Start the Global Comments Document produced by Neil Jarvis.

```
=======================================================================
Global Document Comments
=======================================================================
```

```
Number:   1
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 ser 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.

Editor's Response:

Proposal to add a paragraph stating that the /H/H/T/R/ (However, see item 21, JLM-E4), abort sequence shall be used whenever it is available, otherwise the invalid FCS/E bit set method may be employed. This will done be in Clause 13 (option flags to be added, since they are currently missing). **Neil's item**.

Action: Formal request to be sent to the RMII group, specifying the HSTR requirements for the RMII interface. **Karl's item.**

- Karl has written the formal request document. It will be published as a meeting document on the Web page. This document should be reviewed via the reflector by **23 Jan 98**. Karl will submit the document to the RMII group.

```
=======================================================================
Clause 1 Comments
=======================================================================


Number:    2
Ident:     SAV-E1
Type:      Editorial
Location: Clause 1, Page 1, Line 1

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Replace 1997 with 1998.

Editor's Response:
Yes – Tam Ross' item.
----------------------------------------

Number:    3
Ident:     JLM-Q1
Type:      Question
Location: Clause 1.2, Page 1, Line 6

Comment:

Is it Media Independent Interface or Medium ...

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
Media. Line 6, interface should be capitalised.  Tam Ross' item.
```

```
=======================================================================
Clause 9.0 Comments
=======================================================================


Number:    4
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.

Editor's Response:
Global change to the document.  Tam Ross' item.

Done by KTWilson.

Changed clause 9 as follows.
    1. Used "100 Mbit/s" instead of "High Media Rate" where appropriate.
    2. Clarified definition of "High Media Rate".
    3. Added definition of FSMRO>1 and FPMRO>1 not in StrawMan 0.5.
----------------------------------------

Number:    5
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes — Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:    6
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes – Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:    7
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes – Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:    8
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".

Editor's Response:
Yes – Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:    9
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes – Done by KTWilson.                                          |
----------------------------------------

Number:    10
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes – Done by KTWilson.                                          |
----------------------------------------

Number:    11
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".

Editor's Response:
Yes – Done by KTWilson.                                          |
----------------------------------------

Number:    12
Ident:     JLM-E1
Type:      Editorial
Location: Clause 9, Page 9-3, Line 77

Comment:

Bullets missing from 9.7 and 9.8

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
Yes – Done by KTWilson.                                          |
----------------------------------------
```

```
Number:   13
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 by this supplement for operation at 100 Mbit/s. ~~the High Media Rate.~~"

Editor's Response:
OK with correction. Add "by this supplement." ~~To end of sentence.~~ **Done by KTWilson.**

- **For clarity, the resolution is modified as shown above and added to the first paragraph of 9 (after sentence on line 4).**

```
=======================================================================
Clause 9.1 Comments
=======================================================================

Number:   14
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   15
Ident:    JLM-E3
Type:     Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-2, Line 47

Comment:

"notations" should be "notation".

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   16
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.

Also, the following changes were made for consistency.

1. Moved line 186 to after 192 for consistency between lines 186-192 and
   lines 197-216.
```

2. Changed "High Media Rate" on line 196 to "100 Mbit/s" to be
   consistent with changes made to 9.0 (see item 4, NAJ-E1).

Number: 17
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".
Editor's Response:
See NAJ-E2 for resolution. Done by KTWilson.

Number: 18
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.

Number: 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:

Editor's Response:
Line 186. Refer to base standard.
Done by KTWilson (see item 16, NAJ-E3).

