



# 802.5t/D1 Comment Report

802.5/98/03-07r3

## Comment RDL-11

Section 0.0 Line 1 Severity A/C Type ED Status MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee ☐ Commenter Agrees? ☒ Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** Missing Annexes,

**Solution:** Annexes L, and M must be updated (since these are informative annexes, this comment is A/C)

**Response:** This will be done in the May release of the document.

## Comment RDL-12

Section 0.0 Line 1 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐ Commenter Agrees? ☒ Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Annex O should be re-named

**Solution:** Add a page after Annex M stating: "Change Title of Annex O to Channel considerations for 16 Mbit/s Token Ring."

**Response:** RDL does this.

## Comment RDL-10

Section 0.0 Line 1 Severity DIS Type TECH Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☒ Commenter Agrees? ☒ Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** Global Concern, Annex A, conformance requirements have not yet been specified.

**Solution:** Each Clause editor should extract appropriate requirements and indicate where in Annex A they belong.

**Response:** Done (Neil to do).

## Comment RDL-01

Section 1.0 Line 2 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐ Commenter Agrees? ☒ Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** The title does not state the purpose.

**Solution:** Add after "supplements" "to support 100 Mbit/s DTR operation"

**Response:**

## Comment RDL-16

Section 1.0 Line 2 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐ Commenter Agrees? ☒ Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** This supplement needs a statement of scope

**Solution:** Add an introductory paragraph 1.0 which specifies the purpose and scope of this Supplement

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-01**

**Section** 1.0    **Line** 9    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inconsitent wording "C-PORT acting in"

**Solution:** Replace with "C-Port in"

**Response:**

---

**Comment MJH-12**

**Section** 1.0    **Line** 13    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Shouldn't definition for PMC and PSC be added here?

**Solution:**

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-02**

**Section** 1.0    **Line** 22    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Missing references

**Solution:** Add [20] ISO/IEC 8802-5:1998  
Add [21] ISO/IEC 8802-5:1998/Amd. 1:1998

**Response:**

---

**Comment RDL-17**

**Section** 1.1    **Line** 3    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** The scope of the overall standard changes with this supplement. Those changes need to be reflected in 1.1, Scope.

**Solution:** Add 100 Mbit/s operation appropriately.

**Response:**

---

**Comment SJH-01**

**Section** 1.2    **Line** 7    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inappropriate indent.

**Solution:** Remove it.

**Response:**

---

**Comment ANF-02**

**Section** 1.4    **Line** 20    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** The details in normative reference [18] are wrong; they should read:

ANSI X3.263-1995 Fibre Distributed Data Interface (FDDI) - Token Ring Twisted Pair  
Physical Layer Medium Dependent (TP-PMD). Approved September 25 1995.

**Solution:** Correct it.

**Response:** RDL does this.

---

**Comment ANF-03**

**Section** 1.4    **Line** 22    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** The details in normative reference [19] are wrong; they should read:

ISO 9314-3: 1990, Information processing systems

Fibre Distributed Data Interface (FDDI)

Part 3:  
Physical Layer Medium Dependent (PMD).

**Solution:** Correct it.

**Response:** RDL does this.

---

**Comment KR-01**

**Section** 2.0    **Line** 1    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Will there be a need for a separate drawing showiwnng a typical HMR fiber port?

**Solution:** Pending outcome of serveral open fiber issues, there may be a need to do a separate drawing for fiber station/C-port

**Response:** Karl to provide two diagrams to show fibre in the Station and C-Port.

---

**Comment NAJ-03**

**Section** 2.0    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** C-Port diagram missing

**Solution:** Create a new diagram, showing C-Port functionality including the repeat path options.

**Response:** Ken to draw a new C-Port diagram.

---

**Comment KTW-02**

**Section** 2.1    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** MAC Protocol should be labeled "(9.1, 9.2)" instead of "Clause 9.6".

**Solution:** Change "Clause 9.6" to "(9.1, 9.2)".

**Response:** Do it.

## Comment KTW-07

Section 2.1 Line 1 Severity DIS Type TECH Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☒ Commenter Agrees? ☐ Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** Figure on page 2-1 as it relates to "Interface signals" and their useage in 9.2, 9.3 and their definitions in 9.8.

There is TOTAL confusion as to how MAC transmits data and idles. MAC is either transmitting frame data or idles. The confusion relates to what happens when FxTI is set to a 0 (no fill) or 1 (fill) and was caused by a pre-release version of the Draft 1 subclause 9.8 which I reviewed, but was changed before it was released without my knowledge.

I will comment on 9.2 below, but the same problem exists in 9.3.

GIVEN:

When in TS=STXN, the transmission of idles is turned ON (FSTI=1). When TS=STXN recognizes the need to transmit a frame, the following occurs.

Upon exit from the TS=STXN state and BEFORE entry into the TS=STXD state, the transmission of idles is turned OFF (FSTI=0), the transmit of SFS occurs and then the TS=TSXD state is entered to transmit the frame's data occurs until EOD is reached.

When TS=STXD recognizes the EOD, the following occurs.

Upon exit from the TS=STXD state and BEFORE entry into the TS=STXN state, the EFS is transmitted, the transmission of idles is turned ON (FSTI=1) and then the TS=TSXN state is entered.

Now a description of the problem.

- 1) Draft 1 9.2 table 9.2-5 (page 9.2-33) uses PM\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=Fill) OR PS\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=Fill) to turn ON the transmission of idles (FSTI=1) [implementers choice], and PM\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=No\_fill) OR "PS\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=No\_fill)" to turn OFF the transmission of idles (FSTI=0) [implementers choice]. This change was made at the request of the committee to bring 4, 16 and 100 Mbit/s in line with each other.

However, this DISAGREES with 9.8.1.1.2 lines 105 through 117.

- 2) To confuse the issue even more, the precise specifications in 9.2.5.8.2 on page 9.2-45 at 100 Mbit/s agrees with 9.8 (got caught between 9.8 releases) and uses the PS\_UNITDATA.request[Tx\_symbol=Idle] signal to transmit idles and the PS\_UNITDATA.request[Tx\_symbol=Data\_byte] signal to transmit data.

Note: The references are incorrect because I used the pre-release Draft 1 subclause 9.8 organization.

Furthermore, at 4 and 16 Mbit/s, the "PS\_CONTROL.request" OR "PM\_CONTROL.request" signals are used [implementers choice].

Both can't be right, so which is correct? I think the "CONTROL" Interface is correct (see solution).

Also, when would PM\_UNITDATA.request be used at 100 Mbit/s (see Tam Ross' comment on page 9.8-3 lines 97-103)?

Finally, I have opened many items relating to this item with each of these items referring to this item.

**Solution:** What we need is a clear and concise definition of how the Station and C-Port transmit "idles" and "data" and which Interface signals are used at 4, 16 and 100 Mbit/s.

This needs discussion by the committee so I know how to change 9.2 and 9.3 and Andy (?) knows how to change 9.8. The following items need discussion:

- 1) How to define transmit as it relates to FxTI (Station and C-Port) for control over idles.
- 2) How to define transmit as it relates to the transmission of data.
- 3) We must again discuss how 4 and 16 Mbit/s is changed (current DTR standard uses PM\_CONTROL.request, but with different words). Do we want to change it since it changes the BASE 1998 and the DTR Supplement standards?

DISCUSSION of item 1.

The implication of "PS\_UNITDATA.request..." is one of supplying "data" via the "MII data bits" to be transmitted. However, "fill" is not data that is derived from the "MII data bits" (Note: Even though data must be provided to the MII data bits, these bits are ignored.), but rather a special MII signal.

Therefore, I believe the correct terms for the "control" of fill are:

- 1) "PM\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=Fill)" OR  
"PS\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=Fill)" [implementers choice] to turn ON the transmission of fill and
- 2) "PM\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=No\_fill)" OR  
"PS\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=No\_fill)"  
[implementers choice] to turn OFF the transmission of fill.

This would agree with the decision the committee made during the January meeting in York and with 9.2 table 9.2-5 (page 9.2-33).

Finally, when "fill" is turned OFF (FxTI=0) "data" is supplied but not used. Therefore, in my opinion, it makes more sense to use a "CONTROL" type Interface signal than a "UNITDATA" type Interface signal.

DISCUSSION of item 2.

Paper 802.5/1998/03-04 is a presentation outlining a new 9.1.1.1 definition for the transmit function. This paper has been written as if this item was accepted. If this item is not accepted, the proposal's needs to be changed to include the names of the appropriate Interface signals used to turn on and off idle transmission.

DISCUSSION of item 3.

I have no problem changing the BASE and Supplement standards provided the committee agrees it is the right thing to do and it is allowed by our PAR.

**Response:** KTWilson to do.

---

**Comment** KTW-06

**Section** 2.1    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** C-Port should be labeled "(9.2, 9.3)" instead of "Clause 9.3".  
9.2 should be included because it defines the "C-Port in Station Emulation Mode".

**Solution:** Change "Clause 9.3" to "(9.2, 9.3)".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-05

**Section** 2.1    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** PMC should be labeled "(9.7, 9.8)" instead of "Clause 9.8".  
9.7 should be included since, at 100 Mbit/s, it defines PM\_STATUS.indication for Phantom detect.

**Solution:** Change "Clause 9.8" to "(9.7, 9.8)".

Question: Should a block labeled "Phantom Detect" be added to PMC?

**Response:** Do it.  
Answer: Yes.

---

**Comment** KTW-04

**Section** 2.1    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** PSC should be labeled "(9.8)" instead of "Clause 9.8".

**Solution:** Change "Clause 9.8" to "(9.8)".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-03

**Section** 2.1    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** MAC Facilities should be labeled "(10, 13)" instead of "Clause 9.2".

**Solution:** Change "Clause 9.2" to "(10, 13)".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-01

**Section** 2.1    **Line** 1    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** The C-Port definition is confusing because it includes the terms "Ring In" and "Ring Out". These terms are associated with Token-passing and should not be included.

**Solution:** Remove the terms "Ring In" and "Ring Out" as well as the lines and arrows associated with these terms.

**Response:** RDL to do this.

---

**Comment RDL-02**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Title doesn't indicate that this clause is a replacement for existing text.

**Solution:** Add "Replace Clause 9.0 with the following:" before the title.

**Response:** OK

---

**Comment NAJ-04**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 3    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** 100 Mbit/s is too specific

**Solution:** Replace with high media rate

**Response:** Replace:  
"operating at 4, 16 or 100 Mbit/s"  
with:  
"operating at 4 or 16 Mbit/s, or the High Media Rate"

---

**Comment NAJ-05**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 5    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** 100 Mbit/s is too specific

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:**

---

**Comment MJH-01**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 15    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** TXI\_AP and TKP\_AP are now used here, with Access Protocol being deleted. The rest of the document, well at least the next page, uses TXI Access Protocol (i.e. phrase all spelt out). Given our current consistency crisis is there a reason why Access Protocol was deleted here and should it not be the same as the rest of the document?

