refs 1105 & 1094**Comment:**

Condition should check FPRPTO when operating at 100mbit/s as don't need to break repeat path if it does not exist.

**Resolution:****Ident:** IPO-E14**Type:** Editorial**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-19, Line 201, Ref 1023**Comment:**

Invalid specification "4 and 16 bit/s".

**Resolution:**

In Action/Outputs section of REF 1023 "<<Clock change for 4 and 16 bit/s only>>" should be corrected to read "<<Clock change for 4 and 16 Mbit/s only>>".

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E20  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-19, Ref 1121

**Comment:**

S/T column contains "JLM?"

**Resolution:**

Should read "JLMc"

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-E27  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-19, Refs 1121

**Comment:**

Action contains duplicated FPHBA=1

**Resolution:**

Fix

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T15  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-20, Ref 1115 and 1116

**Comment:**

These transition are aborting the LMT, leaving FA(LMT) active.

**Resolution:**

Add "FA(LMT)=0" to actions.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E21  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-20, Ref 1003, 1113 and 1114

**Comment:**

The AND() conditions have an extra comma at the end of the parenthesised parameters.

**Resolution:**

Remove it.

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T29  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-20, Refs 1113 + lots

**Comment:**

Why set FA(LMT)=1 here, would it not be more appropriate to set it in one place only - i.e. when the LMT notification frame is received?

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T30  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-20, Refs 1120

**Comment:**

Do you not want to close regardless of where the RMV\_ALERT frame comes from, what its VC is... If it is not from the correct place, then surely this is a protocol error.

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T28  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-20, Refs 1112

**Comment:**

Both condition and action contain FPRPTO=1 - Fix this  
Add a new line before SUA=0 in action - this is not conditional on FPRPTO

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T16  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-21, Ref 1117

**Comment:**

No longer used.

**Resolution:**

Delete.

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T31  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-21, Refs 1117

**Comment:**

Does this not need conditioning on FPMRO - otherwise all 4 & 16 Mbit/s ports will close as soon as they attempt to open!

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T17  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-21, Refs 1094, 1100, 1095 and 1096

**Comment:**

These transitions are for 4/16 only.

**Resolution:**

Add appropriate FPMRO<2 to conditions.

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T32  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-21, Refs 1094, 1100

**Comment:**

The actions should be marked as optional

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T13  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-25, Monitor and Misc state machines

**Comment:**

Monitor state machine is still relying on the Station using phantom.

**Resolution:**

Add new transition to monitor state tables:

```
FR_LMTN(DA=broadcast) & SPD=0002
=> if (FPRPTO=0) then TXI_LMTN_PDU;
    FPBNT=1;
    if (FPMRO<2) then [FPRF=0 (optional-rf)];
    if (FPMRO>1) then FPRF=0
```

Replace Ref 2028 with

```
FR_LMTN(DA=broadcast) & FPRPTO=0 & SPD=0001
=> TXI_LMTN_PDU
```

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T21  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3.3.2, Page 9.3-10, Refs line 194,  
Page 9.3-6, Refs 2028  
Page 9.3-29, 9.3-3 Ref 1406  
Page 9.3-25

**Comment:**

Surely FPRF should be set to 0 on receiving a LMT notification frame for 100 Mbit/s operation. Committee agreed that link status would not be used as an indication to start LMT for 100 Mbit/s.

**Resolution:**

change text  
condition transition 1406 on FPMRO<2  
add FPRF=0 action to 2028  
note also typo in line 200 (TRPF should read TPRF)

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E29  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-23, Line 359 (ref 1215)

**Comment:**

Incorrect and duplicated text "Maximum frame has been exceeded" in Action/Output column.

**Resolution:**

Delete.

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T33  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3-3, Page 9.3-25, Refs 1401, 1404, 1403

**Comment:**

What is CPFRE, what purpose does it serve? Why is it only used at 100Mbit/s?

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E30  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-29, Line 372 (ref 2027)

**Comment:**

Notation wrong. Also, term not defined in precise specification of events/conditions. Also, the term should be DA=FA(TEST) which is already used in 13.

