



# 802.5t/D2 Comment Report

802.5/98/05-06r3

## Comment JLM-05

Section 0.0 Line 0 Severity DIS Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐ Commenter Agrees? ☐ Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** The text "clause <number>" has started to appear more. The latest that I heard was that the required style was to say things like "as specified in 9.1".

**Solution:** Change "clause <number>" to "<number>".

**Response:** Appropriate format is to specify e.g. Clause 9 if no subclauses are referenced, otherwise just specify e.g. 9.1.

## Comment NAJ-01

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

Highlight To Committee ☐ Commenter Agrees? ☒ Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Title Page: Extraneous space on first line:

"Supplement to Inform..."

**Solution:** Remove space

**Response:** Special Dash in Word, not printed by PDF. Will correct if possible. If not, the editors will see the right stuff and print it with the proper long dash signal.

## Comment NAJ-02

Section 0.0 Line 9 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐ Commenter Agrees? ☐ Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Title Page:

The PAR is for multimode optical fibre.

**Solution:** Insert word multimode in title.

**Response:**

## Comment NAJ-03

Section 0.0 Line 13 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐ Commenter Agrees? ☐ Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Extra baseline skip after line 13.

**Solution:** Remove.

**Response:**

## Comment JLM-01

Section 1.2 Line 37 Severity A/C Type ED Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐ Commenter Agrees? ☐ Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** PORT shouldn't be uppercase

**Solution:** Change C-PORT to C-Port

**Response:**

---

**Comment** EDTR-E-3

**Section** 1.3    **Line** 43    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Clarify definitions of PSC and PMC

**Solution:** Add words (per Messenger) appropriately.

**Response:** Messenger's Words:

Modify the following definitions:

1.3.42 physical media components (PMC): The sublayer of the PHY responsible for interfacing with the transmission medium. The functions of the PMC include receive, transmit, clock recovery and ring access control. The PMC for different medium rates and types are different.

1.3.43 physical signalling components (PSC): The sublayer of the PHY responsible for processing the signal elements received from the ring by the PMC, for sending symbols to the MAC and for conditioning the symbols received from the MAC for inclusion as signal elements in the repeated data stream to the PMC. At a particular medium rate the PSC for different medium types are identical.

---

**Comment** ANF-04

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 0    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Figure 2.2-1 shows the C-Port / Station crossover function as a PMC function. Should Figure 2.2-2 show this crossover explicitly (at the bottom of the diagram in the lines between the C-Port and the Station) to emphasise that this crossover is \*not\* carried out in the concentrator?

**Solution:**

**Response:** Add boxes on bottom of Figure 2.2-2 saying To Receiver and From Transmitter

---

**Comment** ANF-03

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 0    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Figure 2.2-2 shows Auto-negotiation as an optional function.

This function is not currently defined for 100Base-FX in 802.3u, partly because 10M Ethernet and 100M Fast Ethernet cannot interoperate due to their use of different wavelengths.

Since 4/16M TR and 100M HSTR have the same wavelength disparity, they also cannot directly interoperate. Hence, autonegotiation for 802.5 over fibre is similarly meaningless.

Unless this is forward planning for 100/1000Mbit/s HSTR (which may or may not use the same wavelength), this function should be removed from this diagram.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Remove Box

---

**Comment ANF-02**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 0    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Remove hyphen from 'defined' in last line in clauses 2.2.3 b & c;  
'This service interface is de-fined in 9.8.'

**Solution:** Using the mouse or the arrow keys, place cursor immediately before the hyphen and then press the 'delete' key once.

Repeat this procedure for the second hyphen.

**Response:**

---

**Comment ANF-01**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 0    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** No line numbers.

**Solution:** Add line numbers.

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-05**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** 2.2.3, second paragraph.

"The operation of a station..."

**Solution:** "station" should be "Station".

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-04**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** 2.2.2: Note needs to be answered.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Removed Section 2.2.2 with the note.

---

**Comment RDL-01**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Page 1, Clarification required.

**Solution:** Change words "This paragraph covers 4 and 16 Mbit/s Classic Station and remains unchanged" to  
"The remainder of this clause remains unchanged"

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-08**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** 2.2.3, list item c.

Last line, "de-fined".

**Solution:** Should be "defined".

**Response:**

---

**Comment RDL-02**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** This section does not belong in this document

**Solution:** Delete 2.2.2 and renumber 2.2.3 as 2.2.2

**Response:** Change in introductory words to next section "2.2.3" to "2.2.2", and any references to the subclause.

---

**Comment KR-01**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** No line numbers

**Solution:** Add line numbers

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-07**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** 2.2.3, list item b.

Last line, "de-fined"!

**Solution:** Should be "defined".

**Response:**

---

**Comment RJK-09**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** The position of the repeat path and elastic buffer are inconsistent between Figure 2.2-1 and Figure 9.7-2.

**Solution:** Logically, the repeat path elastic buffer must be above the delimiter detector (because elastic buffer recentring requires knowledge of the delimiters) and so it belongs at the MII level or above. This places it between the PSC and MAC as in Figure 9.7-2, so Fig 2.2-1 needs to be changed in the same way.

**Response:** Move the repeat path to above the PSC and below the MAC in Figures 2.2-1 and 2.2-2 with comment (9.7 & 9.8)- In addition, add a dotted line just above and just to the left of the PSC and PMC dotted lines, stating that it is the MII, for both figures. - In addition, add the following text for subclause 2.2.3 at the end of the second paragraph: "The approximate position of an optional MII type interface is shown in figures 2.2-1 and 2.2-2. Although the service primitives shown crossing this interface do not directly correspond to physical MII signals, it is possible to implement logically equivalent functionality either directly via the MII signals or indirectly via serially accessed PHY management registers."

---

**Comment NAJ-09**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** 2.2.3, list item e.

Last line, "ex-change"

**Solution:** Should be "exchange"

**Response:**

---

**Comment RJK-04**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Figure 2.2-2 Shows autonegotiation as an option for High Media Rate over Fibre. There is no equivalent of the link pulse scheme defined for fibre, and so autonegotiation is not an option at 100Mbit/s, although there may be a form of link configuration available for Gigabit Token Ring.

**Solution:** Either remove the box for this rev of the Spec, or change the text to state that it may not be an option at all High Media Rates.

**Response:** Box Removed

---

**Comment NAJ-10**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** 2.2.3

These are words for copper. We need words for fibre as well.

**Solution:** Add new words.

**Response:** Remove penultimate sentence on Page 2 beginning There are also additional...

---

**Comment NAJ-11**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Figure 2.2-1 and 2.2-2

Text talks about PS\_EVENT.indication, but it is not shown in the figure.

**Solution:** Add.

**Response:** In Clause 2.2.3, b. remove ", PS\_EVENT.response" from second line.

---

**Comment NAJ-12**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Figure 2.2-1 and 2.2-2

Figures are missing PMC repeat path options.

**Solution:** Add repeat path to PMC modules

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-13**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Figure 2.2-2

How is C-Port/Station rx/tx switching performed in fibre?  
Should there be a box indicating how this is done, like in the copper figure?

**Solution:**

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-06**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** 2.2.3, end of second paragraph

"for a physical interface." Physical is the wrong word.

**Solution:** Replace with

"for an externally visible interface."

**Response:**

---

**Comment JLM-02**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 22    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** REJECTED

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

**Concern:** "are not requirements for a physical interface" is what it says in the 1995 std, and it's OK as is, despite Neil's comment.

**Solution:** Reject Neil's comment.

**Response:**

---

**Comment** SJH-01

Section 2.2    Line 25    Severity A/C    Type ED    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☐    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Not sure about line number...  
Capitalise "station" and change "a" to "the" for consistency.

**Solution:** Change "The operation of a station is..."  
to "The operation of the Station is..."

**Response:**

---

**Comment** JLM-03

Section 2.2    Line 28    Severity A/C    Type TECH    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☐    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** PS\_EVENT.response does not exist for TXI.

**Solution:** Delete PS\_EVENT.response from this list.

**Response:**

---

**Comment** SJH-02

Section 2.2    Line 38    Severity A/C    Type ED    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☐    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Line number?  
Superfluous hyphenation. (Twice). Also on 2nd line of page 2.

**Solution:** Change "de-fined" to "defined" in both cases.

**Response:**

---

**Comment** JLM-04

Section 2.2    Line 39    Severity A/C    Type ED    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☐    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** "and specified ISO/IEC 15802-1" is gramatically wrong. If you read the whole sentence, it would be clearer that the interface is specified in 15802-1 and used as shown in 9.1 if you reword as shown below. Also suggest splitting sentence as shown.

**Solution:** ... MA\_UNITDATA.request) is specified in ISO/IEC 15802-1 and is used as specified in 9.1. It defines the ...

**Response:**

---

**Comment** JLM-06

Section 2.2    Line 42    Severity A/C    Type ED    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☐    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** (Para e.) The text stating where the bridge interface is specified has been omitted

**Solution:** Insert "is specified in <802.1d reference here> and" before "used".

**Response:** add "is specified in 802.1d and" between "...response)" and "is used as..."

---

**Comment SJH-03**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 47    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** More random hyphenation.

**Solution:** Change "ex-change" to "exchange".

**Response:**

---

**Comment KR-02**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 53    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** page 2, 3rd line from end.  
"There are also additional optional components available for use on twisted pair media only" only applies to the Phantom Functions box. Repeat path is optional for both media types. Needs clarification.

**Solution:** Change to..  
"The Phantom Functions are optional for twisted pair media. The Hardware Repeat Path is optional for both media types."

**Response:**

---

**Comment SJH-04**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 60    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Figure 2.2-1. This diagram should indicate there can be a repeat path at either or both of the PMC and PSC levels.  
This comment also applies to the fibre diagram, Figure 2.2-2.

**Solution:** Add an optional repeat path block at the PMC level.

**Response:**

---

**Comment JLM-10**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 99    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** REJECTED

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

**Concern:** The terms used for the different parts of the physical layer confuse me. I thought that PHY meant the physical layer as a whole, PSC meant Physical Layer's Signalling Component (that part of the PHY that independent of the medium) and PMC meant Physical Layer's Medium-dependent Component. But 2.2.3 uses the term PHY to mean PMC here (last para, first line). So does para (c.) above. I think I've seen it in later clauses too.

I don't believe we use or should use the terms PMI (medium-independent) or PMD (media dependent) except in the context of 802.3.

**Solution:** Review uses of the term PHY. Often it will be appropriate, but sometimes it should say PSC or PMC.

**Response:** Need each instance identified.

---

**Comment JLM-07**

**Section** 2.2    **Line** 999    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Figure 2.2-1 at the bottom of the PMC box: Tx/Rx switching is only in the C-Port.

**Solution:** Suggest changing "C-Port Transmit/Receive Switching" to "Transmit/Receive switching (C-Port only)".

**Response:**

---

**Comment JLM-08**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 32    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Option flags are really called policy flags.

**Solution:** Change "Option Flags" to "policy flags". This is not the kind of thing to capitalise.

**Response:** Changed "Option Flags" to "Policy flags".

---

**Comment NAJ-14**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 42    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** References to 9.8 should additionally refer to 13.9.8 for fibre.

Also on lines 44 and 48.

**Solution:** Add 13.9.8 (3 times).

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment KTW-01**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 74    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The word "clause" is wrong.

**Solution:** Change "clause" to "subclause".

**Response:** Remove reference to "clause" (see JLM-05).

---

**Comment NAJ-16**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 76    **Severity** Q    **Type** ED    **Status** REJECTED

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

**Concern:** Annex N, annex R and annex Q are 4/16 Mbit/s only

**Solution:** Say so.

**Response:** Already stated in first paragraph.

---

**Comment NAJ-15**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 76    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** And lines 80 and 83.

Extraneous parenthesis.

**Solution:** Remove parenthesis from "Annex (N)", "Annex (R)" and "Annex (Q)"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-05**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 84    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Missing full-stop at end of line.

**Solution:** Add it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment JLM-09**

**Section** 9.0    **Line** 89    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** "Specifies the PHY/PMD functions." Why mention PMD? PMD is not an 802.5 term. The PMD from 802.3u is imported into 9.8, but shouldn't be mentioned outside a PHY clause.