Line 196. Add section defining ~~what~~ "data symbols". ~~are.~~
Done by KTWilson. Added "(0 through F)" as agreed during 1/98 meeting.

```
Number:    20
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:    21
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes. "R – Ends with a valid ESD (code symbols /T/R)." Done by KTWilson.
Fix up JK to read /J/K. Done by KTWilson.
Note to clause 13: Fix "/H/H/T/R/" to be "/H/H/T/R". Neil's work.
----------------------------------------

Number:    22
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:    23
Ident:     JLM-E5
```

```
Type:     minor editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-7, Line 218

Comment:

Space missing after "C".

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
-----------------------------------------

Number:   24
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
-----------------------------------------

Number:   25
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?

Editor's Response:
Remove -N from 222 and 223. Also remove Q from 223. Done by KTWilson.
-----------------------------------------

Number:   26
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:

Editor's Response:
Remove note. Done by KTWilson.
-----------------------------------------
```

```
Number:    27
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).


Editor's Response:
Yes. Add reference to section 13.5.2.3 for allowable flag settings. Done
by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:    28
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.


Editor's Response:
Action: Ken, Neil and Ivar will create a stand-alone document detailing
the modifications that could be made to the standard to support HSTR
Speed Trade Up. This will be submitted to the committee for approval.

Ivar will produce a first pass of this document by 29th Jan 98. To be
revieweds by Neil and Ken (and anyone else who is interested).
----------------------------------------

Number:    29
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.

Editor's Response:
Fix appropriately.
Action Taken:

Bullet 1 (line 444): add the words:
        " or the value of the Station's PD when logically ANDed with the
        C-Port's PPV(PD) results in a value of X'0000' indicating the PD
        value is not supported by the C-Port " immediately following the
        word "recognized" on line 445.

Bullet 2 (line 448): add the words:
        " and the value of the Station's PD when logically ANDed with the
        C-Port's PPV(PD) results in a value of X'0001' " immediately
        following the term "X'0002' on line 449.

Note to Mick Hanrahan: This is also an error in 802.5r.

Done by KTWilson.

Number: 30
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Modification:
        The word "recognized" changed to "supported".
Done by KTWilson.

Number: 31
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 32
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

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 33
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 34
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.

Editor's Response:
Replace first sentence on line 503 with "The Station shall request the
Lobe Media Test with the TXI_TEST action." **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 35
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 36
Ident: JLM-E9
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 504, 517~~518~~

Comment:

Reference errors: text says "0".

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 37
Ident: DWW-E13
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1.6.1, Page 9.1-15, Lines 504,517

Comment:

Correct references from '0'

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 38
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".

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson (40 minutes for this one change!).**

Number: 39
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:

Editor's Response:
Withdrawn

Number: 40
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.

Editor's Response:
Add to line 552, that LMT MAC Frames are sent without tokens. **Done by
KTWilson.**

Number: 41
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!

Editor's Response:
Accept with modifications. **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 42
Ident: JLM-E11
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-16, Line 543

Comment:

Repetitive~~Repetetive~~ text.

Resolution:

Delete "for this Frame".

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 43
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 44
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."

Editor's Response:
Accepted with modification:

"The Station shall fail its Lobe Media Test if
more than one of the "n8" 1120 frames transmitted is either not received
or is received with an error."
Done by KTWilson with above modification.

Number: 45
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."

Editor's Response:
Accepted with modification. **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 46
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:

Editor's Response:
Clause 13: A 4/16/100 Mbit/s C-Port shall have FPRPTO=1…Neil's item.

Number: 47
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes to 545, 548 **Done by KTWilson.**
No to 555, see item 44, NAJ-E8.

```
Number:    48
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 Repalce Flag with flag.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:    49
Ident:     NAJ-E9
Type:      Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-23, Line 838

Comment:

Contains TBD text.

Resolution:

Determine it...

Editor's Response:
OK. KTWilson: Action not taken on item.
Well, I still did not get this written.  Worked on more important items.
I will put together words for this before February 10th.
----------------------------------------

Number:    50
Ident:     JLM-T6
Type:      technical
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-23, Line 838

Comment:

Text says TBD

Resolution:

Discuss

Editor's Response:
Yes - See item 49, NAJ-E9. Done by KTWilson.

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

Number:    51
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes - See item 49, NAJ-E9. Done by KTWilson.

```
=======================================================================
Clause 9.2 Comments
=======================================================================


Number:   52
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 (from the state transition tables), and use
PS_CONTROL.request(Repeat_mode=) where appropriate.

Editor's Response:
```
- Del 3517, 3518, 3519, 3520. **Done by KTWilson in 9.2 and 9.3.**
- Remove FSMRO<2 from 3504. **Done by KTWilson in 9.2 and 9.3.**
- Rename PS_CONTROL.request(Repeat_mode=) to
  (Transmit_mode=fill/no_fill/repeat (C-Port only)). **Done by KTWilson.**
- TX_SFS and TX_EFS should receive HSTR definitions. **Done by KTWilson.**
- TS=STXD needs words for HSTR. (talking about
  PS_UNITDATA.request(data_byte)). **Done by KTWilson.**

- Fix 9.1.1.1: Set FxTI=0/1 should also state that PS_CONTROL… is
  executed. **Done by KTWilson.**

```
NOTE: This item: "Rename PS_CONTROL.request(Repeat_mode=) to
(Transmit_mode=fill/no_fill/repeat (C-Port only))" is not resolved. This
will be revisited. OpenAction:

Closed: Transmit_mode will be added as defined here with the three
states.
```