**Solution:**

**Response:** Since this paragraph is addressing figure 9.1, editor agrees. I have changed the insert "(TXI\_AP and TKP\_AP)" to the following:

"(the TXI Access Protocol abbreviated as "TXI AP" or the TKP Access Protocol abbreviated as "TKP AP")"

---

**Comment NAJ-06**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 34    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Missing 4 and 16 definitions.

**Solution:** For clarity, add FxMRO=0 and FxMRO=1 descriptions

**Response:** I have rewritten lines 31-36 as follows.

The Option Flags FSMRO (Station Media Rate Option) and FPMRO (C-Port Media Rate Option) are defined as follows.  
? FSMRO=0 or FPMRO=0: 4 Mbit/s.  
? FSMRO=1 or FPMRO=1: 16 Mbit/s.  
? FSMRO<2 or FPMRO<2: 4 or 16 Mbit/s.  
? FSMRO>1 or FPMRO>1: High Media Rate.  
? FSMRO=2 or FPMRO=2: 100 Mbit/s.  
? FSMRO>2 or FPMRO>2: reserved and not defined by this supplement.

NOTE: above "?" are a bullet.

---

**Comment NAJ-07**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 39    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** 100 Mbit/s is too specific

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Replace:  
"100 Mbit/s"  
with:  
"the High Media Rate".

---

**Comment NAJ-08**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 41    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** 100 Mbit/s is too specific

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Replace:  
"100 Mbit/s"  
with:  
"the High Media Rate".

---

**Comment NAJ-09**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 43    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** 100 Mbit/s is too specific

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Replace:  
"100 Mbit/s"  
with:  
"the High Media Rate".



---

**Comment NAJ-10**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 57    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** 100 Mbit/s is too specific

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Replace:  
"100 Mbit/s"  
with:  
"the High Media Rate".

---

**Comment MJH-02**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 57    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** (and line 65) Apparently we've defined more than one way to do TKP. Or else Protocols should be Protocol.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Changed to singular tense.

---

**Comment NAJ-11**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 61    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** 100 Mbit/s is too specific

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Replace:  
"100 Mbit/s"  
with:  
"the High Media Rate".

---

**Comment NAJ-12**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 65    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** 100 Mbit/s is too specific

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Replace:  
"100 Mbit/s"  
with:  
"the High Media Rate".

---

**Comment NAJ-13**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 81    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** 100 Mbit/s is too specific

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Replace: "for (4 or 16 Mbit/s) and 9.7.2 (100 Mbit/s)"  
With:  
"for 4 or 16 Mbit/s, and 9.7.2 and 9.7.3 for the High Media Rate"

---

**Comment NAJ-14**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 83    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** 100 Mbit/s is too specific

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Replace:  
"100 Mbit/s"  
with:  
"the High Media Rate".

---

**Comment RDL-03**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 4    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Does not state this is a replacement clause.

**Solution:** Add "Replace Clause 9.1 with the following:" before the title.

**Response:** OK

---

**Comment KTW-09**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 59    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** The definition of transmit fill, data and repeat on pages 9.1-2 and 9.1-3, lines 59-98, needs to be clarified.

**Solution:** Paper number 802.5/1998/03-04 is submitted as a possible solution.

It should be noted that this paper is written as if KTW-07 was accepted. Even if KTW-07 is not accepted, the only change would be in the names of the interface signals.

**Response:** This requires attendees to provide feedback by Thursday morning.

Accepted by straw poll 03-01.

---

**Comment DWW-16**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 67    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** I am concerned that we are fixing perceived errors in the base document within flagging the changes. A reader looking at Ammd 1 and this document would not know which is correct - and may not even notice the changes which affect how he should design his product.

**Solution:** There should be an appendix flagging any changes to the base documents which are errata, rather than mods to allow 100/16/4 to co-exist in one standard. If possible, this errata should be distributed with the base documents as well as in the appendix to this document.

**Response:** Need to open a maintenance PAR, rather than an annex. Capture comments in Mick's list of changes. Neil to own this.

---

**Comment NAJ-15**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 67    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Why was FxTI moved before delay?

**Solution:**

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-08**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 83    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** This item is related to KTW-7. If KTW-7 is accepted as proposed, then item i) is incorrect. Should be "Fill", not "No\_fill".

**Solution:** If KTW-7 is accepted: Change "PS\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=No\_fill" to "PS\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=Fill"

If KTW-7 is not accepted, then work to be done.

**Response:** Accepted.

---

**Comment DWW-17**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 111    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Replace the word "terms" with "actions"

**Solution:**

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-02**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 113    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Table missing top horizontal dividing line. Vertical line doesn't reach top.

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** It is OK in master. Work with Neil to fix PDF if possible.

---

**Comment SJH-03**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 117    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Bad English? "are used internal to the port"

**Solution:** "are used internally to the port"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment DWW-18**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 137    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Flags are not set by tables.

See also lines 144, 149

**Solution:**

**Response:** Change "by the Port Operation Table" to "by the C-Port's Join FSM in 9.3".

Also, correct lines 144, 149 and 154. Do a search for others.

---

**Comment DWW-19**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 150    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Re-insert "that"

**Solution:**

**Response:** Done

---

**Comment SJH-05**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 187    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** "4 or 16Mbit/s" is inconsistent with "4 and 16Mbit/s" used elsewhere (eg line 189)

**Solution:** "4 and 16Mbit/s"

**Response:** Done

---

**Comment SJH-04**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 188    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** "100mbit/s" missing capital

**Solution:** "100Mbit/s"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment DWW-20**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 192    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Any chance of having the properties in alphabetical order?

**Solution:**

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** SJH-06

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 200    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Clarity issue: "...AC and FC fields have been received and satisfies the following..."

**Solution:** Add "that": "...AC and FC fields have been received and that satisfies the following..."

**Response:**

---

**Comment** DWW-21

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 202    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** REJECTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Should E be included In the definition of FR\_FC? Does it matter what the FC value is as long as it is present?

See also line 229

**Solution:** Committee discussion required

**Response:** This is used for cut-through and is required.

## Comment NAJ-66

Section 09.1 Line 213 Severity DIS Type TECH Status MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee ☒ Commenter Agrees? ☒ Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** Considering the definitions of a frame with error in 9.1.1.6:

- 1) The property R of a frame

R - Ends with a valid ESD /T/R

cannot be tested in an implementation using the MII interface as it is impossible to distinguish a code violation in the final nibble from a premature end-of-frame. Both result in the final nibble on the MII receive interface having RX\_ER asserted.

In a valid frame (FR), we also have condition P

P - Has no code violations between SSD and ESD

and in this context property R is testable. But in a frame with error (FR\_WITH\_ERR), property R is not testable when the final data nibble with RX\_DV asserted has RX\_ER asserted as this may indicate a code violation preceding a valid /T/R/ sequence or a premature end-of-frame with /I/I/ seen an no /T/R/ sequence.

- 2) A frame that doesn't end in a /T/R/ at 100 Mbit/s should be treated in a similar manner to a 4/16 Mbit/s frame with no ED. In particular, it should not be a FR\_WITH\_ERR.
- 3) An aborted frame (ending with RX\_ER asserted for two nibbles) should also be treated in a similar manner to a 4/16 Mbit/s aborted frame. In particular, it should not be a FR\_WITH\_ERR.

The following sequences may clarify my understanding of the problem. Hexadecimal symbols are shown with token ring (MSB first) encoding.

Frame 1 - A valid frame

```
Rx:      |AC |FC |      |      FCS      |ET |
         /J/K/1/0/4/0/ ...  /a/a/a/a/a/a/a/a/0/0/T/R/

RXD<0:3>  |A|A|1|0|4|0| ...  |a|a|a|a|a|a|a|a|0|0|
RX_DV _____|_____|_____
RX_ER _____|_____|_____
```

Frame 2 - A frame with no TR sequence

```
Rx:      |AC |FC |      |      FCS      |ET |
         /J/K/1/0/4/0/ ...  /a/a/a/a/a/a/a/a/0/

RXD<0:3>  |A|A|1|0|4|0| ...  |a|a|a|a|a|a|a|a|0|x|
RX_DV _____|_____|_____
RX_ER _____|_____|_____
```

Frame 3 - A frame with a code violation in the final nibble

```
|AC |FC |      |      FCS      |ET |
```

```

Rx:      /J/K/1/0/4/0/   ...   /a/a/a/a/a/a/a/a/0/V/T/R/
RXD<0:3>  |A|A|1|0|4|0|   ...   |a|a|a|a|a|a|a|a|0|x|
RX_DV _____|_____|_____
RX_ER _____|_____|_____

```

Frame 4 - An aborted frame with two code violations

```

Rx:      |AC |FC |   ...   |      FCS      |ET |
         /J/K/1/0/4/0/   ...   /a/a/a/a/a/a/a/a/H/H/T/R/
RXD<0:3>  |A|A|1|0|4|0|   ...   |a|a|a|a|a|a|a|a|x|x|
RX_DV _____|_____|_____
RX_ER _____|_____|_____

```

The MII representations of frames 2 and 3 are identical but frame 3 is supposed to be a FR\_WITH\_ERR and frame 2 is not supposed to be.

**Solution:** Changing the definition of R to be:

R' - Ends with a valid hexadecimal digit followed by a valid ESD signal (code symbols /X/T/R/)

addresses all these problems.

An alternative is to require both nibbles of the ET octet to be valid hexadecimal values:

R'' - Ends with two valid hexadecimal digits followed by a valid ESD signal (code symbols /X/X/T/R/)

I personally think R'' is preferable. It looks cleaner as a specification with the end of FCS coverage switching immediately to the no-violations ruling of the ET/ESD. It may also offer a small amount of protection against transmission errors hiding an abort sequence.

A corrected definition of frame with error (FR\_WITH\_ERR) would then be one of the following conditions [This includes other corrections from previous NAJ comments]:

E & N & R' & L & (-C or -P or -F or -Q)  
or -E & N & R' & L & (-C or -P)

R' or R'' can be used instead of R in the definition of a valid frame (FR) with no change of semantics.

It may be noted that at 4/16 Mbit/s, a code violation in the I, E, A and C bits does not affect the conditions for FR, or FR\_WITH\_ERR. The current 100 Mbit/s standard says that a code violation in ET will turn a FR into a FR\_WITH\_ERR and this proposal will turn a FR with a code violation in ET into a sequence that is neither a FR nor a FR\_WITH\_ERR.