**Solution:** Change PHY/PMD to PHY. I don't see any need to be more specific but a more specific wording would be PSC/PMC.

**Response:** Changed "PHY/PMD" to "PHY".

---

**Comment SJH-06**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 27    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Missing point number 3.

**Solution:** Renumber 4, 5 and 6 to 3,4,5.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-17**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 60    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** "FxTI=1 using one of" could be phrased better.

To save on comment numbers, this comment also applies to lines: 72, 74, 96, 98, 111, 113, 124, 126, 147, 156, 172.

**Solution:** Replace "using" with "to invoke".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment NAJ-18**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 65    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Missing words from "detects the end of frame data transmission".

**Solution:** Replace with "detects the need to end frame data transmission"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-07**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 79    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Bad wording.

**Solution:** Change "...and starts transmission..." to  
"...and start with transmission..."

**Response:** Replace lines 78 and 79 with the following.

ii) The C-Port and Station use the  
PS\_UNITDATA.request(Tx\_symbol=Data\_byte) signal for  
transmitting each octet. The transmission of the frame  
starts with the SFS [TX\_SFS(P=x;R=0)].

---

**Comment SJH-08**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 84    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** (1) not correctly indented.

**Solution:** Indent it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-19**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 84    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Word list formatting error.

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-20**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 92    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** "with the I-bit, if present set to 0 and the E-bit set to 0" is tautological with  
the next phrase.

**Solution:** Remove phrase.

**Response:** Done.

---

---

**Comment NAJ-21**

Section 9.1    Line 121    Severity A/C    Type ED    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☒    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** This starts with the transmission of the EFS. What about that invalid FCS. This is also a good place for a definition of the invalid FCS.

**Solution:** Add new bullet a) to indicate that an invalid FCS is transmitted. Define what an invalid FCS is.

**Response:** Changed lines 121 through 123 as follows.

- (a) The transmission of an invalid FCS followed by the transmission of the EFS.
- (b) When the last octet of the EFS is transmitted, the transmission of fill is started as follows.

---

**Comment SJH-09**

Section 9.1    Line 139    Severity A/C    Type ED    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Bad wording.

**Solution:** Insert "a" between "using" and "signal"  
or  
Remove "signal derived from".

**Response:** Inserted an "a" between "using" and "signal".

---

**Comment NAJ-22**

Section 9.1    Line 184    Severity A/C    Type ED    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** "Transmit Port Operation Table 9.3-2 or Station Operation Table 9.2-2" did not read well.

**Solution:** Replace with "C-Port or Station Transmit Operation Tables 9.3-2 or 9.2-2"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-10**

Section 9.1    Line 244    Severity A/C    Type ED    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** "column" is singular, "include" expects a plural subject.

**Solution:** Change "include" to "includes".

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-11**

Section 9.1    Line 283    Severity A/C    Type ED    Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☒    Editing Complete ☒

**Concern:** Lines 283-285 are indented too far.

**Solution:** Remove one level of indentation.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-23**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 328    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** FR\_FC is wrong.

**Solution:** Should be FR\_AC.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-24**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 340    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** FR\_AC is wrong

**Solution:** Should be FR\_FC

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-12**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 341    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Bad wording. Also lines 353, 385 and 389.

**Solution:** Change "that satisfies" to "such that they satisfy"  
or  
just change "satisfies" to "satisfy".

**Response:** Change lines 341, 353, 385 and 389 as follows.  
From: "that satisfies"  
To: "that satisfy".

---

**Comment RJK-03**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 356    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** There is an inconsistency in the position of the backslashes in symbol pair descriptions. Sometimes the trailing backslash is added as in line 365 "/T/R/", sometimes not as in line 356 "/J/K".

**Solution:** We should be consistent.  
Personally I think that we should be consistent with the symbol notation used in 802.3u which always uses the trailing backslash, ie /J/K/ rather than /J/K.

**Response:** Change for example: "/J/K" to "/J/K/".

---

**Comment RJK-02**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 357    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Properties B and D should be on separate lines.

**Solution:** Put them on separate lines.

**Response:** OK in Master.

---

---

**Comment** SJH-13

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 357    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Missing new line.  
Property "D" is connected to "B".

**Solution:** Add new line.

**Response:** OK in master. Neil?

---

**Comment** NAJ-25

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 357    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Word strikes again. "D - ..." should be on a new line.

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** OK in Master.

---

**Comment** RJK-01

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 367    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** My understanding of transmit abort was that an RX\_ER in both final nibbles signified a transmit abort, but an RX\_ER in just one of them was a FR\_WITH\_ERR. Parameter L would cause any frame with either one of the last nibbles received with RX\_ER to be treated as an aborted frame which seems inconsistent with the abort definition in clause 14.

**Solution:** Change the definition of L to read:  
"Ends with a valid ESD signal, and at least one valid hexadecimal value (0 through F) in the previous two symbols."

**Response:** Defined a new entry "M" and changed FR\_WITH\_ERR as follows.

M – Ends with a code violation in one of the two code symbols preceding a valid ESD signal.

o Frame with Error (FR\_WITH\_ERR). The FR\_WITH\_ERR signal indicates a frame has been detected that satisfies one of the following conditions:

A & F & H & M & (-E or -G or -J or -K ) (for MAC and LLC frames)

or A & -F & H & M & (-E or -J) (for undefined frame formats)

---

**Comment** SJH-14

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 388    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** "The FR\_AC signal" is wrong. It should read "The FR\_FC signal".

**Solution:** Change it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-15**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 396    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Bad wording.

**Solution:** Add "media rate" after "16 Mbit/s"  
or  
delete "the" before "4 Mbit/s".

**Response:** Added "Media Rates" after "16 Mbit/s"

---

**Comment NAJ-26**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 396    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** REJECTED

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

**Concern:** Extraneous use of the word "the"

**Solution:** Delete both occurrences of "the" on this line.

**Response:** Don't like: See item SJH-15 for solution.

---

**Comment SJH-16**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 409    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Ambiguous wording: it sounds like JS=BP is caused by the optional abort sequence.

**Solution:** Remove "shall cause" and change "C-Port to enter" to "C-Port shall enter"

**Response:** Changed lines 409 and 410 to the following.

or TS=PTXN) and the Station or C-Port Join function shall enter the Bypass state (JS=BP).

---

**Comment SJH-17**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 587    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** New line missing after "the same Access Protocols)."

**Solution:** Add it.

**Response:** OK in the Master. Neil.

---

**Comment NAJ-27**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 587    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Word strikes again. "1. If they..." should be on a new line.

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** OK in the master. Neil?

---

---

**Comment DWW-02**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 624    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** It appears in the station state tables that the station instigates the request for trade-up by saying "I support TXI and 100" in its reg req frame rather than just saying "I support TXI". The text in 9.1 implies that the station does not do anything in support of trade up until it receives a response from the C-Port stating OK to trade up. The text and state tables appear to contradict one another

**Solution:** Either modify the description to match the state tables or modify the state tables to match the description. However, more thought is needed in either case.

**Response:** The definition in lines 624 through 633 is incorrect. The new wording is as follows

5. If the Station operating at 4 Mbit/s or 16 Mbit/s receives a REG\_RSP MAC frame with an AP\_RSP subvector value of X'0004' (indicating the C-Port has honored the Station's request to Trade-up to the High Media Rate), then it enters the High Speed Trade-up state (JS=SHSTU) and attempts to activate the High Media Rate link by taking one of the following actions.
  - a. If the High Media Rate Link Status fails to activate before timer TSHSW expires, then the Station enters the Bypass state (JS=BP).
  - b. If the High Media Rate Link Status activates before timer TSHSW expires, then the Station enters the Registration state (JS=SREG) and requests operation at the High Media Rate.

KTWilson to add what the Station does to START the Trade-up to the High Media Rate.

---

**Comment DWW-01**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 624    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** General Concern: The trade up mechanism is very poorly described in 9.1 and whole mechanism appears to be a rush job which has not been thought through properly. However, my understanding (or lack of understanding) of the mechanism as documented (see other comments) may be as a result of the poor description.

**Solution:** Add a section to 9.1 providing an overview of the trade up mechanism as for registration query protocol instead of burying it in the Station and C-Port support of registration.

**Response:** Agreed that a new description of the Trade-up function is required.

This will be added to the next document as subclause 9.1.14 after line 1152 (current items 9.1.14 through 9.1.16 will change to 9.1.15 through 9.1.17) and item "m)" will be added after line 24.

KTWilson work to be done.

---

**Comment SJH-18**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 629    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Bad wording.

**Solution:** Change "and takes one of the actions."  
to  
"by taking one of the following actions."

**Response:** This has been modified as per DWW-02.

---

**Comment DWW-03**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 658    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The result of ANDing the PPV(AP\_MASK) and stations AP\_REQ will not equal X'0004' unless something strange is going on as this implies that the station and port can operate at 100Mbit/s but do not have a compatible access protocol!

**Solution:** You could change the value to X'0006' as used in the state tables, but this is limiting in terms of future expansion. The best answer would be a check for the "100 Mbit/s" bit being set if the port can cope with this speed. Even this is messy as there will be problems when gigabit comes along.

**Response:** Make the text agree with the State tables.

---

**Comment DWW-04**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 658    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Although we went to a reasonable amount of trouble to get AP\_REQ and AP\_MASK to be a bit mask and to perform the checks using ANDs to ensure future upgradability there appears to be a problem with 802.5r which means that stations requesting to join with AP\_REQ=X'0006' will be refused. It is possible that FSTUI is supposed to work around this somehow, but I cannot see where it is ever set to 1 in the state tables (possibly the problem of working on paper copies!) I assume that the aim of the trade up protocol is to allow 4/16/100 stations to trade up to 100 if available, but operate at 4 or 16 if attached to a 4/16 C-port. The problem is that if a station attempts to register (with a 4/16 C-Port) with AP-REQ=X'0006' then transitions 1003 (p9.3-22) does not fire as AP\_REQ <> 0002 and 1067 (p9.3-23) will fire. The station will receive a response with AP\_RSP = 0 and will either close or try a TKP join, it will then probably try registration query,... and life gets very complicated!

**Solution:** The trade up protocol needs more in depth thought, particularly in relation to its impact on existing DTR implementations.

**Response:** KTWilson will evaluate Dave's concern and put response in Dave's general Trade-up issue DWW-01.

---

**Comment SJH-19**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 682    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** "TXI capable" should be hyphenated.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-28**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 704    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** FSLTA=1 is wrong.

**Solution:** Replace with FSRLMT=1

**Response:** Done as follows.

- o If FSLMTO is set to 0, the Station uses the 4 Mbit/s or 16 Mbit/s method of testing (TXI\_TEST) defined in 9.1.6.1.
- o If FSLMTO is set to 1, the Station uses the 4 Mbit/s, 16 Mbit/s or High Media Rate method of testing (FSRLMT=1) defined in 9.1.6.2.

Note: "o" above are equal to bullets.

---

**Comment NAJ-29**

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

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

**Concern:** "rate" should be pluralised.

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment DWW-05**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 730    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** In the case where replacement frames are generated there is no repeat path during lobe test in the literal sense - no frames are repeated.

**Solution:** It would be better if repeat path was in quotes when describing lobe test. Even then, the term is misleading and confusing as can be seen in the incorrect modifications to the state tables - see later comment

**Response:** Don't understand issue. We have defined two types of repeat paths: the PMAC Repeat path and the PHY Repeat path.

I have reworded lines 729 through and 732 to the following.

This Lobe Media Test function tests the lobe by transmitting frames without Tokens and is designed to be used at any media rate (e.g., 4, 16, 100, etc.). The frames transmitted by the Station are returned by the C-Port using the repeat path defined in 9.1.6.2.2.

---

**Comment NAJ-30**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 742    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Make a reference to Annex X, which shows the timing analysis for LMT.

**Solution:**

**Response:** Added the following after the sentence in line 746.

Informative Annex X provides an analysis of the timing requirements for the Notification and Testing stages.

---

**Comment KR-03**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 840    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Looks like multiple queues to me!

