802.5t/D2 Comment Report

Comment JLM-05

Section 0.0 **Line** 0 **Severity** DIS **Type** ED **Status** OPEN

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

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

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

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

KTWilson - I have done this in 9.0, 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 as follows.

1. When it makes grammatical sense to change "clause 9.1" to "9.1", I have changed to "9.1".
2. When it does not make grammatical sense to change "clause 9.1" to "9.1", I have changed to "subclause 9.1".
3. When it makes grammatical sense to change "clause 9" to "9", I have changed to "9".
4. When it does not make grammatical sense to change "clause 9" to "9", I left unchanged.

Note: This was a global search and may not have corrected all occurrances. However, the IEEE Editors will correct this anyway, so I will do no further searching.

Comment NAJ-01

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

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

Concern: Title Page: Extraneous space on first line:

"Supplement to   Inform…"

Solution: Remove space

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

Comment NAJ-02

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

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

Concern: Title Page:

The PAR is for multimode optical fibre.

Solution: Insert word multimode in title.

Response:

Comment NAJ-03

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

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

Concern: Extra baseline skip after line 13.

Solution: Remove.

Response:

Comment JLM-01

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

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

Concern: PORT shouldn't be uppercase

Solution: Change C-PORT to C-Port

Response:

Comment EDTR-E-3

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

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

Concern: Clarify definitions of PSC and PMC

Solution: Add words (per Messenger) appropriately.

Response: Messenger's Words:

Modify the following definitions:

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

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

Comment ANF-04

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

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

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

Solution:

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

Comment ANF-01

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

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

Concern: No line numbers.

Solution: Add line numbers.

Response:

Comment ANF-02

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

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

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

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

Repeat this procedure for the second hyphen.

Response:

Comment ANF-03

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

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

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

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

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

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

Solution:

Response: Remove Box

Comment NAJ-12

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

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

Concern: Figure 2.2-1 and 2.2-2

Figures are missing PMC repeat path options.

Solution: Add repeat path to PMC modules

Response:

Comment NAJ-11

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

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

Concern: Figure 2.2-1 and 2.2-2

Text talks about PS_EVENT.indication, but it is not shown in the figure.

Solution: Add.

Response: In Clause 2.2.3, b. remove ", PS_EVENT.response" from second line.

Comment NAJ-10

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

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

Concern: 2.2.3

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

Solution: Add new words.

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

Comment RDL-02

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

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

Concern: This section does not belong in this document

Solution: Delete 2.2.2 and renumber 2.2.3 as 2.2.2

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

Comment NAJ-13

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

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

Concern: Figure 2.2-2

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

Solution:

Response:

Comment NAJ-08

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

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

Concern: 2.2.3, list item c.

Last line, "de-fined".

Solution: Should be "defined".

Response:

Comment NAJ-09

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

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

Concern:　2.2.3, list item e.

　　　　　Last line, "ex-change"

Solution:　Should be "exchange"

Response:

Comment NAJ-07

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

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

Concern:　2.2.3, list item b.

　　　　　Last line, "de-fined"!

Solution:　Should be "defined".

Response:

Comment NAJ-06

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

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

Concern:　2.2.3, end of second paragraph

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

Solution:　Replace with

　　　　　"for an externally visible interface."

Response:

Comment NAJ-05

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

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

Concern:　2.2.3, second paragraph.

　　　　　"The operation of a station…"

Solution:　"station" should be "Station".

Response:

Comment NAJ-04

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

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

Concern:　2.2.2: Note needs to be answered.

Solution:

Response: Removed Section 2.2.2 with the note.

Comment KR-01

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

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

Concern: No line numbers

Solution: Add line numbers

Response:

Comment RDL-01

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

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

Concern: Page 1, Clarification required.

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

Response:

Comment RJK-09

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

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

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

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

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

Comment RJK-04

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

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

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

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

Response: Box Removed

Comment JLM-02

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

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

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

Solution: Reject Neil's comment.

Response:

Comment SJH-01

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

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

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

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

Response:

Comment JLM-03

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

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

Concern: PS_EVENT.response does not exist for TXI.

Solution: Delete PS_EVENT.response from this list.

Response:

Comment SJH-02

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

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

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

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

Response:

Comment JLM-04

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

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

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

Solution: … MA_UNITDATA.request) is specified in ISO/IEC 15802-1 and is used as specified in
9.1. It defines the …

Response:

Comment JLM-06

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

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

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

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

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

Comment SJH-03

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

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

Concern: More random hyphenation.

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

Response:

Comment KR-02

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

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

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

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

Response:

Comment SJH-04

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

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

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

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

Response:

Comment JLM-10

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

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

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

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

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

Response: Need each instance identified.

Comment JLM-07

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

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

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

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

Response:

Comment JLM-08

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

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

Concern: Option flags are really called policy flags.

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

Response: Changed line 32
From: " … Option Flags … "
To: " … Policy flags … "

Comment NAJ-14

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

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

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

Also on lines 44 and 48.

Solution: Add 13.9.8 (3 times).

Response: Added 13.9.8 on lines 42, 45 and 48 as follows.

From: " … 9.7.2 and 9.8."
To: " … 9.7.2, 9.8 and 13.9.8."

Comment KTW-01

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

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

Concern: The word "clause" is wrong.

Solution: Change "clause" to "subclause".

Response: Changed line 74 as follows (per JLM-05 agreement).

```
From: "Mbit/s. This clause defines …"
To:   "Mbit/s. 9.4 defines …"
```

Comment NAJ-15

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

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

Concern: And lines 80 and 83.

Extraneous parenthesis.

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

Response: Changed as follows.

```
Line 76 From: "ANNEX (N) … " to: "Annex N … ".
Line 80 From: "ANNEX (R) … " to: "Annex R … ".
Line 83 From: "ANNEX (Q) … " to: "Annex Q … ".
```

Comment NAJ-16

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

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

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

Solution: Say so.

Response: Already stated in first paragraph.

Comment SJH-05

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

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

Concern: Missing full-stop at end of line.

Solution: Add it.

Response: Changed line 84 as follows.

```
From: " … in 9.6"
To:   " … in 9.6."
```

Comment JLM-09

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

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

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

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

Response: After a discussion whether "PHY" or "PSC/PMC" should be used, the committee decided on the term "PHY".
Changed line 89 as follows.

From: " … the PHY/PMD functions … "
To: " … the PHY functions … "

Comment NAJ-E-321

Section 09.1   **Line** 25   **Severity** A/C   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: The Remove Alert process is not defined.

NOTE: This item was opened by KTWilson after the May
      Interim meeting while updating 9.1.

Solution: 1. Add to list in 9.1 item 2 the Remove Alert protocol.

2. Add the definition of Remove Alert protocol before line
   1153.

9.1.15 Remove Alert Protocol

The intention of the Remove Alert protocol is to allow local management (either C-
Port or Station management) to be informed that the entity on the other end of the
link is returning to its Bypass state (JS=BP).

The C-Port and Station in their respective Join Complete states, executing the TXI
Access Protocol and operating at the High Media Rate use the Remove Alert protocol
when certain conditions require them to enter the Bypass state.

Any condition requiring the C-Port or Station to enter the Bypass state and the
link between them is evaluated as operative causes the Remove Alert process to be
started. The Remove Alert protocol first transmits a Remove Alert MAC frame and
then enters the Remove Alert Wait state (either JS=PRAP or JS=SRAP). The Remove
Alert Wait state is used for the retransmission of the Remove Alert MAC frame to
provide a reliable notification process. The retransmission of the Remove Alert MAC
frame is controlled by the C-Port's counter CPRAT and the Station's counter CSRAT.
The initial value of the Station's counter is controlled by n8 (see 9.2.5) while
the C-Port's counter is controlled by n9 (see 9.3.4).

Response: 1. The following has been added before line 25.

   n) Remove Alert protocol is described in 9.1.16.

2. The following has been added before line 1153.

9.1.15 Remove Alert Protocol

The intention of the Remove Alert protocol is to allow local management (either C-
Port or Station management) to be informed that the entity on the other end of the
link is returning to its Bypass state (JS=BP).

The C-Port and Station in their respective Join Complete states, executing the TXI
Access Protocol and operating at the High Media Rate use the Remove Alert protocol
when certain conditions require them to enter the Bypass state.

Any condition requiring the C-Port or Station to enter the Bypass state and the
link between them is evaluated as operative causes the Remove Alert process to be
started. The Remove Alert protocol first transmits a Remove Alert MAC frame and
then enters the Remove Alert Wait state (either JS=PRAP or JS=SRAP). The Remove
Alert Wait state is used for the retransmission of the Remove Alert MAC frame to
provide a reliable notification process. The retransmission of the Remove Alert MAC
frame is controlled by the C-Port's counter CPRAT and the Station's counter CSRAT.
The initial value of the Station's counter is controlled by n8 (see 9.2.5) while
the C-Port's counter is controlled by n9 (see 9.3.4).

Comment SJH-06

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

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

Concern: Missing point number 3.

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

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-17

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

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

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

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

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

Response: Changed lines 72, 74, 96, 98, 111, 113, 124, 126, 147, 156 and 172 as follows.
From: "… using …"
To: "… to invoke …".

Comment NAJ-18

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

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

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

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

Response: Changed line 65 as follows.

From: "detects the end of frame data transmission"
To: "detects the need to end frame data transmission"

Comment SJH-07

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

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

Concern: Bad wording.

Solution: Change "…and starts transmission…" to
"…and start with transmission…"

Response: Replace lines 78 and 79 with the following.

ii) The C-Port and Station use the
    PS_UNITDATA.request(Tx_symbol=Data_byte) signal for
    transmitting each octet. The transmission of the frame
    starts with the SFS [TX_SFS(P=x;R=0)].

Comment SJH-08

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

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

Concern: (1) not correctly indented.

Solution: Indent it.

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-19

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

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

Concern: Word list formatting error.

Solution: Fix it.

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-20

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

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

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

Solution: Remove phrase.

Response: Changed lines 92 and 93 as follows.

```
From: "… of the EFS with the I-bit, if present set to 0 and
       the E-bit set to 0 [TX_EFS(I=E=0) for 4 Mbit/s …"
To:   "… of the EFS [TX_EFS(I=E=0) for 4 Mbit/s …"
```

Comment NAJ-21

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

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

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

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

Response: Change line 121 as follows.

```
From: (a) The transmission of the EFS is started.

To:   (a) The transmission of an invalid FCS (frame shall
          not pass FCS receive checking) followed by the
          transmission of the EFS.
```

Comment SJH-09

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

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

Concern: Bad wording.