**Response:** Changed the definition of R as follows.

R - Ends with two valid hexadecimal values (0 through F) followed by a valid ESD signal (code symbols /T/R/)

---

**Comment NAJ-17**

Section 9.1    Line 222    Severity DIS    Type TECH    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☒    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** FR\_WITH\_ERR is specified for MAC and LLC frames as having property 'Q', a minimum of 19 octets between SSD and ESD.

So what is a frame with less than 19 octets if it is not a FR\_WITH\_ERR?

**Solution:** Remove '& Q' from line 222, \*and\* add 'or -Q' to the bracketed term.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-16**

Section 9.1    Line 222    Severity DIS    Type TECH    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☒    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Re: NAJ-Q1 from StrawMan 0.5

My solution to that comment was incomplete. -N should (and was removed), but N needs to be added to both lines 222 and 223.

**Solution:** Add 'N' to 222 and 223.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment DWW-24**

Section 9.1    Line 222    Severity DIS    Type TECH    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☒    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Why is Q required for FR\_WITH\_ERR? What is a FR\_WITH\_ERR if there are less than 19 octets between SSD and ESD and what should a station do with it?

**Solution:** Committee discussion required, but I would suggest FR\_WITH\_ERR should be: E & N & R & L & (-C or -Q or -F or -P) for MAC and LLC frames, with similar mods for undefined frame formats.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment DWW-23**

Section 9.1    Line 222    Severity DIS    Type TECH    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☒    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** I think that FR\_WITH\_ERR should also contain N (ie have an SSD)

**Solution:** Done.

**Response:** Added "N" to lines 222 and 223.

---

**Comment SJH-07**

Section 9.1    Line 222    Severity DIS    Type TECH    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Why does FR\_WITH\_ERR not include property "N" when most (all?) other properties can only be determined with reference to the (valid) SSD.

**Solution:** Add property "N" to both FR\_WITH\_ERR definitions (lines 222 and 223).

**Response:** Added "N" to lines 222 and 223.



---

**Comment NAJ-18**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 223    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** For undefined frames, a FR\_WITH\_ERR should also check for code violations between SSD and ESD.

**Solution:** Add 'or -P' to bracketed term on line 223.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-19**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 227    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** 'ST' should read 'SSD'

**Solution:** Fix it

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-08**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 228    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Clarity issue: "...have been received and satisfies the..."

**Solution:** Add "that": "...have been received and that satisfies the..."

**Response:**

---

**Comment SJH-09**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 240    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Colon unnecessary

**Solution:** Remove it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment DWW-25**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 275    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** All FSMs may be active when a transition occurs. I understand what you are trying to say, but "active" is not the correct word.

See also 276 and 277

**Solution:** Change the word "active" to a more suitable substitute.

**Response:** Replace "active" with "current" in lines 275, 276 and 277.

---

**Comment DWW-26**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 278    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** I hope that multiple transitions do not occur between two states!

**Solution:** Rephrase to something like: "Occasionally, a transition between two states can be caused by a number of different conditions, each with different resulting actions. In these cases, the different paths are differentiated by the addition of a letter in the state transition label (eg J13A or J13B)."

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-10**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 299    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Apostrophe missing after "Operation Tables"

**Solution:** Add it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-11**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 302    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Apostrophe missing after "Operation Tables"

**Solution:** Add it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-12**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 336    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Incorrect reference. "figure 9.1-3" should be "9.1-4"

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-20**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 405    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Trade-up proposal missing

**Solution:** Add Ivar's trade-up proposal (03-02r1)

**Response:** Vote for approval required on Thursday. If accepted, Wilson will make changes.  
Accepted by straw poll 03-02

---

**Comment** SJH-13

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 414    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Unnecessary capital T: "e.g., They..."

**Solution:** Make lower case.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** SJH-14

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 425    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Bad English: "...transmits..." should be "...transmitting...".

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** KTW-10

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 474    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Comment: KTWilson action should be removed.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** DWW-27

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 486    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** The C-Port does not change its lobe test support dependant on PPV(PD).

**Solution:** The C-Port does not change its lobe test support dependant on PPV(PD). Remove the word "according ... PPV(PV)"

**Response:** Done.ktwilson here.

---

**Comment** IMJ-01

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 486    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** The variable PPV(PV) is not defined.

**Solution:** Change "PPV(PV)" to the correct option flag (FPRPTO?).

**Response:** See resolution to DWW-27.

---

**Comment** SJH-15

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 506    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Bad English: Change "...is..." to "...are...".

**Solution:** Fix it

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** KTW-11

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 506    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** The phrase "between the Station's SMAC and the C-Port's PMAC" is incorrect. The LMT tests the SMAC, the media and the C-Port, where C-Port may or may not include the PMAC.

**Solution:** Change "'between the Station's SMAC and the C-Port's PMAC" to "between the Station's SMAC and the C-Port".

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** NAJ-21

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 512    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** 100Mbit/s is too specific

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** The committee accepted using the same LMT for 4/16/100/1000 Mbit/s. Change: "4/16/100" to: "4/16 Mbit/s, and the High Media Rate"

---

**Comment** KTW-17

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 515    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** On page 9.2-45, "PS\_UNITDATA.request(Tx\_symbol=Data\_byte)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, delete this entry.

**Response:** Delete this entry since KTW-7 is accepted.

---

**Comment** DWW-28

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 518    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** The use of the word "request" in this sentence implies that it is asking some other entity to do the lobe test.

See also line 540

**Solution:** Sentence needs rephrasing

**Response:** Replace the word "request" with "start"?

---

**Comment DWW-29**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 534    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Can the A and C bits also be set? I can't remember the outcome of that discussion many years ago...

See also 599

**Solution:**

**Response:** Since the hardware repeat path may set the A and C bits, add the A and C bits to lines 533 and 599.

---

**Comment IMJ-08**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 547    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** The description of setting the FA(TEST) in the C-Port do not correspond with the tables in clause 9.3.

See table 9.3-1, page 9.3-15 ref 1109  
and table 9.3-1, page 9.3-20 ref 1113, 1114.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Update words to agree with table.

---

**Comment SJH-16**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 571    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Doesn't point out that the returned frame may not contain the same frame data as the outgoing one.

**Solution:** Add something like:

"The station shall not expect to find the returned LMT MAC frame containing the same SA or information field as its transmitted frame."  
after full-stop on line 571.

**Response:** This is specified in 9.1.6.2.2, lines 588 and 589.

---

**Comment SJH-17**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 594    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Unresolved timings.

**Solution:** If these timings are correct, remove comment. Else resolve timings. Possible inclusion of a more detailed description of whole test process timings similar to NAJ's presentation.

**Response:** Committee agreed that the comment on line 594 can be removed. A new set of words will be added to the Station paragraph in lines 568 through 572 similar to the words in lines 591 through 593.

---

**Comment** IMJ-02

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 599    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Using MII repeat path the C-Port does not calculate CRC, so why set the E-bit?

**Solution:** The C-Port return received code violation errors. (See IMJ-3)

**Response:** Lobe Media Test issue: Andy will resolve by providing a Repeat-path definition in 9.7.2. This includes how the PHY repeat path handles receive (RX\_ER) and transmit (TX\_ER) errors.

---

**Comment** SJH-18

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 631    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Superfluous new line.

**Solution:** Remove it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** MJH-03

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 650    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** ANSWERED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** (and 668) Reference 9.1.1.1 does not seem correct. Is it?

**Solution:**

**Response:** Change lines 649 and 650, and 667 and 668 as follows.

FROM:

"... 9.1.8, provides the appropriate starting frame sequence (see 9.1.1.1) and enters the Transmit Data"

With:

"... 9.1.8 by providing the frame transmit sequence specified in 9.1.1.1, item 5 and entering the Transmit Data"

Notes:

1. This solution assumes the KTW-9 redefinition of the frame transmit sequence (9.1.1.1 items 5 and 6) is accepted.

2. This item also resolves SJH-20.

---

**Comment SJH-19**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 656    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Paragraph above is talking about listing detected conditions. The following items are result-action sentences. Makes better sense if these are separated into two sentences.

**Solution:** Break into two sentences: change "...reached), releases the..." into  
"...reached). It releases..."

Similarly on line 658, "...error and..." -> "...error. It..."

Same comment applies to lines 674 and 676, and to lines 725 and 727.

**Response:** Change lines 656 and 674 as follows.

FROM:

"reached), releases the end-of-frame sequence (EFS) and returns to the Transmit Normal state"

TO:

"reached). The Station or C-Port then releases the end-of-frame sequence (EFS) and returns to the Transmit Normal state"

NOTE: For consistency, I changed lines 658 and 676 as follows.

FROM:

"... transmission error and takes one"

TO:

"... transmission error. The Station or C-Port then takes one"

---

**Comment SJH-20**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 667    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** "...honors the condition and selection scheme..." describes the next two items so shouldn't be equal in the list.

**Solution:** Change "...identified in 9.1.8, provides..." to  
"...identified in 9.1.8 by providing..."  
and "enters" to "entering" on the next line.

Same comment applies to line 720.

**Response:** See solution in MJH-03.

---

**Comment SJH-21**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 707    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Comma not needed after "of the flag".

**Solution:** Remove it.

**Response:** Did a global change to remove the comma between flag and the name of the flag.

---

**Comment DWW-30**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 733    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** I think that "Heat" should read "Beat"

**Solution:**

**Response:** Did a global search and correction made in lines 733 and 736.

---

**Comment MJH-04**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 733    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** (and 736) In the words of the veritable Go-Gos, 'We've got the beat'. Change Heart Heat to Heart Beat.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Did a global search and correction made in lines 733 and 736.

---

**Comment DWW-31**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 736    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** I think that "Heat" should read "Beat"

**Solution:**

**Response:** Did a global search and correction made in lines 733 and 736.

---

**Comment SJH-22**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 736    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** No such thing as a "Heart Heat".

**Solution:** Change to "Heart Beat".

**Response:** Did a global search and correction made in lines 733 and 736.

---

**Comment MJH-05**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 774    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Holy schizophrenia Batman. This section is titled TXI Hard Error Recovery, but 774 now refers to TKP rather than TXI. Is this what was intended?

**Solution:**

**Response:** Ken Wilson will clarify line 774 to indicate that the change was made in support of the TXI Access Protocol.

---

**Comment IMJ-05**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 857    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** This is also the case for high media rate and phantom supported. Table 9.3-3 ref 1406.

