| | **1** | JLM 3 | **Sect /Line** 02.6 | 83 | **Sev:** DIS | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

The agreed text for 2.6.2.3 was omitted.

Solution:

2.6.2.3 Cut-through Operation

The interface between a C-Port and a DTU may support the transfer of frame data before the actual frame length is known.

A DTU may use this facility to support cut-through operation, in which the DTU, receiving a frame, signals that frame for transmission before the frame has been fully received. The notation "FR_LTH=UNK" is used to represent the fact that the frame length is not known.

| | **2** | RDL 1 | **Sect /Line** 02.6 | 83 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Lines of Text were left out of Draft 6, following line 83 in Clause 2, please insert the following text.

Solution:

Please add, :

83.1 2.6.2.3 Cut-through Operation

83.2 The interface between a C-Port and DTU may support the transfer of frame

83.3 data before the actual frame length is known.

83.4

83.5 A DTU may use this facility to support cut-through operation, in which

83.6 the DTU, receiving a frame, signals that frame for transmission before

83.7 the frame has been fully received. The notation "FR_LTH=UNK" is used

83.8 to represent the fact that the frame length is not known.

| | **3** | KTW 20 | **Sect /Line** 09.1 | 405 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 405, page 9.1-12: Delete this line since this was an editior's comment.

Solution:

Delete line 405 on page 9.1-12.

| | **4** | RDL 2 | **Sect /Line** 09.1 | 405 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

An editors note was inadvertantly left in Draft 6 at line 405

Solution:

Please delete line 405

| | **5** | KTW 21 | **Sect /Line** 09.1 | 540 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 540, page 9.1-16: Delete this Editor's comment.

Solution:

Delete line 540 page 9.1-16.

| | **6** | RDL 3 | **Sect /Line** 09.1 | 540 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Editors instructions were left in the text, and their intent was not fully carried out in Draft 6.

Solution:

On page 9.1-16, please delete lines 540 and 549. In addition, please indicate lines 550 - 560 as deleted text, i.e. with the text crossed out, but the lines remaining in the document.

| ☐ | **7** | KTW 22 | **Sect /Line** 09.1 | 549 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Lines 549 through 560, pages 9.1-16 and 9.1-17: The text in lines 541 through 548 was accepted during the October 802.5 Interim meeting. Delete the Editor's comment and two paragraphs following.

Solution:

Delete lines 549 through 560 on pages 9.1-16 and 9.1-17.

| ☐ | **8** | KTW 1 | **Sect /Line** 09.2 | 395 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 395, Page 9.2-14: The comment in the action column of REF 3105 (FR_REG_RSP ..) which is conditioned by FIPTXIS=0 (DTR Station) states "exit to 4.3" should have been changed to "exit to 9.6" when 9.6 was generated for the DTR Station using the TKP Access Protocol.

Solution:

Change the action column of REF 3105
FROM: ".. exit to 4.3."
TO: ".. exit to 9.6."

| ☐ | **9** | KTW 59 | **Sect /Line** 09.2 | 397 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

Line 397 page 9.2-18: REF 3121 (DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication ...) is incorrect. As part of an agreement during the Andover meeting, the event
DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(condition) was changed to
DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(condition). This one was missed.

Solution:

Change line 397, REF 3121 as follows.

FROM:
  "DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(Fail) ..."
TO:
  "DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(Fail) ..."

| ☐ | **10** | KTW 71 | **Sect /Line** 09.2 | 397 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 397 page 9.2-18: REF 3210 (PDU_QUEUED & ...) explanation words incorrectly indicate that FPOP=1 is a requirement (FSOP=1 is the requirement).

Solution:

Change comment in REF 3210 on page 9.2-18 as follows.

FROM:
  ".. when FPOP=1 >>"
TO:
  ".. when FSOP=1. >>"

| ☐ | **11** | KTW 60 | **Sect /Line** 09.2 | 405 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

Line 405 page 9.2-22: REF 3513 (DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication ...) is incorrect. As part of an agreement during the Andover meeting, the event
DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(condition) was changed to
DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(condition). This one was missed.

Solution:

Change line 405, REF 3513 as follows.

FROM:
  "DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(Fail) ..."
TO:
  "DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(Fail) ..."

| ☐ | **12** | KTW 61 | **Sect /Line** 09.2 | 405 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

Line 405 page 9.2-22: REF 3516 (DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication ...) is incorrect. As part of an agreement during the Andover meeting, the event
DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(condition) was changed to
DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(condition). This one was missed.