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

Response: Changed line 139 as follows.

```
From:  "… transmits using signal …"
To:    "… transmits using a signal …"
```

Comment NAJ-22

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

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

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

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

Response: Changed lines 184 and 185 as follows.

```
From:  "value of FxTXC is not under control of the
        Transmit Port Operation Table 9.3-2 or Station
        Operation Table 9.2-2 …"

To:    "value of FxTXC is not under control of the C-Port
        or Station Transmit Operation Tables 9.3-2 or 9.2-2
        …"
```

Comment SJH-10

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

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

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

Solution: Change "include" to "includes".

Response: Changed line 244 as follows.

```
From: "… column that include the notations: …"
To:   "… column that includes the notations: …"
```

Comment SJH-11

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

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

Concern: Lines 283-285 are indented too far.

Solution: Remove one level of indentation.

Response: Fixed indentation.

Comment NAJ-23

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

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

Concern: FR_FC is wrong.

Solution: Should be FR_AC.

Response: Change line 328 as follows.

```
From:  "… and FR_FC signals …"
To:    "… and FR_AC signals …"
```

Comment NAJ-24

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

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

Concern: FR_AC is wrong

Solution: Should be FR_FC

Response: Change line 340 as follows.

```
From:  "The FR_AC signals …"
To:    "The FR_FC signals …"
```

Comment SJH-12

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

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

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

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

Response: Change lines 341-342, 353-354, 385-386 and 389-390 as follows.

```
From: "… have been received that satisfies the following
       conditions."
To:   "… have been received that satisfy the following
       conditions."
```

Comment RJK-03

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

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

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

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

Response: Changed lines 349 and 356 as follows.

```
From: "… /J/K)."
To:   "… /J/K/)."
```

Comment RJK-02

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

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

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

Solution: Put them on separate lines.

Response: OK in Master.

Comment SJH-13

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

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

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

Solution: Add new line.

Response: OK in master. Neil?

Comment NAJ-25

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

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

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

Solution: Fix it.

Response: OK in Master.

Comment RJK-01

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

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

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

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

Response: Defined a new entry "M" (after line 368) as follows.

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

Replaced lines 380 through 382 as follows.

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

Comment SJH-14

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

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

Concern: "The FR_AC signal" is wrong. It should read "The FR_FC signal".

Solution: Change it.

Response: Changed line 388 as follows.

```
From: "… The FR_AC signal …"
To:   "… The FR_FC signal …"
```

Comment NAJ-26

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

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

Concern: Extraneous use of the word "the"

Solution: Delete both occurances of "the" on this line.

Response: See item SJH-15 for resolution.

Comment SJH-15

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

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

Concern: Bad wording.

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

Response: Changed line 396 as follows.

```
From: "… for the 4 Mbit/s and 16 Mbit/s and …"
To:   "… for the 4 Mbit/s and 16 Mbit/s media rates and …"
```

Comment SJH-16

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

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

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

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

Response: Changed lines 409 and 410 as follows.

```
From: "or TS=PTXN) and shall cause Join function of the
       Station or C-Port to enter the Bypass state (JS=BP)."

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

Comment **NAJ-27**

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

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

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

Solution: Fix it.

Response: OK in the master. Neil?

Comment **SJH-17**

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

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

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

Solution: Add it.

Response: OK in the Master. Neil.

Comment DWW-02

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

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

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

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

Response: The definition in lines 624 through 633 is incorrect. Further, KTWilson to add what the Station and C-Port do to START the Trade-up to the High Media Rate.

    1. Lines 624 through 633 have been rewritten as follows.

     5. If the Station operating at 4 Mbit/s or 16 Mbit/s receives a REG_RSP MAC frame with an AP_RSP subvector value of X'0004' (indicating the C-Port has honored the Station's request to Trade-up to the High Media Rate), then the Station activates its High Media Rate PHY (implementation dependent) and enters the Join High Media Rate Trade-up state (JS=SHMRTU). The Station waits for its High Media Rate PHY to activate by taking one of the following actions.

       a. If the High Media Rate Link Status fails to activate before timer TSHSW expires, then the Station shall enter the Bypass state (JS=BP).

       b. If the High Media Rate Link Status activates before timer TSHSW expires, then the Station shall enter the Registration state (JS=SREG) and request High Media Rate operation.

    2. Lines 658 through 661 have been rewritten as follows.

     o If the value of the Station's AP_REQ when logically ANDed with the C-Port's PPV(AP_MASK) results in a value of X'0004', then the C-Port requests the Station to execute its Trade-up protocol by transmitting a Registration Response (REG_RSP) MAC frame with an AP_RSP subvector value of X'0004', then the C-Port activates its High Media Rate PHY (implementation dependent) and enters the Join High Media Rate Trade-up state (JS=PHMRTU). The C-Port waits for its High Media Rate PHY to activate by taking one of the following actions.

       a. If the High Media Rate Link Status fails to activate before timer TPHMRW expires, then the C-Port shall enter the Bypass state (JS=BP).

       b. If the High Media Rate Link Status activates before timer TPHMRW expires, then the C-Port shall enter the Registration state (JS=PREG) and wait for the Station to make its request for High Media Rate operation (see 9.1.4.1).

Comment DWW-01

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following explanation of the Trade-up protocol has been added after line 1152.

9.1.14 High Media Rate Trade-up Protocol

The High Media Rate Trade-up protocol is used only by the Station that has been requested by management to operate at 4 Mbit/s or 16 Mbit/s, but has been given permission to Trade-up to the High Media Rate via the Policy flag FSTUO (=1). The Station requests the C-Port to operate using the TXI Access Protocol and to support 100 Mbit/s, if possible, via the Registration Request MAC frame's AP_REQ subvector value of X'0006'.

If the C-Port does not support the High Media Rate as requested by the Station, then the C-Port responds with a Registration Response MAC frame subvector value of X'0002' (registration complete). The C-Port and Station do not start the Trade-up function, but rather operate at the media speed originally requested by the Station

If the C-Port does support the High Media Rate, then the C-Port responds with a Registration Response MAC frame subvector value of X'0004' (indicating the C-Port supports the High Media Rate) and both the C-Port and Station start the Trade-up function.

9.1.14.1 Station support of the High Media Rate Trade-up
       function

The Station, upon reception of a Registration Response MAC frame with an AP_RSP subvector value of X'0004' starts the Trade-up function by entering the High Media Rate Trade-up state (JS=SHMRTU), activating the High Media Rate link speed and resetting the timer, TSHMRW.

If TSHMRW expires before the PM_STATUS.indication(Link_status=Asserted) signal occurs, then the High Media Rate link failed to operate, the Station enters the Bypass state (JS=BP) and provides management with an indication that the High Media Rate request failed (an indication that the setting of the Policy flag FSTUO needs to be changed by management).
If the PM_STATUS.indication(Link_status=Asserted) signal occurs before timer TSHMRW expires, then the C-Port and Station can operate at the High Media Rate. The Station restarts the registration process at the High Media Rate using the TXI Access Protocol.

9.1.14.2 C-Port support of the High Media Rate Trade-up
       function

The C-Port, upon reception of a Registration Request MAC frame with a AP_REQ subvector value of X'0006', determines whether it is able to support the High Media Rate request.

If the C-Port does not support the High Media Rate (FPTUO=0), then the C-Port responds with a Registration Response MAC frame with an AP_RSP subvector value of X'0002' indicating that the C-Port and Station will continue to operate at the media speed originally requested by management.

If the C-Port does support the High Media Rate (FPTUO=1), then the C-Port responds
with a Registration Response MAC frame with an AP_RSP subvector value of X'0004'
indicating that the C-Port and Station are to attempt operating at the High Media
Rate. The C-Port starts the Trade-up function by entering the High Media Rate
Trade-up state (JS=PHMRTU) and activating the High Media Rate link speed and
resetting the timer, TPHMRW and takes one of the following actions.

o If TPHMRW expires before the
  PM_STATUS.indication(Link_status=Asserted) signal occurs,
  then the High Media Rate link failed to operate, the
  C-Port enters the Bypass state (JS=BP) and provides
  management with an indication that the High Media Rate
  request failed (an indication that the setting of the
  Policy flag FPTUO needs to be changed by management).

o If the PM_STATUS.indication(Link_status=Asserted) signal
  occurs before timer TPHMRW expires, then the C-Port and
  Station can operate at the High Media Rate. The C-Port
  enters the Registration state and waits for the Station
  to request operation at the High Media Rate using the TXI
  Access Protocol.

Comment SJH-18

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

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

Concern: Bad wording.

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

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

Comment DWW-03

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

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

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

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

Response: Make the text agree with the State tables.

              This paragraph has been rewritten as per DWW-02.

Comment DWW-04

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

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

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

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

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

Comment SJH-19

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

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

Concern: "TXI capable" should be hyphenated.

Solution: Do it.

Response: Line 682 has been changed as follows.

```
From:  "… allow two TXI capable entities …"
To:    "… allow two TXI-capable entities …"
```

Comment NAJ-28

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

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

Concern: FSLTA=1 is wrong.

Solution: Replace with FSRLMT=1

Response: Lines 701 through 704 changed as follows.

o If FSLMTO is set to 0, the Station uses the 4 Mbit/s or 16 Mbit/s method of testing (TXI_TEST) defined in 9.1.6.1.

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

   Note: "o" above are equal to bullets.

Comment NAJ-29

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

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

Concern: "rate" should be pluralised.

Solution: Fix it.

Response: Changed lines 706 and 707 as follows.

```
From:   "… at the 4 Mbit/s and 16 Mbit/s media rate with …"
To:     "… at the 4 Mbit/s and 16 Mbit/s media rates with …"
```

Comment DWW-05

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comment NAJ-30

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

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

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

Solution:

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

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

Comment KR-03

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

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

Concern: Looks like multiple queues to me!

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

Response: Done.

After a lengthy committee discussion, it was agreed that Karl's suggestion was the best solution.

Comment SJH-20

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

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

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

Solution: Remove it.

Response: Change lines 852 and 853 as follows.

```
From: "transmitting idles from either its Crystal (FSTXC=1)
       or its recovered clock (FSTXC=0).  Flag FSTXC is set
       by the Join and Monitor Station Machines.