**Solution:** Delete "although Fig 9.1-5 does not illustrate multiple queues"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-20**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 852    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** "Crystal" doesn't need a capital "C".

**Solution:** Remove it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment SJH-21**

**Section** 9.1    **Line** 1162    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** "C Port" should be hyphenated.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-E-318**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 0    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Make the names of timers and flags concerned with high media rate trade-up match with clause 14.

**Solution:** e.g., replace all TxHSW with TxHMRW

**Response:**

---

**Comment SJH-22**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 9    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Bad English.

**Solution:** Change "is" to "are" near end of line.

**Response:** Done.

Comment

NAJ-31

---

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 41    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:**    Figure 9.2-1, State "Trade-up" title uses different formatting.

**Solution:**    Fix it.

**Response:**    KTWilson to do.

## Comment KTW-02

Section 9.2 Line 41 Severity DIS Type TECH Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☒ Commenter Agrees? ☒ Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** This item explains the Remove Alert problem, first identified by Neil Jaris' comments NAJ-34, NAJ-35 and NAJ-53 against Draft 1. This explanation is referenced by many items.

Figure 9.2-1 on page 9.2-2 needs to be updated to include the Remove Alert Wait state.

RATIONALE for Remove Alert Change:

Neil's items correctly identified a problem with the Draft 2 Remove Alert process. The current process is handled within the Join Complete state and during this state other events that should not cause transistion out of Join Complete can occur

Neil suggested a new state that only processed the Remove Alert function and ignores other conditions (which would not possible in the Join Complete state).

Therefore, it is proposed to define a new Station state called Remove Alert Wait (JS=SRAW). This new state is used as follows.

1. Upon entry into the Remove Alert Wait state (JS=SRAW), the Station transmits the first Remove Alert MAC frame, the counter CSRAP is set and the timer TSRAP is reset.
2. After entry into JS=SRAW, retries of the Remove Alert MAC frame occur, paced by TSRAP until counter CSRAP reaches zero. When CSRAP reaches zero, the Station enters the Bypass state (JS=BP).

**Solution:** This solution is explained as it relates to the Station, not just to the change needed in figure 9.2-1.

The following changes are proposed to resolve Neil's items.

1. A New State

JS=SRAW (Station Remove Alert Wait), state JF.

This state is entered whenever a transition is recognized that the Station needs to start the Remove Alert process (initial transmit which occurs in the Join Complete state (JS=SJC) and the retries which occur in the new Remove Alert Wait states (JS=SRAW).

2. The following changes are proposed for the Station.
  - a) The references changed are done by other items opened by me (KTW) by referencing this item.
  - B) Change figure 9.2-1 to include the Remove Alert Wait state.

**Response:** Do it. Also do the following.

1. Add a definition of Remove Alert to 9.1.
2. Update the Low level FSMs (Annex L).

---

**Comment NAJ-32**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 41    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Figure 9.2-1, transition from JS=SREG to JS=SHSTU contains "C=Port"

**Solution:** Should be "C-Port".

**Response:** KTWilson to do.

---

**Comment DWW-06**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 42    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Probably a "Wordism" or a problem with the printout Bob sent me, but there is a line across the middle of the diagram

**Solution:**

**Response:** See item KTW-03 for resolution.

---

**Comment KTW-03**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 42    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The figure on page 9.2-3 should not have shown up. However, when the subclauses were released, they were marked for changes incorrectly.

It was agreed during the March meeting that cross-outs would be hidden. But they were not hidden in Draft 2.  
This impacts many parts of the document.

**Solution:** Release all clauses with deletions (cross-outs) hidden.

**Response:** 802.5t will be released with cross-outs hidden.

---

**Comment NAJ-33**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 68    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Word gone mad again.

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** See item KTW-03 for resolution.

---

**Comment DWW-07**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 68    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Again, probably a "Wordism", but the formatting of this table is screwed up.

**Solution:**

**Response:** See item KTW-03 for resolution.

---

---

**Comment** KTW-09

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 68    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Word has struck again. This line is correct in the master file.

**Solution:** Check Word output.

**Response:** See item KTW-03 for resolution.

---

**Comment** KTW-08

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 135    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Correct the name of JS=BP.

**Solution:** Change line 135 as follows.

```
FROM: JS=BP : Bypass
TO:   JS=BP : Station Bypass
```

Also, see item KTW-03, about lines 136 and 137 which should not have shown up.

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-04

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 141    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Add the state JS=SRAW as per item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Add after line 141:

```
JS=SRAW : Station Remove Alert Wait
```

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** NAJ-34

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 152    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Word gone mad again.

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** See item KTW-03 for resolution.

---

**Comment** KTW-10

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 152    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** This line does not show up in the master file (deleted text should be hidden).

**Solution:** See item KTW-03 for resolution.

**Response:** See item KTW-03 for resolution.

---

---

**Comment DWW-08**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 196    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Should be a newline after "n7"

**Solution:**

**Response:** OK in master. Neil?

---

**Comment SJH-23**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 196    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** New line missing.

**Solution:** Add new line after "n7".

**Response:** OK in master. Neil?

---

**Comment IMJ-01**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 330    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The Trade-up Interlock flag (FSTUI) limit the window for the High Speed Trade-up protocol, to the very first transmitted Registration Request frame.  
Ref. 3119 on page 9.2-23: FSTUI set to 1.  
If the C-Port do not response on the very first FR\_REG\_REQ, the repeated FR\_REG\_REQ's will not request the High Media Rate Trade-up protocol (Ref. 3122 on page 9.2-25) because the FSTUI=1 (set in ref 3119).

**Solution:** Remove the FSTUI flag.

**Response:** See IMJ-02.

---

**Comment IMJ-02**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 330    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The implementation of the FSTUI flag in the Join FSM do not the described interlock protection, but there is no reason for implementing a Trade-up Interlock flag, because the High Speed Trade-up protocol will execute one time only.  
If the Trade-up protocol is activated (ref. 3178 on page 9.2-19) and the Link-Status change to Asserted (ref. 3194 on page 9.2-22) the FSTUI is set to 0 (by the set\_initial\_conditions function). If the High Media Rate Join fails, the end Join State will always be JS=BP. The upper level is informed that the High Media Rate Join failed.  
If Link\_status is not asserted within the time limit (Ref. 3195 on page 9.2-23) the Join State change to BP, and upper level is informed that the Trade-up failed.  
It is up to the upper level to decide, which option flag to set on the next Connect

**Solution:** Remove the FSTUI flag.

**Response:** Don't agree with this entirely.

The retries of the registration request are done when TSREQ expires. However, this transition is incorrectly condition with FSTUI.

It was suggested that the Station Operation Table use the FSRM flag value to do the same job. KTWilson will select the correct solution (simplest is to use the FSRM flag). If FSRM is used, FSTUI interlock flag will be removed.

---

**Comment KTW-05**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 399    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Spurious word "Join" in the Title.

**Solution:** Change line 399 as follows.

FROM: Join State J~~E~~, Station Join High Speed Trade-up  
(JS=SHSTU)

TO:    Join State J~~E~~, Station High Speed Trade-up  
(JS=SHSTU)

**Response:**

---

**Comment DWW-09**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 402    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** and 404 - what then exits?

**Solution:**

**Response:** Change lines 402 and 404 as follows.

From: "... exit to the ..."  
To:    "... exit the Station High Speed Trade-up state and  
enter the ..."

---

**Comment KTW-06**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 404    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Add a definition of the Remove Alert state (JS=SRAW) as per item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Add the following after line 404.

Join State JF, Station Remove Alert Wait

This state is entered when the Station in the Join Complete state (JS=SJC) detects that it needs to enter the Bypass state (JS=BP) because of an error condition and this error condition allows the Station to notify the C-Port it is entering the Bypass state. The initial Remove Alert MAC frame is transmitted by detection of the error condition that causes the Station to enter the Remove Alert Wait state, while counter CSRAT controls the number of Remove Alert MAC frame transmission retries in the Remove Alert Wait state. When counter CSRAT reaches zero, the Station enters the Bypass state.

**Response:** Done.

## Comment KTW-74

Section 9.2 Line 468 Severity DIS Type TECH Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☒ Commenter Agrees? ☒ Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** General change for the Join, Transmit and Monitor Station Operation Tables to allow the Trade-up function to operate correctly.

Problem:

The Trade-up function is used only when the Station is directed to exit the Bypass state (JS=BP) and start the Station Operation Table operating at the 4 or 16 Mbit/s media rate. When the Trade-up option is active (FSTUO=1), the Station can request the C-Port's permission to raise its media rate to 100 Mbit/s. If the C-Port allows this Trade-up request, the Station would normally expect FSMRO=2, but the current values is either FSMRO=0 or FSMRO=1. However, the value of FSMRO can not be changed the Station Operation Table since they are forbidden to change the setting of Option flags.

Thus, it is proposed to have internal media rate flags for all transitions except the Connect.SMAC and Connect.PMAC events. The Connect.SMAC and Connect.PMAC events test the option flags and set the initial value for these proposed internal media rate flags.

The proposed names of these flags are FSMR (flag, Station Media Rate) and FPMR (Flag, C-Port Media Rate).

**Solution:** Change all testing of the FSMRO flag except the Connect.PMAC or Connect.SMAC events to an internal flag named FSMR.

Change the Connect.SMAC events test the FSMRO flag and set the FSMR flag equal to the FSMRO flag.

Change the Connect.PMAC REFs 1001 and 1107 (C-Port in Station Emulation Mode) to also set FSMR equal to the FPMRO flag to allow the Monitor Station Operation Table to function correctly.

The changes to all Station Operation Tables are detailed as follows.

1. General Change to all table events and actions EXCEPT the Connect.PMAC and Connect.SMAC REFs (1001, 1107, 3108 and 3179):

- a) Change "FSMRO=" to: "FSMR=" (6 changes)
- b) Change "FSMRO<" to: "FSMR<" (30 changes)
- c) Change "FSMRO>" to: "FSMR>" (29 changes)

2. Changes to Connect.SMAC.

Add to the action column of REFs 3108 and 3179 (page 9.2-15) "; FSMR=FSMRO".

3. Changes to Connect.PMAC. (FSMR set as per KTW-73)

Add to the action column of REFs 1001 and 1107 (page 9.2-15) "; FPMR=FPMRO; FSMR=FSMRO".

4. Add to REF 3194 on page 9.2-22: "FSMR=2".

**Response:** I have done this in Station.

---

**Comment NAJ-35**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 483    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Plurals wrong in sentence.

**Solution:** Replace "parameter" with "parameters".  
Replace "value" with "values".

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment KTW-07**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 486    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The description column of the parameter n7 is incorrect since this form of LMT supports any media rate, not just the High Media Rate.

**Solution:** Change description column for "n7" as follows.

FROM:

n7 is the initial setting of CSLTF which governs the number of TEST MAC Frames transmitted by the Station's High Media Rate LMT function (see 9.1.6.2).

TO:

n7 is the initial setting of CSLTF which governs the number of TEST MAC Frames transmitted by the Station's LMT function when the policy flag FSLMT0=1 (see 9.1.6.2 for description). This form of LMT, specified by the Station Operation Table 9.2-7, is designed to support any media rate.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment KTW-17**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3187 on page 9.2-20 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3187 REF column from blank to "JDF".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

TO: "JS=SRAP; CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:** See IMJ-08

---

**Comment NAJ-40**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** R3190, 9.2-21

Setting FSRRC=1 is not required at High Media Rate.

**Solution:** Remove from actions.

**Response:** Remove 100 Mbit/s comment from conditions only.

---

**Comment KTW-18**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3188 on page 9.2-21 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3188 REF column from blank to "JDF".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=SRAW; CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:** See IMJ-04

---

**Comment KTW-19**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3193 on page 9.2-26 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3193 REF column from blank to "JDF".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=SRAW; CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:** See IMJ-05.

---

**Comment KTW-20**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3176 on page 9.2-24 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3176 as follows.

FROM: "TSRAP=E & CSRAT<>0 & JS=SJC"  
TO: "TSRAP=E & CSRAT<>0 & JS=SRAW"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment KTW-21**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3192 on page 9.2-24 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3192 as follows.