**Solution:** Change "When operating at 4 or 16 Mbit/s,"  
To "When operating at any media rate and Phantom is supported (SPD=0001),"

**Response:** Changed line 857 as per solution.

NOTE: Table 9.3-3 ref 1406 is incorrect, but did not find change request in database.

Event column "FPRMO<2" should be "SPD=0001"?



---

**Comment** SJH-23

Section 9.1    Line 860    Severity DIS    Type TECH    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Unresolved item.

**Solution:** Resolve it.

**Response:** Resolved by item IMJ-06.

---

**Comment** IMJ-06

Section 9.1    Line 860    Severity DIS    Type TECH    Status MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee ☒    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** This is only the case when Phantom is not supported.  
Table 9.3-3, ref 1407

**Solution:** Change: "When operating at the High Media Rate,"  
to: "When operating at the High Media Rate and Phantom is not supported (SPD=0002),"

**Response:** Changed line 860 to the following.  
? When operating at the High Media Rate and Phantom is not  
supported (SPD=0002), the C-Port transmits the Lobe Media  
& Right([Sect Number],1))UCase(DLookUp("[Initials]","My Information1")) &  
(FPRPTO=0) and informs its Join Machine  
to re-enter the C-Port's Lobe Test state (JS=PLT) by  
setting FPBNT=1 (see 9.3.3.2).

---

**Comment** SJH-24

Section 9.1    Line 869    Severity A/C    Type ED    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Bad English.

**Solution:** Change "remove them" to "remove themselves".

**Response:** OK

---

**Comment** SJH-25

Section 9.1    Line 953    Severity A/C    Type ED    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Previous change means verb doesn't agree with subject/object.

**Solution:** Change "causes" to "cause".

**Response:** OK. Since this is the original set of words, change bar has been removed.

---

**Comment** MJH-06

Section 9.1    Line 955    Severity Q    Type ED    Status REJECTED

Highlight To Committee ☒    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** General question: We include full references to other documents within the text of our clauses. Would it be easier for the editors to have a reference section at the start that has the full reference (i.e. [8802-5] - ISO/IEC 8802-5:1998) and just refer to [8802-5] within the text. This would mean only one item has to be changed when the referred document name changes.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Good point, but why change now and introduce errors?

---

**Comment MJH-07**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 964    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Should this section include a reference to Figure 9-1?

**Solution:**

**Response:** Changed line 6, which identifies configurations 1 through 4, as follows.

FROM:

"... configurations 1 through 4. ..."

TO:

"... configurations 1 through 4 illustrated in Figure 9.1. ..."

Is this acceptable?

---

**Comment RDL-04**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 4    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Does not indicate this is replacement text.

**Solution:** Add "Replace Clause 9.2 with the following:" before the title.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-26**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 39    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Strange use of past tense.

**Solution:** Change "...Access Protocol was activated..." to "...Access Protocol can be activated..."

**Response:** Line 39 changed as follows.

FROM:

"The TKP Access Protocol was activated ..."

TO:

"The TKP Access Protocol is activated ..."

---

**Comment SJH-27**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 111    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** FSIE is no longer used.

**Solution:** Remove reference to it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-22**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 111    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** FSIE is not used.

**Solution:** Delete line.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** KTW-33

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 185    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Reference to 10.5.1.2 is incomplete.

**Solution:** Change:  
"10.5.1.2"  
to:  
"10.5.1.2 when operating at 4 or 16 Mbit/s and 13.5.1.2 when operating at 100 Mbit/s".

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** NAJ-23

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 187    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inappropriate use of 100Mbit/s

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** NAJ requests that line 187 and 190 be changed to:  
"is used when FSLMTO=1 to ..."

---

**Comment** NAJ-24

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 190    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inappropriate use of 100Mbit/s

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** NAJ requests that line 187 and 190 be changed to:  
"is used when FSLMTO=1 to ..."

---

**Comment** NAJ-25

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 264    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inappropriate use of 100Mbit/s

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** SJH-28

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 265    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Bad English.

**Solution:** Change "Station using the 100Mbit/s has..." to "Station at 100Mbit/s has..."

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment SJH-29**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 309    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Capitalisation unnecessary for "Idles (Fill)". Cf line 318.

**Solution:** Lower case all round.

"idles (fill"

**Response:** A search for the term "idles(fill) [not case sensitive]" was done in 9.2 and 9.3 and all occurrences were changed to "idles(Fill)". 9.0 and 9.1 do not use this term.

---

**Comment NAJ-26**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 317    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inappropriate use of 100Mbit/s

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:**

---

**Comment SJH-30**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 324    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Unnecessary comma: "When, FSTXC..."

**Solution:** Remove it.

**Response:** Lines 324 through 327 where change to the following.

The setting of FSTXC controls the Station's transmit clock and affects the PSC interface as follows.  
? When FSTXC is 1, the PS\_CONTROL.request(Crystal\_transmit=Asserted) signal indicates that the Station's SMAC transmit timing reference is derived from the Station's internal crystal clock.

---

**Comment NAJ-27**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 339    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inappropriate use of 100Mbit/s

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:**

---

**Comment SJH-31**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 391    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Unnecessary colon: "...is a 1, the Station: sets..."

**Solution:** Remove it.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** SJH-32

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 395    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Extra colon and "it" : "...is a 1, the Station: sets FSOP to a 0, it resets the..."

**Solution:** Change to "...is a 1, the Station sets FSOP to a 0, resets the..."

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** SJH-33

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 417    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Bad English: "If the Station's Internal Test were..."

**Solution:** Change to "Tests were" or "test was".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** MJH-08

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 438    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** ref. 9.8.1.1.3 should be 9.8.1.1.4  
(and line 443)

**Solution:**

**Response:** Correct both references.

---

**Comment** NAJ-28

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 438    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inappropriate use of 100Mbit/s

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:**

---

**Comment** NAJ-29

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 443    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inappropriate use of 100Mbit/s

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:**

---

**Comment MJH-09**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 444    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** ref. 9.8.1.1.1 should be 9.8.1.1.2

**Solution:**

**Response:** See MJH-08

---

**Comment NAJ-30**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 462    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Incomplete edit.

**Solution:** Add 'initial' and pluralise sentence:

...are used to represent the initial values of CSREQ...

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment SJH-34**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 464    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Table n8 description bad English: "transmitted by the Station's 100Mbit/s before"

**Solution:** Say "transmitted by the Station at 100Mbit/s before"

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-31**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 464    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Two inappropriate uses of 100Mbit/s in this table

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment NAJ-39**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 467    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 3130 & 3132, 9.2-21

Both transitions have unnecessary check on FSMRO<2

**Solution:** Remove check.

**Response:** I agree check is not required, but for clarity I added it.

---

**Comment NAJ-38**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 467    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 3173, 9.2-21

Action contains check on FSPDO.

**Solution:** Typo, should be FSPDA

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-36**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 467    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Ref 3191 & 3192, 9.2-20 & 9.2-22

S/T contains a ?.

**Solution:** Fix it

**Response:** OK

---

**Comment NAJ-34**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 467    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref ???, 9.2-19

RMV\_ALRT MAC frames not dealt with.

**Solution:** Add a new transition:

JD0?  
FR\_RMV\_ALRT(VC=03 & SA=SUA) & JS=SJC  
=> JS=BP

**Response:** Wilson will add this transition to Station Join SOT.

---

**Comment NAJ-32**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 467    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 1107, 9.2-14

FSTI use at high media rate is now required.

**Solution:** Add FSTI=1 to actions.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-36**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 467    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 3191 - Action "If FSPDO=1". No such flag.

**Solution:** Change to FSPDA.  
Also Ref 3173.

**Response:** Resolved by NAJ-37 and NAJ-38.

---

**Comment NAJ-33**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 467    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 3179, 9.2-14

FSTI use at high media rate is now required.

**Solution:** Add FSTI=1 to actions

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-37**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 467    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 3191, 9.2-20

Action contains check on FSPDO.

**Solution:** Typo, should be FSPDA.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-35**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 467    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** OPEN

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Once the remove alert process has started, no checks are made to prevent one of the following happening:

- 1) Beacon process starts, moving JS to SLT, thus preventing the remove alert process completing.
- 2) Another Disconnect.SMAC is received, restarting the remove alert process.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Ken Wilson, Neil Jarvis, Simon Harrison and Ivar Jeppesen will work up a solution before the release of Draft 2.

---

**Comment SJH-35**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 467    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Events 3152 and 3184 are just a subset of 3146 and 3182 and are therefore superfluous.

**Solution:** Remove them.

**Response:** Hold off until 12 MAR 98 (Thursday morning) for Neil and Ken. See paper 03-10 to investigate the possibility of removing lots of redundant transitions as pointed out in concern.  
Interesting observaton! Needs investigation as this problem also exists in 802.5r.

Transitions are not redundant, but will add text to 9.1 to explain FR, FR\_MAC and FR\_xxx interactions.



---

**Comment NAJ-45**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 470    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 3213, 9.2-25

Action should be [optional-unk]

**Solution:** Add it.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment NAJ-42**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 470    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 3210 & 3211, 9.2-26 & 9.2-27 \*also\*  
Ref 1202 & 1201, 9.3-25

Action contains CSBTX=13 for high media rates. My calculation of the value is

IFG + SSD + AC + FCS + ET + ESD, which is  
12 + 1 + 1 + 4 + 1 + 1 = 20 (14 hex) for high media rates.

**Solution:** Change 13 to be 14.

**Response:** Changed 3210, 3211, 1202 and 1201 to agree with solution.

---

**Comment NAJ-40**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 470    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** OPEN

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Has FPASO become overloaded. I can envisage a cobbled together 4/16/100 Mbit/s implementation, which uses FPASO=0 at 4/16 (since FPASO=1 is discouraged at 4/16), and uses FPASO=1 at 100Mbit/s (maybe because of RMII).

Is this a problem?

Also 9.3 issue.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Ken Wilson and Neil Jarvis will evaluate FPASO before the release of Draft 2.

---

**Comment MJH-10**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 470    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** ANSWERED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** S/T TABB ref 3210. This refers to PPV(MAX\_TX). This is not defined anywhere in 9.2. (Define in 9.3.2). Should some definition be included in 9.2? (Base document problem as well)

**Solution:**

**Response:** "FR\_LTH<=PPV(MAX\_TX)" has been defined in 9.2.5.8.2 (on Draft 1 page 9.2-44 after DTU\_UNITDATA.indication), changed the C-Port definition (page 9.3-35) to agree with Station's precise definition for events and added this missing C-Port's precise definition for actions (Draft 1 page 9.3-44 after [FA(address)=1]).