To:   "transmitting idles from either its crystal (FSTXC=1)
       or its recovered clock (FSTXC=0).  The Join and
       Monitor Station Operation Tables control the setting
       of the Flag FSTXC.
```

Comment SJH-21

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

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

Concern: "C Port" should be hyphenated.

Solution: Do it.

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-E-318

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

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

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

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

Response: Done in subclauses 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3.

Comment SJH-22

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

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

Concern: Bad English.

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-02

Section 9.2   **Line** 41   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

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

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

RATIONALE for Remove Alert Change:

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

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

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

1. Upon entry into the Remove Alert Wait state (JS=SRAW),
   the Station transmits the first Remove Alert MAC frame,
   the counter CSRAP is set and the timer TSRAP is reset.

2. After entry into JS=SRAW, retries of the Remove Alert
   MAC frame occur, paced by TSRAP until counter CSRAP
   reaches zero. When CSRAP reaches zero, the Station
   enters the Bypass state (JS=BP).

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

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

1. A New State

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

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

2. The following changes are proposed for the Station.

    a) The references changed are done by other items
       opened by me (KTW) by referencing this item.

    B) Change figure 9.2-1 to include the Remove Alert Wait
       state.

Response: Changes made to 9.2. (Done)

Also have done the following.

o Added a definition of Remove Alert to 9.1. (Done)

Comment NAJ-31

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

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

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

Solution: Fix it.

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-32

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

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

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

Solution: Should be "C-Port".

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-03

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comment DWW-06

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

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

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

Solution:

Response: See item KTW-03 for resolution.

Comment KTW-09

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

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

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

Solution: Check Word output.

Response: See item KTW-03 for resolution.

Comment NAJ-33

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

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

Concern: Word gone mad again.

Solution: Fix it.

Response: See item KTW-03 for resolution.

Comment DWW-07

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

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

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

Solution:

Response: See item KTW-03 for resolution.

Comment KTW-08

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

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

Concern: Correct the name of JS=BP.

Solution: Change line 135 as follows.

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

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

Response:

Comment KTW-04

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

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

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

Solution: Add after line 141:

    JS=SRAW : Station Remove Alert Wait

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-34

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

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

Concern: Word gone mad again.

Solution: Fix it.

Response: See item KTW-03 for resolution.

Comment **KTW-10**

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

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

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

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

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

Comment **SJH-23**

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

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

Concern: `New line missing.`

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

Response: `OK in master.  Neil?`

Comment **DWW-08**

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

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

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

Solution:

Response: `OK in master.  Neil?`

Comment **IMJ-01**

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

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

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

Solution: `Remove the FSTUI flag.`

Response: `See IMJ-02.`

Comment IMJ-02

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

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

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

Solution: Remove the FSTUI flag.

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

As per committee discussion, FSMR was used and Flag FSTUI has been removed as follows.

1. Line 127 page 9.2-6 deleted.
2. Lines 330 through 333 on page 9.2-10 deleted.
3. FSTUI removed from Station Operation Table transitions 3119 on page 9.2-23 and 3122 on page 9.2-25.
4. FSTUO=1 (now called FSHMRTUO=1) has been removed from REF 3178 on page 9.2-19 since AP_RSP can only occur if Station sent AP_REQ of 0006 (REF 33119 and 3122) which also requires FSTUO=1 (now called FSHMRTUO=1).

Comment KTW-05

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

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

Concern: Spurious word "Join" in the Title.

Solution: Change line 399 as follows.

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

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

Response: Change line 399 to the following.

Join State JE, Station High Media Rate Trade-up (JS=SHMRTU).

Comment DWW-09

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

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

Concern: and 404 - what then exits?

Solution:

Response: Lines 400 through 404 have been rewritten as follows.

This state is entered when the Station's Registration state (JS=SREG) detects the C
Port has agreed to its request to Trade-up from 4 Mbit/s or 16 Mbit/s operation to
the High Media Rate operation and the Station has activated its High Media Rate
PHY. The Station High Media Rate Trade-up state waits for one of the following
actions to occur.

o If the High Media Rate Link status becomes active before
  timer TSHMRW expires, then enter the Registration state
  (JS=SREG) to restart the Registration state (JS=SREG) at
  the High Media Rate.

o If High Media Rate Link Status fails to become active
  before the timer TSHMRW expires, then enter the Bypass
  state (JS=BP).

Comment KTW-06

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

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

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

Solution: Add the following after line 404.

Join State JF, Station Remove Alert Wait

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

Response: The following was added after line 404.

Join State JF, Station Remove Alert Wait (JS=SRAW)

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

Comment KTW-74

Section 9.2   **Line** 468   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

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

Problem:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Changes to Connect.SMAC.

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

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

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

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

Response: I have done this in Station.

Comment NAJ-35

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

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

Concern: Plurals wrong in sentence.

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

Response: Lines 483 and 484 have been changed to the following.

Parameter n6, n7 and n8 represent the initial value of the counters CSREQ, CSLTF
and CSRAT respectively to allow flexibility among station implementations.

Comment KTW-07

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

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

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

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

FROM:

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

TO:

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-77

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

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

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

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

Change Action column as follows.

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

Response: Changed REF 3181 as per IMJ-08.

Comment KTW-81

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

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

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

Solution: Change REF 3174 as follows.

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-80

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

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

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

Solution: Change REF 3173 as follows.

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-82

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

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

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

Solution: Change REF 3175 as follows.

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-78**

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

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

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

Solution: Change REF 3194 as follows.

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

Response: Done

Comment **KTW-19**

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

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

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

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

Change Action column as follows.

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

Response: See IMJ-05.

Comment **NAJ-36**

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

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

Concern: R3179, 9.2-15

Comment in condition talks about Connect.PMAC

Solution: Should be Connect.SMAC

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-79**

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

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

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

Solution: Change REF 3172 as follows.

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-23**

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

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

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

Solution: Remove it.

Response:

Comment **KTW-22**

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

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

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

Solution: Change 3171 as follows.

```
1. Change S/T column as follows.

   FROM: "JD0B"
   TO:   "JD0C"

2. Change Action column as follows.

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-20**

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

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

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

Solution: Change 3176 as follows.

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-18**

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

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

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

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

```
Change Action column as follows.

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

Response: See IMJ-04

Comment KTW-17

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

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

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

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

Change Action column as follows.

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

Response: See IMJ-08

Comment KTW-16

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

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

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

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

Change Action column as follows.

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

Response: See IMJ-08

Comment KTW-15

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

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

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

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

Change Action column as follows.

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

Response: See IMJ-08

Comment KTW-14

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

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

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

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

Change Action column as follows.

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

Response: See IMJ-08

Comment NAJ-40

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

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

Concern: R3190, 9.2-21

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

Solution: Remove from actions.

Response: Remove 100 Mbit/s comment from conditions only.
Also see DWW-11.

Comment NAJ-37

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

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

Concern: R3170, 9.2-15

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

Solution: Fix it.

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-21

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

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

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

Solution: Change 3192 as follows.

1. Change S/T column as follows.

   FROM: "JD0C"
   TO: "JF0"

2. Change Event column as follows.

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

Response:

Comment DWW-10

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

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

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

Solution: Maybe ok as "remove" comes from management

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

Comment KTW-12

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

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

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

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

Change Action column as follows.

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

Response: See IMJ-08.

Comment KTW-11

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

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

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

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

Change Action column as follows.

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

Response: Evaluated as part of IMJ-03. The proposed change was done.

Comment IMJ-11

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

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

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

Solution: Remove event/action

Response: REF 3184 deleted.

Comment IMJ-10

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

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

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

Solution: Remove event/action

Response: I don't agree.

Comment IMJ-09

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

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

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

Solution: Remove event/action

Response: Accepted, REF 3152 deleted - see IMJ-08.

Comment IMJ-08

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

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

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

Solution: Change the "Action" field to: "JS=BP; if FSPDA=1 then Remove_station"

Response: Change to 3182 and 3183 made.

3184 was deleted by IMJ-11.

Comment KTW-13

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

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

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

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

Change Action column as follows.

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

Response: See IMJ-08

Comment IMJ-03

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

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

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

Solution: Add to the "Action" field: "; if FSPDA=1 then Remove_station"

Response: KTWilson to recheck above transitions for correction. REFs 3180 and 3185 not
changed. 3180 is Disconnect.SMAC while 3185 is FR_REMOVE. Both of these
conditions should be allowed to notify the C-Port the Station is preparing to
remove itself from the link. Therefore, the following change was made.

1. Change action column of REFs 3181, 3186 and 3187 to:

   JS=BP; If FSPDA=1 then Remove_station

2. Change S/T column of REFs 3181, 3186 and 3187 to "JDO"
   (now blank):

Comment IMJ-05

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

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

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

Solution: Ref 3193 on page 9.2-26.
Add to "action" field: "; Remove_station".

Response: Changed "action" column of REF 3193 on page 9.2-26 to the following.

   JS=BP; Remove_station

Comment DWW-11

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

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

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

Solution: fix it

Response: Done. Also see NAJ-40.

Comment DWW-12

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

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

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

Solution:

Response: Removed FSMRO (now known as FSMR) from condition.

Comment DWW-13

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

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

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

Solution: Sort it out with Neil

Response: OK, do it in clause 14.

New name of flag is FSHMRTUO for:

Flag, Station High Media Rate Trade-up Option (FSHMRTUO).

Comment DWW-14

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

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

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

Solution:

Response: Action column of REF 3177 has been changed as follows.

```
CSREQ=n6; TSREQ=R;
  If SPV(PD)=0001 then FSPDA=1;
  If SPV(PD)=0002 then
      (FSPDC=1; FSPDA=0);
TXI_REG_REQ
    (AP_REQ=0002;
    IAC=SPV(IAC);
    PD=SPV(PD))
```
<<Setup Phantom Drive control and then transmit Registration Request with the following AP_REQ, IAC and PD Subvector setup. >>

Comment NAJ-38

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

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

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

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

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

Response: See KTW-02 for solution.

Comment NAJ-E-322

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

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

Concern: REF 3167 missing S/T Transition

Solution: Add to REF S/T column: JA0.

Response: Done.

Comment IMJ-04

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

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

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

Solution: Change "Action" field to: "JS=BP; if FSPDA=1 then Remove_station".

Response: Changed action field of 3188 on page 9.2-21 to the following.