**Resolution:**

Use parentheses not square brackets. Nested parentheses are allowed.

Add in precise specification of events/conditions (before DA=MA), this:

DA=FA(TEST): The DA of the received frame is equal to the functional address specified for use in the lobe media test.

AS A SIMPLER ALTERNATIVE: in transitions 2027 and 2028 I see no reason for any checking of the DA. Why not just remove the DA critereon?

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E31  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-31, Line 380

**Comment:**

Same as JLM-E24 (inconsistent punctuation in table).

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E32  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-32, Line 385 (FR)

**Comment:**

Same as JLM-E25 (combine FR entries)

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** IMJ-T1  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Page 9.3-34

**Comment:**



Counter CSLTFE replaced with flag FSLTFE.

Replacement of this counter was noted in the previous version, if accepted by the committee. I do not remember any discussion, so no one rejected the change.

I prefer to count errors by a counter not a flag.

The description of the counter (CSLTFE) has been removed, but I did not find any description of the flag (FSLTFE).

**Resolution:**

Define the flag FSLTFE in clause 9.2.3.1

-----

**Ident:** IMJ-T2  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Page 9.3-34

**Comment:**

Undefined flag: FSSLMT = Flag, Station start Lobe Media Test

**Resolution:**

Define the flag FSSLMT in clause 9.2.3.1

-----

**Ident:** IPO-T14  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-34, Line 385

**Comment:**

Need to clarify usage of idle violation detection.

**Resolution:**

Per the Note in Section 9.8.1.4 (PS\_STATUS.indication), there should be text included in the "Meaning of this term" section for PS\_STATUS.indication (Idle violation) that clarifies the usage of idle violation detection with regard only to disconnected links. Since this is a "Precise Specification of Events/Conditions" it would seem appropriate either to emphasize that this Event/Condition term is only applicable in a disconnected link context or remove any reference to this event from this section.

-----

**Ident:** IPO-T13  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-34, Line 385

**Comment:**

Invalid reference in "Meaning of this term" section for PS\_STATUS.indication (Idle Violation) "Event/Condition term".

**Resolution:**

Reference to "The PHY indicates an idle violation (invalid code between frames) has been detected as specified by 9.8.1.5" should be corrected to refer to section 9.8.1.4 which specifically describes the PS\_STATUS.indication primitive.

-----

**Ident:** IPO-T12  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-34, Line 385

**Comment:**

Invalid reference in "Meaning of this term" section for PS\_STATUS.indication(Link Status=Not Asserted) "Event/Condition term".

**Resolution:**

Reference to "The PHY indicates that the link is inactive (9.8.1.5)" should be corrected to refer to section 9.8.1.4 which specifically describes the PS\_STATUS.indication primitive.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E33

**Type:** editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-35, Line 394 (FPTI)

**Comment:**

As JLM-E26 (Don't include FPTI in this table).

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T15

**Type:** Technical

**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-36, Line 393

**Comment:**

In "Meaning of this term" section for the PS\_CONTROL.request(Crystal Transmit=Asserted), reference to the non-existent section "...9.8.1.6 for High Media Rate operation" is incorrect.

**Resolution:**

Refer to section 9.8.1.5 which correctly describes the parameters for the PS\_CONTROL.request primitive parameters including Crystal Transmit.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T16

**Type:** Technical

**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-36, Line 393

**Comment:**

In "Meaning of this term" sections for the PS\_UNITDATA.request(Tx\_symbol=Data\_byte) and PS\_UNITDATA-request(Tx\_symbol=Idle), references to "9.8.1.4" are incorrect.

**Resolution:**

In both cases, refer to section "9.8.1.3" where the PS\_UNITDATA.request primitive and associated parameters are correctly described.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E34

**Type:** editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-36, Line 394 (PS\_CONTROL.request(Crystal\_transmit)

**Comment:**

Both Crystal Transmit entries need to refer to 9.8.1.6. The one which does has the closing parenthesis too early.