1. Change S/T column as follows.

FROM: "JD0C"  
TO: "JF0"

2. Change Event column as follows.

FROM: "TSRAP=E & CSRAT=0 & JS=SJC"  
TO: "TSRAP=E & CSRAT=0 & JS=SRAW"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-22**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** REF 3171 on page 9.2-20 is incorrect because it fails to remove phantom if active (FSPDA=1).

**Solution:** Change 3171 as follows.

1. Change S/T column as follows.

```
FROM: "JD0B"  
TO:   "JD0C"
```

2. Change Action column as follows.

```
FROM: "JS=BP"  
TO:   "JS=BP; If FSPDA=1 then Remove_station"
```

3. This item also causes Annex L figure L-1 to change.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment KTW-23**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** REF 3189 on page 9.2-21 has text that needs to be removed.

**Solution:** Remove it.

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-82**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** REF 3175 on page 9.2-22 is incorrect since it should not test FSMRO since Link\_status=Asserted is only active for the High Media Rate. This change brings 3194 in line with changes made to REFs 3194 and 3172 through 3174.

**Solution:** Change REF 3175 as follows.

```
S/T      = (no change)  
REF      = (no change)  
EVENT    = PM_STATUS.indication  
          (Link_status=Not_asserted) & JS=SREG  
ACTION   = (no change)
```

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment KTW-81**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** REF 3174 on page 9.2-22 is incorrect since it should not test FSMRO since Link\_status=Asserted is only active for the High Media Rate. This change brings 3194 in line with changes made to REFs 3194, 3172, 3173 and 3175.

**Solution:** Change REF 3174 as follows.

```
S/T      = (no change)
REF      = (no change)
EVENT    = PM_STATUS.indication
          (Link_status=Not_asserted) & JS=SLT
ACTION   = (no change)
```

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment KTW-80**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** REF 3173 on page 9.2-22 is incorrect since it should not test FSMRO since Link\_status=Asserted is only active for the High Media Rate. This change brings 3194 in line with changes made to REFs 3194, 3172, 3174 and 3175.

**Solution:** Change REF 3173 as follows.

```
S/T      = (no change)
REF      = (no change)
EVENT    = PM_STATUS.indication
          (Link_status=Not_asserted) & JS=SJC
ACTION   = (no change)
```

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment KTW-79**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** REF 3172 on page 9.2-22 is incorrect since it should not test FSMRO since Link\_status=Asserted is only active for the High Media Rate. This change brings 3194 in line with changes made to REFs 3194 and 3173 through 3175.

**Solution:** Change REF 3172 as follows.

```
S/T      = (no change)
REF      = (no change)
EVENT    = PM_STATUS.indication
          (Link_status=Not_asserted) & JS=SDAC
ACTION   = (no change)
```

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment KTW-78**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** REF 3194 on page 9.2-22 is incorrect since it should not test FSMRO since Link\_status=Asserted is only active for the High Media Rate. This change brings 3194 in line with changes made to REFS 3172 through 3175.

**Solution:** Change REF 3194 as follows.

```
S/T      = (no change)
REF      = (no change)
EVENT    = PM_STATUS.indication
          (Link_status=Asserted) & JS=SHSTU
ACTION   = (no change)
```

**Response:** Done

---

**Comment KTW-77**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3181 on page 9.2-17 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3181 REF column from blank to "JDF".

Change Action column as follows.

```
FROM: "CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
TO:   "JS=SRAP; CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
```

**Response:** See IMJ-08

---

**Comment KTW-16**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3186 on page 9.2-20 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3186 REF column from blank to "JDF".

Change Action column as follows.

```
FROM: "CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
TO:   "JS=SRAP; CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
```

**Response:** See IMJ-08

---

**Comment NAJ-38**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** R3180 (and lots more), 9.2-16

Remove Alert process is broken. See my comment on draft 1 for details.

**Solution:** I agree with Ken's e-mail of 3rd May as a solution to my concerns.

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-11**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3180 on page 9.2-16 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3180 REF column from blank to "JDF".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=SRAP; CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:** IMJ-03

---

**Comment KTW-12**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3182 on page 9.2-17 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3182 REF column from blank to "JDF".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=SRAP; CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:** See IMJ-08.

---

**Comment KTW-13**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3183 on page 9.2-17 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3183 REF column from blank to "JDF".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=SRAP; CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:** See IMJ-08

---

**Comment KTW-14**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3184 on page 9.2-18 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3184 REF column from blank to "JDF".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=SRAP; CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:** See IMJ-08

---

**Comment IMJ-03**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Ref. 3180 on page 9.2-16.  
Ref. 3181 on page 9.2-17.  
Ref. 3185 on page 9.2-19.  
Ref. 3186 on page 9.2-20.  
Ref. 3187 on page 9.2-20.  
If Phatom supported it should be removed.

**Solution:** Add to the "Action" field: "; if FSPDA=1 then Remove\_station"

**Response:** Change action columnm to:

JS=BP; If FSPDA=1 then Remove\_station

KTWilson to recheck above transitions for correction.

---

**Comment DWW-11**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** ref 3190 page 9.2-21. The new lobe test may be used by stations at all speeds. However, this transition assumes that it is for 100Mbit/s only (although it does not prevent 4/16). If 4/16 then need to set FSTXC=1 as in TEST\_OK transition

**Solution:** fix it

**Response:** See NAJ-xx

---

**Comment IMJ-11**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Ref. 3184 on page 9.2-18.  
Duplicate event/action.  
This event/action is done by Ref. 3182 on page 9.2-17.

**Solution:** Remove event/action

**Response:** I accept this.

---

**Comment IMJ-10**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Ref. 3136 on page 9.2-18.  
Duplicate event/action.  
This event/action is done by Ref. 3112 on page 9.2-17.

**Solution:** Remove event/action

**Response:** I don't agree.

---

**Comment IMJ-09**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Ref. 3152 on page 9.2-18.  
Duplicate event/action.  
This event/action is done by Ref. 3149 on page 9.2-17.

**Solution:** Remove event/action

**Response:** I accept.

---

**Comment IMJ-08**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Ref. 3182 on page 9.2-17.  
Ref. 3183 on page 9.2-17.  
Ref. 3184 on page 9.2-18.  
I see no reason for the Station to transmit Remove Alert frames to a foreign C-Port in an unknown State, but if Phatom supported it should be removed.

**Solution:** Change the "Action" field to: "JS=BP; if FSPDA=1 then Remove\_station"

**Response:** Change to 3182 and 3183 made.

3184 is deleted by IMJ-11.

---

**Comment DWW-10**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** ANSWERED

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

**Concern:** ref 3185 page 9.2-19. If station is told to remove does it make any sense to tell port it is removing?

**Solution:** Maybe ok as "remove" comes from management

**Response:** Yes it makes sense because the Remove MAC frame is from management and C-Port does not know Station was requested to be removed.

---

**Comment DWW-14**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** ref 3177 page 9.2-24. The layout of the action in transitions like this is confusing and unclear. It would be better without the comments breaking up the action.

**Solution:**

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-43**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** R3121, 9.2-24  
  
Unterminated comment in actions column.

**Solution:** Add ">>" after "as per 9.1.6.1."

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-37**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** R3170, 9.2-15

Comment in Actions doesn't use "<<" and ">>" as delimiters.

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:**

---

**Comment DWW-12**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** ref 3132 page 9.2-23. The check for FSMRO<2 is unnecessary as a 100Mbit/s station cannot reach this transition

**Solution:**

**Response:** Removed FSMRO from condition.

---

**Comment NAJ-39**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** R3171, 9.2-20

This transition is conditional on JS=SJC. This leaves a (very small) window of opportunity when the C-Port closes mprior to the Station join completing for the Station ignore the remove alert MAC frame, and transition in join complete.

**Solution:** Change JS=SJC to be JS>=SDAC.

If you don't like the terminology, create a new transition for JS=SDAC.

**Response:** Remove JS=SJC condition from the event column of 3171.

---

**Comment DWW-13**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** ref 3119 page 9.2-23. What is FSTUO - it is not described in clause 14 - Is it FSHSO? (see also 3122 p.9.2-25). Where is FSTUI set to 1?

**Solution:** Sort it out with Neil

**Response:** OK, do it in clause 14.

---

**Comment NAJ-36**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** R3179, 9.2-15

Comment in condition talks about Connect.PMAC

**Solution:** Should be Connect.SMAC

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-42**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** R3177 (and many, many more), 9.2-24

In the event column, there is comment text prefixed by "Note:" that is not enclosed by "<<" and ">>". This is not consistent with other comments in these tables, and makes it very difficult for these tables to be machine read.

**Solution:** Please enclose all comments in "<<" and ">>".

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-15**

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Change REF 3185 on page 9.2-19 to agree with item KTW-02.

**Solution:** Change 3185 REF column from blank to "JDF".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=SRAP; CSRAT=n8; TSRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:** See IMJ-08

## Comment NAJ-46

Section 9.2 Line 489 Severity DIS Type TECH Status WITHDRAWN

Highlight To Committee ☒ Commenter Agrees? ☒ Editing Complete ☐

Concern: R3178: 9.2-19

Implicit setting of FxMRO flag by actions. Tut, tut.

**Solution:** I think the trade-up problem requires some more careful thought, especially in light of the concerns raised by Bob and Andy. I agree with them that the tables as they are currently written, allow for a Station/C-Port link to cycle from 4 or 16 Mbit/s (a speed at which the link works) to 100 Mbit/s (which the link cannot support) and then into bypass, only to repeat when management re-opens the connection.

My first thought was that management would be able to identify this cycle, and prevent the 4/16 to 100 trade-up using the FSTUO option flag on subsequent open attempts. Without close monitoring of state changes however (which means extension to the current tables), management will not be able to identify the cycle. Then I looked in detail at what Ken was proposing for a fix to the FxMRO setting problem, and I came up with a solution to both these issues:

I think we should extend the MAC/management interface to allow the MAC to request management to change speed. Management will use this request to control the hardware (a feature completely missing from the original and modified proposals) and set FxMRO to the correct value. It will also give the management the visibility to implement the scheme described above to prevent 16->100->16->100... cycling on a link that cannot support 100Mbit/s, without wasting committee time designing such a scheme to be standardised in the MAC.

Also shown below are C-Port changes attempting to fix the problem of not waiting for the Registration Response MAC frame to complete transmission before changing speeds. This problem exists with both the original design, Ken's proposed modifications and my proposal, so must also be fixed.

New control:

```
MGMT_CONTROL.request(Select_speed)
```

```
Select_speed can be
0000 - 4 Mbit/s
0001 - 16 Mbit/s
0002 - 100 Mbit/s
>0003 - reserved for future standardisation
```

Station transition changes:

```
R3178: In actions add "MGMT_CONTROL.request(Select_speed=0002)"
```

C-Port transition changes:

```
R1132: In actions add "FPEFS=0"
New: FPEFS=1 & JS=PHSTU & FPBPW=0
=> MGMT_CONTROL.request(Select_speed=0002)
```

**Response:**

---

**Comment** IMJ-04

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Ref. 3188 on page 9.2-21.  
The flag FSBPF is set to 1 by the Transmit FSM, when an unrecoverable error is detected (ref. 3218 on page 9.2-28 and ref. 3220 on page 9.2-29).  
Do NOT initiate a new transmission on a C-Port/Station that has an unrecoverable error.

**Solution:** Change "Action" field to: "JS=BP; if FSPDA=1 then Remove\_station".

**Response:** Done. Also, S/T changed to JD0.

---

**Comment** IMJ-05

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Ref 3193 on page 9.2-26.  
Phantom supported, so it must be removed.

**Solution:** Ref 3193 on page 9.2-26.  
Add to "action" field: "; Remove\_station".

**Response:** Change action column to:

JS=BP; Remove\_station

---

**Comment** NAJ-41

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 489    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** R3172, R3174, R3175, 9.2-22  
  
Comments in Actions column are wrong.

**Solution:** Delete comments.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** NAJ-44

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 494    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** R3301, R3302, 9.2-30  
  
Typo in actions column:  
  
"FSDPA=1" should read "FSPDA=1"

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-76

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 509    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct Formatting - make this item 2.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:**

Comment

NAJ-45

---

**Section** 9.2    **Line** 522    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:**    FR\_TEST, 9.2-43

                  This is also used at high media rate.

