

=====
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 set will be added to the standard.

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

Resolution:

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

Editor's Response:

[Proposal to add a paragraph stating that the /H/H/T/R/ abort sequence shall be used whenever it is available, otherwise the invalid FCS/E bit set method may be employed. This will be in Clause 13 \(option flags to be added, since they are currently missing\).](#)

[Action: Formal request to be sent to the RMII group, specifying the HSTR requirements for the RMII interface.](#)

[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](#)

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.](#)

=====
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.](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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 for operation at the High Media Rate."

Editor's Response:

OK with correction. Add "by this supplement." To end of sentence.

=====
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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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.](#)

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](#)

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.](#)

[Line 196. Add section defining what data symbols are.](#)

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](#)

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 \(code symbols /T/R\)." Fix up JK to read /J/K. Note to clause 13: Fix /H/H/T/R/ to be /H/H/T/R.](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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.](#)

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.](#)

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.

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 reviews 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.

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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."](#)

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](#)

Number: 36
Ident: JLM-E9
Type: editorial
Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-15, Line 504, [517518](#)

Comment:

Reference errors: text says "0".

Resolution:

Editor's Response:

[Yes](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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.

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.

Number: 42

Ident: JLM-E11

Type: editorial

Location: Clause 9.1, Page 9.1-16, Line 543

Comment:

| Repetitive~~Repetitive~~ text.

Resolution:

Delete "for this Frame".

Editor's Response:

Yes

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](#)

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 1120 frames transmitted is either not received or is received with an error."](#)

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](#)

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...](#)

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](#)
| [No to 555, see 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:

| [ReplaceRepalee](#) Flag with flag.

Editor's Response:

| [Yes](#)

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.](#)

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

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

=====
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](#)
- [Remove FSMRO<2 from 3504](#)
- [Rename PS_CONTROL.request\(Repeat_mode=\) to \(Transmit_mode=fill/no_fill/repeat \(C-Port only\)\)](#)
- [TX_SFS and TX_EFS should receive HSTR definitions.](#)
- [TS=STXD needs words for HSTR. \(talking about PS_UNITDATA.request\(data_byte\)\).](#)
- [Fix 9.1.1.1: Set FxTI=0/1 should also state that PS_CONTROL... is executed.](#)

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.

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.

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

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

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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.](#)

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](#)

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. To be checked with Annex P editor.](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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. New ref 3168.](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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. Action: KTW.](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

[KTW: Note to go 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](#)

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 3301 3302](#)

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 3303](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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.](#)

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](#)

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.](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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

Comment:

Use of undefined term "hierarchical~~heirarchical~~ address match".

Resolution:

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

Editor's Response:

Reject.

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

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.

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

=====
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](#)

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.](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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.

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

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

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

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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.](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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 132.](#)

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](#)

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, optional-i](#)

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](#)

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

Editor's Response:

[Yes](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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.](#)

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

Comment:

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

Resolution:

Editor's Response:

| [Yes](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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.](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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.](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

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](#)

=====
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 0 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 0) 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 required 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 Rates" 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 principles.

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: Clause 13.4.1.1, Page 12-10, Lines 205-206

Comment:

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

Resolution:

fix

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 inappropriate.

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 inappropriate.

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.

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.

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 knowledgeable 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