```
   JS=BP; If FSPDA=1 the Remove_station
    << Station Fault, Transmit Error >>
```


Also, S/T changed to JD0.

Comment NAJ-42

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

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

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

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

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

Response: This was done manually and I may have missed some (Neil, please verify for me -
thanks!), but I think I found them all. Done as follows.

NAJ-42: Subclause 9.2 tables searched and corrected.

NAJ-53: Subclause 9.3 tables searched and corrected.

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

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

Concern: R3178: 9.2-19

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

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

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

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

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

New control:

MGMT_CONTROL.request(Select_speed)

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

Station transition changes:

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

C-Port transition changes:

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

Response:

Comment NAJ-43

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

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

Concern: R3121, 9.2-24

Unterminated comment in actions column.

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

Response: After reading the comments in REF 3121 action column, I modified changed action as follows for clarity (minor technical change: added semi-colon after TXI_TEST that was missing and comment changes).

```
JS=SLT; TSLMTC=R;
  << Start Lobe Media Test
      Completion Timer >>
  If FSLMTO=0 then TXI_TEST;
    << FSLMTO=0: Start the Lobe Media Test
            defined by 9.1.6.1. >>
  If FSLMTO=1 then FSRLMT=1
      << FSLMTO=1: Start the Lobe Media Test
          defined by  9.1.6.2 Table 9.2-7. >>
```

Comment NAJ-41

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

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

Concern: R3172, R3174, R3175, 9.2-22

Comments in Actions column are wrong.

Solution: Delete comments.

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-39

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

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

Concern: R3171, 9.2-20

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

Solution: Change JS=SJC to be JS>=SDAC.
If you don't like the terminology, create a new transition for JS=SDAC.

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

Comment NAJ-44

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

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

Concern: R3301, R3302, 9.2-30

Typo in actions column:

"FSDPA=1" should read "FSPDA=1"

Solution: Fix it.

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-76**

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

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

Concern: Correct Formatting - make this item 2.

Solution: Do it.

Response: Done.

Comment **NAJ-45**

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

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

Concern: FR_TEST, 9.2-43

This is also used at high media rate.

Solution: Remove comment from "event term" column.

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-24

Section 9.3   **Line** 58   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

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

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

RATIONALE (for this and many other changes):

RATIONALE for Remove Alert Change:

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

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

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

1. Upon entry into the Remove Alert Wait state (JS=PRAW),
   the C-Port transmits the first Remove Alert MAC frame,
   the counter CPRAP is set and the timer TPRAP is reset.

2. After entry into JS=PRAW, retries of the Remove Alert
   MAC frame occur, paced by TPRAP until counter CPRAP
   reaches zero. When CPRAP reaches zero, the C-Port
   enters the Bypass state (JS=BP).

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

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

1. A New State

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

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

2. The following changes are proposed for the C-Port.

   a) The references changed are done by other items
      opened by me (KTW) by referencing this item.

   B) Change figure 9.3-1 to include the Remove Alert Wait
      state.

Response: Figure 9.3-1 has been updated to include the Remove Alert Wait state.

Comment KTW-25

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

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

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

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

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

Response: Neil to fix.

Comment NAJ-47

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

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

Concern: Missing TPHSW

Solution: Add it

Response: Add this as TPHMRW as per agreement during Interim Meeting.

Comment KTW-26

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

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

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

Solution: Add around line 88, after PLT:

PRAW : C-Port Remove Alert Wait

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-48

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

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

Concern: FPRF is no longer used.

Solution: Delete lines 192-214

Response:

Comment SJH-24

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

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

Concern: Don't understand sentence.

Solution: Split up into something like:
At 4 Mbit/s and 16 Mbit/s the flag FPRF is set to 0 when
PS_STATUS.indication(Phantom=Not_asserted) occurs. At the High Media Rate the flag
FPRF is set to 0 when either PS_STATUS.indication(Phantom=Not_asserted) (Station is
using phantom) or receipt of the LMTN MAC frame (Station is not using phantom)
occurs. These operations are carried out as follows.

Response: Simon Harrison needs to agree to withdraw this comment for the following reason.

This text has been deleted by acceptance of item NAJ-48
that removed definition of FPRF which is no longer used.

Comment KTW-27

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

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

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

Solution: Add the following in place of line 321.

Join State JW, C-Port Remove Alert Wait

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

Response: The following, with a minor correction, replaces line 321.

Join State JW, C-Port Remove Alert Wait

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

Comment NAJ-E-326

Section 09.3 **Line** 357 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: REF 1209 on page 9.2-27 is missing a S/T entry.

Solution: Change REF 1209 S/T column to "TEDH"

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-E-327

Section 09.3   **Line** 357   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: REF 1216 on page 9.2-27 is missing a S/T entry.

Solution: Change REF 1209 S/T column to "TEDE".

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-73

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

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

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

Problem:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Changes to Connect.PMAC.

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-35

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

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

Concern: Change REF 1126 on page 9.3-23 to agree with item KTW-24.

Solution: Change 1118 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

```
FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
TO:   "JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
```

Response: 1. REF 1126 has been deleted because this is a protocol error which means that Station that transmitted the FR_RP would not understand the Remove Alert MAC frame.

2. REF 1054 has been modified by removing &FPMRO<2 (now FPMR<2) so REF 1054 operates at any media rate.

Comment NAJ-E-324

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

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

Concern: REF 1129 on page 9.3-25 is incorrect. TPPD occurs only in the JS=PJCI state, but is not conditioned with JS=PJCI. The current REF is too general.

Solution: Change Ref 1129 as follows.

```
1. S/T column:  Add JP0
2. Event column: Add "& JS=PJCI"
```

Response: Done.

This is a Amd 1 problem.

Comment NAJ-E-323

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

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

Concern: REF 1121 on page 9.3-18 has an incorrect ";" after last action.

Solution: Remove the ";".

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-31

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

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

Concern: Change REF 1123 on page 9.3-20 to agree with item KTW-24.

Solution: Change 1123 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

```
FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
TO:   "JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
```

Response: 1. REF 1123 has been deleted because this is a protocol error which means that Station that transmitted the FR_RP would not understand the Remove Alert MAC frame.

2. REF 1053 has been modified by removing &FPMRO<2 (now FPMR<2) so REF 1053 operates at any media rate.

Comment **KTW-39**

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

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

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

    1. It should not test FPMRO since Link_status=Asserted is
       only active for the High Media Rate.

    2. It should set up JS=PREG as if it were initial entry and
       set FPMR (see item KTW-nn) to indicate it is operating
       at the High Media Rate.

Solution: Change REF 1137 as follows.

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-32**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Response: It was decided that the Remove Alert process should not be executed when FR_MAC is received with SA<>SUA is received since the protocol is not functioning correctly because the entity that transmitted this frame would not understand the Remove Alert MAC frame.

Comment KTW-33

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

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

Concern: Change REF 1124 on page 9.3-22 to agree with item KTW-24.

Solution: Change 1124 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

```
FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
TO:   "JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
```

Response: 1. REF 1124 has been deleted because this is a protocol error which means that Station that transmitted the FR_MAC with SA<>SUA would not understand the Remove Alert MAC frame.

2. REF 1084 has been modified by removing &FPMRO<2 (now FPMR<2) so REF 1084 operates at any media rate.

Comment KTW-34

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

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

Concern: Change REF 1125 on page 9.3-22 to agree with item KTW-24.

Solution: Change 1125 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

```
FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
TO:   "JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
```

Response: It was decided that the Remove Alert process should not be executed when FR_MAC is received with SA<>SUA is received since the protocol is not functioning correctly because the entity that transmitted this frame would not understand the Remove Alert MAC frame.

I have correct all the events mentioned above.

Comment NAJ-E-325

Section 09.3   **Line** 380   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: REF 1130 on page 9.3-25 is missing a S/T entry.

Solution: Add to REF S/T column: "JPW".

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-58

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-50

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

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

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

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

Response: Solution incorrect. Changed REF 1113 on page 9.3-22 S/T column to "JKLB".

Comment KTW-49

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

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

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

Solution: Change REF 1003 S/T from: "JLK" to: "JLKA"

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-52

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-53

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

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

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

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

Response: 1. Changed REF 1132 S/T from: "blank" to: "JKU".

     2. Removed FPMRO<2 from REFs 1131 and 1132 since only the Station operating at the 4 Mbit/s or 16 Mbit/s media rate can use the AP_REQ value of 0006 (thus, implicit FPMRO<2 value).

Comment KTW-54

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-48

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-47

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-46

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-45

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-37**

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

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

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

Solution: Change 1128 as follows.

```
1. Change S/T column as follows.

   FROM: "JP0"
   TO:   "JW0"

2. Change Event column as follows.

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-59**

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-36**

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

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

Concern: Change REF 1127 on page 9.3-26 to agree with item KTW-24.

Solution: Change 1127 as follows.

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-57**

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-56**

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-43**

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-28**

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

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

Concern: Change REF 1118 on page 9.3-18 to agree with item KTW-24.

Solution: Change 1118 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
TO: "JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"

Response: Done.

Comment **DWW-17**

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

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

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

Solution:

Response: REF 1125 has been deleted for the following reason.

The condition "FPMRO<2" has been removed from 1090 allowing 1090 to operate at all media speeds.

Comment KTW-41

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

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

Concern: Correct REF 1000 on page 9.3-17 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1000 S/T from: "JK0" to: "JK0A"

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-40

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

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

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

    1. It should not test FPMRO since Link_status=Asserted is only active for the High Media Rate. This change brings 1133 in line with 1134 through 1136.

    2. It should set up JS=PREG as if it were initial entry and set FPMR to indicate it is operating at the High Media Rate. This is proposed by item KTW-39.

Solution: Change REF 1133 as follows.

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-51

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

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

Concern: Correct REF 1114 on page 9.3-23 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1114 S/T from: "JKL" to: "JKLB"

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-38**

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

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

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

Solution: 1. Change 1052 event column as follows.

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

2. Add the following new REF 1139.

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

Response: It was decided that the Remove Alert process should not be executed when the FR_AMP MAC frame is received since the protocol is not functioning correctly because the entity that transmitted the AMP MAC frame would not understand the Remove Alert MAC frame.

Comment **KTW-42**

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-44**

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment **IMJ-12**

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

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

Concern: Ref. 1125 on page 9.3-22.
The Remove Alert process should only be initiated from the Join completed state.

Solution: Remove event/action.

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-49

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

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

Concern: R1055, 9.3-21

This transition should be split into 2, and conditioned on FPMRO. FPRMO<2, return to bypass. FPRMO>1, use remove alert process.

