Global Document Comments

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

Comment:
Aborting a frame at High Media Rate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Resolution:

Unless there is a valid technical reason for including the invalid FCS abort method (Committee discussion required), remove the method from the StrawMan.
Clause 1 Comments

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

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

Resolution:

------------------------------------------

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

Comment:
Is it Media Independent Interface or Medium ...

Resolution:
Clause 9.0 Comments

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

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

--

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

add Mbit/s after 16.

--

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

add Mbit/s after 16.

--

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

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

--

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

Comment:
Inconsistency in "TKP Access Protocol" syntax.

Resolution:

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

Ident: IPO−E3
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.0, Page 9−3, Line 59

Comment:

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

Resolution:

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

Ident: SAV−E4
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.0, Page 9−3, Line 62

Comment:

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

Resolution:

add Mbit/s after 16.

Ident: IPO−E4
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.0, Page 9−3, Line 63

Comment:

Inconsistency in "TKP Access Protocol" syntax.

Resolution:

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

Ident: JLM−E1
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9, Page 9−3, Line 77

Comment:

Bullets missing from 9.7 and 9.8

Resolution:
Ident: JLM-E2
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9, Page 9-3, Line 82

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

Resolution:
Add: "The TKP Access Protocol is not specified for operation at the High Media Rate."
Clause 9.1 Comments

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

Comment:
Should be a space between determine and an.

Resolution:
Fix it.

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

Comment:
"notations" should be "notation".

Resolution:

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

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

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

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

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

Resolution:

Add "B".

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

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

Resolution:
Change 18 to read 19.
Ident: JLM-T1
Type: minor technical
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 207

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

Resolution:

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

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

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

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

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

Resolution:

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

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

Resolution:
Refer to 13 and use SSD and ESD here instead.

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

Comment:
Space missing after "C".

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

Comment:
Property ‘B’ is not defined. Should be ‘R’

Resolution:
Change ‘B’ to ‘R’ in both definitions.

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

Question:
For High Media Rates, property ‘−N’ (Does not start with valid SSD) cannot be checked when using an MII interface. Should ‘−N’ be removed from both FR_WITH_Err definitions?

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

Comment:
Review FR_WITH_Err as Ken did not make the change.

Resolution:

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

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

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

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

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

Resolution:
Committee decision required.

Ident: IPO-T1
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-13, Line 439

Comment:

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

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

Resolution:

Provide appropriate detail regarding PD subvector examination.

---------------------------------------------------

Ident: JLM-T4
Type: minor technical
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-13 and 14, Line 445, 461

Comment:

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

Resolution:

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

---------------------------------------------------

Ident: NAJ-E4
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-14, Line 457

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Delete the phrase quoted above.

---------------------------------------------------

Ident: NAJ-E5
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-14, Line 494

Comment:

Reference 13.x.x.x incomplete!

Resolution:

Should be 13.5.1.1.2

---------------------------------------------------

Ident: IPO-T2
Type: Technical  
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-14, Line 494  
Comment:  
Invalid reference "13.x.x.x".  
Resolution:  
Reference to "13.x.x.x" should be replaced with "13.5.1.1.2" which is the correct FSLMTO reference.

Ident: JLM-E8  
Type: editorial  
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 503  
Comment:  
You can’t set an action.  
Resolution:  
Replace the sentence with "This test is designated TXI_TEST in the SOTs." 

Ident: NAJ-E6  
Type: Editorial  
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 504  
Comment:  
Text ‘define in 0 and ’ contains a bad reference.  
Resolution:  
Fix it.

Ident: JLM-E9  
Type: editorial  
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 504, 518  
Comment:  
Reference errors: text says "0".  
Resolution:  
Correct references from ’0’

Ident: DWN-E13  
Type: Editorial  
Location: Clause 9.1.6.1, Page 9.1-15, Lines 504,517  
Comment:  

Ident: JLM-E10  
Type: editorial  
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15 etc., Line 518, 523, 531, etc.  
Comment:
The word "frame" should not be capitalised, regardless of whether the text uses the word by itself (e.g., line 518) or a particular named MAC frame (e.g., line 523). This is a widespread error in the newer text.

Resolution:
Replace "Frame" with "frame".