Solution:

Change line 405, REF 3516 as follows.

FROM:
  "DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(Fail) ..."
TO:
  "DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(Fail) ..."

| ☐ | **13** | KTW 62 | **Sect /Line** 09.2 | 405 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

Line 405 page 9.2-22: REF 3512 (DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication ...) is incorrect. As part of an agreement during the Andover meeting, the event
DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(condition) was changed to
DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(condition). This one was missed.

Solution:

Change line 405, REF 3512 as follows.

FROM:
  "DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(OK) ..."
TO:
  "DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(OK) ..."

| ☐ | **14** | DWW 1 | **Sect /Line** 09.2 | 407 | **Sev:** | **Type:** |

Concern:

P 25, Reference 3610 - the action should be marked optional-x for consistency
with 802.5s

Solution:

| ☐ | **15** | DWW 2 | **Sect /Line** 09.2 | 407 | **Sev:** DIS | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

P 25, Ref: 3630 - the action should not contain the optional-x statement. The
definition of CORR=UNK_VALUE states that the corellator may be omitted as
it is unknown. The transition is no different from 3601, 3604, ... where
the correlator is also unknown - it is inconsistent to mark one of these
as optional-x and not the others.

Solution:

| ☑ | **16** | JLM 4 | **Sect /Line** 09.2 | 409 | **Sev:** DIS | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

CORR=UNK_VALUE transitions, e.g. 3601

There has been email discussion of these transitions. There is agreement that transmission of frames with correlators not
based on received correlator values is to be discouraged. This requires a notation to discourage their use.

Solution:

I favour marking transitions which send bad correlators as optional-x. This represents quite some work for the editors. It
also applies to 802.5s.

| ☐ | **17** | KTW 63 | **Sect /Line** 09.2 | 417 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 417 page 9.2-28: Definition of DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(Status_Code) is missing. Use 9.3 definition of
this event.

Solution:

Add the following definition after "DTU_UNITDATA.request" on page 9.2-28.

Event column:
  DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(Status_Code)
Meaning column:
  Frame status is reported by the DTU to the PMAC. The Status_Code may be one of the
  following.
  1. OK: The frame has been successfully transferred to the PMAC without error.
  2. Fail: Transfer of the frame to the PMAC has failed due to a frame error.

| ☐ | **18** | KTW 68 | **Sect /Line** 09.2 | 425 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 425 on page 9.2-31: The definition of DTU-UNITDATA.indication() needs to be made clearer. Refer to Ballot
Comments KTW69 and KTW70. These Ballot comments should cause the definition of DTU-UNITDATA-
STATUS.indication(Status_Code) to be the same across 9.2 through 9.5 (see KTW72 for change to 9.3).

Solution:

Change the definition of "DTU-UNITDATA.indication()" on page 9.2-31 to the following.

Action column:
  DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(Status_Code)
Meaning column:
  Frame status is indicated by the PMAC to the DTU. Status_Code may be one of
  the following.
  1. OK: The frame has been successfully transferred to the DTU without error.
  2. Fail: Transfer of the frame to the DTU has failed due to a frame error.

| ☐ | **19** | DWW 3 | **Sect /Line** 09.3 | 342 | **Sev:** DIS | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

p-26 Ref: 2011 - the action should not contain the optional-x statement. The definition of CORR=UNK_VALUE states that the corellator may be omitted as it is unknown. The transition is no different from 3601, 3604, ... where the correlator is also unknown - it is inconsistent to mark one of these as optional-x and not the others.

Solution:

| ☐ | **20** | KTW 72 | **Sect /Line** 09.3 | 361 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 361 on page 9.3-32: The definition of DTU-UNITDATA.indication() needs to be changed to agree with changes to 9.2, 9.4 and 9.5 by Ballot Comments KTW68, KTW69 and KTW70. These Ballot Comments cause the definition of DTU-UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(Status_Code) to be the same across 9.2 through 9.5.

Solution:

Change the definition of "DTU-UNITDATA-STATUS.indication()" on page 9.3-32 to the following.

Action column:
 DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(Status_Code)
Meaning column:
 Frame status is indicated by the PMAC to the DTU. Status_Code may be one of the following.
 1. OK: The frame has been successfully transferred to the DTU without error.
 2. Fail: Transfer of the frame to the DTU has failed due to a frame error.

| ☐ | **21** | RDL 4 | **Sect /Line** 09.3 | 361 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

On page 9.3-33, a change to D5 was made incorrectly.