**Solution:**    Remove comment from "event term" column.

**Response:**

## Comment KTW-24

Section 9.3 Line 58 Severity DIS Type TECH Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☒ Commenter Agrees? ☒ Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** This item explains the Remove Alert problem, first identified by Neil Jaris' comments NAJ-34, NAJ-35 and NAJ-53 against Draft 1. This explanation is referenced by many items.

Figure 9.3-1 on page 9.3-3 needs to be updated to include the Remove Alert Wait state.

RATIONALE (for this and many other changes):

RATIONALE for Remove Alert Change:

Neil's items correctly identified a problem with the Draft 2 Remove Alert process. The current process is handled within the Join Complete state and during this state other events that should not cause transition out of Join Complete can occur

Neil suggested a new state that only processed the Remove Alert function and ignore other conditions (not possible in the Join Complete state).

Therefore, it is proposed to define a new C-Port state called Remove Alert Wait (JS=PRAW). This new state is used as follows.

1. Upon entry into the Remove Alert Wait state (JS=PRAW), the C-Port transmits the first Remove Alert MAC frame, the counter CPRAP is set and the timer TPRAP is reset.
2. After entry into JS=PRAW, retries of the Remove Alert MAC frame occur, paced by TPRAP until counter CPRAP reaches zero. When CPRAP reaches zero, the C-Port enters the Bypass state (JS=BP).

**Solution:** This solution is explained as it relates to the C-Port, not just to the change needed in figure 9.3-1.

The following changes are proposed to resolve Neil's items.

1. A New State

JS=PRAW (C-Port Remove Alert Wait), state JW.

This state is entered whenever a transition is recognized that the C-Port needs to start the Remove Alert process (initial transmit which occurs on exit of the Join Complete state (JS=PJCI) and the retries which occur in the new Remove Alert Wait state (JS=PRAW).

2. The following changes are proposed for the C-Port.
  - a) The references changed are done by other items opened by me (KTW) by referencing this item.
  - B) Change figure 9.3-1 to include the Remove Alert Wait state.

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-25

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

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

**Concern:** The figures on pages 9.3-4 and 9.3-5 should not have shown up. However, when the subclauses were released, they were marked for changes incorrectly.

It was agreed during the March meeting that cross-outs would be hidden. But they were not hidden in Draft 2.

This impacts many parts of the document.

**Solution:** Release all clauses with deletions (cross-outs) hidden. Meanwhile, I have deleted these two figures to prevent them showing up on future releases.

**Response:** Neil to fix.

---

**Comment** NAJ-47

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 87    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Missing TPHSW

**Solution:** Add it

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-26

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 88    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Add the state JS=PRAW as per item KTW-24.

**Solution:** Add around line 88, after PLT:

PRAW : C-Port Remove Alert Wait

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** NAJ-48

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 192    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

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

**Solution:** Delete lines 192-214

**Response:**

---

**Comment** SJH-24

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 202    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Don't understand sentence.

**Solution:** Split up into something like:

At 4 Mbit/s and 16 Mbit/s the flag FPRF is set to 0 when PS\_STATUS.indication(Phantom=Not\_asserted) occurs. At the High Media Rate the flag FPRF is set to 0 when either PS\_STATUS.indication(Phantom=Not\_asserted) (Station is using phantom) or receipt of the LMTN MAC frame (Station is not using phantom) occurs. These operations are carried out as follows.

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-27

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 321    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Add a definition of the Remove Alert state (JS=PRAW) as per item KTW-24.

**Solution:** Add the following in place of line 321.

Join State JW, C-Port Remove Alert Wait

This state is entered when the C-Port in the Join Complete state (JS=PJCI) detects that it needs to enter the Bypass state (JS=BP) because of an error condition and this error condition allows the Station to notify the Station it is entering the Bypass state. The initial Remove Alert MAC frame is transmitted by detection of the error condition that causes the C-Port to enter the Remove Alert Wait state, while counter CPRAT controls the number of Remove Alert MAC frame transmission retries in the Remove Alert Wait state. When counter CPRAT reaches zero, the C-Port enters the Bypass state.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** KTW-73

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 371    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** General change for the Join, Transmit and Monitor Port Operation Tables:

Problem:

The Trade-up function is used only when the C-Port is directed to exit the Bypass state (JS=BP) and start the Port Operation Table operating at the 4 or 16 Mbit/s media rate. When the Trade-up option is active (FPTUO=1), the C-Port can be given permission by the Station to raise its media rate to 100 Mbit/s. If the C-Port allows this Trade-up request, the Station would normally expect FSMRO=2, but the current values is either FSMRO=0 or FSMRO=1. However, the value of FSMRO can not be changed the Station Operation Table since they are forbidden to change the setting of Option flags.

Thus, it is proposed to have internal media rate flags for all transitions except the Connect.PMAC event. The Connect.PMAC event tests the option flag and set these proposed internal media rate flags.

The proposed name of this C-Port flag is FPMR (Flag, C-Port Media Rate). The proposed name of the Station flag is FSMR (Flag, Station Media Rate and is proposed by KTW-74.

**Solution:** Change all testing of the FPMRO flag except the Connect.PMAC events to an internal flag named FPMR.

Change the Connect.PMAC events to test the FPMRO flag and set the FPMR flag equal to the FPMRO flag.

Change the Connect.PMAC REFs 1001 and 1107 test the FPMRO flag and set the FSMR flag equal to the FPMRO flag (see KTW-74).

The changes to all Port Operation Tables are detailed as follows.

1. General Change to all table events and actions EXCEPT the Connect.PMAC REFs (1001 and 1107):

- a) Change "FPMRO=" to: "FPMR=" (6 changes)
- b) Change "FPMRO<" to: "FPMR<" (23 changes)
- c) Change "FPMRO>" to: "FPMR>" (24 changes)

2. Changes to Connect.PMAC.

Add to the action column of REFs 1001 and 1107 (page 9.3-17) "; FPMR=FPMRO; FSMR=FSMRO".

3. Add to REF 1137 on page 9.3-24: "FPMR=2"

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** DWW-17

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** ref 1125 - page 9.3-22. Why send remove alert frame when in PLT? Should just go to bypass.

**Solution:**

**Response:** 1125 has been deleted.

---

**Comment KTW-37**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Change REF 1128 on page 9.3-18 to agree with item KTW-24.

**Solution:** Change 1128 as follows.

1. Change S/T column as follows.

```
FROM: "JP0"  
TO:   "JW0"
```

2. Change Event column as follows.

```
FROM: "TPRAP=E & CPRAT=0 & JS=PJCI"  
TO:   "TPRAP=E & CPRAT=0 & JS=PRAW"
```

**Response:**

---

**Comment DWW-16**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** ref 1052 - page 9.3-20. The action should send remove alert frames

**Solution:**

**Response:** Done

---

**Comment DWW-15**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** ref 1108 page 9.3-17, 1109 on 9.3-18, 1110 on 9.3-19 and throughout state tables. The modification which have been made are incorrect as there is not always a general repeat path available. The description of FPRPT (line 215) states that FPRPT=1 means FPTI=0;FPTXC=0. This is just plain wrong and needs fixing. There is no action for FPRPT=1 in the case where frames are sent rather than repeated, but the use of FPRPT in these transitions is misleading and confusing.

**Solution:** fix it

**Response:** KTWilson to evaluate.

However, the definition of a "repeat" that allows a pre-formatted frame is not defined.

Simon Harrison to contact Dave Wilson to get an exact understanding of this issue. KTWilson to generate a response to the committee.

There was a consensus that the pre-formatted frame method of repeat not be defined.

---

**Comment KTW-38**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** REF 1052 on page 9.3-20 should be treated in the same manner as REF 1123 on page 9.3-20. That is, if supporting the High Media Rate, the C-Port should execute the Remove Alert process.

**Solution:** 1. Change 1052 event column as follows.

```
FROM:  "FR_AMP & JS=PJCI"
TO:    "FR_AMP & FPMRO<2 & JS=PJCI"
```

2. Add the following new REF 1139.

```
S/T      = JPW
REF      = 1139
EVENT    = FR_AMP & FPMRO>1 & JS=PJCI
ACTION   = JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT
```

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-39**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** REF 1137 on page 9.3-24 is incorrect.

1. It should not test FPMRO since Link\_status=Asserted is only active for the High Media Rate.
2. It should set up JS=PREG as if it were initial entry and set FPMR (see item KTW-nn) to indicate it is operating at the High Media Rate.

**Solution:** Change REF 1137 as follows.

```
S/T      = JUK      (now JKU)
REF      = 1137     (no change)
EVENT    = PM_STATUS.indication
           (Link_status=Asserted) & JS=PHSTU
ACTION   = JS=PREG; TS=PRPT;
           Set_initial_conditions; FPTXC=1;
           FPRPT=1; FPMR=2
```

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment KTW-49**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1003 on page 9.3-22 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1034 S/T from: "JLK" to: "JLKA"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-59**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1024 on page 9.3-25 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1024 S/T from: "JLK" to: "JLKC"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-58**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1047 on page 9.3-25 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1047 S/T from: "JMPb" to: "JMPB"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-57**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1039 on page 9.3-25 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1039 S/T from: "JMPa" to: "JMPA"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-56**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1116 on page 9.3-23 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1116 S/T from: "JLK" to: "JLKB"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-55**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1115 on page 9.3-23 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1115 S/T from: "JLK" to: "JLKA"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-54**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1091 on page 9.3-23 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1091 S/T from: "JLK" to: "JLKC"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-53**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1132 on page 9.3-23 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1132 S/T from: "blank" to: "JKU"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-52**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1131 on page 9.3-23 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1131 S/T from: "JKL" to: "JKLA"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-44**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1109 on page 9.3-18 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1109 S/T from: "JPL" to: "JPLB"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-50**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1113 on page 9.3-22 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1113 S/T from: "JLK" to: "JLKB"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-40**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** REF 1133 on page 9.3-24 is incorrect for the following reasons.

1. It should not test FPMRO since Link\_status=Asserted is only active for the High Media Rate. This change brings 1133 in line with 1134 through 1136.
2. It should set up JS=PREG as if it were initial entry and set FPMR to indicate it is operating at the High Media Rate. This is proposed by item KTW-39.

**Solution:** Change REF 1133 as follows.

```
S/T      = (no change)
REF      = (no change)
EVENT    = PM_STATUS.indication
          (Link_status=Not_asserted) & JS=PDAC
ACTION   = (no change)
```

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-48**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1034 on page 9.3-22 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1034 S/T from: "JLK" to: "JLKC"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-47**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1121 on page 9.3-21 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1121 S/T from: "JLMc" to: "JLMC"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-46**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1073 on page 9.3-21 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1073 S/T from: "JLMb" to: "JLMB"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-32**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** In the process of adding the Remove Alert changes, I found REF 1055 on page 9.3-21 in error. REF 1055 should test for 4 or 16 Mbit/s and enter the Bypass state is the event is true.

A new transition, 1140, is required for the High Media Rate. Add this new REF on page 9.3-21 to agree with items KTW-24 and KTW-73.

**Solution:** 1. Change REF 1055 for 4 or 16 Mbit/s operation as follows.

```
S/T      = JP0 (no change)
REF      = 1055 (no change)
EVENT    = FR_MAC(DA=any_recognized_address &
              SA<>SUA & VC=00) & FPMR<2 & JS=PJCI
ACTION   = JS=BP
```

2. Add new REF 1140 for the High Media Rate operation as follows.

```
S/T      = JPW
REF      = 1140
EVENT    = FR_MAC(DA=any_recognized_address &
              SA<>SUA & VC=00) & FPMR>1 & JS=PJCI
ACTION   = JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
```

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment KTW-45**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1023 on page 9.3-21 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1023 S/T from: "JLMa" to: "JLMA"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-43**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1051 on page 9.3-18 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1051 S/T from: "JPL" to: "JPLA"

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-42

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1108 on page 9.3-17 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1108 S/T from: "JK0" to: "JK0B"

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-41

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1000 on page 9.3-17 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1000 S/T from: "JK0" to: "JK0A"

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-51

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1114 on page 9.3-23 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1114 S/T from: "JKL" to: "JKLB"

**Response:**

---

**Comment** IMJ-13

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Ref. 1124 on page 9.3-22  
The events 1060, 1055, 1059, 1082, 1084 and 1090 all handle the case where the Station address has changed, and the C-Port is closed. I see no reason for the C-Port to transmit Remove Alert frames to a foreign Station in an unknown State.