⇒   **KTWilson comment for *next* release of this supplement.**

- **This change impacts 9.4, 9.5 and 9.6. More seriously, it
  also changes the base standard. I have not attempted to
  make any of these changes due to the lack of time.**
```
---------------------------------------


Number:   53
Ident:    JLM-E13
Type:     editorial
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-5, Line 66-161


Comment:


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

Resolution:

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

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

Editor's Response:
Deferred. Input is required from IEEE editors on how our capitalisation
(and other editorial stuff) is going to be modified by them.
No action taken by KTWilson.

Number: 54
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 55
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".

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 56
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".

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson (changed lines 188 and 191).**

Number: 57
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, "

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 58
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".

Editor's Response:
Yes **Reworded sentence on line 252 as follow:**
The flag FSLMTS is used to indicate the success of the Station's Lobe
Media Test. Done by KTWilson.

Number: 59
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".

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 60
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,".

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 61
Ident: NAJ-E11
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-8, Line 260

Comment:

Repeat word "Flag"

Resolution:

Remove it.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 62
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).

Editor's Response:
Yes
Done by KTWilson as follows.

- **Lines 307, 310 and 313: Changed PS_UNITDATA.request as per item 52, NAJ-T5.**
- **Line 313 as per this item.**

```
Number:    63
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.
```

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

```
Number:    64
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

```
Number:    65
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".
```

Editor's Response:
Text is already hidden. **No action by KTWilson.**

```
Number:   66
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   67
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes. Done by KTWilson.
Range numbers to be checked withby Annex P editor.
KTWilson: Contacted Bob Love.  Indicated numbers were OK.
----------------------------------------

Number:   68
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------
```

```
Number:    69
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes
Changed S/T to "JBCB" and added "JS=SDAC and TSIP=R" to actions (see
item 72, DWW-T17). Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:    70
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;"

Editor's Response:
Yes
Changed S/T to "JBCB" and added "JS=SDAC and TSIP=R" to actions (see
item 72, DWW-T17). Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:    71
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;"

Editor's Response:
Yes Changed S/T to "JBCB" and added "JS=SDAC and TSIP=R" to actions (see
item 72, DWW-T17). Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:    72
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

Editor's Response:
Yes.
Changed S/T to "JBCB" and added "JS=SDAC and TSIP=R" to actions.
Added new ref as 3168. Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   73
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   74
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   75
Ident:    IMJ-E2
Type:     Editorial
Location: Page 9.2-21, ref. 3176, Action


Comment:
```

Typo

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

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 76
Ident: DWW-T18
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.2-1, Page 9.2-21, Refs 3176,3192

Comment:

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

Resolution:

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

Editor's Response:
To be evaluated.
KTWilson: – Will work on this next week.
No change made in Draft 1.

Number: 77
Ident: NAJ-E14
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-22, Ref 3122

Comment:

Closing parenthesis missing from actions.

Resolution:

Add it.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 78
Ident: NAJ-E15
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-23, Ref 3214

Comment:

Addition closing parenthesis in actions.

Resolution:

Remove it.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Removed closing parenthesis and last semicolon. Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 79
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Removed closing parenthesis and last semicolon. Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 80
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Removed closing parenthesis and last semicolon. Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 81
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?

Editor's Response:
Open
: Note to go to reflector.
KTWilson: No work on this for Draft 1.
I will work on this next week and send note to reflector.

```
----------------------------------------

Number:   82
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   83
Ident:    DWW-T19
Type:     Technical
Location: Clause 9.2-3, Page 9.2-26, Refs 3317,3320

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
New transitions are numbered 3301 and 3302. Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   84
Ident:    DWW-T20
Type:     Technical
Location: Clause 9.2-3, Page 9.2-26, Refs 3324

Comment:

CSTFQ is not relevant for 100Mbit/s operation.

Resolution:

Condition CSTFQ action on media rate

Editor's Response:
New transition is numbered 3303. Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   85
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 86
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 87
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".

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 88
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:

```
Editor's Response:
Reject, correct as written. No action by KTWilson.
-----------------------------------------


Number:   89
Ident:    IMJ-T1
Type:     Technical
Location: Page 9.2-34

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

Editor's Response:
Reject No action by KTWilson.
-----------------------------------------


Number:   90
Ident:    IMJ-T2
Type:     Technical
Location: Page 9.2-34

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

Resolution:
Define the flag FSSLMT in clause 9.2.3.1

Editor's Response:
OPEN
Yes, but work to be done.
Done by KTWilson.
-----------------------------------------


Number:   91
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
-----------------------------------------
```

```
Number:   92
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".

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   93
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.

Editor's Response:
Add periods where missing. Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   94
Ident:    JLM-T7
Type:     technical
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-37, Line 497 (DA=MA)

Comment:

Use of undefined term "hierarchicalheirarchical 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 hierarchicalheirarchical address match is not specified in this
standard
and is referred to only for compatibility with old implementations."