Solution: Split it.

Response:

Comment NAJ-50

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

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

Concern: R1132, 9.3-23

See NAJ-46 for a general discussion. Also this is the transition that doesn't wait for the REG_RSP frame to be sent before getting management to change speeds. Big disaster.

Solution: See NAJ-46 solution.

Response: Do it. Can't change speed here, but transmit frame here.

Added a comment about the C-Port activating the High Media Rate Link.

Note: Committee did not actually state how we were going to activate the High Media Rate link, so I used words to do this.

Comment NAJ-51

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

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

Concern: R1133, R1135, R1136, 9.3-24

Comment in action field is wrong.

Solution: Delete it.

Response: Done.

Comment IMJ-14

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

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

Concern: Ref. 1055 on page 9.3-21.
See IMJ-13.

Solution: Change "Action" field to: "JS=BP"

Response: Accept. Withdraw NAJ-49.

Comment **IMJ-13**

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

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

Concern: Ref. 1124 on page 9.3-22
The events 1060, 1055, 1059, 1082, 1084 and 1090 all handle the case where the
Station address has changed, and the C-Port is closed. I see no reason for the C-
Port to transmit Remove Alert frames to a foreign Station in an unknown State.

Solution: Remove event/action.

Response: It was decided that the Remove Alert process should not be executed when FR_MAC is
received with SA<>SUA is received since the protocol is not functioning correctly
because the entity that transmitted this frame would not understand the Remove
Alert MAC frame.

I have correct all the events mentioned above.

Comment **IMJ-07**

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

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

Concern: Ref. 1058 on page 9.3-18
See IMJ-06

Solution: Remove from "event" field: "& FPMRO<2"

Response: Done. Also deleted 1122 on page 9.3-18.

Comment **IMJ-06**

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

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

Concern: Ref. 1122 on page 9.3-18.
The flag FPBPF is set to 1 by the Transmit FSM, when an unrecoverable error is
detected (ref. 1217 on page 9.3-28).
Do NOT initiate a new transmission on a C-Port that is detected broken.

Solution: Remove event.

Response: Done.

Comment DWW-15

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

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

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

Solution: fix it

Response: KTWilson to evaluate.

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

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

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

As of June 7th I have had no input on this item, thus no work has been done.

Comment DWW-16

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

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

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

Solution:

Response: Done

Comment KTW-30

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

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

Concern: Change REF 1122 on page 9.3-18 to agree with item KTW-24.

Solution: Change 1122 REF column from blank to "JPW".

Change Action column as follows.

FROM: "CPRAT=n9; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"
TO: "JS=PRAW; CPRAT=n8; TPRAP=R; TXI_RMV_ALRT"

Response: REF 1122 has been deleted as per IMJ-06.

Comment KTW-55

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

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

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

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

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-65

Section 9.3 **Line** 382 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1206 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1206 S/T from: "TDF" to: "TDFA"

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-70

Section 9.3 **Line** 382 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1208 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1208 S/T from: "TEDd" to: "TEDD"

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-69

Section 9.3 **Line** 382 **Severity** DIS **Type** TECH **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1205 on page 9.3-27 (PORT_ERR(Correctable) & FPMRO>1 & JS=PTXD): 1) S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998) and 2) correct the REF number which is duplicate of the previous transition.

Solution: Change REF 1205 S/T from: "TEDe" to: "TEDE"

Change REF 1205 REF column from: "1205" to: "1218"

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-52

Section 9.3 **Line** 382 **Severity** A/C **Type** TECH **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: R1216, 9.3-27

I tried this in D1...

FPIT=1 in action should be FPIT=1

Solution: Fix it.

Response:

Comment KTW-61

Section 9.3   **Line** 382   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1210 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1210 S/T from: "TEDb" to: "TEDB"

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-72

Section 9.3   **Line** 382   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1201 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1201 S/T from: "TDEb" to: "TDEB"

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-60

Section 9.3   **Line** 382   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1215 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1215 S/T from: "TEDa" to: "TEDF"

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-71

Section 9.3   **Line** 382   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1217 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1217 S/T from: "TEDd" to: "TEDG"

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-66

Section 9.3   **Line** 382   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1214 on page 9.3-28 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1214 S/T from: "TDF" to: "TDFB"

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-68

Section 9.3   **Line** 382   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1205 on page 9.3-27 (PORT_ERR(Correctable) & FPMRO<2 & JS=PTXD) S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1205 S/T from: "TEDe" to: "TEDH"

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-64

Section 9.3   **Line** 382   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1213 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1213 S/T from: "TPD" to: "TPDB"

Response: Correction is incorrect: Change REF 1207 S/T column to: "TFDB".

Comment KTW-62

Section 9.3   **Line** 382   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1204 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1204 S/T from: "TEDc" to: "TEDC"

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-63

Section 9.3   **Line** 382   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1207 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1207 S/T from: "TPD" to: "TPDA"

Response: Correction is incorrect: Change REF 1207 S/T column to: "TFDA".

Comment KTW-67

Section 9.3   **Line** 382   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Correct REF 1202 on page 9.3-27 S/T entry to agree with Annex M Figure M-1 Low Level FSM that supports the High Media Rate (released to the committee on 3 May 1998).

Solution: Change REF 1202 S/T from: "TDEa" to: "TDEA"

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-53

Section 9.3 **Line** 388 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: R1805, 9.3-32

Comment in condition is not enclosed by "<<" and ">>".

Solution: Please fix.

Response: Fixed as per NAJ-42.

Comment KTW-75

Section 9.3 **Line** 388 **Severity** DIS **Type** TECH **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: REF 1824 on page 9.3-32 incorrectly test FPMRO>1 since the PM_STATUS.indication(Link_status=Asserted) only occurs at the High Media Rate.

Solution: Delete "& FPMRO>1" in the event column of 1824.

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-83

Section 9.7 **Line** 11 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Figure 9.7-1 on page 9.7-1 has faint lines around PSC and PMS.

Solution: Make these dotted lines more visable by increasing the lines weight.

Response: Done.

Comment JLM-11

Section 9.7 **Line** 50 **Severity** A/C **Type** TECH **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Can't say Transmit_mode(5.4.1). 5.4.1 doesn't mention Transmit_mode, but Repeat_mode. If we use Transmit_mode, we'll have to define it. I am having trouble with the idea that 9.7.1 refers to clause 5 for the meaning of the parameters to PM_CONTROL.request. 9.7.1 is used for a C-Port, Port mode, TXI for example, whereas clause 5 is Station Specific components (isn't it?). Is 5 part of the specification of a C-Port's PSC, or not? Where does the missing definition of Transmit_mode (akin to 5.4.1) belong?

Solution: What to do depends on what's really wrong.

Response: Reverted to base standard usage.

Comment SJH-25

Section 9.7   **Line** 84   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

Concern: Is this diagram supposed to show just one example of a repeat path? It is not clear that there are other equally viable examples of repeat paths (at the PMAC and PMC levels). Compare with the 4/16 diagram (line 12) where two positions for the repeat path are shown.

Solution: Illustrate other possible repeat path positions on the diagram, or change the caption to "Figure 9.7-2 below illustrates one example of a repeat path" [line 83] and "Figure 9.7-2: One example of a C-Port repeat path." [line 85]

Response:

Comment KR-05

Section 9.7   **Line** 84   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: Figure 9.7-2 is wrong for fiber connections

Solution: Add a Figure 9.7-3 that has same elements as figure 2.2-2
(see also KR-04)

Response: Clause 9.7 is all about C-Ports and is not really about copper or fibre. In the overall format of 9.7 it is not clear where a figure like 9.7-2 for fibre should be included.

To avoid possibly confusing the reader, the words in line 83 have been changed from

"Figure 9.7-2 below illustrates the repeat path."

to:

"Figure 9.7-2 below illustrates the repeat path for a C-Port operating over twisted pair. The repeat path for a C-Port operating over a fibre optic medium appears in the same place."

Comment KR-04

Section 9.7   **Line** 84   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Figure 9.7-2 does not match figure 2.2-1

Solution: make elements in figure 9.7-2 same as elements in 2.2-1.
If editor feels that "repeat path" and "elastic buffer" elements are needed for hardware repeat path then make them boxes within hardware repeat path box

Response:

Comment KTW-84

Section 9.7   **Line** 84   **Severity** Q   **Type** TECH   **Status** WITHDRAWN

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

Concern: Why are the Repeat Path and Elastic Buffer outside of PSC?

Solution: Discussion required.

Response:

Comment EDTR-E-3

Section 9.7   **Line** 86   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** OPEN

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

Concern: Need words describing where repeat path can be placed.

Solution:

Response:

Comment NAJ-54

Section 9.7   **Line** 92   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Remove note, and add a reference to annex X.

Solution: Do it.

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-85

Section 9.7   **Line** 93   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Lines 93 through 96 should be removed now that Annex W is in place.

Solution: Do it.

Response: Done but with the strong suspicion that Annex W is now cunningly disguised as Annex X (see response to NAJ-54).

Comment SJH-26

Section 9.7   **Line** 93   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Editor's note is now covered by annex X.

Solution: Remove it.

Response: Done (see response to NAJ-54).

Comment KTW-86

Section 9.7   **Line** 131   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: A paragraph explaining gigabit operation to be determined (like line 350 in 9.8 on page 9.8-11).

Solution: Do it.

Response: Done. Also replaced the word 'Gigabit' with '1000Mbit/s' to maintain similarity with 9.8.1 heading.

Comment KTW-87

Section 9.8   **Line** 1   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: This subclause should not have change bars because it is a new subclause.

Solution: For the next release, remove all change bars.

Response: Change bars removed (see also response to KTW-100).

Comment NAJ-55

Section 9.8   **Line** 1   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: General comment. References in this clause a very important, but completely inconsistent in how they are used.

Solution: Pick one, and stick with it!

Response: Picked one and stuck with it.

Comment NAJ-56

Section 9.8   **Line** 1   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: General concern: Word has screwed up a lot of formatting. Extraneous new lines, unaligned lists etc.

Solution: Clause needs to be printed and proof read before release to catch these Word gothas

Response: I must print out and proof read my clauses.
I must print out and proof read my clauses.
I must print out and proof read my clauses.
I must print out and proof read my clauses.
I must print out and proof read my clauses.
I must print out and proof read my clauses.
I must print out and proof read my clauses.
I must print out and proof read my clauses.

P.s. Are 'Word gothas' Microsofts take on Golgothas?

