Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **4**   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 20   **Starting Line #** 11   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   0

There appears to be two em dashes, rather than just one.

Suggested Remedy

Delete the extra em dash from the heading and regenerate the table of contents.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

An extra em-dash was present in the LOF but nothing in the actual figure title could be found that might cause this. This is ascribed to one of the many FrameMaker bugs. The extra em-dash was deleted manually.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **7**   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 114   **Starting Line #** 25   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 7.3.1

While officially correct, I find it hard to parse sentences that start with a lower case variable name.
Clarity is improved by improvising other words to lead the sentence;

Relevant text:
(addRateA0, addRateA1, and addRateB are specified in 7.5.5,
7.5.5, and 7.5.6, respectively. sizeStq is specified in 7.2.2. stqHighThreshold is specified in 10.2.2.
responseTime is specified in G.1.)

Suggested Remedy

(The addRateA0, addRateA1, and addRateB values are specified in 7.5.5,
7.5.5, and 7.5.6, respectively. The sizeStq value is specified in 7.2.2. The stqHighThreshold value is specified in 10.2.2.
The responseTime value is specified in G.1.)

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking
existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have
passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited
to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking
existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have
passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited
to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

      Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

        Comment # **8**   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 114   **Starting Line #** 25   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 7.3.1

The responseTime value is not specified, it is only estimated.

responseTime is specified in G.1.)

Suggested Remedy

==>The responseTime value is estimated in G.1.)

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **9**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 114   **Starting Line #** 25   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 7.3.1

Incomplete specification:

How the actual split of classA into subclassA1 and subclassA0 is done is an implementation decision. If the decision does not follow Equation 7.11, it is possible that the bandwidth, delay, and jitter of classA is not guaranteed.

Suggested Remedy

==>
How the actual split of classA into subclassA1 and subclassA0 is done is an implementation decision. If the value of responseTime is estimated incorrectly or the decision does not follow Equation 7.11, it is possible that the bandwidth, delay, and jitter of classA is not guaranteed.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, the information provided is both correct and sufficient.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation (non change-bar text). Additionally, the information provided is both correct and sufficient.

Unanimous: Commentor not present

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **10**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 114   **Starting Line #** 25   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 7.3.1

Inaccurate specification:

Relevant text:
"ClassB service provides an allocated, guaranteed data rate, and bounded end-to-end delay and jitter for the
traffic within the allocated rate, bounded on the order of a ring round trip time (RRTT)."

This text relies on a correct estimate of the *responseTime* value, which no one on the committee
(much less an inexperienced reader of this standard) is capable of performing, particularly when
the conservative fairless is used.

If the *responseTIme* value is estimated too low, then the *hiLimitB* threshold of the shaper will be
exceeded, which implies the classB bandwidth guarantee will be broken. If the *responseTime* is
estimated too high (or perhaps even correctly), the resposne time will be much larger than the RRTT.

As such, there is really no viable way of ensuring that the classB bandwidth is guaranteed, so this
claim should not be made.

Suggested Remedy

==>
"The coding space for ClassB service is provided for future revisions of this standard, which are
intended to be developed through the maintenance cycle. When properly revised, the classB
service is intended to provide an allocated, guaranteed data rate, and bounded end-to-end delay and jitter for the
traffic within the allocated rate, bounded on the order of a ring round trip time (RRTT). "

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, the guarantee claim is believed to be correct.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The clause and line numbers are incorrect and should be 7.3.2 and 40. In any event, this text is not being reviewed in this recirculation (non changebar text)
Additionally, the guarantee claim is believed to be correct.

Additionally, the guarantee claim is believed to be correct.

Unanimous: Commentor not present

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **25**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 237   **Starting Line #** 7   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 9.2.2.7

Unclear implications:
"9.2.2.7 hec: A 16-bit (header error check) field that is a checksum of the header (see E.1). The hec is computed over the ttl, baseControl, da, sa, ttlBase, and extendedControl fields."

Suggested Remedy

Add the following note:==>
NOTE--Because the hec field is half of the fcs field width, the undetected error rate associated with long burst errors is approximately 4,000 greater for the header than for an RPR payload and/or an Ethernet frame. If the RPR payload is further protected (for example, with an IP checksum), then this number increases to approximately 100,000. Implementers should consider the potential effects of this reduced error coverage when computing distances between repeaters or the possibility of enabling other physical-layer dependent error coverage (such as 8/10 coding checks or optional forward error correction).

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, the implications are believed to be clear.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, the implications are believed to be clear.

Unanimous: Commentor not present

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **29**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 316   **Starting Line #** 43   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 11.2.1.2

The indent is a bit excessive and therefore distracting.

With reference to:

"11.2.1.2.1 Detection time: Amount of time to detect a change in protection status of a span.
                    Value: <= 10 milliseconds"

Suggested Remedy

Two steps:
1) Be sure the tab settings are at every 18 points.
2) Use only one tab spacing.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **30**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 338   **Starting Line #** 5   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 11.4.8

The use of this small of an identifier has consequences that have not been mentioned.