Editor's Response:
Reject. No action by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   95
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).

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 96
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes **Committee agreed FR_TEST must be a verified frame. No action by
KTWilson.**

Number: 97
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 98
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

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 99
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

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 100
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 101
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
---------------------------------------

Number:   102
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:

Editor's Response:
Remove "timer<>E" from condition
Removed definition and from ref 3802 on page 9.2-35. Done by KTWilson.
---------------------------------------

Number:   103
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
---------------------------------------

Number:   104
Ident:    NAJ-E17
Type:     Editorial
Location: Clause 9.2, Page 9.2-43

Comment:
```

Entry "TX_ET" is no longer used.

Resolution:

Remove it.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 105
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 106
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.

Editor's Response:
Reject.

Number: 107
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:

Editor's Response:
Reject. These flags have side-effects, and benefit from extra
information in these tables.

Number: 108
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:

Editor's Response:
Deleted by NAJ-E17. <Generated more work>

Number: 109
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:

Editor's Response:
MOD: New words chosen **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 110
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

```
========================================================================
Clause 9.3 Comments
========================================================================


Number:    111
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


Editor's Response:
Yes

References 1118 and 1122 through 1128 were added to handle Remove Alert
transmit by the C-Port missing in StrawMan 0.5.  Also, added CPRAT in
the list of counter abbreviations list and its definition.
Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------


Number:    112
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:


Editor's Response:
No.  No action by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------


Number:    113
Ident:     NAJ-E18
Type:      Editorial
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-6, Line 91


Comment:
```

TPRAP is missing.

Resolution:

Add it.

Editor's Response:
Yes

This item points out that Remove Alert is not handled by 9.3. See item 111, DWW-T26 for more information.
Done by KTWilson.

Number: 114
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.

Editor's Response:
Action: Open
See previous editorial comments from JLM
No action taken by KTWilson.

Number: 115
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"

Editor's Response:
Yes **Above change was done by KTWilson.**

Also, the "PS_STATUS.indication" was changed to "PM_STATUS.indication" at all appropriate places in 9.2 and 9.3 to agree with change to 9.8 agreed to during the 1/98 meeting.

Number: 116
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **- Also, see item 111, DWW-T26 for more information. Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 117
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 118
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.

```
Editor's Response:
MOD: Accept Done by KTWilson.
-----------------------------------------

Number:   119
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.
-----------------------------------------

Number:   120
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes Modification.

FPRPTO determines the type of repeat path that is available, either PMAC
(FPRPTO=0) or PHY (FPRPTO=1).  It was incorrectly used in StrawMan 0.5
to set FPRPT which is independent of FPRPTO.

As the result, references 1108, 1109, 1121 and 1034 were changed while
reference 1112 was deleted by change made to 1034.

Done by KTWilson.

KTWilson: - Note to Neil: Clause 13 definition of FPRPTO does not agree
with the above definition.  However, this is how it is used in 9.3.
Sorry about this, but did not notice problem until 26Jan98.
-----------------------------------------

Number:   121
Ident:    IPO-Q1
Type:     Question
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-16, Line 356, Ref 1109
```

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Please resolve "FPRTO" issue in this section.

Editor's Response:
Yes – changed "FPRTO" to "FPRPTO".
Done by KTWilson.

Also, see item 120, DWW-T22 for more information on FPRPTO.

Number: 122
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:

Editor's Response:
'r' maintenance issue. Need to bring up the 2 lock-up conditions that C-
Port currently has (phantom never being detected, phantom never going
away). Today this transition solves part of these lock-ups (but does not
report it very well to management).
Action: Task force to resolve these issues (NAJ, KTW, MJH, SH, others).
NAJ will produce first pass on reflector by 29th Jan. **Neil's item.**

Number: 123
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes Modification: See item 111, DWW T-26 for resolution.
Done by KTWilson.

```
Number:    124
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>>".

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.

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

Number:    125
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"

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.

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

Number:    126
Ident:     DWW-E27
Type:      Editorial
Location: Clause 9.3-1, Page 9.3-19, Refs 1121

Comment:

Action contains duplicated FPHBA=1

Resolution:

Fix

Editor's Response:
Yes Done by KTWilson.

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

Number:    127
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 128
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 129
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:

Editor's Response:
Open
KTW will evaluate.
I like it the way it is and since it causes no problems no change was
made.
Done by KTWilson.

Number: 130
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:

Editor's Response:
Reject **No action by KTWilson.**

Number: 131
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes – **modification:** See item 120, DWW-T22 for resolution.
Done by KTWilson.

Number: 132
Ident: NAJ-T16
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-21, Ref 1117

Comment:

No longer used.