Comment KTW-88

Section 9.8   **Line** 1   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Lines 4 through 10 should be removed.

Solution: Do it.

Response: And Lo! There was a goneness of lines 4 through 10.

Comment BBT-01

Section 9.8   **Line** 28   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Reference to TP-PMD revision 2.2 should be identical to ref [18] in sect number 1.4 (Normative references)

Solution:

Response: Done.

Comment BBT-03

Section 9.8   **Line** 60   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: lines 60 to 101

It migth be confusing to reference the SSD (/J/K), ESD (T/R) and Idle (/I) symbols
at the MII level because these symbols are defined at the wire level and a direct
mapping between the symbols and MII symbols don't exist.

SSD symbol:
At the MII level is the first two nibbels after RX_DV is asserted an indication of
reception of a valid SSD symbol

ESD symbol:
At the MII level is the first two nibbels after RX_DV is deasserted an indication
of reception of a valid ESD symbol

Idle symbol:
At the MII level are all nibbels with RX_DV deasserted (ESD as exception) an
indication of the reception of Idles

Solution: A solution could be to define the HSTR frame structure at the MII level as 802.3u
section 22.2.3 does for Ethernet

Response: See RJK-08.

Comment KTW-89

Section 9.8   **Line** 95   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: I disagree with Tam's observation since the Station and
C-Port do not use these signals.

Solution: Remove lines 95 through 100.

Response: See RJK-08.

Comment RJK-08

Section 9.8   **Line** 95   **Severity** DIS   **Type** ED   **Status** OPEN

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

Concern: Tam's note is absolutely correct. There should be definitions for the PM_UNITDATA
primitives. PS_UNITDATA primitives should be in terms of the MII signals only,
which form the interface between the MAC and the PSC (as shown in Fig 9.8-1),
whereas PM_UNITDATA primitives should be in terms of symbol level codes /J/, /K/,
/T/, /R/ etc which form the physical interface between PMC and PSC.
Making this distinction between the two interfaces would avoid the confusion caused
by mixed use of symbol level and MII level definitions which occur throughout the
spec.
 In particular, MAC level designers should not need to know anything about the
frame format at the symbol level (Which is how it is currently defined)

Solution: Add PM_UNITDATA definitions to 9.8.1.1.
If anyone is interested in how this might look in the spec, I have defined these
primitives in the first attempt at 9.8.2 (The equivalent of 9.8.1 for Gigabit).

Response: A study group is to rewrite 9.8.

This item resolves BBT-02, BBT-03, BBT-04, BBT-05 and
KTW-89.

The study group will send resolution to the committee by 27 May and copy the
committee.

Comment BBT-04

Section 9.8   **Line** 102   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: lines 102 to 129
Same as BBT-03

Solution: Same as BBT-03

Response: See RJK-08.

Comment KTW-90

Section 9.8   **Line** 136   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Alighment of this definition is messed up.

Solution: Fit it.

Response: Fitted!

Comment NAJ-58

Section 9.8   **Line** 143   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Either delete the note or convert into real text.

Solution: Do it.

Response: Note deleted.

Comment BBT-05

Section 9.8   **Line** 148   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: The ESD is not a defined symbol at the MII and it could therefore be confusing to
reference this symbol

Solution: Change the words to:
Abort shall be asserted only if both of the last two nibbels of the received frame
have the RX_ER signal asserted.

Response: See RJK-08.

Comment ANF-05

Section 9.8   **Line** 163   **Severity** Q   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: 'The PHYs shall be able to correctly exchange data within ??s of the assertion of
Initialize.'

Is this timeout really necessary?

Solution:

Response: No, delete sentence.

Comment BBT-06

Section 9.8   **Line** 163   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: The timer value must be defined

Solution: It is a problem to find an appropiate number because this parameter is usally not specified for the PHY's. I guess that 1 second could be good number, but can't guarantee that it will be sufficient in all cases. (I know one PHY that requires approx. 250ms to complete the RESET cycle)

Response: See ANF-05.

Comment NAJ-57

Section 9.8   **Line** 163   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: ??s is not acceptable :-)

Solution: Either give a value or remove the sentence.

Response: See ANF-05.

Comment KTW-91

Section 9.8   **Line** 179   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: The paragraph in lines 179 and 180 should not be italicized and should have a 6-point space after it.

Solution: Do it.

Response: Done.

Comment BBT-02

Section 9.8   **Line** 193   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: The ESD is not a defined symbol at the MII level and it could therefore be confusing to reference this symbol

Solution: Change the words to:
The abort_frame shall consist of asserting the TX_ER MII signal on the last two nibbels of the frame

Response: See RJK-08.

Comment BBT-07

Section 9.8   **Line** 201   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: The link status polling time is not defined.

Solution: I guess that the maximum time the MAC can accept is in the order of 5 seconds. A maximum value in the range 0.5 to 2 seconds should then be appropriate.

Response: See KTW-92.

Comment **NAJ-59**

Section 9.8   **Line** 201   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: `TBD ms is unacceptable!`

Solution: `Either remove or fill in.`

Response: `See KTW-92.`

Comment **KTW-92**

Section 9.8   **Line** 201   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: `The note in lines 202 and 203 should be removed and the range of time defined in line 201.`

Solution: `Discussion required to determine range of polling time.  E.g., 40 to 500 ms.`

Response: `The maximum time needs to be at least half the granularity of the MAC. A figure of 500ms is acceptable here. A lower limit need not be defined.`

`Editors note in following two lines deleted.`

Comment **KTW-93**

Section 9.8   **Line** 213   **Severity** Q   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: `I do not understand why this is included.`

Solution: `Decide what to do.`

Response: `Delete it: study group to review (See RJK-08.).`

Comment **KTW-94**

Section 9.8   **Line** 215   **Severity** Q   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: `I do not understand why this is included.`

Solution: `Decide what to do.`

Response: `Delete it: study group to review (See RJK-08.).`

Comment **KTW-95**

Section 9.8   **Line** 225   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: `Two comments about figure 9.8-1 on page 9.8-6.`

```
1.  Make shading of MII lighter.
2.  Make the figure full size for the page.
```

Solution: `Do it.`

Response: `Done it.`

Comment NAJ-60

Section 9.8   **Line** 226   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Figure 9.8-1

Where does the line from the SMT box meant to go?

Solution: Fix it.

Response: Removed SMT box as uninformative.

Comment KTW-96

Section 9.8   **Line** 228   **Severity** Q   **Type** TECH   **Status** ANSWERED

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

Concern: I do not understand what this is for (so others won't either).

Solution: Discussion required.

Response: ANF to create new Normative Annex Y called 'Autonegotiation for High Speed Token Ring'. Put footnote 1 from annex U & paras 9.8.1.4.1 & 9.8.1.4.2 into a new annex Y. Put reference into new 9.8.1.4.1 to new annex.

Number to replace 'VWXYZ' chosen to be 00011.

NOTE: This annex is now called Annex Z! (Y has been annexed by Auto-detection . . .)

Comment NAJ-61

Section 9.8   **Line** 229   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: You can't publish this with a value VWXYZ. Bob Love was actioned to get a value.

Solution: Talk to Bob.

Response: See KTW-96.

Comment JLM-13

Section 9.8   **Line** 256   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: The term PMA is undefined. The PMC client is the PSC I suppose. Is this what you mean?

Solution: Fix it.

Response: This entry in table 9.8-2 has been corrected as part of the response to RJK-08.

Comment JLM-12

Section 9.8   **Line** 256   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: These table headers in table 9.8-4 should be bold, on this page and the next.

Solution: Embolden "FDDI term or concept" and "Interpretation for 100Mbit/s token ring".

Response: Done & all on same page now.

Comment **KTW-97**

Section 9.8   **Line** 256   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Table structure needs to be fixed.

Solution: Fix as follows.

1. Header entries should be bold and centered.
2. Each row needs to have entries made with 2-points before and after row entry.

Response: Done.

Comment **JLM-14**

Section 9.8   **Line** 256   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Several entries in the right column of this table make no sense to me as 802.5 terms.   These are: PMD_SIGNAL.indicate, PMD_UNITDATA.indicate, PMD_UNITDATA.request, SM_PM_BYPASS.request, SM_PM_CONTROL.request.

Solution: It almost looks as though some of these entries are in the wrong columns, but this is not the whole story.

Response: The PMD_SIGNAL.indicate, PMD_UNITDATA.indicate, PMD_UNITDATA.request entries in table 9.8-2 have been corrected as part of the response to RJK-08.

The SM_PM_BYPASS.request, SM_PM_CONTROL.request entries - although not referred to within 802.5 - are actually correct as assumptions about their states in the context of their original TP-PMD referrences.

Comment **KTW-98**

Section 9.8   **Line** 258   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: This important set of notes needs to be made easier to read.

Solution: Fix it.

Response: Remove notes.

Comment **KTW-99**

Section 9.8   **Line** 283   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Spurious lines.

Solution: Remove lines 283 and 284.

Response: The original paragraphs here were a bit confusing since STP contact assignments were rolled into the UTP heading. The two assignments are now separated out under two headings and the headings themselves corrected to reflect those used in TP-PMD.

As a result of this change the spurious lines have been removed.

Comment KTW-100

Section 9.8 **Line** 315 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Lines 315 through 348 need to be removed (will be done automatically if subclause is released without change bars as per item KTW-87).

Solution: Do it.

Response: Made it so (see also response to KTW-87).

Comment KTW-101

Section 9.8 **Line** 350 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Missing: "<< End of 9.8 >> after line 350.

Solution: Add "<< End of 9.8 >> after line 350. This should be centered and bold in 14 point size with 12-18 points before it.

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-102

Section 13.9 **Line** 23 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Table structure needs to be fixed.

Solution: Fix as follows.

1. Header entries should be bold and centered.
2. Each row needs to have entries made with 2-points before and after row entry.

Response: Done.

Comment SJH-27

Section 13.9 **Line** 26 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Little square thingies have appeared after the point number.

Solution: Change to conventional bullets or brackets.

Response: Changed to conventional spotty bulletty thingies.

Comment KTW-103

Section 14.0   **Line** 1   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: General tables are hard to read because of the space before and after a row entry. Examine all tables for readability.

Solution: Fix as follows.

1. Header entries should be bold and centered.
2. Each row needs to have entries made with 2-points before and after row entry.

Response: Which general tables?

I will embolden the headings of the tables describing the frame formats. I will attempt to fix the spacing.