Suggested Remedy

Do (1,2) or (3):
    1) Note that the IAB (a range of 48-bit identifiers, based on the OUI) cannot be used in this application.
     AND
    2) Provide a rationalization for why a more readily available EUI-48 or EUI-64 was not used
      (more efficient transfers is the most likely rationale, although this is hardly defensible).
OR

    3) Extend this to be an EUI-48 or EUI-64 based identifier.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, there is no need to mention every possible consequence of every identifier length.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation (non changebar text). Additionally, there is no need to mention every possible consequence of every identifier length.

Unanimous: Commentor not present

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **37**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 370   **Starting Line #** 19   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 11.6.6.3

Inconsistent notation.

instabilityTimeout
    The time after which the instability defect timer is due to expire.
        Value—10 seconds

Suggested Remedy

instabilityTimeout
    The time after which the instability defect timer is due to expire.
        Value: 10 seconds

This is also consistent with #317, line 21.

Many other places use the em-dash convention for "Value--", which is (I suppose)
acceptable also, if done uniformly. I like the ':' convention better, but consistency
on colon or em dash is OK, regardless of which is chosen.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **38**   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 373   **Starting Line #** 39   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 11.6.6.4

Inconsistent notation.

I am not sure, but it seems that the usage of:
  sourceCheck[ringlet][hops] = 0x000000000000;

Assumes that the EUI-48 is "owned" by this standard, as a null value.
This is owned by Xerox, and therefore cannot be used in this fashion.

Suggested Remedy

Initialze to 0xFFFFFFFFFFFF instead, since the broadcast address can
also be safely used to connotate a null MAC address.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **40**   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 390   **Starting Line #** 17   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   11.6.13.4

Inconsistent notation.

The following definition (as tracked down through reference), is incorrect for Row 1 or Row 8 of the state machine.

NULL
A constant that indicates the absence of a frame and (by design) cannot be confused with a frame.

Suggested Remedy

Change in 7.2.1
==>
NULL
A constant that indicates the absence of a ~~frame~~ value and (by design) cannot be confused with a frame or a valid MAC address.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by**

NULL
A constant that indicates the absence of a value and (by design) cannot be confused with a valid value.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

NULL
A constant that indicates the absence of a value and (by design) cannot be confused with a valid value.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **41**   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 391   **Starting Line #** 15   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 11.6.13.4

Lack of clarity.

Suggested Remedy

Change:
   0XFFFFFFFFFFFF ==> BROADCAST, with other changed in defined constants as appropriate.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **46**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   **Member**

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 407   **Starting Line #** 21   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 12.2.4

Inconsistent statement:
 This clause references the following literals and routines defined in Clause 7:

Suggested Remedy

line 21==>
 This clause references the following literals, variables, and routines defined in Clause 7:
line 33==>
 This clause references the following ~~literals~~ literal defined in Clause 9:

line 37==>
 This clause references the following ~~literals and routines~~ variables defined in Clause 7:

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by**

line 21==>
 This clause references the following literals, variables, and routines defined in Clause 7:
line 33==>
 This clause references the following ~~literals~~ literal defined in Clause 9:

line 37==>
 This clause references the following ~~literals and routines~~ variable defined in Clause 10:

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

line 21==>
 This clause references the following literals, variables, and routines defined in Clause 7:
line 33==>
 This clause references the following ~~literals~~ literal defined in Clause 9:

line 37==>
 This clause references the following ~~literals and routines~~ variable defined in Clause 10:

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

        Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

    Comment # 48   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 426   **Starting Line #** 38   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   13.2.1.2

Inconsistent statement:
  SUCCESS--The request was successful.
  FAIL--(Otherwise.)

Suggested Remedy

 Replace the two en dashes with a single em dash, in two instances, here and throughout.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation: Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group: Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **47**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 426   **Starting Line #** 34   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 13.2.1.2

Inconsistent notation:
 mib_attributevalue

Suggested Remedy

==>
 mib_attribute_value, here and throughout

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **49**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 428   **Starting Line #** 5   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 13.2.3.2

Straddling the right column would make it clear which events are described in the same place.

Suggested Remedy

==>
  straddle the common right column entries

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **50**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 428   **Starting Line #** 5   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 13.2.3.2

Excess capitalization

Suggested Remedy

Critical Severity
==>
Critical severity

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**　　　　　　**Ballot Number:** **3**　　　　　　　　　　**Comment Da**

Comment # **51**　　　　　**Comment submitted by:** David　　　　　James　　　　　　　　　Member

Comment　　**Type** Editorial　　　　　**Starting Page #** 428　　**Starting Line #** 5　　**Fig/Table#**　　**Clause** 13.2.3.2

Wrong font size.