**Solution:** Remove event/action.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** NAJ-49

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** R1055, 9.3-21

This transition should be split into 2, and conditioned on FPMRO. FPMRO<2, return to bypass. FPMRO>1, use remove alert process.

**Solution:** Split it.

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-50**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** R1132, 9.3-23

See NAJ-46 for a general discussion. Also this is the transition that doesn't wait for the REG\_RSP frame to be sent before getting management to change speeds. Big disaster.

**Solution:** See NAJ-46 solution.

**Response:** Do it. Can't change speed here, but transmit frame here.

---

**Comment NAJ-51**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** R1133, R1135, R1136, 9.3-24

Comment in action field is wrong.

**Solution:** Delete it.

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-34**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Change REF 1125 on page 9.3-22 to agree with item KTW-24.

**Solution:** Change 1125 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment IMJ-14**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Ref. 1055 on page 9.3-21.  
See IMJ-13.

**Solution:** Change "Action" field to: "JS=BP"

**Response:** Accept. Withdraw NAJ-49

---

**Comment IMJ-12**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Ref. 1125 on page 9.3-22.  
The Remove Alert process should only be initiated from the Join completed state.

**Solution:** Remove event/action.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** IMJ-07

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Ref. 1058 on page 9.3-18  
See IMJ-06

**Solution:** Remove from "event" field: "& FPMRO<2"

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** IMJ-06

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Ref. 1122 on page 9.3-18.  
The flag FPBPF is set to 1 by the Transmit FSM, when an unrecoverable error is detected (ref. 1217 on page 9.3-28).  
Do NOT initiate a new transmission on a C-Port that is detected broken.

**Solution:** Remove event.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-28

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Change REF 1118 on page 9.3-18 to agree with item KTW-24.

**Solution:** Change 1118 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=PAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:** Done

---

**Comment** KTW-30

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Change REF 1122 on page 9.3-18 to agree with item KTW-24.

**Solution:** Change 1122 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=PAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:** Done

---

**Comment** KTW-33

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Change REF 1124 on page 9.3-22 to agree with item KTW-24.

**Solution:** Change 1124 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-35

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Change REF 1126 on page 9.3-23 to agree with item KTW-24.

**Solution:** Change 1118 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-31

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Change REF 1123 on page 9.3-20 to agree with item KTW-24.

**Solution:** Change 1123 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"  
TO: "JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI\_RMV\_ALRT"

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-36

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 380    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Change REF 1127 on page 9.3-26 to agree with item KTW-24.

**Solution:** Change 1127 as follows.

FROM: "TPRAP=E & CPRAT<>0 & JS=PJCI"  
TO: "TPRAP=E & CPRAT<>0 & JS=PRAW"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-65**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1206 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1206 S/T from: "TDF" to: "TDFA"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-60**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1215 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1215 S/T from: "TEDa" to: "TEDF"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-72**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1201 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1201 S/T from: "TDEb" to: "TDEB"

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-52**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** R1216, 9.3-27

I tried this in D1...

FPIT=1 in action should be FPIT=1

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-71**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1217 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1217 S/T from: "TEDd" to: "TEDG"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-70**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1208 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1208 S/T from: "TEDd" to: "TEDD"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-69**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1205 on page 9.3-27 (PORT\_ERR(Correctable) & FPMRO>1 & JS=PTXD): 1) S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998) and 2) correct the REF number which is duplicate of the previous transition.

**Solution:** Change REF 1205 S/T from: "TEDe" to: "TEDE"

Change REF 1205 REF column from: "1205" to: "1218"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-68**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1205 on page 9.3-27 (PORT\_ERR(Correctable) & FPMRO<2 & JS=PTXD) S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1205 S/T from: "TEDe" to: "TEDH"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-67**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1202 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1202 S/T from: "TDEa" to: "TDEA"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-61**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1210 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1210 S/T from: "TEDb" to: "TEDB"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-66**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1214 on page 9.3-28 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1214 S/T from: "TDF" to: "TDFB"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-64**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1213 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1213 S/T from: "TPD" to: "TPDB"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-63**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1207 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1207 S/T from: "TPD" to: "TPDA"

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-62**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 382    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Correct REF 1204 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

**Solution:** Change REF 1204 S/T from: "TEDc" to: "TEDC"

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-53**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 388    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** R1805, 9.3-32

Comment in condition is not enclosed by "<<" and ">>".

**Solution:** Please fix.

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-75**

**Section** 9.3    **Line** 388    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** REF 1824 on page 9.3-32 incorrectly test FPMRO>1 since the PM\_STATUS.indication(Link\_status=Asserted) only occurs at the High Media Rate.

**Solution:** Delete "& FPMRO>1" in the event column of 1824.

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-83**

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 11    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Figure 9.7-1 on page 9.7-1 has faint lines around PSC and PMS.

**Solution:** Make these dotted lines more visable by increasing the lines weight.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment JLM-11**

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 50    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Can't say Transmit\_mode(5.4.1). 5.4.1 doesn't mention Transmit\_mode, but Repeat\_mode. If we use Transmit\_mode, we'll have to define it. I am having trouble with the idea that 9.7.1 refers to clause 5 for the meaning of the parameters to PM\_CONTROL.request. 9.7.1 is used for a C-Port, Port mode, TXI for example, whereas clause 5 is Station Specific components (isn't it?). Is 5 part of the specification of a C-Port's PSC, or not? Where does the missing definition of Transmit\_mode (akin to 5.4.1) belong?

**Solution:** What to do depends on what's really wrong.

**Response:** Reverted to base standard usage.

---

**Comment KTW-84**

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 84    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Why are the Repeat Path and Elastic Buffer outside of PSC?

**Solution:** Discussion required.

**Response:**

---

**Comment SJH-25**

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 84    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Is this diagram supposed to show just one example of a repeat path? It is not clear that there are other equally viable examples of repeat paths (at the PMAC and PMC levels). Compare with the 4/16 diagram (line 12) where two positions for the repeat path are shown.

**Solution:** Illustrate other possible repeat path positions on the diagram, or change the caption to "Figure 9.7-2 below illustrates one example of a repeat path" [line 83] and "Figure 9.7-2: One example of a C-Port repeat path." [line 85]

**Response:**

---

**Comment KR-05**

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 84    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Figure 9.7-2 is wrong for fiber connections

**Solution:** Add a Figure 9.7-3 that has same elements as figure 2.2-2  
(see also KR-04)

**Response:**

---

**Comment KR-04**

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 84    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Figure 9.7-2 does not match figure 2.2-1

**Solution:** make elements in figure 9.7-2 same as elements in 2.2-1.  
If editor feels that "repeat path" and "elastic buffer" elements are needed for hardware repeat path then make them boxes within hardware repeat path box

**Response:**

---

**Comment EDTR-E-3**

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 86    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Need words describing where repeat path can be placed.

**Solution:**

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-54**

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 92    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Remove note, and add a reference to annex X.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment KTW-85**

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 93    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Lines 93 through 96 should be removed now that Annex W is in place.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Done but with the strong suspicion that Annex W is now cunningly disguised as Annex X (see response to NAJ-54).

---

**Comment** SJH-26

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 93    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Editor's note is now covered by annex X.

**Solution:** Remove it.

**Response:** Done (see response to NAJ-54).

---

**Comment** KTW-86

**Section** 9.7    **Line** 131    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** A paragraph explaining gigabit operation to be determined (like line 350 in 9.8 on page 9.8-11).

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Done. Also replaced the word 'Gigabit' with '1000Mbit/s' to maintain similarity with 9.8.1 heading.

---

**Comment** KTW-88

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Lines 4 through 10 should be removed.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** And Lo! There was a goneness of lines 4 through 10.

---

**Comment** KTW-87

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** This subclause should not have change bars because it is a new subclause.

**Solution:** For the next release, remove all change bars.

**Response:** Change bars removed (see also response to KTW-100).

---

**Comment** NAJ-56

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** General concern: Word has screwed up a lot of formatting. Extraneous new lines, unaligned lists etc.

**Solution:** Clause needs to be printed and proof read before release to catch these Word gothas

**Response:** I must print out and proof read my clauses.  
I must print out and proof read my clauses.  
I must print out and proof read my clauses.  
I must print out and proof read my clauses.  
I must print out and proof read my clauses.  
I must print out and proof read my clauses.  
I must print out and proof read my clauses.  
I must print out and proof read my clauses.

P.s. Are 'Word gothas' Microsofts take on Golgothas?

---

**Comment NAJ-55**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** General comment. References in this clause a very important, but completely inconsistent in how they are used.

**Solution:** Pick one, and stick with it!

**Response:** Picked one and stuck with it.

---

**Comment BBT-01**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 28    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Reference to TP-PMD revision 2.2 should be identical to ref [18] in sect number 1.4 (Normative references)

**Solution:**

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment BBT-03**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 60    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** lines 60 to 101

It might be confusing to reference the SSD (/J/K), ESD (T/R) and Idle (/I) symbols at the MII level because these symbols are defined at the wire level and a direct mapping between the symbols and MII symbols don't exist.

SSD symbol:

At the MII level is the first two nibbels after RX\_DV is asserted an indication of reception of a valid SSD symbol

ESD symbol:

At the MII level is the first two nibbels after RX\_DV is deasserted an indication of reception of a valid ESD symbol

Idle symbol:

At the MII level are all nibbels with RX\_DV deasserted (ESD as exception) an indication of the reception of Idles

**Solution:** A solution could be to define the HSTR frame structure at the MII level as 802.3u section 22.2.3 does for Ethernet

**Response:** See RJK-08.

---

**Comment RJK-08**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 95    **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Tam's note is absolutely correct. There should be definitions for the PM\_UNITDATA primitives. PS\_UNITDATA primitives should be in terms of the MII signals only, which form the interface between the MAC and the PSC (as shown in Fig 9.8-1), whereas PM\_UNITDATA primitives should be in terms of symbol level codes /J/, /K/, /T/, /R/ etc which form the physical interface between PMC and PSC. Making this distinction between the two interfaces would avoid the confusion caused by mixed use of symbol level and MII level definitions which occur throughout the spec.

In particular, MAC level designers should not need to know anything about the frame format at the symbol level (Which is how it is currently defined)

**Solution:** Add PM\_UNITDATA definitions to 9.8.1.1.  
If anyone is interested in how this might look in the spec, I have defined these primitives in the first attempt at 9.8.2 (The equivalent of 9.8.1 for Gigabit).

**Response:** A study group is to rewrite 9.8.

This item resolves BBT-02, BBT-03, BBT-04, BBT-05 and KTW-89.

The study group will send resolution to the committee by 27 May and copy the committee.

---

**Comment KTW-89**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 95    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** I disagree with Tam's observation since the Station and C-Port do not use these signals.

**Solution:** Remove lines 95 through 100.

**Response:** See RJK-08.

---

**Comment BBT-04**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 102    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** lines 102 to 129  
Same as BBT-03

**Solution:** Same as BBT-03

**Response:** See RJK-08.

---

**Comment KTW-90**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 136    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Alignment of this definition is messed up.

**Solution:** Fit it.

**Response:** Fitted!

---

**Comment NAJ-58**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 143    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Either delete the note or convert into real text.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Note deleted.

---

**Comment BBT-05**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 148    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The ESD is not a defined symbol at the MII and it could therefore be confusing to reference this symbol

**Solution:** Change the words to:  
Abort shall be asserted only if both of the last two nibbels of the received frame have the RX\_ER signal asserted.

**Response:** See RJK-08.

---

**Comment ANF-05**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 163    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** 'The PHYs shall be able to correctly exchange data within ??s of the assertion of Initialize.'

Is this timeout really necessary?