Also, found "FR\_LTH<=MAX\_TX" which is not used. Corrected this to "FR\_LTH<=SPV(MAX\_TX)" (Draft 1 page 9.2-41).

---

**Comment** SJH-37

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 482    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 3530. Error in comment. "to the this C-Port"

**Solution:** Remove "the"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** KTW-12

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 482    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** On page 9.2-33, references 3504, 3537, 3505 and 3538 are the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** No change is required provided the suggestion in KTW-7 is accepted.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, change will be required.

**Response:**

---

**Comment** SJH-38

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 482    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 3507. Unnecessary comma "Tables and, may"

**Solution:** Remove it.

**Response:** Do it. Actually, the comma was in the wrong place. I have changed to:

1. When operating at 4 and 16 Mbit/s, Crystal Transmit is controlled by the Join and Monitor Station Operation Tables, and may or may not be asserted.

---

**Comment** SJH-39

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 497    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Strange word "equalivent"

**Solution:** Change to "equivalent."

**Response:** Remove note.

---

**Comment** SJH-40

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 504    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Unnecessary full-stop after table entry "{term1}={term2}."

**Solution:** Remove it.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment NAJ-44**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 508    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** 2 entries describe TSRAT=E. These are not required (and TSRAT is called TSRAP!)

**Solution:** Delete both entried

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment NAJ-43**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 508    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Missing FR\_RMV\_ALRT definition

**Solution:** Add it.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment SJH-41**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 508    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Meaning box of "AND(x,y)": "Bit wise" should be hyphenated.

**Solution:** Change to "Bit-wise"

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment SJH-42**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 508    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** FR\_LMTN "High media rate only" is wrong. Frame may optionally be used at 16/4. Similarly FR\_TEST.

**Solution:** Remove comment.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment KTW-13**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 515    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** On page 9.2-45, "PM\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Fill)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, make the following changes.

- 1) "PM\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Fill)" to  
"PM\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=Fill)".
- 2) Remove "<< 4 and 16 Mbit/s only >>".
- 3) Change the meaning of this term to the following.  
The C-Port PMAC requests the PMC to stop repeat and  
start sourcing fill (see 9.7.2.2 for 4 or 16 Mbit/s, or  
9.8.? For 100 Mbit/s).

Note: 9.8.? needs to be filled in when 9.8 is  
changed as per KTW-7.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a different change will be required.

**Response:** KTW-7 was accepted so do it. Leave Editing Complete unmarked until get 9.8.? is assigned.

---

**Comment KTW-15**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 515    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** On page 9.2-45, "PS\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Fill)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, make the following changes.

- 1) "PS\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Fill)" to  
"PS\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=Fill)".
- 2) Remove "<< 4 and 16 Mbit/s only >>".
- 3) Change the meaning of this term to the following.  
The C-Port PMAC requests the PSC stop repeat and start  
sourcing fill (see 9.7.2.2 for 4 or 16 Mbit/s, or  
9.8.? For 100 Mbit/s).

Note: 9.8.? needs to be filled in when 9.8 is  
changed as per KTW-7.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a different change will be required.

**Response:** KTW-7 was accepted so do it. Leave Editing Complete unmarked until get 9.8.? is assigned.

---

**Comment KTW-14**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 515    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** On page 9.2-45, "PM\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Repeat)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, make the following changes.

- 1) "PM\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Repeat)" to  
"PM\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=No\_fill)".
- 2) Remove "<< 4 and 16 Mbit/s only >>".
- 3) Change the meaning of this term to the following.  
The C-Port PMAC requests the PMC to stop sourcing fill  
and start repeat (see 9.7.2.2 for 4 or 16 Mbit/s, or  
9.8.? For 100 Mbit/s).

Note: 9.8.? needs to be filled in when 9.8 is  
changed as per KTW-7.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a different change will be required.

**Response:** KTW-7 was accepted so do it. Leave Editing Complete unmarked until get 9.8.? is assigned.

---

**Comment KTW-18**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 515    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** On page 9.2-45, "PS\_UNITDATA.request(Tx\_symbol=Idle)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, delete this entry.

**Response:** KTW-7 was accepted so do it.

---

**Comment MJH-11**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 515    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** ANSWERED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** TX\_SFS : Was there a good reason for chnaging the wording for the bits T and M?

**Solution:**

**Response:** Yes.

---

**Comment KTW-16**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 515    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** On page 9.2-45, "PS\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Repeat)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, make the following changes.

- 1) "PS\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Repeat)" to "PS\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=No\_fill)".
- 2) Remove "<< 4 and 16 Mbit/s only >>".
- 3) Change the meaning of this term to the following.  
The C-Port PMAC requests the PSC to stop sourcing fill and start repeat (see 9.7.2.2 for 4 or 16 Mbit/s, or 9.8.? For 100 Mbit/s).

Note: 9.8.? needs to be filled in when 9.8 is changed as per KTW-7.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a different change will be required.

**Response:** KTW-7 was accepted so do it. Leave Editing Complete unmarked until get 9.8.? is assigned.

---

**Comment KR-10**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 3173    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Is this here for the case when the C-Port transmits a RMV\_ALRT to the station?

**Solution:** If so, then restore the event back to the way it was and remove editor's comment. If not, how is RMV\_ALRT from the C-port handled by the station? I don't see it anywhere in the state tables.

**Response:** Ken Wilson to add comment to 3173 on page 9.2-21 to clarify why RMV\_ALRT MAC frame is not used. Also, 3191 page 9.2-20. Do a search for others.

---

**Comment SJH-43**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 0    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Title is wrong. "Draft 0.5 Nov 1997".

**Solution:** Fix next time.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment IMJ-14**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 1    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** OPEN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** REF 1060, 1055, 1059, 1082, page 9.3-19.  
1) Why not use TXI\_RMV\_ALRT when VC=00?  
2) Why not use TXI\_RMV\_ALRT when JS=PDAC?

**Solution:**

**Response:** TXI\_RMV\_ALRT should be sent after the C-Port has entered Join Complete. Therefore, 1055 needs to be changed and eliminates changing 1060 and 1082. However, 1059 is another question since JS=PLT can be entered as the result beaconing after Join complete. It is my opinion that it should not do the transmit remove alert function.

Will evaluate correction as per NAJ-34.

---

**Comment** RDL-05

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 4    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Does not state this is replacement text

**Solution:** Add "Replace Clause 9.3 with the following:" before the title.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** SJH-44

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 36    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Bad English "This clause and its figures provides".

**Solution:** Change "provides" to "provide".

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** SJH-45

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 60    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Unnecessary UPPER CASE in state diagram "TEST FAILURE" transition.

**Solution:** "Test Failure"

**Response:** Will do as soon as I figure how to edit figure. Working.

---

**Comment** NAJ-46

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 83    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** FPRAP is not used

**Solution:** Remove entry

**Response:** Removed flag from definition. However, since this was a new definition for 802.5t, there will be no change bars to reflect change.

---

**Comment** IMJ-12

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 83    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** The flag FPRAP is not defined.

**Solution:** Remove the flag (not used).

**Response:** Removed flag from definition. However, there will be no change bars to reflect change.

---

**Comment NAJ-47**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 108    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inappropriate use of 100Mbit/s

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-48**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 113    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inappropriate use of 100Mbit/s

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-46**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 113    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Bad English. "...is used at the 100Mbit/s to determine..."

**Solution:** Remove "the" or change "100Mbit/s" to "higher media rate" if that is what is intended.

**Response:** Resolved by NAJ-48.

---

**Comment SJH-47**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 128    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** "flag is set to 1 on the receipt of any frame, or optionally, token." Does this mean that an implementation could choose to set the flag only on a token? If so, it won't disrupt a tokenless lobe test, as is optionally allowed at 4/16. Even if the open were disrupted further down the process, the open failure to management may be different.

In the state transition tables, the notation TK\_AC suggests that both Frame and Token are mandated (since the T bit of the AC isn't specified).

**Solution:** If token-only flag setting isn't allowed, change "frame, or optionally" to "frame, and optionally".

**Response:** Flag FPBLT is set to 1 upon receipt of any frame or, optionally a token. Line 128 changed as follows.

FROM:

"... receipt of any frame, or optionally, token. ..."

TO:

"... receipt of any frame and optionally any token. ..."

Ken Wilson: any frame=FR\_AC (9.1.x.x) and any token=TK\_AC (9.1.x.x). Therefore, write new words.



---

**Comment NAJ-49**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 183    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** This is good a holding place as any...

FPRF attempts to fix a lockup problem in 4/16 TXI. It is not complete. The complete problem has been analysed, and is published as 802.5/1998/03-03.

**Solution:** Remove (or modify) lockup solution as described in this document. This affects FPRF, optional-rf, TPRF (and maybe more).

**Response:** Paper 03-03 presented on 10 Mar 98 will be voted on on Thursday morning

Accepted by straw poll 03-03

---

**Comment SJH-48**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 193    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** "PS\_STATUS.indication(Phantom=Not\_asserted) isn't defined.

**Solution:** Use "PS\_STATUS.indication(Insert=Not\_Detected) instead.

**Response:** See NAJ-49 for FPRF change which will change this text.

---

**Comment NAJ-50**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 355    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** CSRAT in "Used with" column is wrong

**Solution:** Should be CPRAT.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment NAJ-51**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 355    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Inappropriate use of 100Mbit/s

**Solution:** Replace with "high media rate"

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment NAJ-E-256**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 358    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** C-Port Join FSM.

Missing transitions to deal with PM\_STATUS.indication(Link\_status=Not\_asserted) returning the C-Port to the Bypass state. See Station transitions, 3172, 3173, 3174 and 3175 (all on 9.2-21) for templates for required transitions.

See NAJ-E-255 for a related change.

**Solution:** Add new transitions to return C-Port to bypass, when link\_status becomes not\_asserted.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment SJH-51**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 358    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Ref 1094 and 1100 are a subset of 1105 and 1101 since FPRPTO=1 for FPMRO<2.  
In any case, disruption of lobe test is required at 100Mbit/s to be compatible with any future shared implementation.

**Solution:** Remove FPMRO<2 from 1094 and 1100.

**Response:** Delete FPMRO<2 from both 1094 and 1100. (Done.)  
Add FPRPTO=1 to 1094's conditions. (Done.)  
Add properties of TK\_AC to 9.1 (see FR\_AC for a template).  
Hold open until this is done.

---

**Comment IMJ-13**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 358    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** REF 1125, page 9.3-19  
The TXI\_RMV\_ALERT is not repeated because no events match TPRAP=E & JS=PLT.