Resolution:

Delete.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 133
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:

Editor's Response:
Deleted by item 132, NAJ-T16. **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 134
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 135
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes, marked as "optional-i". **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 136
Ident: NAJ-T13
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-25, Monitor and Misc state machines

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Add new transition to monitor state tables:

        FR_LMTN(DA=broadcast) & SPD=0002
           => if (FPRPTO=0) then TXI_LMTN_PDU;
               FPBNT=1;

```
            if (FPMRO<2) then [FPRF=0 (optional-rf)];
            if (FPMRO>1) then FPRF=0

Replace Ref 2028 with

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

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

KTWilson here.
Number: 137
Ident: DWW-T21
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 9.3.3.2, Page 9.3-10, Refs line 194,
                          Page 9.3-6, Refs 2028
                    Page 9.3-29, 9.3-3 Ref 1406
                    Page 9.3-25

Comment:

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

Resolution:

change text ok
condition transition 1406 on FPMRO<2 –no (already there)
add FPRF=0 action to 2028 –ok
note also typo in line 200 (TRPF should read TPRF) ok

Editor's Response:
Yes – modified as follows.

- *Change text* – **Done by KTWilson.**

- *Condition transition 1406 on FPMRO<2* – **Reject: Event must occur at
  any media speed. Test of FPMRO<2 is already present in action.**

- *Add FPRF=0 action to 2028* – **Done by KTWilson.**

- *Typo in line 200* – **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 138
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.

Editor's Response:

- Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 139
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:

Editor's Response:

Yes – Deleted this counter (left over from previous pass).
Done by KTWilson.

Number: 140
Ident: JLM-E30
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-29, Line 372 (ref 2027)

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Use parentheses not square brackets. Nested parentheses are allowed.

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

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

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

Editor's Response:

MOD.

- Changed all appearances of "FA(LMT)" to "FA(TEST)" in 9.2 and 9.3.
- Changed all appearances of "[FA(TEST)]" to "(FA(TEST))" in 9.3.

Done by KTWilson.

```
Number:    141
Ident:     JLM-E31
Type:      editorial
Location:  Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-31, Line 380

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

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

Number:    142
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes **Done by KTWilson.**

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

Number:    143
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.

Editor's Response:
Item deleted **– No action by KTWilson.**
----------------------------------------

Number:    144
```

```
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.

Editor's Response:
Item deleted – No action by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   145
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.

Editor's Response:
Yup – Modified.
Corrected reference and changed "PS_STATUS.indication" to
"PM_STATUS.indication".
Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------

Number:   146
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:

Editor's Response:
```

Withdrawn, thank you. **- No action by KTWilson.**

Number: 147
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes **- Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 148
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes**- Done by KTWilson.**

Number: 149
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:

```
Editor's Response:
Mod: 9.8.1.5 and change parenthesis. - Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------


Number:   150
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes- Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------


Number:   151
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes- Done by KTWilson.
----------------------------------------


Number:   152
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes- Done by KTWilson.

Number: 153
Ident: NAJ-E22
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.3, Page 9.3-37

Comment:

Entry "TX_ET" is no longer used.

Resolution:

Delete it.

Editor's Response:
Yes- Done by KTWilson.

Number: 154
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.

Editor's Response:
Withdrawn

Number: 155
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes- Done by KTWilson.

```
======================================================================
Clause 9.7 Comments
======================================================================


Number:   156
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.

Editor's Response:
Action: Simon, Tam, Neil and others to discuss off-line.
Presentation to be given by Neil on Friday.
----------------------------------------

Number:   157
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."

Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------

Number:   158
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------
```

```
Number:    159
Ident:     JLM-E38
Type:      editorial
Location: Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-3, Line 92

Comment:

"Mac" is wrong.

Resolution:

Say "MAC".

Editor's Response:
Yes
-----------------------------------------

Number:    160
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.

Editor's Response:
Remove '<' and '?>'. Reference 9.?. Also see 156. Action: Reference
resolution to 156.
-----------------------------------------

Number:    161
Ident:     JLM-E39
Type:      editorial
Location: Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-4, Line 102, 104

Comment:

"signaling" is wrongly spelt.

Resolution:

Say "signalling".

Editor's Response:
No
-----------------------------------------

Number:    162
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.

Editor's Response:
Reject renaming. Appropriate wording for conditions text.

Number: 163
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".

Editor's Response:
New words "If FPOTO is set to 0…" and repeat.

Number: 164
Ident: JLM-E42
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.7, Page 9.7-4, Line 120

Comment:

Make the corrections and remove the note.

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
Delete bullet 5.

```
=======================================================================
Clause 9.8 Comments
=======================================================================


Number:   165
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.