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E35  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-36, Line 394 (PS\_UNITDATA.request)

**Comment:**

These two entries lack the bolding in the left column.

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T17  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-37, Line 393

**Comment:**

In "Meaning of this term" section for the TX\_AB "Action/Output Term", reference to "A frame abort[PS\_CONTROL.request(Abort\_frame) as specified in 9.8.1.6]" is incorrect.

**Resolution:**

Refer to section 9.8.1.5 which correctly describes the parameters for the PS\_CONTROL.request primitive and associated parameters including Abort\_frame.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T18  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-37, Line 393

**Comment:**

In "Meaning of this term" section for the TX\_SFS(P=value;R=value) "Action/Output Term", reference to "A Start Frame[PS\_UNITDATA.request (Start\_stream\_delimiter) see 9.8.1.4]..." is incorrect.

**Resolution:**

Refer to section 9.8.1.3 which correctly describes the parameters for the PS\_UNITDATA.request primitive and associated parameters.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E22  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-37

**Comment:**

Entry "TX\_ET" is no longer used.

**Resolution:**

Delete it.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-T11

**Type:** technical

**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-37, Line 394 (TX\_ET)

**Comment:**

TX\_ET is badly named as ET is the frame status equivalent.

**Resolution:**

Change to TX\_ESD.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-T12

**Type:** Question

**Location:** Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-37, Line 394 (TX\_EFS...)

**Comment:**

Are these transitions used in High Media Rate operation? If so, they'll need changing to use ESD etc.

**Resolution:**

=====  
**Clause 9.7 Comments**  
=====

**Ident:** RDL-T1  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-3, Line 84

**Comment:**  
Comment indicates committee discussion needed to resolve. We must have a solution that does not require the C-Port to know about a specific implementation timing on an attached station..

**Resolution:**  
Tam, propose a solution for discussion at the interim meeting.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E36  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-1, Line 4, 70, 84.

**Comment:**  
Do not refer to implementors. The standard specifies an entity, not an implementor. Anyway, it's spelt "implementor" commonly, referring to documents on the IEEE Standards site.

**Resolution:**  
Say something like "Implementations may provide two different types of repeat path."

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E37  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-3, Line 79

**Comment:**  
No, Tam, you can't get away with leaving the text in angle brackets in. The rest is fine.

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E38  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-3, Line 92

**Comment:**  
"Mac" is wrong.

**Resolution:**

Say "MAC".

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T19  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-3, Line 92

**Comment:**  
Need to address the open issue flagged by the <and LMTN?> text in the "Soft" repeat path or alternatively remove this text.

**Resolution:**

Discuss and resolve open issue in committee.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E39**Type:** editorial**Location:** Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-4, Line 102, 104**Comment:**

"signaling" is wrongly spelt.

**Resolution:**

Say "signalling".

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E40**Type:** editorial**Location:** Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-4, Line 103**Comment:**

Insert is a bad name for the signal, because it is one of the values.

Also "any of the conditions" is too weak. As written, the "when generated" clause says nothing.

**Resolution:**

Suggest changing this to PM\_STATUS.indication(Phantom=Insert) and (Phantom=De-insert).

Specify the conditions for when generated, preferably by reference to the appropriate clause.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E41**Type:** editorial**Location:** Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-4, Line 110, 112**Comment:**

Incorrect spurious wording. Flags ending in O are policy flags (not option flags) and their name tells you this.

**Resolution:**

Delete the words "PMAC option".

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E42**Type:** editorial**Location:** Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-4, Line 120**Comment:**

Make the corrections and remove the note.

**Resolution:**

=====  
**Clause 9.8 Comments**  
=====

**Ident:** RDL-E4  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-1, Line 1

**Comment:**  
It is not clear from the title if the clause is for Station Only, or for both Stations and Ports.

**Resolution:**  
Clarify scope of Clause in the title.

-----

**Ident:** IPO-E15  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-1, Line 18

**Comment:**  
Extraneous comment/question.

**Resolution:**  
Address "(and clause 8: concentrator specifications?)" enclosing parentheses and question if appropriate or alternatively delete this extraneous text.