**Solution:** Add two new events: 1127 and 1128 with JS=PJCI changed to JS=PLT

**Response:** See NAJ-34 for Remove Alert work will change this transition.

---

**Comment KR-02**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 358    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Disagree with ref 1118 p9.3-15 comment "C-port closed for unknown reason".

**Solution:** Reason is known. Should be "C-port closed by port management".

**Response:** Remove comment in action column.

---

**Comment SJH-49**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 358    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Ref 1033. Should this not be gated on FPINSLE=1?

**Solution:** Gate it.

**Response:** See NAJ-49 for FPRF change which will change this text.

---

**Comment SJH-52**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 358    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 1095, 1096. Need 100M versions of these transitions for 100M lobe test disruption to work, as controlled by 1105, 1101.

**Solution:** Change FPMRO<2 to FPRPTO=1.

**Response:** Delete FPMRO<2 from both 1095 and 1096 only.

---

**Comment NAJ-52**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 358    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 1107, 9.3-14  
(See NAJ-32)

FSTI is missing from action column

**Solution:** Add FSTI=1

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment NAJ-53**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 358    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Ref 1122, 9.3-16

See NAJ-35. This transition shows a clear problem with the remove alert process. 1122 fires and causes a RMV\_ALERT MAC frame to be transmitted. When this completes, and TS returns to PTXN, 1122 fires again, restarting the RMV\_ALERT process.

**Solution:** Some sort of mechanism (like bypass wait) that stops the remove alert process being restarted or interrupted.

**Response:** NAJ-34 will probably require either a new state or flag (to simulate a state) and will resolve this problem.

---

**Comment IMJ-11**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 358    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** REF 1119, page 9.3-22.  
High Media Rate comment in EVENT field.

Why must Link\_status go Not\_asserted???  
This require the Station to Remove the PHY, which will set the PHY into an undefined state. (see page 9.8-5)

**Solution:** Remove the High Media Rate comment in the EVENT field.

**Response:** Concern is correct. See NAJ-49 for FPRF change which will change this text.

---

**Comment IMJ-10**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 358    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** REF 1125, page 9.3-19.  
The Event do not include a High Media Rate check.

**Solution:** Add to EVENT "& FPMRO>1"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** SJH-50

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 358    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Extra commas on Ref 1080 and 1004 - ",)=0000 & JS=PREG".

**Solution:** Remove them.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** NAJ-54

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 359    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 1112 is also available...

**Solution:**

**Response:** Thanks.

---

**Comment** NAJ-56

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 361    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 1216, 9.3-24

FPIT=1 in actions is a typo

**Solution:** Should read FPTI=1

**Response:** Do a search for FPIT, just in case. Found 3 occurrences and corrected all.

---

**Comment** NAJ-55

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 361    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 1215, 9.3-24  
(See NAJ-45)

Actions should be marked [optional-unk]

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Do it.

Also, removed FPMRO<2 conditioning and "<< 4 and 16 Mbit/s only. >> comment from event column of ref 1203 since this abort sequence is supported at all speeds.

---

**Comment** NAJ-57

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 361    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 1202 & 1201, 9.3-25  
See NAJ-42

CSBTX=13 is wrong

**Solution:** CSBTX=14

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment NAJ-58**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 364    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 1407, 9.3-26

Wrong font used for event.

**Solution:** Fix it

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment SJH-54**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 364    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 1406. No such flag FPRMO.

**Solution:** Change to FPMRO.

**Response:** This comment was withdrawn, but I searched 9.3 and found 3 occurrences. Corrected all. Changed status to ACCEPTED and marked commenter agrees and editing complete.

---

**Comment SJH-55**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 364    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 1407 missing bold event.

**Solution:** Embolden FR\_LMTN(...)

**Response:** Do it. (despite from the bad English)

---

**Comment IMJ-09**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 364    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** REF 1407, the repeat path is not enabled, when the C-Port receiving the very first FR\_LMTN doing recovery.

**Solution:** Add to ACTION: if FPRPTO=1 & FPRPT=0 then TXI\_LMTN\_PDU  
<<I withdraw this comment because it gives the C-Port 20 msec (TSLMTP) to establish the PHY repeat path>>  
New solution: add comment that the C-Port establish the repeat path after reception of the first FR\_LMTN, if not already established.

**Response:** New solution above will be inserted in REF 1407.

---

**Comment SJH-53**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 364    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Under actions/outputs, ref 1406 "FPMRO>1" can't occur since it is filtered by the condition "FPMRO<2".

**Solution:** Remove "If FPMRO>1 then FPRF=0"

**Response:** See IMJ-07 for correction.

---

**Comment** IMJ-07

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 364    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** REF 1406, The action will not be executed at High Media Rate.

**Solution:** Remove from Event: "& FPRMO<2"

**Response:** Do it. Also new item NAJ-E-255 opened due to conflict in FPINS=0 signal.

---

**Comment** NAJ-59

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 367    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Lots of refs...

Almost got this one licked (9.2 is OK). Counters are compared to value 255. Should be FF.

**Solution:** Replace 255 with FF

**Response:** Do it. Searched 9.3 and changed six "255" entries to "FF".

---

**Comment** KTW-19

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 370    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** On page 9.3-28, references 1802 and 1803 are the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** No change is required provided the suggestion in KTW-7 is accepted.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a change will be required.

**Response:** No change made since KTW-07 is accepted.

---

**Comment** NAJ-E-255

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 370    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Ref 1825, Page 9.3-30

Left over transition from strawman

**Solution:** Delete transition, but also see NAJ-E-256

**Response:** Do it

---

**Comment** NAJ-60

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 370    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 1823, 9.3-29

Transition not required (like 1813 does not have a high media rate counterpart).

**Solution:** Delete transition

**Response:** Delete 1823 and remove FPRMO<2 from 1812. (Done.)  
Wilson to search 9.2 and 9.3 for FxRMO and replace with FxMRO. (Done)

---

**Comment NAJ-61**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 374    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Ref 2028, 9.3-31

Condition SPD=0001 is checked here. Why? I can see no reason.

**Solution:** Delete SPD=0001 from event.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment SJH-56**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Table entry "{term1}={term2}." has unnecessary full-stop.

**Solution:** Remove full-stop.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment SJH-58**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 387    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** FR\_AC is not defined.

**Solution:** Define it

**Response:** Do it. Added FR\_AC to event list in 9.2 and 9.3.

---

**Comment SJH-59**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 387    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** PM\_STATUS.indication(Link\_status=Asserted) is missing.

**Solution:** Add it.

**Response:** Do it. Also corrected references for  
PM\_STATUS.indication(Link\_status=Not\_asserted) and  
PM\_STATUS.indication(Link\_status=Asserted).

---

**Comment SJH-57**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 387    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Hyphenate "Bit wise" under "AND(x,y)" meaning.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Do it. (search...)

---

**Comment** KTW-21

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 395    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** On page 9.3-38, "PM\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Repeat)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, make the following changes.

- 1) "PM\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Repeat)" to  
"PM\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=No\_fill)".
- 2) Remove "<< 4 and 16 Mbit/s only >>".
- 3) Change the meaning of this term to the following.  
The C-Port PMAC requests the PMC to stop sourcing fill  
and start repeat (see 9.7.2.2 for 4 or 16 Mbit/s, or  
9.8.? For 100 Mbit/s).

Note: 9.8.? needs to be filled in when 9.8 is  
changed as per KTW-7.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a different change will be required.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-24

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 395    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** On page 9.3-38, "PS\_UNITDATA.request(Tx\_symbol=Data\_byte)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, delete this entry.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-22

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 395    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** On page 9.3-38, "PS\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Fill)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, make the following changes.

- 1) "PS\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Fill)" to  
"PS\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=Fill)".
- 2) Remove "<< 4 and 16 Mbit/s only >>".
- 3) Change the meaning of this term to the following.  
The C-Port PMAC requests the PSC stop repeat and start  
sourcing fill (see 9.7.2.2 for 4 or 16 Mbit/s, or  
9.8.? For 100 Mbit/s).

Note: 9.8.? needs to be filled in when 9.8 is  
changed as per KTW-7.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a different change will be required.

**Response:** Do it.



---

**Comment** KTW-20

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 395    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** On page 9.3-38, "PM\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Fill)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, make the following changes.

- 1) "PM\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Fill)" to "PM\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=Fill)".
- 2) Remove "<< 4 and 16 Mbit/s only >>".
- 3) Change the meaning of this term to the following.  
The C-Port PMAC requests the PMC to stop repeat and start sourcing fill (see 9.7.2.2 for 4 or 16 Mbit/s, or 9.8.? For 100 Mbit/s).

Note: 9.8.? needs to be filled in when 9.8 is changed as per KTW-7.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a different change will be required.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-23

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 395    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** On page 9.2-45, "PS\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Repeat)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, make the following changes.

- 1) "PS\_CONTROL.request(Repeat\_mode=Repeat)" to "PS\_CONTROL.request(Transmit\_mode=No\_fill)".
- 2) Remove "<< 4 and 16 Mbit/s only >>".
- 3) Change the meaning of this term to the following.  
The C-Port PMAC requests the PSC to stop sourcing fill and start repeat (see 9.7.2.2 for 4 or 16 Mbit/s, or 9.8.? For 100 Mbit/s).

Note: 9.8.? needs to be filled in when 9.8 is changed as per KTW-7.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a different change will be required.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-25

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 395    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** On page 9.2-45, "PS\_UNITDATA.request(Tx\_symbol=Idle)" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, delete this entry.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** RDL-06

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Does not specify this is replacement text

**Solution:** Add "Replace Clause 9.7 with the following:" before the title.

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-26

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 51    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** The term "Repeat\_Mode (5.4.1) ]" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, change "Repeat\_Mode(5.4.1) ]" to "Transmit\_mode (5.4.1) ]".

Note: This requires a change to 5.4.1. Committee decision is required.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a different change will be required.

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-27

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 55    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** The term "Repeat\_Mode" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, change lines 55-57 as follows.

"Transmit\_mode specifies one of the following:  
    No\_fill  
    Fill  
    Repeat (C-Port only)

Note: This requires a change to 5.4.1. Committee decision is required.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a different change will be required.

**Response:** Accepted subject to acceptance of KTW-07

---

**Comment** NAJ-62

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 81    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** 4/16 has a picture..

**Solution:** Draw a figure (like 9.7-1) for 100 Mbit/s

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KR-03

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 87    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** The use of "re-transmit" implies a hardware repeat path or that the software repeat path must send back the same LMT frame it received.