Ident: JLM-T5
Type: technical
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 518
Comment:
The text referring to the setting of the E bit cannot change the apply to the 4/16 Mbit/s case. That is, you can’t change the base standard here.

Resolution:

Ident: NAJ-E7
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 520
Comment:
Lobe Media Test for FSLMTO=1 does not use tokens.

Resolution:
Say so.

Ident: DWW-T14
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.1.6.2, Page 9.1-15, Refs 523
Comment:
New lobe test does not always return "the" lobe test frame.

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

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

Resolution:
Delete "for this Frame".

Ident: IPO-E5
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-16, Line 543

Comment:
Spelling error "assurred".

Resolution:
Replace with correct "assured" spelling.

Ident: NAJ-E8
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-16, Line 555

Comment:
Text "1 Frame error" is imprecise.

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

Ident: RDL-E1
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-16, Line 564

Comment:
"but equivalent Frame." is not specific enough.

Resolution:
Replace above with "as defined in 9.7.2.1."

Ident: DWW-T16
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.1.6.2.2, Page 9.1-16

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

Resolution:

Ident: DWW-E15
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1.6.2.1, Page 9.1-16, Refs 545,548,555

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

Resolution:

Ident: JLM-E12
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-19, Line 644

Comment:
Flags are not referred to with a capital F.

Resolution:
Replace Flag with flag.

Ident: NAJ-E9
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-23, Line 838
Comment:
Contains TBD text.
Resolution:
Determine it...

Ident: JLM-T6
Type: technical
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-23, Line 838
Comment:
Text says TBD
Resolution:
Discuss

Ident: IPO-T3
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-23, Line 838
Comment:
Missing action related text as indicated by <<action TBD>> comment.
Resolution:
Include text if needed and/or remove <<action TBD>> comment.
Clause 9.2 Comments

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Remove it, and use PS_CONTROL.request(Repeat_mode=) where appropriate.

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

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

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

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

Comment:

FSPDO is not longer an option flag.

Resolution:

Remove it.

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

Comment:

See JLM-E10, capitalisation of "Frame".

Resolution:

Don’t say "Frame", say "frame".
Ident: JLM-E15
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-6, Line 191

Comment:
Incorrect use of English.

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

-----------------------------

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

Comment:
Missing flag type

Resolution:
Add to start of line: "Flag, "

-----------------------------

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

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

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

-----------------------------

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

Comment:
Word missing.

Resolution:
Add "that" before "the station’s".

-----------------------------

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

Comment:
The word "Flag," has been erroneously added.

Resolution:
Change "Flag, Flag," to "Flag,".

-----------------------------

Ident: NAJ-E11
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-8, Line 260

Comment:
Repeat word "Flag"

Resolution:
Remove it.

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

Comment:
Reference to "PS_UNITDATA.request(TX symbol=Idle) see 9.8.1.4]..." is incorrect.

Resolution:
Refer to relevant section (9.8.1.3).

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

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

Resolution:
Refer to relevant section 9.8.1.5 which contains the description of the PS_Control.request primitive and its associated parameters.

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

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

Resolution:

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

Comment:
"available refs" text is inappropriate for standard.

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

**Ident:** NAJ-E12  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-12, Line 452  
**Comment:**  
n8 parameter: Description column: Missing space after CSRAT.  
**Resolution:**  
Add it.

---

**Ident:** NAJ-T6  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-12, Line 452  
**Comment:**  
(note 1) needs to be removed.  
**Resolution:**  
n7 parameter values should be in the range 1117 to 1123, to give the correct Annex P coverage.

---

**Ident:** IPO-E6  
**Type:** Editorial  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-13, Line 455, Ref 3170  
**Comment:**  
Inconsistent usage of "<" and ">" around the "4 and 16 Mbit/s only" syntax.  
**Resolution:**  
Add missing "<" and ">" around the "4 and 16 Mbit/s only" syntax to ensure consistency with other 9.2-1 Station Join Station Operation Table entries.

---

**Ident:** NAJ-T7  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-19, Ref 3190  
**Comment:**  
Actions missing state transition.  
**Resolution:**  
Add JS=SDAC to actions.