-----

**Ident:** RDL-E7  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-1, Line 40

**Comment:**  
Error! Reference source not found. - problem.  
**Resolution:**  
Fix the problem.

-----

**Ident:** IPO-E16  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-1, Line 41

**Comment:**  
Address "(did we want to keep this figure?)" remark within the text or alternatively remove this comment.

**Resolution:**  
Discuss in committee if appropriate.

-----

**Ident:** SAV-E6  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-1, Line 51

**Comment:**  
Operating at 4 and 16 is not consistent with the rest of the Strawman.

**Resolution:**  
add Mbit/s after 16.

-----  
**Ident:** ANF-E1  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-2, Ref 62

**Comment:**

text "(or should this be in x.1 about all of chapter 5)." is an editorial comment and should be in italics.

**Resolution:**

Change to italics (or resolve question in next meeting).

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E17  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-2, Line 63

**Comment:**

Address "(or should this be in x.1 about all of Chapter 5)" comment within the text or alternatively remove this comment.

**Resolution:**

Discuss in committee if appropriate.

-----  
**Ident:** ANF-E2  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-4, Ref 139

**Comment:**

Sense of text "This is extremely unlikely on working link.", is incorrect.

**Resolution:**

Change to read as "This is extremely unlikely on a working link." or "This is extremely unlikely on working links."

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-E18  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-4, Line 144

**Comment:**

Missing millisecond value.

**Resolution:**

Provide value in place of "??" placeholder for "Link\_Status shall be updated(read) at least every ?? ms" syntax.

-----  
**Ident:** IPO-T20  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-4, Line 146

**Comment:**

There appear to be several issues relative to



the PS\_STATUS.indication primitive and its parameters that require committee discussion as indicated by comments/questions from lines 146-157 of Page 9.8-4

**Resolution:**

Discuss and resolve open issues in committee.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E43**Type:** editorial**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-4, Line 146**Comment:**

I think  
PM\_STATUS.indication(Signal\_Detect)=Signal\_acquired/Signal\_loss is best.

**Resolution:****Ident:** IPO-T21**Type:** Technical**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-4, Line 160**Comment:**

Need to remove notes to reviewers in 9.8.1.5 PS\_CONTROL.request section and incorporate appropriate additional text/explanations that result from committee discussion.

**Resolution:**

Discuss and resolve open 9.8.1.5 issues in committee.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-T13**Type:** technical**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-4, Line 179, 191, 193**Comment:**

Note: The policy flags (names ending in 0) are inputs to the MAC only. Nothing in the standard sets these: they are set outside, either by "management" or by implementation limits.

**Resolution:****Ident:** RDL-E2**Type:** Editorial**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-4, Line 182**Comment:**

Global formatting concern: Tables should have first "definition line" with heavier underlining than remaining lines for easy reading.

**Resolution:**

Follow this formatting recommendation for all tables in the standard.

-----

**Ident:** IPO-T22**Type:** Technical**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-7, Line 263

**Comment:**

Reference to Table 28B-1 is incorrect.

**Resolution:**

Either need to adjust the reference or table designation as appropriate.

-----  
**Ident:** ANF-E3  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-9, Ref 289

**Comment:**

The FDDI term of "symbol" is interpreted as a 100M term of "code-group" whereas earlier in the table FDDI frame size of "... 9000 symbols" is interpreted as a 100M frame size of "... 18200 octets"

**Resolution:**

Change "code-group" to "octet".

-----  
**Ident:** RDL-E8  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-9, Line 290

**Comment:**

Explain further differentiation between "preamble" and "inter-frame gap"

**Resolution:**

add  
<<comes at start of frame>>  
to "preamble", and add  
<<comes at end of frame>>  
to "inter frame gap (IFG)"

-----  
**Ident:** RDL-T2  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-9, Line 312

**Comment:**

Lack of knowledge is a problem.

**Resolution:**

Tam, talk with an appropriate 802.3 expert and be prepared to discuss why proposed solution is correct at interim meeting.