Solution:

On page 9.3-33, five boxes from the bottom of the page, please change "it's" to "sets its".

| ☐ | **22** | KTW 2 | **Sect /Line** 09.4 | 210 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 210, Page 9.4-10: The S/T entry for REF 4201 is incorrect as required by Ballot Comment KTW16 which calls for the update of annex N.

Solution:

Change the S/T entry for REF 4201as follows.
FROM: T10D
TO: T10G.

| ☐ | **23** | KTW 3 | **Sect /Line** 09.4 | 210 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 210, Page 9.4-13: The S/T entry for REF 4209 is incorrect as required by Ballot Comment KTW16 which calls for the update of annex N.

Solution:

On 9.4, line 210, Page 13 change the S/T entry for REF 4209 as follows.
FROM: T01A
TO: T01C.

| ☐ | **24** | KTW 32 | **Sect /Line** 09.4 | 210 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 210 on page 9.4-11: REF 4213 (PORT_ERR(correctable) ...) is missing a closing parenthesis.

Solution:

Change line 210 on page 9.4-11, REF 4213 as follows.

FROM: "PORT_ERR(correctable & ..."
TO: "PORT_ERR(correctable) & ..."

| ☐ | **25** | KTW 23 | **Sect /Line** 09.4 | 212 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 212 page 9.4-18: REF 282 (TID=E & ...) has an incorrect S/T entry. Change REF 282 S/T of M52B to agree with the Action/Output column of M52A (has the same action of, for example, REF 212 (FSL=1 ...) on page 9.4-17.

Solution:

Change line 212 page 9.4-18 REF 282 (TID=E & ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: M52B
TO: M52A

| ☐ | **26** | DWW 4 | **Sect /Line** 09.4 | 220 | **Sev:** DIS | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

 p-24,   Ref: 141 - the action should not contain the optional-x statement. The
definition of CORR=UNK_VALUE states that the corellator may be omitted as
it is unknown. The transition is no different from 3601, 3604, ... where
the correlator is also unknown - it is inconsistent to mark one of these
as optional-x and not the others.

Solution:

| ☐ | **27** | KTW 64 | **Sect /Line** 09.4 | 232 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 232 page 9.4-27: Definition of DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(Status_Code) is missing. Use 9.3 definition of this event. This item relates to KTW65.

Solution:

Add the following definition after "DTU_UNITDATA.request" on page 9.4-27.

Event column:
 DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(Status_Code)
Meaning column:
 Frame status is reported by the DTU to the PMAC. The Status_Code may be one of the
 following.
 1. OK: The frame has been successfully transferred to the PMAC without error.
 2. Fail: Transfer of the frame to the PMAC has failed due to a frame error.

| ☐ | **28** | KTW 65 | **Sect /Line** 09.4 | 232 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 232 page 9.4-27: Definition of DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication() is no longer used. This item relates to KTW64.

Solution:

Delete DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication() event and its definition from the table on page 9.4-27.

| ☐ | **29** | KTW 66 | **Sect /Line** 09.4 | 232 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 228 page 9.5-33: Definition of DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(Status_Code) is missing. Use 9.3 definition of this event. This item relates to KTW67.

Solution:

Add the following definition after "DTU_UNITDATA.request" on page 9.5-33.

Event column:
 DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.request(Status_Code)
Meaning column:
 Frame status is reported by the DTU to the PMAC. The Status_Code may be one of the
 following.
 1. OK: The frame has been successfully transferred to the PMAC without error.
 2. Fail: Transfer of the frame to the PMAC has failed due to a frame error.

| ☐ | **30** | KTW 67 | **Sect /Line** 09.4 | 232 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 228 page 9.5-33: Definition of DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication() is no longer used. This item relates to KTW66.

Solution:

Delete DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication() event and its definition from the table on page
9.5-33.

| ☐ | **31** | KTW 69 | **Sect /Line** 09.4 | 240 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 240 on page 9.4-33: The definition of DTU-UNITDATA.indication() needs to be made clearer. Refer to Ballot Comments KTW68 and KTW70. These Ballot comments should cause the definition of DTU-UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(Status_Code) to be the same across 9.2 through 9.5 (see KTW72 for change to 9.3).

Solution:

Change the definition of "DTU-UNITDATA.indication()" on page 9.4-33 to the following.