---

**Ident:** IMJ-T3  
**Type:** Technical  
**Location:** Page 9.2-19, REF 3190  
**Comment:**  
JS do not change to SDAC when Lobe test success.  
**Resolution:**  
Add to Action: "JS=SDAC;"
Ident: IMJ-T4
Type: Technical
Location: Page 9.2-19, REF 3190

Comment:
INS_REQ_PDU is not repeated.

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

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

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

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

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

Comment:
TSRAP=E is not a valid action.

Resolution:
Should read TSRAP=R.

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

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

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

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

Comment:
Typo

Resolution:
Change "TSRAP=E" to "TSRAP=R"

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

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

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

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

Comment:
Closing parenthesis missing from actions.

Resolution:
Add it.

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

Comment:
Addition closing parenthesis in actions.

Resolution:
Remove it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ident:   NAJ-Q2  
Type:    Question  
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-24, Ref 3210 and 3211  
         Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-24, Ref 1202 and 1201  
Question:  
What are the values for CxBTX? How were they calculated? Should they not all be 0?

Ident:   NAJ-T8  
Type:    Technical  
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-27, Ref lots...  
         Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-26, Ref lots...  
Comment:  
Numbers in state transitions tables are in hexadecimal, except all the 255s used with the error counters.

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

Ident:   DWN-T19  
Type:    Technical  
Location: Clause 9.2-3, Page 9.2-26, Refs 3317,3320  
Comment:  
Can you remove a station is phantom has not been raised? Condition actions on whether phantom is being used

Resolution:  

Ident:   DWN-T20  
Type:    Technical  
Location: Clause 9.2-3, Page 9.2-26, Refs 3324  
Comment:  
CSTFQ is not relevant for 100Mbit/s operation.

Resolution:  
Condition CSTFQ action on media rate

Ident:   NAJ-T10  
Type:    Technical  
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-34, Ref 3801  
Comment:  
This is the entry point for LMT. FSLMTS and FSLMTF should be initialised here.

Resolution:
Add "FSLMTS=FSLMTF=0" to actions.

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

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

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

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

Comment:
Extraneous words which are also wrong.

Resolution:
Delete "the option flag is equal to".

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

Comment:
Period should be colon at end of line.

Resolution:

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

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

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

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

Comment:
Typo.

Resolution:
"Event / Events/Conditions" should read "Event / Event & Conditions".
Ident: JLM-E24
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-36, Line 493

Comment:
Inconsistent punctuation in the table.

Resolution:
Either add periods or remove them.

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

Comment:
Use of undefined term "heirarchical address match".

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

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

Comment:
Table entries for FR would be better combined.

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

Ident: JLM-T8
Type: Question
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-38, Line 497 (FR_TEST)

Comment:
I would just like the committee to think a moment about whether FR_TEST requires a verified frame (fully parsed) or not.

Resolution:

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

Comment:
Entry "PS_STATUS.indication(100M_capable=no)" is no longer required.

Resolution:
Remove it.
Ident: IPO-T6
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-39, Line 496

Comment:
PS_STATUS.indication(Link status=Asserted) meaning section contains invalid reference to section 9.8.1.5

Resolution:
Correct reference to refer to section 9.8.1.4

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

Comment:
PS_STATUS.indication(Link status=Not Asserted) meaning section contains invalid reference to section 9.8.1.5

Resolution:
Correct reference to refer to section 9.8.1.4

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

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

Resolution:
Correct to "delivery" in both cases.

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

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

Resolution:
Correct spelling to "assured" in both cases.

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

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

Resolution:

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

Comment:

Invalid references in "Meaning of this term sections" for both the PS_UNITDATA.request(Tx Symbol=Data_byte) and PS_UNITDATA.request(Tx Symbol=Idle) Action or Output terms.

Resolution:

References to section 9.8.1.4 should be to section 9.8.1.3 which is relevant to the PS_UNITDATA.request primitive.

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

Comment:

Entry "TX_ET" is no longer used.

Resolution:

Remove it.

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

The "A Frame abort [PS_CONTROL.request(Abort_frame) as specified in 9.8.1.6]" reference should be corrected to refer to the relevant section 9.8.1.5.