**Solution:**

**Response:** No, delete sentence.

---

**Comment NAJ-57**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 163    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** ??s is not acceptable :-)

**Solution:** Either give a value or remove the sentence.

**Response:** See ANF-05.

---

**Comment BBT-06**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 163    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** The timer value must be defined

**Solution:** It is a problem to find an appropriate number because this parameter is usually not specified for the PHY's. I guess that 1 second could be good number, but can't guarantee that it will be sufficient in all cases. (I know one PHY that requires approx. 250ms to complete the RESET cycle)

**Response:** See ANF-05.

---

---

**Comment KTW-91**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 179    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The paragraph in lines 179 and 180 should not be italicized and should have a 6-point space after it.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment BBT-02**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 193    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The ESD is not a defined symbol at the MII level and it could therefore be confusing to reference this symbol

**Solution:** Change the words to:  
The abort\_frame shall consist of asserting the TX\_ER MII signal on the last two nibbels of the frame

**Response:** See RJK-08.

---

**Comment NAJ-59**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 201    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** TBD ms is unacceptable!

**Solution:** Either remove or fill in.

**Response:** See KTW-92.

---

**Comment BBT-07**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 201    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** The link status polling time is not defined.

**Solution:** I guess that the maximum time the MAC can accept is in the order of 5 seconds. A maximum value in the range 0.5 to 2 seconds should then be appropriate.

**Response:** See KTW-92.

---

**Comment KTW-92**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 201    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** The note in lines 202 and 203 should be removed and the range of time defined in line 201.

**Solution:** Discussion required to determine range of polling time. E.g., 40 to 500 ms.

**Response:** The maximum time needs to be at least half the granularity of the MAC. A figure of 500ms is acceptable here. A lower limit need not be defined.

Editors note in following two lines deleted.

---

**Comment KTW-93**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 213    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** I do not understand why this is included.

**Solution:** Decide what to do.

**Response:** Delete it: study group to review (See RJK-08.).

---

**Comment KTW-94**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 215    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** I do not understand why this is included.

**Solution:** Decide what to do.

**Response:** Delete it: study group to review (See RJK-08.).

---

**Comment KTW-95**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 225    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Two comments about figure 9.8-1 on page 9.8-6.

1. Make shading of MII lighter.
2. Make the figure full size for the page.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:**

---

**Comment NAJ-60**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 226    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Figure 9.8-1

Where does the line from the SMT box meant to go?

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:**

---

**Comment KTW-96**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 228    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** ANSWERED

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

**Concern:** I do not understand what this is for (so others won't either).

**Solution:** Discussion required.

**Response:** ANF to create new Normative Annex Y called 'Autonegotiation for High Speed Token Ring'. Put footnote 1 from annex U & paras 9.8.1.4.1 & 9.8.1.4.2 into a new annex Y. Put reference into new 9.8.1.4.1 to new annex.

Number to replace 'VWXYZ' chosen to be 00011.

---

**Comment NAJ-61**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 229    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** You can't publish this with a value VWXYZ. Bob Love was actioned to get a value.

**Solution:** Talk to Bob.

**Response:** See KTW-96.

---

**Comment KTW-97**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 256    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Table structure needs to be fixed.

**Solution:** Fix as follows.

1. Header entries should be bold and centered.
2. Each row needs to have entries made with 2-points before and after row entry.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment JLM-12**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 256    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** These table headers in table 9.8-4 should be bold, on this page and the next.

**Solution:** Embolden "FDDI term or concept" and "Interpretation for 100Mbit/s token ring".

**Response:** Done & all on same page now.

---

**Comment JLM-13**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 256    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** The term PMA is undefined. The PMC client is the PSC I suppose. Is this what you mean?

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:**

---

**Comment JLM-14**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 256    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Several entries in the right column of this table make no sense to me as 802.5 terms. These are: PMD\_SIGNAL.indicate, PMD\_UNITDATA.indicate, PMD\_UNITDATA.request, SM\_PM\_BYPASS.request, SM\_PM\_CONTROL.request.

**Solution:** It almost looks as though some of these entries are in the wrong columns, but this is not the whole story.

**Response:** Correct terminology.

---

**Comment KTW-98**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 258    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** This important set of notes needs to be made easier to read.

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** Remove notes.

---

**Comment KTW-99**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 283    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Spurious lines.

**Solution:** Remove lines 283 and 284.

**Response:** The original paragraphs here were a bit confusing since STP contact assignments were rolled into the UTP heading. The two assignments are now separated out under two headings and the headings themselves corrected to reflect those used in TP-PMD.

As a result of this change the spurious lines have been removed.

---

**Comment KTW-100**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 315    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Lines 315 through 348 need to be removed (will be done automatically if subclause is released without change bars as per item KTW-87).

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Made it so (see also response to KTW-87).

---

**Comment KTW-101**

**Section** 9.8    **Line** 350    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Missing: "<< End of 9.8 >> after line 350.

**Solution:** Add "<< End of 9.8 >> after line 350. This should be centered and bold in 14 point size with 12-18 points before it.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment KTW-102**

**Section** 13.9    **Line** 23    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Table structure needs to be fixed.

**Solution:** Fix as follows.

1. Header entries should be bold and centered.
2. Each row needs to have entries made with 2-points before and after row entry.

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment** SJH-27

**Section** 13.9    **Line** 26    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Little square thingies have appeared after the point number.

**Solution:** Change to conventional bullets or brackets.

**Response:** Changed to conventional spotty bulletty thingies.

---

**Comment** KTW-103

**Section** 14.0    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** General tables are hard to read because of the space before and after a row entry. Examine all tables for readability.

**Solution:** Fix as follows.

1. Header entries should be bold and centered.
2. Each row needs to have entries made with 2-points before and after row entry.

**Response:** Which general tables?

I will embolden the headings of the tables describing the frame formats. I will attempt to fix the spacing.

---

**Comment** KTW-104

**Section** 14.1    **Line** 8    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The word "section" is wrong.

**Solution:** Change "section" to "subclause".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** RJK-05

**Section** 14.1    **Line** 13    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Code violation visibility at the MAC level is limited by what information is available over the MII. A code violation is detectable from the MII when RX\_ER is asserted during RX\_DV assertion. This combination can even occur when an invalid ESD occurs.  
The code violation coverage therefore extends to include the ESD itself.

**Solution:** Extend code violation coverage range to include ESD.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment KTW-110**

Section 14.1    Line    23            Severity A/C    Type ED            Status MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☒            Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** The paragraph in lines 23 through 26 is poorly worded. Also, there is not enough space between this paragraph and the preceeding table.

**Solution:** I suggest lines 23 through 26 be changed to the following.

The abort sequence is transmitted by an entity when it prematurely terminates a frame's transmission. The abort sequence may occur anywhere after the SSD and before the ESD in a frame since the error condition causing the abort can occur on any boundary. The abort sequence causes the receiving entity to recognize that the frame being received is not a valid frame.

**Response:** This is getting silly. This paragraph has been re-written on each draft by different commenters. The editor will chose the appropriate words. (Finito).

---

**Comment RJK-06**

Section 14.1    Line    25            Severity DIS    Type TECH            Status MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee ☐    Commenter Agrees? ☒            Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** Line states that "abort sequence may occur anywhere after the SSD and before the ESD". This is rather misleading because the abort sequence actually includes the ESD and IFG.

**Solution:** Reword as "The abort sequence may occur anywhere after the SSD in a frame sequence and replaces the normal End Frame Sequence defined in Figure 14-1."

**Response:** Arrrrghhh. (See KTW-110)

---

**Comment RJK-07**

Section 14.1    Line    27            Severity A/C    Type ED            Status MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee ☒    Commenter Agrees? ☒            Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** I agree with Dave W on this. I still don't think that we should put a few miscellaneous ideas for High Media Rate TKP in the standard without explaining how to use them. Seeing these definitions will just confuse people.

**Solution:** If the idea is to make sure that potential TKP implementers are thinking along the same lines then could we put these in a clearly labelled informative annex instead?

**Response:** This has been raised on every draft, and the committee decision has always been to retain this information. See also KTW-111.

KTW-111 is accepted, which adds words here, to say that TKP is a placeholder. Therefore this comment is modified.

---

**Comment KTW-111**

Section 14.1    Line    31            Severity DIS    Type TECH            Status ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☒    Commenter Agrees? ☐            Editing Complete ☐

**Concern:** Some place it needs to be explained that the Token stuff is a place holder for future standarization.

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** If RJK-07 is accepted, then this is rejected. Otherwise I accept. Since I reject RJK-07, I accept.

---

**Comment KTW-112**

**Section** 14.2    **Line** 57    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** The sentence on line 57 starting with "Then the E bit shall ..." is confusing.

**Solution:** I suggest the following change.  
FROM: Then the E bit shall be transmitted a 1.

TO: When FxASO=1 and a frame is aborted, then the E bit shall be transmitted as a 1.

**Response:** Oh come on guys. Yet another re-write of this paragraph. Editor will chose the words.

---

**Comment KTW-113**

**Section** 14.2    **Line** 80    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Heading should indicate "using TKP Access Protocol"

**Solution:** Do it.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment KTW-105**

**Section** 14.3    **Line** 111    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The word "clause" is wrong.

**Solution:** Change "clause" to "subclause".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment KTW-114**

**Section** 14.3    **Line** 128    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Sentence in lines 128 through 132 is poorly worded.

**Solution:** I suggest the following replacement.

The Remove Alert MAC frame is used by both the Station and C-Port using the TXI Access Protocol and operating at the High Media Rate. The Remove Alert MAC frame indicates to the entity at the other end of the dedicate link that the sender is about to enter the Bypass state. The Remove Alert MAC frame is sent using an assured delivery mechanism in an attempt to ensure that the receiving receives this frame.

**Response:** OK.

---

**Comment KTW-115**

**Section** 14.3    **Line** 145    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** In the table 14-2, the value X'0004' is used to request to Trade-up to 100 Mbit/s. 9.2 and 9.3 use X'0006' as per Ivar's original proposal.

**Solution:** Decide which is right: X'0006' or X'0004'.

**Response:** Text should say ORing rather ANDing.  
Change table text for 4 and 8, to say 100Mbit/s capable and 1000Mbit/s capable.  
Text should allow multiple capabilities to be ORed into the final request value.  
Possibly some words about what the C-Port does with this value, like what 802.5r does.

---

**Comment KTW-106**

**Section** 14.3    **Line** 175    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The word "subsections" is wrong.

**Solution:** Change "subsections" to "subclauses".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment KTW-107**

**Section** 14.3    **Line** 196    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The word "clause" is wrong.

**Solution:** Change "clause" to "subclause".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment KTW-116**

**Section** 14.4    **Line** 217    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** Title of 14.4.1.1 is incorrect.

**Solution:** In line 217, change "Media Rate" to "Speed".

**Response:** No. "High Speed" is not a recognised term. If anything change the timer acronym to be TSHMRW. Also see KTW-118.

Change to be  
"Timer, Station High Media Rate Wait (TSHMRW)"

---

**Comment SJH-28**

**Section** 14.4    **Line** 219    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The value of TSHSW needs to be defined. It will depend on how HS tradeup is finally implemented (eg whether management gets involved in the tradeup decision).

**Solution:** Obtain value through committee discussion.

**Response:** See NAJ-62.

---

**Comment NAJ-62**

**Section** 14.4    **Line** 219    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** ???ms is unacceptable.

**Solution:** Calculate the values required.

**Response:** This timer allows management to bring down the 4/16 PHYs, switch to 100 PHY, reset and bring up the 100 Mbit/s link, and wait for link status. This contains many implementation dependant details, which are beyond the scope of this standard. Therefore make the timer large(-ish)...

Define timers (Station and C-Port) as having a minimum of 8.5s, and a maximum of 10s. No recommended value.

Also Neil, make sure that you add the C-Port TPHMRW timer, which you forgot...

---

**Comment BBT-08**

**Section** 14.4    **Line** 219    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Timer value need to be defined.

**Solution:** The value of this timer should be the same as the value of the initialize timer (BBT-06)

**Response:** See NAJ-62

---

**Comment KTW-117**

**Section** 14.4    **Line** 243    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The name and abbreviation of the timer is incorrect.