Action column:
 DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(Status_Code)
Meaning column:
 Frame status is indicated by the PMAC to the DTU. Status_Code may be one of
 the following.
 1. OK: The frame has been successfully transferred to the DTU without error.
 2. Fail: Transfer of the frame to the DTU has failed due to a frame error.

| ☐ | **32** | KTW 4 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 188 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 188, page 9.5-11: The reference "3120" is incorrect and is not in the table. It should be3159 which is in the table and is equal to the event described.

Solution:

Change line 188, page 11, from: ".. 3120 .." to: ".. 3159 .."

| ☐ | **33** | KTW 5 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 191 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 191, page 9.5-11: The condition, as stated is correct, but the REF 3105 is incorrect. Correct REF is 3158 (see page 9.2-14).

Solution:

Change Line 191, page 9.5-11 as follows.

FROM:

".. (REF) 3105 .."

TO:

".. (REF) 3158 .."

| ☐ | **34** | KTW 51 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 on page 9.5-14: REF 285 (TJR=E ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 196 on page 9.5-14 REF 285 (TJR=E ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| ☐ | **35** | KTW 45 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 on page 9.5-11: REF 258 (FBPF=1 ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 196 on page 9.5-11 REF 258 (FBPF=1 ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| ☐ | **36** | KTW 46 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 on page 9.5-12: REF 070 (FR_BN ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 196 on page 9.5-12 REF 070 (FR_BN ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| ☐ | **37** | KTW 47 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 on page 9.5-12: REF 160 (FR_REMOVE ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 196 on page 9.5-12 REF 160 (FR_REMOVE ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| | **38** | KTW 48 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 on page 9.5-13: REF 211 (FSL=1 ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 196 on page 9.5-13 REF 211 (FSL=1 ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| | **39** | KTW 49 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 on page 9.5-13: REF 268 (TCT=E ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 196 on page 9.5-13 REF 268 (TCT=E ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| | **40** | KTW 50 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 on page 9.5-13: REF 270 (TCT=E ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 196 on page 9.5-13 REF 270 (TCT=E ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| | **41** | KTW 52 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 on page 9.5-14: REF 320 (TRP=E ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 196 on page 9.5-14 REF 320 (TRP=E ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| | **42** | KTW 53 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 on page 9.5-15: REF 371 (TWF=E ...) has had its S/T notation assigned by 802.5s and the action entry "FNC=0" should be optional due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

1. Change line 196 on page 9.5-15 REF 371 (TWF=E ...) S/T entry as follows.

   FROM: "J58?"
   TO: "J58B"

2. Change line 196 on page 9.5-15 REF 371 (TWF=E ...) action column as follows.
   FROM: JS=BPW; FNC
   TO: JS=BPW; [FNC (optional)]

| | **43** | KTW 54 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 on page 9.5-13: REF 228 (INTERNAL_ERR ...) has had its S/T notation changed due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 196 on page 9.5-13 REF 228 (INTERNAL_ERR ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| | **44** | KTW 13 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196, page 9.5-13: Table is out of sort (e.g., "FSL=1" is before "FR_REG_QRY".

Solution:

Sort table 9.5-1 on pages 9.5-11 through 9.5-15.

| | **45** | KTW 44 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 on page 9.5-11: REF 5105 (Disconnect.PMAC ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 196 on page 9.5-11 REF 5105 (Disconnect.PMAC ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| | **46** | KTW 6 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196, page 9.5-11: Reference 1002 was inadvertenly deleted from an earlier Draft and should be supplied so it is clear, from within the 9.5 Port Operation Table, that this condition causes this Port Operation Table to be activated.

Solution:

9.5, line 196, page 11: Add the following just before REF 5101(first entry in table).

S/T: J01
REF: 1002
Event: Connect.PMAC & FPOTO=0 & FSREGO=0 & JS=BP
          << This is one of the starting points
            for this Join Port Operation Table. >>
          << This transition is executed by 9.3 and
            is shown for reference only >>
Action: JS=LT; Set_initial_conditions; FTI=x; FTXC=1;
          FIPTKPS=1; TEST;[TLMTR=R (Optional-i)]
            << This is a starting point for the C-Port
              in Station Emulation Mode using the TKP
              Access Protocol. >>

| ☐ | **47** | KTW 15 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 196 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 196 page 9.5-13. The starting point of the Join machine is missing for the case of clause 9.2 when supporting the C-Port in Station Emulation Mode (FIPTXIS=1) and AND(SPV(AP_MASK),0001)=0001 (REF 3158 on page 9.2-14). This item relates to Ballot Comment KTW5. The location of this item will be between 6005 and 156 as the result of the sort required by Ballot Comment KTW13.