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

Comment:

Invalid reference in "Meaning of this term section" for the TX_ET "Action or Output Term".
Resolution:

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

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

-----------------------------

Ident: JLM-T10
Type: technical
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-43, Line 504 (TX_ET)

Comment:

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

Resolution:

-----------------------------

Ident: JLM-E27
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-43, Line 504 (TX_SFS(...))

Comment:

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

Resolution:

-----------------------------

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Under the "High Media Rate" bullet item, the reference to section 9.8.1.4 should be changed to refer to section 9.8.1.3 which correctly describes the PS_UNITDATA.request primitive.
Clause 9.3 Comments

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

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

Resolution:
Either add transitions required or modify clause 13

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

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

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

Resolution:

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

Comment:
TPRAP is missing.

Resolution:
Add it.

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

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

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

Ident: NAJ−T12
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-10, Line 194

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Fix text to read "... or the High Media Rate PS_STATUS.indication(Link_status=Not asserted) signal occurs when the Station is using phantom, or the receipt of the LMTN MAC frame when the Station is not using phantom as follows"

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

Comment:

RMV_ALRT mechanism has not been added to the C-Port.

Resolution:

Add it.

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

Comment:

Inconsistent syntax related to "CPBTX = Counter".

Resolution:

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

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

Comment:

Inconsistent syntax for "If flag FPRF..".

Resolution:

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

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

Comment:

Semicolon missing from actions, after FPTXC=1.
Resolution:
Add it.

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

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

Resolution:

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

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

Resolution:
Please resolve "FPRTO" issue in this section.

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

Comment:
should this be conditioned on FPINSLE=1?

Resolution:

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

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

Resolution:

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

Comment:
Invalid specification "4 and 16 bit/s".
Resolution:

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

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

Comment:

S/T column contains "JLM?"

Resolution:

Should read "JLMc"

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

Comment:

Action contains duplicated FPHBA=1

Resolution:

Fix

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

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

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Remove it.

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

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

Resolution:

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

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

Resolution:

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

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

Resolution:

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

Comment:
No longer used.

Resolution:
Delete.

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

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

Resolution:

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

Comment:
These transitions are for 4/16 only.

Resolution:
Add appropriate FPMRO<2 to conditions.
Ident: DWW-T32
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-21, Refs 1094, 1100

Comment:
The actions should be marked as optional

Resolution:

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

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

Resolution:
Add new transition to monitor state tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR_LMTN(DA=broadcast) &amp; SPD=0002</td>
<td>=&gt; if (FPRPTO=0) then TXI_LMTN_PDU; FPBT=1; if (FPMRO&lt;2) then [FPRF=0 (optional-rf)]; if (FPMRO&gt;1) then FPRF=0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Replace Ref 2028 with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR_LMTN(DA=broadcast) &amp; FPRPTO=0 &amp; SPD=0001</td>
<td>=&gt; TXI_LMTN_PDU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

Resolution:
Delete.

Ident: DWW-T33
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.3-3, Page 9.3-25, Refs 1401, 1404, 1403
Comment:
What is CPFRE, what purpose does it serve? Why is it only used at 100Mbit/s?
Resolution:

Ident: JLM-E30
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-29, Line 372 (ref 2027)
Comment:
Notation wrong. Also, term not defined in precise specification of events/conditions. Also, the term should be DA=FA(TEST) which is already used in 13.
Resolution:
Use parentheses not square brackets. Nested parentheses are allowed.
Add in precise specification of events/conditions (before DA=MA), this:
DA=FA(TEST): The DA of the received frame is equal to the functional address specified for use in the lobe media test.
AS A SIMPLER ALTERNATIVE: in transitions 2027 and 2028 I see no reason for any checking of the DA. Why not just remove the DA criterion?

Ident: JLM-E31
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-31, Line 380
Comment:
Same as JLM-E24 (inconsistent punctuation in table).
Resolution:

Ident: JLM-E32
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-32, Line 385 (FR)
Comment:
Same as JLM-E25 (combine FR entries)
Resolution:

Ident: IMJ-T1
Type: Technical
Location: Page 9.3-34
Comment:
Counter CSLTFE replaced with flag FSLTFE.

Replacement of this counter was noted in the previous version, if accepted by the committee. I do not remember any discussion, so no one rejected the change. I prefer to count errors by a counter not a flag. The description of the counter (CSLTFE) has been removed, but I did not find any description of the flag (FSLTFE).