-----  
**Ident:** ANF-E4  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-10, Ref 315, 316

**Comment:**

These two lines refer to section 8.3 of TP-PMD and so should go after lines 317-333, which in turn refer to section 8.1 of TP-PMD.

**Resolution:**

Move text and swap section numbers 9.8.5.9 and 9.8.5.10

-----  
**Ident:** SAV-E7  
**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.8.5.10, Page 9.8-10, Line 325

**Comment:**

Table 9.8-1 is the wrong table.

**Resolution:**

Change to Table 9.8-5

-----

**Ident:** ANF-E5

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-10, Ref 325

**Comment:**

Text "Table 15 is repeated here for clarity as Table 9.8-1" should refer to table 9.8-5

**Resolution:**

Replace "9.8-1" with "9.8-5"

-----

**Ident:** RDL-E3

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-10, Line 328

**Comment:**

Table is for stations only, not for ports.

**Resolution:**

1) Table title is confusing, "Station Port" is a bad combination of words. Change to Station Signal unless Port signaling will also be included. If so, change to Station and Port

2) Add appropriate columns for port signaling or add a new table to the standard with that information.

-----

**Ident:** RDL-T4

**Type:** Technical

**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-11, Line 344 - 347

**Comment:**

Although the prose is technically accurate, because of the complexity of the concept, the paragraph is unclear. Also, the specified value is not yet backed up by analysis.

**Resolution:**

Replace the above lines with:

"When the receiver circuit is unpowered, its return loss specification may degrade to a value that is 5dB less than the minimum return loss required of the receiver circuit when it is active."

In addition, verify that 5dB is the correct number, or correct that value.

-----

**Ident:** ANF-E6

**Type:** Editorial

**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-11, Ref 358

**Comment:**

Typo in "Change to annex G< "Stream cipher scrambling function"

**Resolution:**

Replace "<" with ",,"

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E44  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-11, Line 358

**Comment:**

Typo.

**Resolution:**

Change "G<" to "G,".

-----

**Ident:** ANF-E7  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-11, Ref 365

**Comment:**

Font used for header is different from other headers.

**Resolution:**

Change font.

-----

**Ident:** ANF-E8  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-12, Ref 382

**Comment:**

The Statement "The terminology used in [802.3] was chosen to be consistent with other IEEE 802 standards, rather than with FDDI." is contained in a paragraph that has no references to 802.3. Therefore would it not be better to refer to 802.5?

**Resolution:**

Change [802.3] to [802.5]

-----

**Ident:** RDL-E5  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-13, Line 397

**Comment:**

Statements may be misleading if read out of context.

**Resolution:**

Change "every cable-pair link" to "every optical fiber cable-pair link" in line 397, and "the crossover function is realized" to "the crossover function for fiber attachment is realized" in line 399.

=====  
**Clause 13 Comments**  
=====

**Ident:** NAJ-E23  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13

**Comment:**

All page numbers read 12-??, not 13-??

**Resolution:**

Fix it.

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-T18  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13

**Comment:**

Dave Wilson wants all references to TKP removed.

**Resolution:**

Committee discussion required.

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-T20  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13, Subclause 13.3

**Comment:**

Dave Wilson wants the FC value of TEST frames to be a value other '00', and the VC value of the RMV\_ALRT frame to be '00'.

**Resolution:**

Committee discussion required.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E45  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-1, Line 15

**Comment:**

In all the table entries for shaded values, I think it would be useful to refer to where they are defined. For example: SSD  
Start-of-Sequence Delimiter See 13.2

**Resolution:**

**Ident:** RDL-E6  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-2, Line 39

**Comment:**

No entry exists under "Field Length" in table

**Resolution:**

Add "0 or more" for the number of octets of fill.

-----

**Ident:** DWW-T3  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13.2.1.1.1.3 & 13.2.1.1.2.1, Page 12-3

**Comment:**

"When a frame with error is detected the frame shall be ignored." This does not allow the counting of line errors.

**Resolution:**

Fix the text.