**Solution:** Either..  
A) change "re-transmit" to "transmit" (prefered)  
B) change "The C-Port repeat path shall be able to re-transmit" to "Depending on the type of repeat path active the C-Port repeat path shall be able to transmit or re-transmit".

**Response:** Change "re-transmit" to "transmit".

---

**Comment** IMJ-03

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 95    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Received codeviolation errors is not returned to the Station, when using MII repeat path.

**Solution:** The elastic buffer must include RX\_ER to TX\_ER connect.

**Response:** The base standard does not require that specific knowledge of where errors have occurred be available, only that of how many have occurred.

The proposed solution would only provide information on error location for the specific example of a physical repeat path at the MII to MAC interface. Information gained by including RX\_ER to TX\_ER connect here would still not be available using the other examples given, i.e. deeper inside the MAC layer.

See IMJ-02. We do need to define how RX\_ER is synchronised to TX\_ER. Also need to talk about how RX\_DV is synchronised to TX\_EN.

---

**Comment** KR-04

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 98    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** It is not clear that this LMT frame may be different from the received LMT frame.

**Solution:** Add sentence...

"This stored Lobe Media Test frame may be different from the received Lobe Media Test frame."

**Response:**

---

**Comment** SJH-60

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 101    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Wording. Use "shall" instead of "must" when mandating.

**Solution:** Change "must" to "shall".

**Response:** Andy, you shall consider deleting 93-101.

---

**Comment** NAJ-63

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 132    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Add a placeholder for Gigabit.

**Solution:**

**Response:**

---

**Comment** RDL-07

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Does not indicate this is additional text

**Solution:** Add "Add Clause 9.8" before the title.

**Response:**

---

**Comment KR-05**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 15    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** The statement about PSC may or may not be true depending on the outcome of the current discussions on fiber involving the scrambler.

**Solution:** Revise sentence appropriately when scrambler question settled.

**Response:** Line 15 is talking about the PSC and not the PMC. As such it is absolutely correct.  
See also response to KR-09.

---

**Comment MJH-13**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 21    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Would [802-3u] be a better abbreviation? (regardless it should be -3 rather than .3)

**Solution:**

**Response:** The specification is:

IEEE Std 802.3u-1995  
(Supplement to ISO/IEC 8802-3: 1993  
[ANSI/IEEE Std 802.3, 1993 Edition])  
Recognised as an American National Standard (ANSI)

So, I would suggest that the abbreviation should be [802.3u].

This reminds implementers to which specification they are being referred whilst being usefully short.

Note that this change will require all instances of references to [802.3] to be changed.

From Bob Love: It should as Andy has stated be [802.3u] and not [802-3u].

---

**Comment KR-06**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 48    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** This statement implies that the existing mechanism used for 4/16 may not change. This is not true.

**Solution:** Remove line 48.

**Response:** I agree that the wording is unclear.

However, the key point is the use of the phrase 'as closely as possible'.

It doesn't prohibit changes to the 4/16 Mbit/s signalling interface.

Andy, please use second modification, agreeable to commenter:

"Maintain the equivalent of the existing 4/16 Mbit/s 802.5 signalling interface."

---

**Comment** KTW-28

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 111    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** The term "Idle" is the subject of KTW-7.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, delete this entry.

**Response:** Accepted subject to acceptance of KTW-07.

---

**Comment** KTW-29

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 192    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Transmit\_mode is the subject of KTW-7 and KTW-27. In any case, I do not understand what the second sentence means.

**Solution:** If suggestion made in KTW-7 is accepted, delete second sentence (For 100 Mbit/s operation ... on the PHY.).

**Response:** Accepted subject to acceptance of KTW-07.

---

**Comment** KTW-30

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 197    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** This note should be removed regardless of the decision made in KTW-7 and KTW-27.

**Solution:** Delete lines 197 through 199.

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-32

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 216    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** ANSWERED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Footnote 1: What does the second sentence mean?

**Solution:** Unknown.

**Response:** Quite.

Replace with new words:

SC = Self Clearing. This bit will be set to zero when the reset process is complete. During reset, writes to other bits in this and other registers may have no effect.

---

**Comment** KTW-31

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 245    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** If KTW-7 is accepted, the a new entry is required for PM\_CONTROL.request(...) similar to what is in 9.8.1.1.4 PS\_CONTROL.request.

**Solution:** If KTW-7 is accepted, add suggested text.

If KTW-7 is not accepted, a different change will be required.

**Response:** Accepted subject to acceptance of KTW-07.

## Comment KR-11

Section 9.8    Line 343    Severity Q    Type TECH    Status ANSWERED

Highlight To Committee ☒    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** Were we going to add a clarification on the crystal tolerance? I thought that we were going to specify a 50ppm or 100ppm oscillator which may or may not be specified by 802.3. This was discussed at HSTRA tech 2 or the november plenary (can't find it in the minutes!). Note that this would also apply to fiber operation.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Note that the line reference 343 appears to be incorrect. Is this the Draft line number?

That aside though, the question of crystal tolerance is actually that of transmit clock frequency tolerance.

802.3u has this to say:

'24.2.3.4 Timers

code-bit\_timer

In the Transmit Bits process, the timer governing the output of code-bits from the PCS to the PMA and thereby to the medium with a nominal 8 ns period. This timer shall be derived from a fixed frequency oscillator with a base frequency of 125 MHz  $\pm$  0.005% and phase jitter above 20 kHz less than  $\pm$  8°.'

In our section 9.8, lines 60-61 say (corrected to remove the spurious text, 'PS\_UNITDATA.indication' at the end of the paragraph):

'In the following, a nibble is a 4-bit interface, exchanged with the MAC at a 40 ns time interval. The nibble clock shall have a tolerance of plus or minus 50 ppm or better.'

and lines 253-259 say - with a number of typos - :

9.8.1.4 Media Independent PHY Specifications (PCS)

The PSC shall meet all requirement of [802.3] Clause 24: Physical coding sublayer (PCS) and physical medium attachment (PMA), type 100BASE-X. The MII, if exposed, shall meet all applicable requirements of 802.3 Clause 22: Reconciliation sublayer and media independent interface. In [802.3], informative annexes 21, 22, 23, 27, and 28, with exceptions listed below, provide additional information useful to PMC sublayer implementers. Where there is conflict between specification in [TP-PMD] and those in this standard, those of this standard shall prevail.'

If we add some words to 9.8.1.4 like those quoted from 802.3u 24.2.3.4 above, about the line transmit bits clock period, and reword lines 253-259 to correct the wording of the sub-section heading, remove the reference to a non-existent Annex 21 and then modify the reference to [TP-PMD] something like as shown below then I think that will clarify things.....

.... Even if this response doesn't!

Proposed replacement text:

9.8.1.4 Media Independent PHY Specifications (PSC)

The PSC shall meet all requirement of [802.3] Clause 24: Physical coding sublayer (PCS) and physical medium attachment (PMA), type 100BASE-X. The MII, if exposed, shall meet all applicable requirements of 802.3 Clause 22: Reconciliation sublayer and media independent interface, with the exception as described in sub-section 9.8.1.1 lines 60-61 above. In [802.3], informative annexes 22, 23, 27, and 28, with exceptions listed below, provide additional information useful to PMC sublayer implementers. Where there is conflict between specification in [802.3] clauses 22 and 24, [TP-PMD] or [FO-PMD] and those in this standard, those of this standard shall prevail.'

---

**Comment RDL-09**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 368    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Fibre Optic Changes should be reflected in Clause 13 (the true clause 13, not the misname clause 14).

**Solution:** Find the proper place in Clause 13 to include the fibre optic information. It may also stay here if appropriate.

**Response:** I don't understand what RDL-08 refers to. Hence, this rejection may be subject to review depending on quite what the outcome is of discussing RDL-08!

Allowing for that:

Apart from the obvious difference of the media type, the differences between twisted pair and fibre media operation are that fibre does not use scrambling (today) or MLT-3 coding, whereas twisted pair does.

These are differences in the PMC sub-layer.

As such, the specification of these PMCs within section 9.8, is correct. Therefore the changes to the respective source specifications (FO-PMD & TP-PMD) also belong within section 9.8.

Dear Andy, first the clause 13 in the comment refers not to Neil's clause 13 (which should be 14), but to the fibre clause to be published in IEC/ISO 8802-5:1998/Amd 1:1998 (Still with me?)

The bad news is that you now need to update clause 13 (the real one), and put a reference in 9.8 to the new fibre information contained within that update.

So 9.8.1.6 should be in 13. (Your job to figure out where). Put a reference in 9.8.1.6 to this new section.

It gets worse. We don't have clause 13! So it will probably be published as a new 13 subclause (no need to republish the whole clause).

Talk to Bob Love.

Love and kisses,

802.5

---

**Comment KR-08**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 391    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** They are new connector technologies coming from manufactuers all the time. The standard should not limit implementations to these three types.

**Solution:** Change "shall" to "may". Add sentence "The implementor may also use any other suitable connector style not listed here."

**Response:**

---

**Comment KR-07**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 392    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☐    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** The standard should not denote preference to a certain type of connector.

**Solution:** Remove sentence in line 392.

**Response:**

---

**Comment KR-09**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 402    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** REJECTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Use of scrambler with fiber is still an open issue.

**Solution:** Add note of this to standard.

**Response:** Note that the line reference 402 appears to be incorrect. Is this the Draft line number?

That aside, the use of the scrambler with fibre will further restrict the implementers choice of PHY devices.

One of the declared aims of this standard (in line 45) is to provide an easy and cheap upgrade path by leveraging the mass market success and availability of Fast Ethernet components.

There are already restrictions due the specific implementations of scrambler synchronisation timers for twisted pair operation: can we not place further restrictions on implementers.

----

This needs to be researched by other PHY experts in the committee. Answers are required for:

- 1) Why did 802.3 turned off the scrambler?
- 2) What benefit does it really give you?
  - + Better BER measurement
  - + Can't cross-connect TR to ETH
  - + EMI benefits at the tranceiver
  - Requires testing by other people to verify this data.

Karl will go and get more information, and will consider re-opening this comment on draft 2.0

---

**Comment NAJ-41**

**Section** 13.0    **Line** 0    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** What does SPV(MAX\_TX) really mean? The state tables include the IFG in the count. Is this correct?