Resolution:
Define the flag FSLTFE in clause 9.2.3.1

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

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

Resolution:
Define the flag FSSLMT in clause 9.2.3.1

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

Comment:
Need to clarify usage of idle violation detection.

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

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

Comment:
Invalid reference in "Meaning of this term" section for PS_STATUS.indication(Idle Violation) "Event/Condition term".

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

------------------------
Ident: IPO−T12
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3−34, Line 385
Comment:
Invalid reference in "Meaning of this term" section for PS_STATUS.indication(Link Status=Not Asserted) "Event/Condition term".

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

Ident: JLM-E33
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-35, Line 394 (FPTI)
Comment:
As JLM-E26 (Don’t include FPTI in this table).
Resolution:

Ident: IPO-T15
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-36, Line 393
Comment:
In "Meaning of this term" section for the PS_CONTROL.request(Crystal Transmit=Asserted), reference to the non-existent section "...9.8.1.6 for High Media Rate operation" is incorrect.
Resolution:
Refer to section 9.8.1.5 which correctly describes the parameters for the PS_CONTROL.request primitive parameters including Crystal Transmit.

Ident: IPO-T16
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-36, Line 393
Comment:
In "Meaning of this term" sections for the PS_UNITDATA.request(Tx_symbol=Data_byte) and PS_UNITDATA.request(Tx_symbol=Idle), references to "9.8.1.4" are incorrect.
Resolution:
In both cases, refer to section "9.8.1.3" where the PS_UNITDATA.request primitive and associated parameters are correctly described.

Ident: JLM-E34
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-36, Line 394 (PS_CONTROL.request(Crystal_transmit)
Comment:
Both Crystal Transmit entries need to refer to 9.8.1.6. The one which does has the closing parenthesis too early.

Resolution:

----------------------------------------
Ident: JLM-E35
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-36, Line 394 (PS_UNITDATA.request)
Comment:
These two entries lack the bolding in the left column.
Resolution:

----------------------------------------
Ident: IPO-T17
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-37, Line 393
Comment:
In "Meaning of this term" section for the TX_AB "Action/Output Term", reference to "A frame abort[PS_CONTROL.request(Abort_frame) as specified in 9.8.1.6]" is incorrect.
Resolution:

Refer to section 9.8.1.5 which correctly describes the parameters for the PS_CONTROL.request primitive and associated parameters including Abort_frame.

----------------------------------------
Ident: IPO-T18
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-37, Line 393
Comment:
In "Meaning of this term" section for the TX_SFS(P=value;R=value) "Action/Output Term", reference to "A start Frame[PS_UNITDATA.request (Start_stream_delimiter) see 9.8.1.4]..." is incorrect.
Resolution:

Refer to section 9.8.1.3 which correctly describes the parameters for the PS_UNITDATA.request primitive and associated parameters.

----------------------------------------
Ident: NAJ-E22
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-37
Comment:
Entry "TX_ET" is no longer used.
Resolution:

Delete it.
Ident: JLM-T11
Type: technical
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-37, Line 394 (TX_ET)

Comment:
TX_ET is badly named as ET is the frame status equivalent.

Resolution:
Change to TX_ESD.

-------------------------------------

Ident: JLM-T12
Type: Question
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-37, Line 394 (TX_EFS...)

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

Resolution:
Clause 9.7 Comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Resolution:

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

Comment:
"Mac" is wrong.

Resolution:
Say "MAC".

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

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

-----------------------------------------------

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

Comment:
"signaling" is wrongly spelt.

Resolution:
Say "signalling".

-----------------------------------------------

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

Comment:
Insert is a bad name for the signal, because it is one of the values. Also "any of the conditions" is too weak. As written, the "when generated" clause says nothing.

Resolution:
Suggest changing this to PM_STATUS.indication(Phantom=Insert) and (Phantom=De-insert). Specify the conditions for when generated, preferably by reference to the appropriate clause.

-----------------------------------------------

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

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

Resolution:
Delete the words "PMAC option".

-----------------------------------------------

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

Comment:
Make the corrections and remove the note.

Resolution:
Clause 9.8 Comments

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

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

Resolution:
Clarify scope of Clause in the title.