-----

**Ident:** DWW-T2  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13.2.1.1.1.3, Page 12-3

**Comment:**

The text states that "the E bit shall be transmitted as 0" This does not allow for aborting frames with bad FCS and E bit set.

**Resolution:**

Correct the text.

-----

**Ident:** DWW-T1  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13.2.1.1.1.1 & 13.2.1.1.2, Page 12-3, Refs

**Comment:**

What does "or if indicated by the bridge interface" mean?

**Resolution:**

This statement needs clarifying somehow. Does it mean "or if the frame is indicated to the bridge interface" or "or if the bridge interface says set A bits on all LLC frames",...?

-----

**Ident:** JLM-T14  
**Type:** technical  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-3, Line 67, 77

**Comment:**

The wording is unclear. Can be read to mean "if you set the E bit".

**Resolution:**

If the received E bit was set, the frame shall not be counted as a line error.

-----

**Ident:** DWW-T4  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13.2.1.1.2.1, Page 12-4

**Comment:**

"The E bit shall be transmitted as 0 ..." is as the committee agreed, but does not agree with clause 9 which allows the use of an abort by dodgy fcs + E bit set.

**Resolution:**

Committee needs to agree correct solution and then text modified appropriately

-----

**Ident:** JLM-T15**Type:** technical**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-4, Line 87**Comment:**

In the other E bit sections, it says that you don't count the error if the E bit is set. I think it should say so here too.

**Resolution:**

At the end of the paragraph, add "If in addition, the received E bit was set, the event is not counted as a token error".

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E46**Type:** editorial**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-5, Line 110 (and elsewhere)**Comment:**

The reference to document R as "Supplement to ISO/IEC 8802-5:1998" is not specific enough. What is the proper name for the particular part of this document which contains clause 10? If it doesn't have a better name, then it better get one.

**Resolution:**

Use a better name. Action, Bob Love.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E47**Type:** editorial**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-5, Line 115, 226, 241**Comment:**

"At high media rates" is not how we say it. Also, this isn't the best place to define the test.

**Resolution:**

Change to "At the high media rate". Add a reference to the clause where the test is described, rather than saying how many frames and how long. Delete the last sentence because it duplicates information in 13.3.2.2.

NB please improve the reference on line 124. Clause 9 is rather a lot of ground.

-----

**Ident:** SAV-E8**Type:** Editorial**Location:** Clause 13.3.1.1, Page 12-5, Line 117**Comment:**

It sounds right to say "an RI field", but is is not.

**Resolution:**

Change to "a RI field".

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-T19  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-5, Line 127

**Comment:**

RMV\_ALERT are used on all transitions from join complete to bypass, not just Disconnect.xMAC.

**Resolution:**

Fix text.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E24  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-6, Line 136

**Comment:**

Bad sentence.

**Resolution:**

Remove the word "method" from end of X'0002' definition.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E25  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-6, Line 139

**Comment:**

What about the data within the subvector.

**Resolution:**

Say something about the data.

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T6  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13.3.3 & 13.3.4, Page 12-8 & 12-9

**Comment:**

Traditionally, where a single frame is used for both station -> port and port->station it should be identical in each direction. If it is required to tell the difference between the source of frames then the SA is used for this comparison and if the two types of communication have a different meaning then a different VC is used (cf. Request-Response type frames).

The Remove Alert frame does not follow these principles.

**Resolution:**

The Remove alert frame should have a VC of 00 whoever transmits it - or use a different frame for port-> station if it has a different impact.

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T5  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13.3.3 & 13.3.4, Page 12-8 & 12-9

**Comment:**



If the port is using a software repeat path for lobe test frames, it is important that they are received on the fastest possible path (if the timing constraints are to be met). For this reason, the LMT frame at 100 Mbit/s should be transmitted using an FC for "express MAC" ie other than '00'. It would be nice if this were also a unique value to ease frame parsing but that is not essential.

**Resolution:**

Change the required FC of LMT frames

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-T21  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-8, Line 169 and 175

**Comment:**

Lobe Media Test frames should be marked as being transmitted exactly as shown.