Editor's Response:
Add text within first paragraph to say DTR Stations and C-Ports.
----------------------------------------

Number:   166
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------

Number:   167
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------

Number:   168
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.

Editor's Response:
Keep figure

Number: 169
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 170
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).

Editor's Response:
Remove sentences on 62-64.

Number: 171
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.

Editor's Response:
Remove sentences on 62-64.

Number: 172
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."

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 173
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.

Editor's Response:
?? ms should be ??? ms. **Action KTW:** Find the value, by Friday!
Investigate for inclusion in next draft. Note on reflector by 26th Jan.

First thought is that is should be more frequent than 5s (loss of heart beat). How about
250ms-500ms.

Number: 174
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.

Editor's Response:
Delete lines 146-156.

Number: 175
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:

Editor's Response:
Reject, due to 174. But change PS_STATUS.indication to be
PM_STATUS.indication for link_status only.

Number: 176
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.

Editor's Response:
Delete 171-172, 178-181, sentence starting at end of 189 to 204.

Number: 177
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 178
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 179
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.

Editor's Response:
Table to be dropped. 802.5 selector must be asked requested.
Action: Bob Love. GET THE Auto-negotiation SELECTOR!

Number: 180
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".

Editor's Response:
MOD: Change code-group to be nibble in last line of table.

Number: 181
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)"

Editor's Response:
Reject

Number: 182
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.

Editor's Response:
Delete 312-314.

Number: 183
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

Editor's Response:
Yes

```
Number:    184
Ident:     SAV-E7
Type:      Editorial
Location: Clause 9.8.5.10, Page 9.8-10, Line 325

Comment:

Table 9.8-1 is the wrong table.

Resolution:

Change to Table 9.8-5

Editor's Response:
Yes                                                                      |
----------------------------------------

Number:    185
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"

Editor's Response:
Yes                                                                      |
----------------------------------------

Number:    186
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.

Editor's Response:
Reject since table removed.                                              |
----------------------------------------

Number:    187
Ident:        ANF-Q1
Type:    Question
```

Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-11, Ref 340 - 347

Comment:

I believe that the specification of an unpowered receive return loss is
unnecessary and should be removed from the specification.

I have been thinking a bit more about this requirement for the receive
return
loss to be maintained when the receive circuit is unpowered.

Although I have been unable to confirm this from either my own notes or
the
meeting minutes, I believe that this requirement is based on the
observation
that - when connected to an unterminated (or badly terminated) cable -
valid
data has been recovered from some 4/16Mbps equipment due to the
crosstalk at
the receiver from the same equipments' transmitter (NEXT).

I don't have detailed knowledge of all the existing implementations of
4/16M
Token Ring PHYs but from the ones that I do (TI, Micro Linear, Novacom
and
Madge), it is clear that there is no amplitude derived signal detect
function
in these devices.

I am therefore assuming that the above situation arose from equipment
using
devices that did not have an amplitude derived signal detect function.

Now, TP-PMD specifies just such an amplitude based signal detect
function.
Briefly, a signal detect flag is asserted when the receive signal is
1.0V pk
- pk and is deasserted when this signal drops below 0.2V pk - pk.

If we assume that the worst case cable & connector NEXT loss is 30dB and
that
the transmit signal of 2V pk - pk is effectively doubled by driving into
an
unterminated cable, then the maximum signal at the receiver would be
0.127V
pk - pk. Hence the signal detect flag would be deasserted and recovered
signals ignored.

It is beyond the scope of this comment to go into the detailed sums but
I
believe this figure is actually pretty conservative. In practice, (a)
NEXT
loss should be better than 30dB, (b) the high pass filtering effect of
NEXT
should distort the received waveshape and amplitude such that the
receive
equalisation cannot accurately reproduce the original MLT-3 signal
stream,
and (c) reflections in the unterminated cable will further distort the

transmit waveshape such that the effective doubling of the transmit
voltage
is only apparent for a few bits at a time in a frame.

It is worth noting that in my enquiries about the proper wording of
paragraph
9.2.2 in TP-PMD (i.e. it should have originally stated "unpowered"), it
was
made clear that the original reason for worrying about unpowered return
loss
was fears about increased radiated emissions from unterminated lines
rather
than the risk of crosstalk.

Further, 802.3u does not modify the original wording of TP-PMD despite
their
suffering the same conditions.

Therefore, I'd like have the bare faced cheek to propose that paragraph
9.8.5.13 be removed.

Resolution:

Discuss and resolve question in next meeting.

Editor's Response:
Action: OPEN
Yes

Number: 188
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 requred
of the
receiver circuit when it is active."

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

Editor's Response:
See 187.