**Solution:**

**Response:** Neil will add a new definition in 13 (now known as 14). Change will include SPV(MAX\_TX) and PPV(MAX\_TX).

---

**Comment RDL-08**

**Section** 13.0    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Thre already is a Clause 13!

**Solution:** Before the title include: "Add Clause 14", and then change the clause numbering to 14. The present Clause 13 is "Fibre optic media"

**Response:** Boo hiss.  
Do it. But all editors must do a search for clause 13.xx



---

**Comment DWW-02**

**Section** 13.1    **Line** 14    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Clarity of table could be improved by replacing dashes in Field length column with "media dependent"

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment DWW-01**

**Section** 13.1    **Line** 14    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Table has no caption.

**Solution:** Fix it

**Response:** I know. But it doesn't need it. Remove table header and footer lines. (Also other tables).

---

**Comment DWW-03**

**Section** 13.2    **Line** 62    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** The final sentence of this section is misleading as it is not clear that it only applies to frames with error.

**Solution:** Reword sentence starting "The E bit" in line 62 to:  
"When a frame with error is detected and the received E bit is not set, the E bit of the frame being repeated shall be set to 1 and the frame counted as a line error."  
Delete the last two sentences of the paragraph.

**Response:** Modified to say:

When a frame with error is detected and the received E bit is equal to 0, the E bit of the frame being repeated shall be set to 1 and the frame counted as a line error.

---

**Comment DWW-04**

**Section** 13.2    **Line** 72    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** E bit can be transmitted as 1 if FPASO is set appropriately and the entity is a cut-through bridge/switch port.

**Solution:** Fix it

**Response:** Do it. Investigate whether this is needed for the TKP E bit description. (probably will).

---

**Comment DWW-05**

**Section** 13.2    **Line** 74    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** See DWW-03:

The final sentence of this section is misleading as it is not clear that it only applies to frames with error.

**Solution:**

**Response:** See response to DWW-03:

When a frame with error is detected and the received E bit is equal to 0, the E bit of the frame being repeated shall be set to 1 and the frame counted as a line error.

---

**Comment DWW-06**

**Section** 13.2    **Line** 86    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** See DWW-03

The final sentence of this section is misleading as it is not clear that it only applies to token with error.

**Solution:**

**Response:** See response to DWW-03:

When a token with error is detected and the received E bit is equal to 0, the E bit of the token being repeated shall be set to 1 and the token counted as a line error.

---

**Comment MJH-14**

**Section** 13.3    **Line** 1    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** ANSWERED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** CAPITALIZATION : Sorry. At some time some poor sod is going to have to explain to a bewildered IEEE editor that we have certain phrases that must be capitalized as that gives them meaning. The editor will then respond, "well look, you didn't capitalize it here, or here..or over there..". Now should "bypass" and "bypass state" be capitalized or not? Given we are remarkably consistent in the document using Bypass State, Bypass state and now bypass state. (and, when used alone, should Bypass be Bypass or bypass or even ByPass for C++ chaps)

**Solution:**

**Response:** I will remain consistent with the rest of the document. Bypass should be written as "... Bypass state ...".

---

**Comment DWW-09**

**Section** 13.3    **Line** 114    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** How can anything be acceptable to an Annex?

**Solution:** Reword to "an acceptable BER as defined in Annex P"

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment MJH-15**

**Section** 13.3    **Line** 128    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** ANSWERED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** 'is sent multiple times'. Cool, now is there some reason you don't want to refer to the ubiquitous RAT counters?

**Solution:**

**Response:** Yes. It is too much detail.

---

**Comment DWW-10**

**Section** 13.3    **Line** 129    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Sending a frame multiple times does not guarantee that it is received.

**Solution:** Rephrase "to guarantee" to "to attempt to ensure"

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment MJH-16**

**Section** 13.3    **Line** 131    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Phantom has phantom single quotes. Replace 0C with '0C'.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment DWW-07**

**Section** 13.3    **Line** 135    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Reword description of X'0002' to "The Station does not support phantom signalling and, therefore, cannot support wire fault detection"

**Solution:** Fix it

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment DWW-08**

**Section** 13.3    **Line** 138    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Replace "the subvector data" with SVV for consistency with previous sentence.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** IMJ-04

**Section** 13.3    **Line** 173    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Legend \*\*3:  
The C-Port transmit the TEST frame when the MII repeat path is NOT enabled.

**Solution:** change "FPRPTO set to 1"  
to "FPRPTO set to 0"

**Response:** Duh, do it.

---

**Comment** SJH-61

**Section** 13.3    **Line** 175    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Doesn't make sense.

**Solution:** Add "and" after comma: "...requirements of the Station and C-Port, and the receive..."

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** DWW-11

**Section** 13.3    **Line** 178    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Confusion exists as to what 'Station' means as opposed to 'station'. As I understand it, 'Station' means station or C-Port in station emulation mode and 'station' means station. If this is correct then the sentence means:  
"A station or C-Port in station emulation mode or a C-Port in station or C-Port in station emulation mode emulation mode ..."  
which is garbage.

Alternatively, if the definitions are swapped then there are numerous missing references to C-Ports in station emulation mode in clause 9...

**Solution:** The committee needs to agree the meaning of "station" and "Station" and document this within the standard.

The text of the standard then needs to be checked throughout to ensure that the correct term has been used consistently

**Response:** Replace "A Station or a C-Port in Station Emulation Mode ..."  
with "A DTR station or a C-Port in Station Emulation Mode ..."

Go find the original concern, resolution and vote taken to use Station...

---

**Comment NAJ-E-160**

**Section** 13.4    **Line** 198    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** This timer has been given two different meaning. This was thought desirable since they never run at the same time. However, it requires both timers to have the same time increment.

Our implementors disagree with this. They fail to see why the time-out value while waiting for a Lobe Test MAC frame needs to be 20 ms.  
They feel that 200 ms is more realistic since only a maximum of two of these occurrences can occur, but only one of these matters (since the second one is going to cause failure).

**Solution:** Break this timer into two timers, one for pacing and one for time-out.

If this item is accepted, then changes are needed in 9.2 state table 9.2-7.

**Response:** Agree to two timers.  
Ken to talk to implementors again, about changing 20ms to be 200ms. [Withdrawn from comment]  
Neil to create new informative annex with presentation 01-05 to show lobe media test timing analysis.

---

**Comment SJH-62**

**Section** 13.4    **Line** 217    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** TPRF not values defined.

**Solution:** Decide on some values.

**Response:** See NAJ-49 for resolution.

---

**Comment NAJ-64**

**Section** 13.5    **Line** 229    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** FSASO missing

**Solution:** Add it

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment DWW-12**

**Section** 13.5    **Line** 236    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Document needs to be clarified to make clear that this is a physical layer repeat path.

**Solution:** Fix it

**Response:** Change reference to 9.7 to be 9.7.1, which describes the correct repeat path.

Also change last reference to 9.7 to read "9.7.1 or 9.7.2"

---

**Comment** KTW-34

**Section** 13.5    **Line** 249    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** We have a problem with a frame size of 18.2K.

Only a few PHY vendors can actually handle this frame size since most default to having a 1 ms "idle detect timer" (instead of the 1.8 that 18.2 requires). This 1 ms timer limits frame size to around 12K.

Several methods exist to resolve this problem, but each needs discussion as to advantages and disadvantages.

For example:

1. Keep frame size at 18.2K and require PHY vendors to change (this could delay parts availability)?
2. Limit frame size to 12K?
3. Add to the Registration process to determine what frame size is supported by the link?
4. Others not listed.

**Solution:** Discussion is required in March. Also see KTW-35.

**Response:** In clause 9.8 (9.8.1.5.8?), mandate that the PHY shall support 18200 octets. Remove reference to idle timer. No PICS entry. Modify Annex U in the same manner (e.g. remove timer value).

Committee to decide which solution to adopt. (Thursday)

Accepted by straw poll 03-04.

---

**Comment** NAJ-65

**Section** 13.5    **Line** 267    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** FPASO needs HMR definition

**Solution:** Add it

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment KTW-35**

**Section** 13.5    **Line** 283    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☒    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** We have a problem with a frame size of 18.2K.

Only a few PHY vendors can actually handle this frame size since most default to having a 1 ms "idle detect timer" (instead of the 1.8 that 18.2 requires). This 1 ms timer limits frame size to around 12K.

Several methods exist to resolve this problem, but each needs discussion as to advantages and disadvantages.

For example:

1. Keep frame size at 18.2K and require PHY vendors to change (this could delay parts availability)?
2. Limit frame size to 12K?
3. Add to the Registration process to determine what frame size is supported by the link?
4. Others not listed.

**Solution:** Discussion is required in March. Also see KTW-34.

**Response:** See KTW-34. Accepted by straw poll 03-04.

---

**Comment DWW-13**

**Section** P.0    **Line** 30    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** This sentence basically says the analysis in the annex is based on false assumptions and inaccurate, but hell we'll use it anyway.

It does not give any confidence that the values produced are correct or a sound basis for the lobe test requirements.

If the analysis is valid then the document should justify it. If it is invalid then the annex should be rewritten or removed as it is not helpful.

**Solution:** Fix it

**Response:** New words: "Note that Bit Error Rate, expressed quantitatively for Token Ring Network Links, is an artificial construct used to provide an estimator of the number of transmitted frames that are expected to be received in error because of noise. For complex coding the term is artificial and provides only an approximation to the actual error rate.inaccurate. However, since we are looking to distinguish between bit error rates which differ by an order of magnitude or more from each other, this approximation is adequate., but still useful. In fact, t The analysis below, based on this artificial construct, provides a useful estimator for the frame error rate, even though noise errors may not produce single bit errors. "

---

**Comment RDL-13**

**Section** P.1    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☒

**Concern:** Does not indicate that this is replacement text.

**Solution:** Add: "Replace Annex P with the following" before the title.

**Response:**

---

**Comment DWW-14**

**Section** U.0    **Line** 0    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED  
**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** X should read U

**Solution:** Fix it

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment RDL-14**

**Section** U.0    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED  
**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Does not indicate this is a new annex

**Solution:** Add before the title: "Add Annex U"

Also, change page numbering and subheaders to correspond to the "U" designation.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment MJH-17**

**Section** U.0    **Line** 8    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED  
**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** "Is it U or is it X"? "It's U", said Weed.

Change X1, X2 etc to U.1, U.2 etc.

**Solution:**

**Response:** It is 'U'.

---

**Comment RDL-15**

**Section** V.0    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED  
**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** Does not indicate this is a new annex

**Solution:** Add before the title: "Add Annex V"

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment DWW-15**

**Section** V.0    **Line** 8    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** REJECTED  
**Highlight To Committee** ☐    **Commenter Agrees?** ☒    **Editing Complete** ☐

**Concern:** What is a "non-functional group address" – one that does not work?

**Solution:** Reword the term so that it makes clear what is being referred to.

**Response:** Get a life. Who has ever heard of a broken functional group address?

---



## Comment Summary

Total Comments:: 257