Done

Comment KTW-104

Section 14.1   **Line** 8   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: The word "section" is wrong.

Solution: Change "section" to "subclause".

Response: Done

Comment RJK-05

Section 14.1   **Line** 13   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Code violation visibility at the MAC level is limited by what information is available over the MII. A code violation is detectable from the MII when RX_ER is asserted during RX_DV assertion. This combination can even occur when an invalid ESD occurs.
The code violation coverage therefore extends to include the ESD itself.

Solution: Extend code violation coverage range to include ESD.

Response: Done

Comment **KTW-110**

Section 14.1   **Line**   23   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: The paragraph in lines 23 through 26 is poorly worded.
Also, there is not enough space between this paragraph and the preceeding table.

Solution: I suggest lines 23 through 26 be changed to the following.

The abort sequence is transmitted by an entity when it prematurely terminates a
frame's transmission. The abort sequence may occur anywhere after the SSD and
before the ESD in a frame since the error condition causing the abort can occur on
any boundary. The abort sequence causes the receiving entity to recognize that the
frame being received is not a valid frame.

Response: New words:

The abort sequence is transmitted by an entity when it prematurely terminates a
frame's transmission. The abort sequence may occur anywhere after the SSD and
replaces the normal End Frame Sequence in a frame since the error condition causing
the abort can occur on any boundary. The abort sequence causes the receiving
entity to recognize that the frame being received is not a valid frame.

Comment **RJK-06**

Section 14.1   **Line**   25   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: Line states that "abort sequence may occur anywhere after the SSD and before the
ESD". This is rather misleading because the abort sequence actually includes the
ESD and IFG.

Solution: Reword as "The abort sequence may occur anywhere after the SSD in a frame sequence
and replaces the normal End Frame Sequence defined in Figure 14-1."

Response: New words:

The abort sequence is transmitted by an entity when it prematurely terminates a
frame's transmission. The abort sequence may occur anywhere after the SSD and
replaces the normal End Frame Sequence in a frame since the error condition causing
the abort can occur on any boundary. The abort sequence causes the receiving
entity to recognize that the frame being received is not a valid frame.

Comment **RJK-07**

Section 14.1   **Line**   27   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** MODIFIED

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

Concern: I agree with Dave W on this. I still don't think that we should put a few
miscellaneous ideas for High Media Rate TKP in the standard without explaining how
to use them. Seeing these definitions will just confuse people.

Solution: If the idea is to make sure that potential TKP implementers are thinking along the
same lines then could we put these in a clearly labelled informative annex instead?

Response: This has been raised on every draft, and the committee decision has always been to
retain this information. See also KTW-111.

KTW-111 is accepted, which adds words here, to say that TKP is a placeholder.
Therefore this comment is modified.

New words add to 14.1 introduction:

"The Token sequence shown in 14.1.3 is a placeholder to allow future work to
specify TKP operation at 100 Mbit/s."

Comment **KTW-111**

Section 14.1   **Line** 31   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Some place it needs to be explained that the Token stuff is a place holder for future standarization.

Solution: Do it.

Response: If RJK-07 is accepted, then this is rejected. Otherwise I accept. Since I reject RJK-07, I accept.

See RJK-07.

Comment **KTW-112**

Section 14.2   **Line** 57   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: The sentence on line 57 starting with "Then the E bit shall …" is confusing.

Solution: I suggest the following change.
FROM: Then the E bit shall be transmitted a 1.

TO: When FxASO=1 and a frame is aborted, then the E bit
      shall be transmitted as a 1.

Response: Done.

Comment **KTW-113**

Section 14.2   **Line** 80   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

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

Concern: Heading should indicate "using TKP Access Protocol"

Solution: Do it.

Response: Done

Comment **KTW-105**

Section 14.3   **Line** 111   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: The word "clause" is wrong.

Solution: Change "clause" to "subclause".

Response: Done

Comment KTW-114

Section 14.3   **Line** 128   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: Sentence in lines 128 through 132 is poorly worded.

Solution: I suggest the following replacement.

The Remove Alert MAC frame is used by both the Station and C-Port using the TXI Access Protocol and operating at the High Media Rate. The Remove Alert MAC frame indicates to the entity at the other end of the dedicate link that the sender is about to enter the Bypass state. The Remove Alert MAC frame is sent using an assured delivery mechanism in an attempt to ensure that the receiving receives this frame.

Response: New words:

Both the Station and C-Port using the TXI Access Protocol and operating at the High Media Rate use the Remove Alert MAC frame. The Remove Alert MAC frame indicates to the entity at the other end of the dedicate link that the sender is about to enter the Bypass state. The Remove Alert MAC frame is sent using an assured delivery mechanism in an attempt to ensure that the receiving receives this frame.

Comment KTW-115

Section 14.3   **Line** 145   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee☑   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: In the table 14-2, the value X'0004' is used to request to Trade-up to 100 Mbit/s. 9.2 and 9.3 use X'0006' as per Ivar's original proposal.

Solution: Decide which is right: X'0006' or X'0004'.

Response: Text should say ORing rather ANDing.
Change table text for 4 and 8, to say 100Mbit/s capable and 1000Mbit/s capable. Text should allow multiple capabilities to be ORed into the final request value. Possibly some words about what the C-Port does with this value, like what 802.5r does.

Comment KTW-106

Section 14.3   **Line** 175   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: The word "subsections" is wrong.

Solution: Change "subsections" to "subclauses".

Response: Done

Comment KTW-107

Section 14.3   **Line** 196   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: The word "clause" is wrong.

Solution: Change "clause" to "subclause".

Response: Done

Comment KTW-116

Section 14.4   **Line** 217   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: Title of 14.4.1.1 is incorrect.

Solution: In line 217, change "Media Rate" to "Speed".

Response: No. "High Speed" is not a recognised term. If anything change the timer acronym to be TSHMRW. Also see KTW-118.

Change to be
"Timer, Station High Media Rate Wait (TSHMRW)"

Done.

Comment NAJ-62

Section 14.4   **Line** 219   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☑   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: ???ms is unacceptable.

Solution: Calculate the values required.

Response: This timer allows management to bring down the 4/16 PHYs, switch to 100 PHY, reset and bring up the 100 Mbit/s link, and wait for link status. This contains many implementation dependant details, which are beyond the scope of this standard. Therefore make the timer large(-ish)...

Define timers (Station and C-Port) as having a minimum of 8.5s, and a maximum of 10s. No recommended value.

Done.

Also Neil, make sure that you add the C-Port TPHMRW timer, which you forgot…

Done.

Comment BBT-08

Section 14.4   **Line** 219   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: Timer value need to be defined.

Solution: The value of this timer should be the same as the value of the initialize timer (BBT-06)

Response: See NAJ-62
Done.

Comment SJH-28

Section 14.4   **Line** 219   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☑   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: The value of TSHSW needs to be defined. It will depend on how HS tradeup is finally implemented (eg whether management gets involved in the tradeup decision).

Solution: Obtain value through committee discussion.

Response: See NAJ-62.
Done.

Comment KTW-117

Section 14.4   **Line** 243   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: The name and abbreviation of the timer is incorrect.

Solution: 1. Change line 243 "(TPPL)" to "Detect (TPPLD)".

     2. Change lines 244 and 246 "TPPL" to "TPPLD".

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-118

Section 14.5   **Line** 267   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: The name and abbreviation of the timer is incorrect.

Solution: Change line 267 as follows.

     1. Delete "High Media Rate".

     2. Change "(FSHSO)" to "(FSTUO)".

Response: Comment is not consistent with KTW-116.
Do you want "speed" in the title. (Which I reject).
Or do you accept a change to the acronym?

     Change acronym.

     Done.

Comment NAJ-63

Section 14.5   **Line** 267   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: Wrong acronymn for flag.

Solution: Should be FSTUO.

Response: Changed to FSHMRTUO

Comment KTW-119

Section 14.5   **Line** 281   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☑   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: Table 14-10 is incorrect. FSMRO can not set to a value of >1 or <2. These are
testing values, not acutal values.

     I have explained the meaning of these testing values in 9.

Solution: Delete the rows containing FSMRO>1 and FSMRO<2.

Response: Done.

`Comment` **KTW-120**

Section 14.5   **Line** 285   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee ☑   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: SPV(AP_MASK) value X'0004' disagrees with 9.2 and 9.3. See item KTW-115.

Solution: Discussion required.

Response: This table should show values, not bitmasks that can be ORed to generate values.
Fix the SPV(AP_MASK) and PPV(AP_MASK).

SPV(AP_MASK) speed values not required.
PPV(AP_MASK) speed value are correct

`Comment` **KTW-121**

Section 14.5   **Line** 285   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: The explanation of SPV(MAX_TX) is poorly worded.

Solution: Change "including SSD, ESD and IFG as defined in" to:
            "including the SSD, ESD and IFG defined in".

Response: Exactly equivalent words.
Done.

`Comment` **KTW-108**

Section 14.5   **Line** 287   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: The word "subsections" is wrong.

Solution: Change "subsections" to "subclauses".

Response: Done.

`Comment` **KTW-109**

Section 14.5   **Line** 301   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: The word "clause" is wrong.

Solution: Change "clause" to "subclause".

Response: Done

`Comment` **KTW-122**

Section 14.5   **Line** 321   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: Table 14-12 is incorrect. FPMRO can not set to a value of >1 or <2. These are
testing values, not acutal values.

I have explained the meaning of these testing values in 9.

Solution: Delete the rows containing FPMRO>1 and FPMRO<2.

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-123

Section 14.5   **Line** 324   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: Need a definition of the C-Port's Trade-up Option flag.

Solution: Add the following after line 324.

    14.5.2.1.5 Flag, C-Port Trade-up Option (FPTUO)

    When this flag is set to 1 the C-Port positively responds to the Station's request
    to Trade-up (AP_RSP=0004). If this flag is set to 0, the C-Port responds to the
    Station that it must remain at it designated speed (AP_RSP=0002).

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-64

Section 14.5   **Line** 325   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** WITHDRAWN

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: Missing FPTUO option flag description.

Solution: Add it.

Response: See KTW-123.

Comment KTW-124

Section 14.5   **Line** 328   **Severity** DIS   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee☑   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: PPV(AP_MASK) value X'0004' disagrees with 9.2 and 9.3. See item KTW-115.

Solution: Discussion required.

Response: See KTW-120.