**Solution:** 1. Change line 243 "(TPPL)" to "Detect (TPPLD)".  
2. Change lines 244 and 246 "TPPL" to "TPPLD".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment NAJ-63**

**Section** 14.5    **Line** 267    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Wrong acronymn for flag.

**Solution:** Should be FSTUO.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment KTW-118**

**Section** 14.5    **Line** 267    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** The name and abbreviation of the timer is incorrect.

**Solution:** Change line 267 as follows.

1. Delete "High Media Rate".
2. Change "(FSHSO)" to "(FSTUO)".

**Response:** Comment is not consistent with KTW-116.  
Do you want "speed" in the title. (Which I reject).  
Or do you accept a change to the acronym?

Change acronym.

---

**Comment KTW-119**

**Section** 14.5    **Line** 281    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Table 14-10 is incorrect. FSMRO can not set to a value of >1 or <2. These are testing values, not acutal values.

I have explained the meaning of these testing values in 9.

**Solution:** Delete the rows containing FSMRO>1 and FSMRO<2.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment KTW-120**

**Section** 14.5    **Line** 285    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** SPV(AP\_MASK) value X'0004' disagrees with 9.2 and 9.3. See item KTW-115.

**Solution:** Discussion required.

**Response:** This table should show values, not bitmasks that can be ORed to generate values.  
Fix the SPV(AP\_MASK) and PPV(AP\_MASK).

---

**Comment KTW-121**

**Section** 14.5    **Line** 285    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The explanation of SPV(MAX\_TX) is poorly worded.

**Solution:** Change "including SSD, ESD and IFG as defined in" to:  
"including the SSD, ESD and IFG defined in".

**Response:** Exactly equivalent words.

---

**Comment KTW-108**

**Section** 14.5    **Line** 287    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The word "subsections" is wrong.

**Solution:** Change "subsections" to "subclauses".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-109

**Section** 14.5    **Line** 301    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The word "clause" is wrong.

**Solution:** Change "clause" to "subclause".

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-122

**Section** 14.5    **Line** 321    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Table 14-12 is incorrect. FPMRO can not set to a value of >1 or <2. These are testing values, not acutal values.

I have explained the meaning of these testing values in 9.

**Solution:** Delete the rows containing FPMRO>1 and FPMRO<2.

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** KTW-123

**Section** 14.5    **Line** 324    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Need a definition of the C-Port's Trade-up Option flag.

**Solution:** Add the following after line 324.

14.5.2.1.5 Flag, C-Port Trade-up Option (FPTUO)

When this flag is set to 1 the C-Port positively responds to the Station's request to Trade-up (AP\_RSP=0004). If this flag is set to 0, the C-Port responds to the Station that it must remain at it designated speed (AP\_RSP=0002).

**Response:** Do it.

---

**Comment** NAJ-64

**Section** 14.5    **Line** 325    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

**Concern:** Missing FPTUO option flag description.

**Solution:** Add it.

**Response:** See KTW-123.

---

**Comment** KTW-124

**Section** 14.5    **Line** 328    **Severity** DIS    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** PPV(AP\_MASK) value X'0004' disagrees with 9.2 and 9.3. See item KTW-115.

**Solution:** Discussion required.

**Response:** See KTW-120.

---

**Comment MJH-01**

**Section** A.0    **Line** 1        **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED        **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:**    Following Station Policy Flags should be added to Annex A :-  
                 FSANO, FSASO, FSLMTO

**Solution:**

**Response:** Neil will add a new Annex A.

---

**Comment SJH-29**

**Section** L.0    **Line** 19        **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED        **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:**    HS Tradeup states (SHSTU) and transitions missing from diagram.

**Solution:**    Add them.

**Response:**

---

**Comment SJH-30**

**Section** M.0    **Line** 23        **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED        **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:**    State PHSTU and associated transitions are missing.

**Solution:**    Add them.

**Response:**

---

**Comment JLM-15**

**Section** T.2    **Line** 177        **Severity** DIS    **Type** ED        **Status** REJECTED

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

**Concern:**    Rather than replacing the entire definition of PM\_CONTROL.request (thus incorrectly repeating text elsewhere), it would be better to just list the primitive name and the new parameter.

**Solution:**    Add at end of line 182: "This primitive is in addition to those specified in 9.7.1.2."

Replace lines 183 through 193 with:

"PM\_CONTROL.request [ PMC\_Mode (??ref??) ]"

The current text refers to 9.7.3 which is wrong, but I can't find a definition of the provision of PMC\_mode. Perhaps this needs adding.

**Response:** Beyond the scope of our PAR to fix base standard issues.

---

**Comment JLM-16**

**Section** T.3    **Line** 201        **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED        **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:**    Erroneous space before colon.

**Solution:**    Remove.

**Response:**

---

**Comment JLM-17**

**Section** T.3    **Line** 204    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** Could be better put.

**Solution:** Change "This annex recommends" to "It is recommended".

**Response:**

---

**Comment RDL-03**

**Section** U.0    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** A statement is required indicating that this is a new Annex

**Solution:** Add the words "Add Annex U" before the head title: "Annex U"

**Response:** Done. Also, change marks removed.

---

**Comment NAJ-65**

**Section** U.0    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Word has really gone to task with the formatting in this annex.

**Solution:** Fix the item list numbering format.

**Response:** Fixed.

---

**Comment SJH-31**

**Section** U.1    **Line** 21    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Point number doesn't increment. Strange square box has appeared after digit.

**Solution:** Change to 2).  
See also 26, 31, 34 (more boxes).

**Response:** Scary stuff.  
Opened, investigated and closed X-file on this.  
Fixed.

---

**Comment NAJ-66**

**Section** U.2    **Line** 27    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** The footnote talks about the VWXYZ value in 9.8. This must be determined before the standard can be published.

**Solution:** Get the value from Bob.

**Response:** See KTW-96.

---

**Comment NAJ-67**

**Section** V.0    **Line** 20    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Powers could use superscript font.

**Solution:** Fix it.

**Response:** Done

---

**Comment NAJ-69**

**Section** W.0    **Line** 1    **Severity** Q    **Type** TECH    **Status** ANSWERED

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

**Concern:** Should 100Base-TX used in this annex be 100Base-X?

**Solution:**

**Response:** Yes

---

**Comment RDL-04**

**Section** W.0    **Line** 1    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** A statement is required indicating that this is a new Annex

**Solution:** Add the words "Add Annex W" before the head title: "Annex W"

**Response:** Done

---

**Comment JLM-18**

**Section** W.0    **Line** 4    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** I don't feel that this paragraph fully conveys the purpose of the annex.

**Solution:** Replace lines 4 to 6 with:

"This annex lists the functionality and interfaces required of a physical medium device in order to be able to support dedicated token ring operation at 100Mbit/s in accordance with this specification. Some such devices present an interface which is a variation of the media independent interface defined in ISO/IEC 8802-3:1996 (for example, the RMII), and in such cases, some functionality required for token ring may not be present or may be modified. Some known variations are described in terms of their suitability for use with this specification."

**Response:** Changed to:

"This annex lists the functionality and interfaces required of a PHY device in order to be able to support 100Mbit/s Token Ring in accordance with this supplement. Some such devices present an interface which is a variation of the media independent interface defined in ISO/IEC 8802-3:1996, and in such cases, some functionality required for token ring may not be present or may be modified. Some known variations are described in terms of their suitability for use with this supplement."

My modifications:

- we are allowing for future use in shared media
- term is supplement not specification if you are referring to 802.5t
- Previous consensus was not to use RMII term or any other term for different interfaces.

---

**Comment SJH-32**

**Section** W.0    **Line** 6    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Bad English: "implementation"

**Solution:** Change to "implementations"

**Response:** See KR-06

---

**Comment JLM-23**

**Section** W.0    **Line** 7    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** This annex and annex X use the format "W1.2" for clause numbering, which is wrong.

**Solution:** Change clause numbering to include a decimal point after the annex letter; for example "W.1.2".

**Response:** Done.

---

**Comment NAJ-68**

**Section** W.0    **Line** 22    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** 100Mb/s is written 100Mbit/s

Do a search in this annex, as there are a few.

**Solution:** Fix them.

**Response:** Will be changed to 100 Mbit/s.

---

**Comment SJH-34**

**Section** W.1    **Line** 20    **Severity** A/C    **Type** TECH    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** I am still not happy with the wording and emphasis of this annex. We don't want to talk too much about what may be happening in 100Base-Tx, nor do we unduly want to constrain implementations. It should be sufficient to indicate the signalling systems 100 Mbit/s token ring requires without constraining the implementation of these signals.

I don't think that we should divide the signals up into "likely to be significantly modified" and "likely to be present". It should be sufficient just to list the signals required by 100M Token Ring.

**Solution:** e.g. TX\_ER paragraph (line 20)  
"Unlike most 100Base-Tx implementations, this signal is required for support of 100 Mbit/s token ring implementations. If the TX\_ER pin is no longer available, a signalling mechanism must remain for real time insertion of the /H symbol into the bit stream."

**Response:** Worked with Simon to come up with wording that better conveys the emphasis of the annex.

---

**Comment SJH-33**

**Section** W.1    **Line** 20    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Inappropriate colloquialism "called out".

**Solution:** Change to "present" or "designated".

**Response:** done.

---

**Comment JLM-20**

**Section** W.2    **Line** 39    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** We don't use Mb/s.

**Solution:** Change to Mbit/s.

**Response:** see NAJ-68

---

**Comment JLM-21**

**Section** W.2    **Line** 40    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** Word missing.

**Solution:** Change "and transfer all data" to "and must transfer all data".

**Response:** done.

---

**Comment JLM-22**

**Section** W.2    **Line** 47    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** ISO/IEC 8802-3 doesn't define such a value (for token ring operation at 100Mbit/s).

**Solution:** Change "value defined by" to "value to be defined by"??

**Response:** See KTW-96 for solution.

Will add to W.2.3: " Auto-negotiation is optional for 100Mbit/s Token Ring, but if it is used then it must be possible to change the actual advertised selector value. This selector value is defined in Annex Y of this suppliment."

---

**Comment KR-06**

**Section** W1.0    **Line** 6    **Severity** A/C    **Type** ED    **Status** ACCEPTED

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

**Concern:** "implementation" bad grammer

**Solution:** change to "implementations"

**Response:** Done

---

**Comment** KTW-125

**Section** W2.2   **Line** 44   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** MODIFIED

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

**Concern:** The words in line 44 are misleading.

**Solution:** Change "is programmable but this is not true." to:  
"is programmable, but in many implementations this  
is not true.".

**Response:** Modification as per SJH-34 are acceptable.

---

**Comment** RDL-05

**Section** X.0   **Line** 1   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** A statement is required indicating that this is a new Annex

**Solution:** Add the words "Add Annex W" before the head title: "Annex W"

**Response:**

---

**Comment** JLM-24

**Section** X.0   **Line** 4   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** This annex and annex W use the format "W1.2" for clause numbering, which is wrong.

**Solution:** Change clause numbering to include a decimal point after the annex letter; for  
example "W.1.2".

**Response:**

---

**Comment** JLM-25

**Section** X.1   **Line** 27   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** It's not the average time to receive a frame, but to receive the TEST MAC frame,  
which matters.

**Solution:** Change this sentence to "The average time it takes a Station to receive a TEST MAC  
frame and check that it is valid."

**Response:**

---

**Comment** KTW-126

**Section** X1.0   **Line** 7   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** OPEN

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

**Concern:** I suggest a minor clarification to figure X-1.

**Solution:** Between "success 1" and "success n7-1" put the characters:

" + . . . + " .

**Response:**

Comment

KTW-127

Section

X1.0

Line

23

Severity

A/C

Type

ED

Status

OPEN

Highlight To Committee

☐

Commenter Agrees?

☐

Editing Complete

☐

Concern:

Lines 23 through 30 could be made easier to read.

Solution:

I suggest adding space before and after each definition.  
(e.g., between lines 23 and 24, 25 and 26, an so on).

Response:



Comment Summary

Total Comments:: 321