Solution:

Line 196 page 9.5-13: Add after REF 6005 on page 9.5-13 the REF 3158 as follows.

```
S/T:    JA1B
REF:    3158
Event:  FR_REG_RSP(AP_RSP=0000) & FSRDO=0 & FIPTXIS=1 &
        AND(SPV(AP_MASK),0001)=0001 & JS=SREG
            << This is one of the starting points for this
                Join Port Operation Table. >>
            << This transition is executed by 9.2 and is
                shown for reference only >>
Action: JS=LT; FSTXC=FSTI=0; FTI=x;FIPTXIS=0; FIPTKPS=1;
        Set_initial_conditions; TEST
            << The C-Port in Station Emulation Mode starts
                the TKP Access Protocol. >>
```

| ☐ | **48** | KTW 9 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 200 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 200, Page 9.5-19: The S/T entry for REF 5210 is incorrect. It should be T01C as required by Ballot Comment KTW18 which calls for annex R to be updated.

Solution:

9.5, line 200, Page 19: Change the S/T entry for REF 5210 from: "T01A" to: "T01C".

| ☐ | **49** | KTW 8 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 200 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 200, Page 9.5-16: The S/T entry for REF 5206 is incorrect. It should be T10F as required by Ballot Comment KTW18 which calls for annex R to be updated.

Solution:

9.5, line 200, Page 16: Change the S/T entry for REF 5206 from: "T10E" to: "T10F"

| ☐ | **50** | KTW 7 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 200 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 200, Page 9.5-16: The S/T entry for REF 5201 is incorrect. It should be T10G as required by Ballot Comment KTW18 which calls for annex R to be updated.

Solution:

9.5, line 200, Page 16: Change the S/T entry for REF 5201 from: "T10D" to: "T10G".

| ☐ | **51** | KTW 56 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 203 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 203 on page 9.5-20: REF 003 is incorrect because this "C-Port in Station Emulation Mode" event should be conditioned by FIPTKPS=1. This item relates to Ballot Comment KTW57 which moves REF 003 to annex S.

Solution:

Change line 203 on page 9.5-20 REF 003 to the following.

S/T: M54
REF: 5305
Event: CBR=0 & MS=RBN & FBR=0 & FIPTKPS=1
        < Replaces REF 003 in
          ISO/IEC 8802-5:1995 >
Action: MS=BNT; FBR=FTW=1

| ☐ | **52** | DWW 5 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 214 | **Sev:** DIS | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

 p-30, Ref: 141 - the action should not contain the optional-x statement. The
definition of CORR=UNK_VALUE states that the corellator may be omitted as
it is unknown. The transition is no different from 3601, 3604, ... where
the correlator is also unknown - it is inconsistent to mark one of these
as optional-x and not the others.

Solution:

| ☐ | **53** | KTW 70 | **Sect /Line** 09.5 | 238 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 238 on page 9.5-39: The definition of DTU-UNITDATA.indication() needs to be made clearer. Refer to Ballot Comments KTW68 and KTW69. These Ballot comments should cause the definition of DTU-UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(Status_Code) to be the same across 9.2 through 9.5 (see KTW72 for change to 9.3).

Solution:

Change the definition of "DTU-UNITDATA.indication()" on page 9.5-39 to the following.

Action column:
 DTU_UNITDATA-STATUS.indication(Status_Code)
Meaning column:
 Frame status is indicated by the PMAC to the DTU. Status_Code may be one of
 the following.
 1. OK: The frame has been successfully transferred to the DTU without error.
 2. Fail: Transfer of the frame to the DTU has failed due to a frame error.

| ☐ | **54** | KTW 36 | **Sect /Line** 09.6 | 103 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-7: REF 160 (FR_REMOVE ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 103 on page 9.6-7 REF 160 (FR_REMOVE ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| ☐ | **55** | KTW 43 | **Sect /Line** 09.6 | 103 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-9: REF 371 (TWF=E ...) has had its S/T notation assigned due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 103 on page 9.6-9 REF 371 (TWF=E ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58?"
TO: "J58B"

| ☐ | **56** | KTW 42 | **Sect /Line** 09.6 | 103 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-9: REF 6007 (TSRW=E ...) has an incorrect action field because it ends with an semicolon (;).