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

Comment:
Extraneous comment/question.

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

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

Comment:
Error! Reference source not found. - problem.

Resolution:
Fix the problem.

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

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

Resolution:
Discuss in committee if appropriate.

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

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

Resolution:
add Mbit/s after 16.
Ident: ANF-E1
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-2, Ref 62

Comment:

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

Resolution:

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

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Discuss in committee if appropriate.

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

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

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

Comment:

Missing millisecond value.

Resolution:

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

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

Comment:

There appear to be several issues relative to
the PS_STATUS.indication primitive and its	parameters that require committee discussion
as indicated by comments/questions from lines
146−157 of Page 9.8−4

Resolution:
Discuss and resolve open issues in committee.

Ident: JLM−E43
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8−4, Line 146

Comment:
I think
PM_STATUS.indication(Signal_Detect)=Signal_acquired/Signal_loss is best.

Resolution:

Ident: IPO−T21
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8−4, Line 160

Comment:
Need to remove notes to reviewers in 9.8.1.5
PS_CONTROL.request section and incorporate
appropriate additional text/explanations
that result from committee discussion.

Resolution:
Discuss and resolve open 9.8.1.5 issues in committee.

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

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

Resolution:

Ident: RDL−E2
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8−4, Line 182

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

Resolution:
Follow this formatting recommendation for all tables in the standard.

Ident: IPO−T22
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8−7, Line 263
Comment:
Reference to Table 28B-1 is incorrect.

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

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

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

Resolution:
Change "code-group" to "octet".

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

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

Resolution:
add

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

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

Comment:
Lack of knowledge is a problem.

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

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

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

Resolution:
Move text and swap section numbers 9.8.5.9 and 9.8.5.10
Location: Clause 9.8.5.10, Page 9.8-10, Line 325
Comment:
Table 9.8-1 is the wrong table.
Resolution:
Change to Table 9.8-5

Ident: ANF-E5
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-10, Ref 325
Comment:
Text "Table 15 is repeated here for clarity as Table 9.8-1" should refer to table 9.8-5
Resolution:
Replace "9.8-1" with "9.8-5"

Ident: RDL-E3
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-10, Line 328
Comment:
Table is for stations only, not for ports.
Resolution:
1) Table title is confusing, "Station Port" is a bad combination of words. Change to Station Signal unless Port signaling will also be included. If so, change to Station and Port
2) Add appropriate columns for port signaling or add a new table to the standard with that information.

Ident: RDL-T4
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-11, Line 344 - 347
Comment:
Although the prose is technically accurate, because of the complexity of the concept, the paragraph is unclear. Also, the specified value is not yet backed up by analysis.
Resolution:
Replace the above lines with:
"When the receiver circuit is unpowered, its return loss specification may degrade to a value that is 5dB less than the minimum return loss required of the receiver circuit when it is active."
In addition, verify that 5dB is the correct number, or correct that value.

Ident: ANF-E6
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-11, Ref 358
Comment:
Typo in "Change to annex G< "Stream cipher scrambling function""
Resolution:
Replace "<" with "," 

Ident: JLM-E44  
Type: editorial  
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-11, Line 358  
Comment: 
Typo. 
Resolution: 
Change "G<" to "G,".

Ident: ANF-E7  
Type: Editorial  
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-11, Ref 365  
Comment: 
Font used for header is different from other headers. 
Resolution: 
Change font.

Ident: ANF-E8  
Type: Editorial  
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-12, Ref 382  
Comment: 
The Statement "The terminology used in [802.3] was chosen to be consistent with other IEEE 802 standards, rather than with PDDI." is contained in a paragraph that has no references to 802.3. Therefore would it not be better to refer to 802.5? 
Resolution: 
Change [802.3] to [802.5]

Ident: RDL-E5  
Type: Editorial  
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-13, Line 397  
Comment: 
Statements may be misleading if read out of context. 
Resolution: 
Change "every cable-pair link" to "every optical fiber cable-pair link" in line 397, and "the crossover function is realized" to "the crossover function for fiber attachment is realized" in line 399.
Clause 13 Comments

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

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

Resolution:
Fix it.

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

Comment:
Dave Wilson wants all references to TKP removed.