Number: 189

```
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 ","

Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------

Number:   190
Ident:    JLM-E44
Type:     editorial
Location: Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-11, Line 358

Comment:

Typo.

Resolution:

Change "G<" to "G,".

Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------

Number:   191
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes, so? No.
----------------------------------------

Number:   192
Ident:      ANF-E8
Type: Editorial
Location:   Clause 9.8, Page 9.8-12, Ref 382

Comment:

The Statement "The terminology used in [802.3] was chosen to be
consistent
with other IEEE 802 standards, rather than with FDDI." is contained in a
```

paragraph that has no references to 802.3. Therefore would it not be better
to refer to 802.5?

Resolution:

Change [802.3] to [802.5]

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 193
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

```
=======================================================================
Clause 13 Comments
=======================================================================

Number:   194
Ident:    NAJ-E23
Type:     Editorial
Location: Clause 13

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Fix it.

Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------

Number:   195
Ident:    NAJ-T18
Type:     Technical
Location: Clause 13

Comment:

Dave Wilson wants all references to TKP removed.

Resolution:

Committee discussion required.

Editor's Response:
Rejected by committee.
----------------------------------------

Number:   196
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.

Editor's Response:
Reject TEST suggestion.
Reject RMV_ALRT, because frame may be repeated.
----------------------------------------

Number:   197
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 198
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.

Editor's Response:
Withdrawn.

Number: 199
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 200
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.

Editor's Response:
see NAJ-T3, Yes

Number: 201
Ident: DWW-T1
Type: Technical
Location: Clause 13.2.1.1.1.1 & 13.2.1.1.2, Page 12-3, Refs

Comment:

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

Resolution:

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

Editor's Response:
Reject, see base. But better words may be forthcoming.

Number: 202
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 203
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

Editor's Response:
Yes, see NAJ-T3

Number: 204
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".

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 205
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 206
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes. "High Media Rate**s**" should not be used. Do a search…

Number: 207
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".

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 208
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 209
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.

Editor's Response:

Yes

Number: 210
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 211
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 principes.

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.

Editor's Response:
Reject, VC is used to direct the frame.

Number: 212
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

Editor's Response:
Open: Express buffering is a good reason to accept this, but LMT is a
old frame, which has been defined to use an FC of '00', so this change
may stop old implementations using this for lobe test. (Also hardware
parsing implementations may have problems).

Question to Dave: How about this from Ivar: Make LMTN express buffered
and add to the state tables a <Prepare for Test>DISCARD_QUEUED_PDU
action before transitioning to the LMT test phase. Does not help shared
MAC implementations.

Accept, FC will be '01' for LMT and LMTN.

Number: 213
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 214
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 215
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

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 216
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 217
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 218
Ident: DWW-E8
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause13.4.1.1, Page 12-10, Lines 205-206

Comment:

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

Resolution:

```
fix

Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------


Number:   219
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------


Number:   220
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).

Editor's Response:
Yes, but the beacon lock-up conditions are an open item which will need
to be closed before answering these questions.
Action: Task force under way to investigate lock-up
----------------------------------------


Number:   221
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------


Number:   222
```

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

Comment:

"new and" is innapproriate.

Resolution:

Remove words.

Editor's Response:
Yes
-----------------------------------------

Number:   223
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes
-----------------------------------------

Number:   224
Ident:    DWW-T10
Type:     Technical
Location: Clause 13.5.1.3, Page 12-12, Line 257

Comment:

what is FSRMO?

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
Yes
-----------------------------------------

Number:   225
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.
```

```
Editor's Response:
Yes
-----------------------------------------

Number:   226
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.

Editor's Response:
Yes
-----------------------------------------

Number:   227
Ident:    NAJ-E28
Type:     Editorial
Location: Clause 13, Page 12-14 , Line 283

Comment:

"new and" is innapproriate.

Resolution:

Remove words.

Editor's Response:
Yes
-----------------------------------------

Number:   228
Ident:    NAJ-E29
Type:     Editorial
Location: Clause 13, Page 12-14, Line 289

Comment:

FPASA is wrong.

Resolution:

Fix it.

Editor's Response:
Yes
-----------------------------------------

Number:   229
Ident:    JLM-E50
Type:     editorial
Location: Clause 13, Page 12-14, Line 289
```

Comment:

Typo

Resolution:

Change FPASA to FPASO.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 230
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:

Editor's Response:
Yes

```
=======================================================================
Annex P Comments
=======================================================================

Number:    231
Ident:     NAJ-E30
Type:      Editorial
Location: Annex P, Page P1, Line 39

Comment:

Word has gone mad with section numbering.

Resolution:

Fix it.

Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------

Number:    232
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

Editor's Response:
Yes
```

```
=======================================================================
Annex X Comments
=======================================================================

Number:   233
Ident:    JLM-E51
Type:     Editorial
Location: Clause X, Page X-1, Line 35

Comment:

Bullet too big.  Geneva convention applies.

Resolution:

Shrink.

Editor's Response:
Yes                                                                    |


=======================================================================
END OF COMMENTS:                  Total Comments: 233, Total Commenters: 8
=======================================================================
```

```
=======================================================================
New Comments
=======================================================================


Number:   234
Ident:    BH-E1
Type:     Editorial
Location: Clause 1.2, Clause 9.0


Comment:


High Media Rate is not defined.


Resolution:


Add it. (stating that it is a data rate of 100Mbit/s or above).


John~~Editor~~'s Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------


Number:   235
Ident:    MJH-E1
Type:     Editorial
Location: Clause 13, Page 12-13, Line 279


Comment:


FPRMO should be FPRPTO


Resolution:


Fix it.


Editor's Response:
Oops, I'll fix it. Good placeholder this so here goes: 13.1.1 add SFS
and EFS definitions. 13.2.2.1: Remove /J/K etc and replace with ref to
Tam's stuff.
----------------------------------------


Number:   236
Ident:    MJH-E2
Type:     Editorial
Location: Clause 9.1 Page 9.1-2, Line 79


Comment:


FxTI=1 should be FPTI=1


Resolution:


Fix it.


Editor's Response:
Yes, this is also an Addendum issue. **Done by KTWilson.**
```

For HSTR: While we are here, this needs to cause
PS_CONTROL.request(Transmit_mode=xx) to happen *before* executing c)-i).
Also in a)-iii) and b)-ii) of this section.
KTWilson: Neil Jarvis: Since words referenced are for 4 or 16 Mbit/s
only, what change is desired in lines 85 through 94?

Q: Does this go into 'r' (PS_CONTROL.request(Repeat_mode=yy))?
A: Add it as a comment against the galley proofs.

Number: 237
Ident: MJH-E3
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 13 Page 12-1, Line 1

Comment:

For consistency change '13' to '13.'

Resolution:

Fix it.

Editor's Response:
Yes

Number: 238
Ident: MJH-E4
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 13 Page 12-3, Line 43-44

Comment:

Consistency : frame, token etc. are CAPITALS on line 7, should they be
CAPITALS here?

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
Withdrawn

Number: 239
Ident: MJH-E5
Type: Editorial
Location: Clause 9.2 Page 9.2-44, Line 503

Comment:

Reference for TXI_REQ should 9.1.8

<This occurs in several places>
THIS IS WRONG IN 802.5r!

Resolution:

Fix it.

```
Editor's Response:
Yes
----------------------------------------


Number: 240
Ident: KR-T1
Type: technical
Location: addition to 9.8(9.8.6.7?)

Comment:

Require operation of the PMD scrambler in fiber operation.

Resolution:

Recommend duplicating 9.8.5.16 as new item 9.8.6.7.

Editor's Response:
Concerns were raised that this may affect baseline wander and whether
all the PHYs would allow the scrambler to be turned on for fibre.

Action: Karl, Bo, Tam, Andy and all other knowledgeables to get off-line
and determine an appropriate response.

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

Number:   241
Ident:    MJH-E6
Type:     Question
Location: Clause 13 Page 12-5, Line 125

Comment:

Is RMV_ALRT only used at the high media rate? If so please add
'at the high media rate' <or however we say it> after TXI Access
Protocol

Resolution:

Editor's Response:
Yes
NAJ: Add **1 to RMV_ALRT frames in clause 13 tables to prevent RI being added to these frames.


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

Number:   242
Ident:    TJR-E1
Type:     Editorial
Location: Annex X.

Comment:

Annex fails to address real need (telling TX vendors how to use their
port for TR

Resolution:
Change title to: "100Mbit/s PHY design using 802.3 100BASE-TX
implementations"
```

Add footnote:
"Auto-Negotiation for Token Ring requires a new, to be determined,
selector field value. The use of auto-negotiation is difficult for new
protocols because of the hard-wired nature of the resolution function.
An improvement of the auto-negotiation procedure could remove this
difficulty. This improvement is to add a bit (or interrupt) that
informs higher levels (initially software) that the partner
advertisement register has been properly set from the reception of a
valid partner ability frame. At this point, the higher level could take
over the resolution process from the PHY. In the absence of such an
improvement, auto-negotiation will be disabled by Token Ring devices."

Editor's Response:
MOD words, but accept concept.
- Note that it is a future study item
- 100BASE-TX should be 100BASE-X