Solution:

Correct line 103 on page 9.6-9 REF 6007 (TSRW=E ...) by removing the ending semicolon (;) in the action column.

| ☐ | **57** | KTW 41 | **Sect /Line** 09.6 | 103 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-9: REF 320 (TRP=E ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 103 on page 9.6-9 REF 320 (TRP=E ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| ☐ | **58** | KTW 40 | **Sect /Line** 09.6 | 103 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-8: REF 285 (TJR=E ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 103 on page 9.6-8 REF 285 (TJR=E ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| ☐ | **59** | KTW 39 | **Sect /Line** 09.6 | 103 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-8: REF 270 (TCT=E ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 103 on page 9.6-8 REF 270 (TCT=E ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

| ☐ | **60** | KTW 37 | **Sect /Line** 09.6 | 103 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-8: REF 211 (FSL=1 ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 103 on page 9.6-8 REF 211 (FSL=1 ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

☐ **61** KTW 55 **Sect /Line** 09.6 103 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-8: REF 228 (INTERNAL_ERR ...) has had its S/T notation changed due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 103 on page 9.6-8 REF 228 (INTERNAL_ERR ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

☐ **62** KTW 35 **Sect /Line** 09.6 103 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-6: REF 070 (FR_BN ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 103 on page 9.6-6 REF 070 (FR_BN ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

☐ **63** KTW 34 **Sect /Line** 09.6 103 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-6: REF 258 (FBPF=1 ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 103 on page 9.6-6 REF 258 (FBPF=1 ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

☐ **64** KTW 33 **Sect /Line** 09.6 103 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-6: REF 011 (Disconnect.MAC ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 103 on page 9.6-6 REF 011 (Disconnect.MAC ...) S/T entry as follows.

FROM: "J58"
TO: "J58A"

☐ **65** KTW 14 **Sect /Line** 09.6 103 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:

Line 103, page 9.6-6: Change the comment in the event/condition as the result of KTW10 and add a comment to the action/output.

Solution:

Change REF 006 on page 9.6-6 to the following.

S/T: J01
REF: 006
Event: Connect.MAC & JS=BP
        << This is one of the starting points for this
           Join Station Operation Table. >>
Action: JS=LT; Set_initial_conditions; FTI=x; TEST; FTXC=x
        << This is a starting point for the DTR Station
           when using the TKP Access Protocol. >>

| ☐ | **66** | KTW 10 | **Sect /Line** 09.6 | 103 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 103, page 9.6-7: Reference 3105 is missing between REFs 6005 and 156. This reference should have been added when 9.6 was generated for the DTR Station using the TKP Access Protocol.

Solution:

9.6, line 103, page 7: Add the following reference between REFs 6005 and 156.

```
S/T: JA1A
REF: 3105
Event: FR_REG_RSP(AP_RSP=0000) & FSRDO=0 & FIPTXIS=0 &
        AND(SPV(AP_MASK),0001)=0001 & JS=SREG
        << This is one of the starting points for this
            Join Station Operation Table. >>
        << This transition is executed by 9.2 and is
            shown for reference only >>
Action: JS=LT; FSTXC=FSTI=0; FTI=x;Set_initial_conditions;
        TEST
        << This is a starting point for the DTR Station
          when using the TKP Access Protocol. >>
```

| ☐ | **67** | KTW 38 | **Sect /Line** 09.6 | 103 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 103 on page 9.6-8: REF 268 (TCT=E ...) has had a change it its S/T notation due to a change in 802.5s.

Solution:

Change line 103 on page 9.6-8 REF 268 (TCT=E ...) S/T entry as follows.

```
FROM: "J58"
TO:   "J58A"
```

| ☐ | **68** | KTW 11 | **Sect /Line** 09.6 | 115 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 115, Page 9.6-21: REF 037 event/condition is missing "TS=RPT" which was added by 802.5s.

Solution:

9.6, line 115, Page 21: Change REF 037 as follows.

```
FROM:
S/T:   blank
REF:   037
Event: FR(RI_NOT_PRESENT) & FJR=1 & MS<>BNT
Action: M_UNITDATA.indication

TO:
S/T:   blank
REF:   037
Event: FR(RI_NOT_PRESENT) & FJR=1 & MS<>BNT & TS=RPT
Action: M_UNITDATA.indication
```

This is a change in 802.5s that I missed when updating the 9.6.2.5
Table 9.6-5 - DTR Station Interface Signals Station Operation Table
in Draft 6. This change has been approved in 802.5s.

| ☐ | **69** | DWW 6 | **Sect /Line** 09.6 | 118 | **Sev:** DIS | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

p-23 - Ref: 141 - the action should not contain the optional-x statement. The definition of CORR=UNK_VALUE states that the corellator may be omitted as it is unknown. The transition is no different from 3601, 3604, ... where the correlator is also unknown - it is inconsistent to mark one of these as optional-x and not the others.