**Resolution:**

Add paragraphs like in clause 10 to this effect.

-----

**Ident:** JLM-T16  
**Type:** technical  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-8, Line 169, 175, 184, 190

**Comment:**

X'17' Remove Alert: I think this frame should not be transmittable with RI.

**Resolution:**

Add \*\*1 to the X'17' entries in these four tables. Bump up the \*\*1 in the last two tables to \*\*2.

-----

**Ident:** DWW-E7  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13.3.4.1, Page 12-9, Line 182

**Comment:**

table 13-5 should read table 13-6

**Resolution:**

fix it

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E48  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-9, Line 182

**Comment:**

Reference to table 13-5 should be to 13-6.

**Resolution:**

Get your hooves in the grooves.

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-E26  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-10, Line 204

**Comment:**

"MAC frame" at end of line should be plural.

**Resolution:**

Fix it.

-----

**Ident:** DWW-E8  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13.4.1.1, Page 12-10, Lines 205-206

**Comment:**

Add "of LMT" after "phase" in both lines. Replace "repeated" with "received"

**Resolution:**

fix

-----

**Ident:** JLM-E49  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-10, Line 214, 220

**Comment:**

missing words

**Resolution:**

Change "at high media rate" to "at the high media rate" in line 214.  
Change "is time-out" to "is used to time-out" in line 220. And fill in those question marks while you're there.

-----

**Ident:** RDL-T3  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-10, Line 221

**Comment:**

Values missing

**Resolution:**

Replace the"??" with the appropriate values (2 places).

-----

**Ident:** DWW-E9  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13.5.1.1.2, Page 12-11, Line 239

**Comment:**

add a reference to section where repeat paths are defined/described.

**Resolution:**

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E27

**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-12 , Line 250

**Comment:**

"new and" is inappropriate.

**Resolution:**

Remove words.

-----

**Ident:** SAV-E9  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13.5.1.2, Page 12-12, Line 252

**Comment:**

Table 13-8 is a duplicate.

**Resolution:**

Rename to Table 13-9.

-----

**Ident:** DWW-T10  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13.5.1.3, Page 12-12, Line 257

**Comment:**

what is FSRMO?

**Resolution:**

-----

**Ident:** SAV-E10  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13.5.2.1.2, Page 12-13, Line 276

**Comment:**

Table 13-9 would be a duplicate.

**Resolution:**

Rename to Table 13-10.

-----

**Ident:** SAV-E11  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13.5.2.2.2, Page 12-13, Line 284

**Comment:**

Table 13-10 would be a duplicate.

**Resolution:**

Rename to Table 13-11.

-----

**Ident:** NAJ-E28  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-14 , Line 283

**Comment:**

"new and" is inappropriate.

**Resolution:**

Remove words.

-----  
**Ident:** NAJ-E29  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-14, Line 289

**Comment:**

FPASA is wrong.

**Resolution:**

Fix it.

-----  
**Ident:** JLM-E50  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause 13, Page 12-14, Line 289

**Comment:**

Typo

**Resolution:**

Change FPASA to FPASO.

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-T11  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 13.5.2.3, Page 12-14, Refs 289

**Comment:**

FPRMO does not exist - should this be FPRMO or FPRPTO? What is FPASA?

**Resolution:**

=====  
*Annex P Comments*  
=====

**Ident:** NAJ-E30  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Annex P, Page P1, Line 39

**Comment:**

Word has gone mad with section numbering.

**Resolution:**

Fix it.

-----  
**Ident:** DWW-E12  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause P, Page p1

**Comment:**

P.1 contains no content - delete heading P.1  
Format of page numbers differs from rest of document

**Resolution:**

Fix

=====  
*Annex X Comments*  
=====

**Ident:** JLM-E51  
**Type:** editorial  
**Location:** Clause X, Page X-1, Line 35

**Comment:**

Bullet too big. Geneva convention applies.

**Resolution:**

Shrink.

=====  
*END OF COMMENTS: Total Comments: 232, Total Commenters: 8*  
=====