Comment MJH-01

Section A.0   **Line** 1   **Severity** DIS   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☐

Concern: Following Station Policy Flags should be added to Annex A :-
FSANO, FSASO, FSLMTO

Solution:

Response: Neil will add a new Annex A.

Comment SJH-29

Section L.0   **Line** 19   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** REJECTED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: HS Tradeup states (SHSTU) and transitions missing from diagram.

Solution: Add them.

Response: The Trade-up state was not in the 4 Mbit/s and 16 Mbit/s versions of Annex L. Was
included in Annex L released on May 3rd, 1998 and will be included in Draft 2.1.

Comment SJH-30

Section M.0 **Line** 23 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** REJECTED

Highlight To Committee☐ **Commenter Agrees?**☑ **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: State PHSTU and associated transitions are missing.

Solution: Add them.

Response: The Trade-up state was not in the 4 Mbit/s and 16 Mbit/s versions of Annex M. Was included in Annex M released on May 3rd, 1998 and will be included in Draft 2.1.

Comment JLM-15

Section T.2 **Line** 177 **Severity** DIS **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee☐ **Commenter Agrees?**☑ **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: Rather than replacing the entire definition of PM_CONTROL.request (thus incorrectly repeating text elsewhere), it would be better to just list the primitive name and the new parameter.

Solution: Add at end of line 182: "This primitive is in addition to those specified in 9.7.1.2."

Replace lines 183 through 193 with:

"PM_CONTROL.request [PMC_Mode (??ref??)]"

The current text refers to 9.7.3 which is wrong, but I can't find a definition of the provision of PMC_mode. Perhaps this needs adding.

Response: Beyond the scope of our PAR to fix base standard issues.

Note from KTWilson: Changed this Item to "Modified".

After looking at Annex T, John is right. The only definition required in Annex T is the definition of the PM_CONTROL.request(PMC_mode=Port_mode) and PM_CONTROL.request(PMC_mode=Station_emulation_mode) PMC signals.

Thus, I took the following actions.

1. Changed lines 179 and 180 as follows.

   operation and does not imply any particular implementation. This service specification is in addition to the PMAC service specification defined in 9.7.1.2.2.

2. Changed lines 183 through 198 as follows.

        PM_CONTROL.request [PMC_Mode   ]

          PMC_Mode is specified as one of the following:
                             Port_mode
                             Station_emulation_mode

      When Generated. The AMAC generates a
                       PM_CONTROL.request for each PMC action
                       request.

      Effect of Receipt. The PHY performs the appropriate
                         action as follows.

                         When Port_mode is requested, the
                         PHY is connected to the media as a
                         C-Port.

                         When Station_emulation_mode is
                         requested, the PHY is connected to
                         the media as a Station.

Comment JLM-16

Section T.3   **Line** 201   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: Erroneous space before colon.

Solution: Remove.

Response: Done.

Comment JLM-17

Section T.3   **Line** 204   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☐   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: Could be better put.

Solution: Change "This annex recommends" to "It is recommended".

Response: Changed line 204 as follows.

From: "This annex recommends … "

To: "Therefore, it is recommended … "

Comment RDL-03

Section U.0   **Line** 1   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☐   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: A statement is required indicating that this is a new Annex

Solution: Add the words "Add Annex U" before the head title: "Annex U"

Response: Done. Also, change marks removed.

Comment NAJ-65

Section U.0   **Line** 1   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☐   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: Word has really gone to task with the formatting in this annex.

Solution: Fix the item list numbering format.

Response: Fixed.

Comment SJH-31

Section U.1   **Line** 21   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☐   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: Point number doesn't increment. Strange square box has appeared after digit.

Solution: Change to 2).
See also 26, 31, 34 (more boxes).

Response: Scary stuff.
Opened, investigated and closed X-file on this.
Fixed.

Comment NAJ-66

Section U.2   **Line** 27   **Severity** A/C   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☐   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: The footnote talks about the VWXYZ value in 9.8. This must be determined before the standard can be published.

Solution: Get the value from Bob.

Response: Still waiting for response from 802.3u.

Following Herzliyya meeting, a new annex (Z) has been created. See response to KTW-96.

Comment NAJ-67

Section V.0   **Line** 20   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: Powers could use superscript font.

Solution: Fix it.

Response: Done

Comment NAJ-69

Section W.0   **Line** 1   **Severity** Q   **Type** TECH   **Status** ANSWERED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: Should 100Base-TX used in this annex be 100Base-X?

Solution:

Response: Yes

Comment RDL-04

Section W.0   **Line** 1   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee ☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☐   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: A statement is required indicating that this is a new Annex

Solution: Add the words "Add Annex W" before the head title: "Annex W"

Response: Done

Comment JLM-18

Section W.0   **Line**   4   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** MODIFIED
Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: I don't feel that this paragraph fully conveys the purpose of the annex.

Solution: Replace lines 4 to 6 with:

"This annex lists the functionality and interfaces required of a physical medium
device in order to be able to support dedicated token ring operation at 100Mbit/s
in accordance with this specification. Some such devices present an interface
which is a variation of the media independent interface defined in ISO/IEC 8802-
3:1996 (for example, the RMII), and in such cases, some functionality required for
token ring may not be present or may be modified. Some known variations are
described in terms of their suitability for use with this specification."

Response: Changed to:
"This annex lists the functionality and interfaces required of a PHY device in
order to be able to support 100Mbit/s Token Ring in accordance with this
suppliment. Some such devices present an interface which is a variation of the
media independent interface defined in ISO/IEC 8802-3:1996, and in such cases, some
functionality required for token ring may not be present or may be modified. Some
known variations are described in terms of their suitability for use with this
suppliment."
My modifications:
- we are allowing for future use in shared media
- term is suppliment not specification if you are refering to 802.5t
-Previous consesus was not to use RMII term or any other term for different
interfaces.

Comment SJH-32

Section W.0   **Line**   6   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED
Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☐   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: Bad English: "implementation"

Solution: Change to "implementations"

Response: See KR-06

Comment JLM-23

Section W.0   **Line**   7   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED
Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?** ☐   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: This annex and annex X use the format "W1.2" for clause numbering, which is wrong.

Solution: Change clause numbering to include a decimal point after the annex letter; for
example "W.1.2".

Response: Done.

Comment NAJ-68

Section W.0   **Line**   22   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** MODIFIED
Highlight To Committee☑   **Commenter Agrees?** ☑   **Editing Complete** ☑

Concern: 100Mb/s is written 100Mbit/s

Do a search in this annex, as there are a few.

Solution: Fix them.

Response: Will be changed to 100 Mbit/s.

Comment SJH-33

Section W.1   **Line** 20   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☐   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: Inappropriate colloquialism "called out".

Solution: Change to "present" or "designated".

Response: done.

Comment SJH-34

Section W.1   **Line** 20   **Severity** A/C   **Type** TECH   **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☑   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: I am still not happy with the wording and emphasis of this annex. We don't want to talk too much about what may be happening in 100Base-Tx, nor do we unduly want to constrain implementations. It should be sufficient to indicate the signalling systems 100 Mbit/s token ring requires without constraining the implementation of these signals.

I don't think that we should divide the signals up into "likely to be significantly modified" and "likely to be present". It should be sufficient just to list the signals required by 100M Token Ring.

Solution: e.g. TX_ER paragraph (line 20)
"Unlike most 100Base-Tx implementations, this signal is required for support of 100 Mbit/s token ring implementations. If the TX_ER pin is no longer available, a signalling mechanism must remain for real time insertion of the /H symbol into the bit stream."

Response: Worked with Simon to come up with wording that better conveys the emphasis of the annex.

Comment JLM-20

Section W.2   **Line** 39   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☐   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: We don't use Mb/s.

Solution: Change to Mbit/s.

Response: see NAJ-68

Comment JLM-21

Section W.2   **Line** 40   **Severity** A/C   **Type** ED   **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐   **Commenter Agrees?**☐   **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: Word missing.

Solution: Change "and transfer all data" to "and must transfer all data".

Response: done.

Comment JLM-22

Section W.2 **Line** 47 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee☑ **Commenter Agrees?**☑ **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: ISO/IEC 8802-3 doesn't define such a value (for token ring operation at 100Mbit/s).

Solution: Change "value defined by" to "value to be defined by"??

Response: See KTW-96 for solution.
Will add to W.2.3: " Auto-negotiation is optional for 100Mbit/s Token Ring, but if
it is used then it must be possible to change the actual advertised selector value.
This selector value is defined in Annex Y of this suppliment."

Comment KR-06

Section W1.0 **Line** 6 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐ **Commenter Agrees?**☑ **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: "implementation" bad grammer

Solution: change to "implementations"

Response: Done

Comment KTW-125

Section W2.2 **Line** 44 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee☐ **Commenter Agrees?**☑ **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: The words in line 44 are misleading.

Solution: Change "is programmable but this is not true." to:
"is programmable, but in many implementations this
is not true.".

Response: Modification as per SJH-34 are acceptable.

Comment RDL-05

Section X.0 **Line** 1 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐ **Commenter Agrees?**☑ **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: A statement is required indicating that this is a new Annex

Solution: Add the words "Add Annex W" before the head title: "Annex W"

Response: Done

Comment JLM-24

Section X.0 **Line** 4 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐ **Commenter Agrees?**☑ **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: This annex and annex W use the format "W1.2" for clause numbering, which is wrong.

Solution: Change clause numbering to include a decimal point after the annex letter; for
example "W.1.2".

Response: Done

Comment JLM-25

Section X.1 **Line** 27 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐ **Commenter Agrees?**☑ **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: It's not the average time to receive a frame, but to receive the TEST MAC frame, which matters.

Solution: Change this sentence to "The average time it takes a Station to receive a TEST MAC frame and check that it is valid."

Response: Done

Comment KTW-126

Section X1.0 **Line** 7 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** ACCEPTED

Highlight To Committee☐ **Commenter Agrees?**☑ **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: I suggest a minor clarification to figure X-1.

Solution: Between "success 1" and "success n7-1" put the characters:

"+ . . . +" .

Response: Done.

Comment KTW-127

Section X1.0 **Line** 23 **Severity** A/C **Type** ED **Status** MODIFIED

Highlight To Committee☐ **Commenter Agrees?**☐ **Editing Complete**☑

Concern: Lines 23 through 30 could be made easier to read.

Solution: I suggest adding space before and after each definition. (e.g., between lines 23 and 24, 25 and 26, an so on).

Response: Had a bash, but it is hard.

Comment Summary

Total Comments:: 328