Solution:

| ☐ | **70** | DWW 8 | **Sect /Line** 0a.1 | 49 | **Sev:** DIS | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

Neil has asked that we clarify the meaning of "Support" as used in the PICs as it is unclear what it actually means or requires of the implementor. This comment has been made on 802.5s, but applies to 802.5r as well. Committee needs to decide how to approach and fix this problem. Changes will probably be needed to both r and s.

Solution:

| ☐ | **71** | DWW 7 | **Sect /Line** 10.3 | 362 | **Sev:** Q | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

p-15 - line 362: Whilst most of the changes in this table make it clearer, why on earth have we changed "Notes:" to "Legend:" ?

Solution:

| ☐ | **72** | KDL 2 | **Sect /Line** 11.1 | 0 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Extra period

Solution:

Remove extra period

| ☐ | **73** | KDL 1 | **Sect /Line** 11.1 | 8 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Lines 8-23 need to be reformatted to separate headings from paragraphs

Solution:

Reformat as in D5

| ☐ | **74** | KDL 3 | **Sect /Line** 11.1 | 21 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

MIB acronym has not been defined

Solution:

Define MIB (Management Information Base)

| ☐ | **75** | KDL 4 | **Sect /Line** 11.1 | 140 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

tXI and accessDenied have strange capitalization.

Solution:

Change to TXI and access denied to match mib definition

| ☐ | **76** | KDL 10 | **Sect /Line** 11.1 | 186 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

MGT_EVENT_REPORT should be a heading4; Same comment applies to line 499.

Solution:

make heading4

☐ **77** KDL 5 **Sect /Line** 11.1 204 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:
comma starts the line

Solution:
Move comma to the end of line 203.

☐ **78** KDL 6 **Sect /Line** 11.2 493 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:
Incorrect font

Solution:
Change font to normal, non-italics

☐ **79** KDL 7 **Sect /Line** 11.2 501 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:
The last sentence has two verbs

Solution:
change last sentence to "This service operates as a non-confirmed service.

☐ **80** KDL 8 **Sect /Line** 11.3 1790 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:
The description section of each counter should have a point to the txiStatsTimeStamp object.

Solution:
Add the following to each counter description: "Discontinuties in the value of this counter are indicated by the txiStatsTimeStamp object."

☐ **81** KDL 11 **Sect /Line** 11.3 1882 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:
change coccurred to occurred

Solution:

☐ **82** KDL 9 **Sect /Line** 11.3 1912 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:
two commas and mis-formatted

Solution:
remove one comma and reformat.

☑ **83** JLM 1 **Sect /Line** A.1 33 **Sev:** DIS **Type:** TECH

Concern:
In the tables that describe vectors and subvectors, it is unclear what "station support" and "C-Port support" mean in the question. Does this mean that the entity can receive this information (obviously mandatory), verify the information (also mandatory?) or understand the verified information (optional)? This must be made clear and the tables updated accordingly. This also applies to 802.5s.

Solution:
Once the definition of "support" has been agreed upon, then the tables in Annex A of 802,5r and 802,5s need to be updated accordingly and made consistent.

☐ **84** RDL 6 **Sect /Line** K.6 593 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:
OBJECT IDENTIFIER for ieee8025 requires specification

Solution:
replace xxxx? with the proper number (now established as 2043)

☐ **85** RDL 7 **Sect /Line** K.6 2199 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:

DTR Concentrator Management Group Address needs assignment

Solution:

Change "waiting for assignment" to "80-01-43-00-00-78".

☐ **86** DWW 9 **Sect /Line** L.0 13 **Sev:** DIS **Type:** ED

Concern:

The text states that the rules for these FSMs are the same as in Annex F. This is innacurate as Ken has introduced a new concept of crossing lines. This is not used in 1995 or s and therefore is not explained in the rules in annex F. Ken has suggested that an explanation should be added to 802.5s, but this is not appropriate as the convention is not used there. The text in annex L needs to be modified to explain the new rule.

Solution:

☐ **87** KTW 58 **Sect /Line** L.0 14 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:

Line 14 on page L-2: Figure L-1 Join FSM is missing the entry point from 9.3 as described by figure 9.2-2 and specified by the Join Station Operation Table 9.2-1.