Resolution:
Committee discussion required.

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

Comment:
Dave Wilson wants the FC value of TEST frames to be a value other '00', and the VC value of the RMV_ALRT frame to be '00'.

Resolution:
Committee discussion required.

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

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

Resolution:

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

Comment:
No entry exists under "Field Length" in table

Resolution:
Add "0 or more" for the number of octets of fill.
Ident: DWW−T3
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 13.2.1.1.1.3 & 13.2.1.1.2.1, Page 12-3
Comment:
"When a frame with error is detected the frame shall be ignored." This does not allow the counting of line errors.
Resolution:
Fix the text.

Ident: DWW−T2
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 13.2.1.1.1.3, Page 12-3
Comment:
The text states that "the E bit shall be transmitted as 0" This does not allow for aborting frames with bad FCS and E bit set.
Resolution:
Correct the text.

Ident: DWW−T1
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 13.2.1.1.1 & 13.2.1.1.2, Page 12-3, Refs
Comment:
What does "or if indicated by the bridge interface" mean?
Resolution:
This statement needs clarifying somehow. Does it mean "or if the frame is indicated to the bridge interface" or "or if the bridge interface says set A bits on all LLC frames",...?

Ident: JLM−T14
Type: technical
Location: Clause 13, Page 12-3, Line 67, 77
Comment:
The wording is unclear. Can be read to mean "if you set the E bit".
Resolution:
If the received E bit was set, the frame shall not be counted as a line error.

Ident: DWW−T4
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 13.2.1.1.2.1, Page 12-4
Comment:
"The E bit shall be transmitted as 0 ..." is as the committee agreed, but does not agree with clause 9 which allows the use of an abort by dodgy fcs + E bit set.
Resolution:
Committee needs to agree correct solution and then text modified appropriately

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

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

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

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

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

Resolution:
Use a better name. Action, Bob Love.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Resolution:
Change to "a RI field".
Ident: NAJ-T19
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 13, Page 12-5, Line 127

Comment:
RMV_ALRT are used on all transitions from join complete to bypass, not just Disconnect.xMAC.

Resolution:
Fix text.

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

Comment:
Bad sentence.

Resolution:
Remove the word "method" from end of X’0002’ definition.

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

Comment:
What about the data within the subvector.

Resolution:
Say something about the data.

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

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

The Remove Alert frame does not follow these premises.

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

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

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

Resolution:
Change the required FC of LMT frames

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

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

Resolution:
Add paragraphs like in clause 10 to this effect.

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

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

Resolution:
Add **1 to the X’17’ entries in these four tables. Bump up the **1 in the last two tables to **2.

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

Comment:
table 13−5 should read table 13−6

Resolution:
fix it

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

Comment:
Reference to table 13−5 should be to 13−6.

Resolution:
Get your hooves in the grooves.
Ident:  NAJ−E26
Type:   Editorial
Location:  Clause 13, Page 12−10, Line 204

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

Resolution:
Fix it.

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

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

Resolution:
fix

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

Comment:
missing words

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

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

Comment:
Values missing

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

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

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

Resolution:

Ident:  NAJ−E27
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 13, Page 12-12, Line 250

Comment:
"new and" is inappropriate.

Resolution:
Remove words.

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

Comment:
Table 13-8 is a duplicate.

Resolution:
Rename to Table 13-9.

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

Comment:
what is FSRMO?

Resolution:

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

Comment:
Table 13-9 would be a duplicate.

Resolution:
Rename to Table 13-10.

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

Comment:
Table 13-10 would be a duplicate.

Resolution:
Rename to Table 13-11.

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

Comment:
"new and" is inappropriate.

Resolution:
Remove words.

-----------------------------------------------

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

Comment:
FPASA is wrong.

Resolution:
Fix it.

-----------------------------------------------

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

Comment:
Typo

Resolution:
Change FPASA to FPASO.

-----------------------------------------------

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

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

Resolution:
Annex P Comments

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

Comment:
Word has gone mad with section numbering.

Resolution:
Fix it.

Ident: DWW-E12
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause P, Page P1

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

Resolution:
Fix
Annex X Comments

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

Comment:
Bullet too big. Geneva convention applies.

Resolution:
Shrink.

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