Solution:

Add a new entry point to Figure L-1 on page L-2 to agree with 9.3 (JS=BP) as follows.

```
-----------------
| FROM: 9.3 |
|  (JS=BP)  |                                        STATE JA: JS=SREG
-----------------                                    _____
     |      Connect.PMAC & FPOTO=0 & FSREGO=1             |
     |_____>|
          TS=STXN; Set_initial_conditions;
          FIPTXIS=1; FSTXC=FSTI= 1; TSIS=R
```

This change is documented in Working Paper 802.5-96/11-0?.

☑ **88** KTW 16 **Sect /Line** N.0 1 **Sev:** A/C **Type:** ED

Concern:

Update Annex N FSMs to be inline with the FSMs in 802.5s.

Solution:

This change is documented in the new Annex N released by Ken Wilson on 10/23/96. Further changes have been made to the 10/23/96 document as per the paper 802.5-96/11-06 to be available at the November IEEE 802.5 Plenary meeting. This paper contains a summary which identifies all of the changes made to the 10/23/96 document.

| ☑ | **89** | JLM 2 | **Sect /Line** P.1 | 62 | **Sev:** DIS | **Type:** TECH |

Concern:

Using the formula in Annex P, it is possible to specify as a range the number of bits that must be transmitted for the LMT to satisfy the LMT requirements. Neil has calculated the range to be 664,000 to 1,487,360 bits.

The text does not warn the implementor about the implications of using tokens to send these frames.

Solution:

Two changes to Annex P in this document and in 802.5s.

1. Explicitly mention this range of numbers of bits to be transmitted. Implementations that fall outside that range would be non-compliant.

2. Add a warning to implementors about tokens (terrible things, tokens).

If LMT frames are sent on tokens, and token errors are not ignored when checking a successful transmission/reception of a frame, then the token length in bits, times the number of times it rotates around the lobe must be taken into account when calculating the number of bits tested. If this is not done, then the number of bits may exceed the mandatory maximum, and the implementation will fail "good" lobes. For example if the token is allowed to rotate a number of times between each LMT frame, the number of bits tested could easily approach 10,000,000 so that a good lobe with a BER of 10^{-7} would fail ~25% of the time.

| ☑ | **90** | KTW 17 | **Sect /Line** Q.0 | 1 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Update Annex Q FSMs to be inline with the FSMs in 802.5s.

Solution:

This change is documented in the new Annex Q released by Ken Wilson on 10/23/96. Further changes have been made to the 10/23/96 document as per the paper 802.5-96/11-06 to be available at the November IEEE 802.5 Plenary meeting. This paper contains a summary which identifies all of the changes made to the 10/23/96 document.

| ☑ | **91** | KTW 18 | **Sect /Line** R.0 | 1 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Update Annex R FSMs to be inline with the FSMs in 802.5s.

Solution:

This change is documented in the new Annex R released by Ken Wilson on 10/23/96. Further changes have been made to the 10/23/96 document as per the paper 802.5-96/11-06 to be available at the November IEEE 802.5 Plenary meeting. This paper contains a summary which identifies all of the changes made to the 10/23/96 document.

| ☐ | **92** | KTW 57 | **Sect /Line** S.0 | 75 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 75 on page S-11: Add REF 003 to Table S-8 just before REF 264 because it was deleted when REF 003 was changed to a C-Port in Station Emulation Mode unique REF by Ballot Comment KTW56.

Solution:

Add to line 75 on page S-11 REF 003 to Table S-8 just before REF 264 as follows.

S/T: M54
REF: 003
Event: CBR=0 & MS=RBN & FBR=0
Action: MS=BNT; FBR=FTW=1

| ☐ | **93** | KTW 12 | **Sect /Line** S.1 | 46 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Line 47, Page S-8: In REF 037, FR(RI_ ...), remove working comment.

Solution:

Line 47, Page S-8: In REF 037, FR(RI_ ...), remove: "==> ktw??"

| | **94** | RDL 5 | **Sect /Line** T.0 | 9 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Footnote referenced to Line 9 has a spelling error.

Solution:

On Page T-1, the footnote, the change from "its" to "it's" was in error. Change back to "its".

| | **95** | RDL 8 | **Sect /Line** T.1 | 169 | **Sev:** A/C | **Type:** ED |

Concern:

Spelling error

Solution:

change "hexidecimal" to "hexadecimal" and do a global search on "hexidecimal" to make sure all of them have been changed.