Suggested Remedy

Apply the TableCellCenter to the right column, then Default Font from the characer type if necessary, to reduce #10 point font to #9 point font.

Proposed Resolution　　　**Recommendation:** **Accepted**　　　　　　**Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group　　　　　**Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes　　　　**Editor's Actions**　　k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **52**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 428   **Starting Line #** 5   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 13.2.3.2

Inconsistent wording.

Suggested Remedy

Either:
  1) Change the left column heading to "Name", and use the actual variable names (not the nearly-the-same English).
or
  2) Add another column, so that "Name" and "Description" are both provided.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Unanimous: Commentor not present

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **53**   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 428   **Starting Line #** 32   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 13.2.3.3

Inconsistent font size.

Suggested Remedy

Use standard default font (not #9 point) font on:
  13.3.1.2

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **56**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** **434**   **Starting Line #** **7**   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   13.4.3.1

Wrong cross reference.

Suggested Remedy

Change:
  12.1 ==> 13.1

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **57**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Binding   **Starting Page #** 434   **Starting Line #** 7   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 13.4.3.1

Hard-coded cross-references.
If not already incorrect (as the 12.1 cross-reference is), these can become incorrect
as editing may add or subtract specific subclauses.

Suggested Remedy

These subclauses should be cross-references, not specific typed numbers.
THIS HAS BEEN MENTIONED MANY TIMES, so WATER TORTURE on the editors
may be in order, to correct this now, RATHER THAN LATER.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **58**   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 434   **Starting Line #** 14   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 13.4.3.2

Inexact cross reference.

Suggested Remedy

On the LME1 row, change:
  13.2 ==> 13.2.1 through 13.2.3
On the LME2* row, change:
  13.2 ==> 13.2.4

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **54**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 430   **Starting Line #** 40   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 13.3.3

Excess capitalization

Suggested Remedy

Change:
  MAC Control
==>
  MAC control

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **55**   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 430   **Starting Line #** 40   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   13.3.3

Inappropriate use of italics

Suggested Remedy

Use normal font for:
    Client, MAC Control, MAC
Italics has too much of a key-word implication to be used in this way.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **60**   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 455   **Starting Line #** 22   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   C.2.1

Overlapping lines, crossing into the box.

Suggested Remedy

Pull the "PHY" box to the front, and make it while (as opposed to clear),
so that the line ends are hidden underneath.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking
existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have
passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited
to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking
existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have
passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited
to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **5**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 95   **Starting Line #** 34   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 6.6.3

Excessive capitalization

Suggested Remedy

East ==> east
West ==> west
   Also, do this on #96, lines 21 and 46.
Topology and Protection control ==> Topology and protection control

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking
existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have
passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited
to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking
existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have
passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited
to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **11**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 118   **Starting Line #** 31   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 7.4.4

Excessive capitalization

Suggested Remedy

East ==> east
West ==> west

The key thing is that these should be consistent.
The textual use generally appears to be east and west (see page 47, line 15)

Also, seach throughout for other instances, and correct similarly.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking
existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have
passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited
to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking
existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have
passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited
to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **59**   **Comment submitted by:**   David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #**   455   **Starting Line #**   15   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   C.2.1

Inconsistent notation.

Suggested Remedy

Datalink ==> Data link

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   Comment Da

Comment # **66**   **Comment submitted by:** David   James   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 681   **Starting Line #** 1   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** Index

Remove the bugs from the index.

Suggested Remedy

As noted.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   h) defer to next round

This can be done in a single pass after a clean recirc and there are no more changes to the draft.
(The TOC, LOT, LOF and Index are within the purview of the IEEE editorial staff, and changes to
these don't constitute technical or editorial changes to the draft.) We should try to get the source
text to David James so that he can work his index magic before the next recirc, but there is no need
to hold up the recirc for this.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **19**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 233   **Starting Line #** 34   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 8.5.4.2

Item G1 status entry is C2:M, should be C1:M

Suggested Remedy

C2:M, should be C1:M

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Duplicate**   **Recommendation by**

Duplicate of #17.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

Duplicate of #17.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **20**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 233   **Starting Line #** 34   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 8.5.4.2

Item X1 status entry is C3:M, should be C2:M

Suggested Remedy

C3:M --> C2:M

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Duplicate**   **Recommendation by**

Duplicate of #18.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

Duplicate of #18.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**

Comment # **26**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 247   **Starting Line #** 3   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 9.8.3.1

'FF" is used for clause 9 (9.8.3.1) PICS and clause 12 PICS (12.6.3.3) with overlapping numbering.

Suggested Remedy

Assign unique labels for PICS entries.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **13**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 216   **Starting Line #** 8   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 7.8.3.1

'SM" is used for clause 7 (7.8.3.1) PICS and clause 12 PICS (12.6.3.3) with overlapping numbering.

Suggested Remedy

Assign unique labels for PICS entries.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **6**   **Comment submitted by:**   Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 100   **Starting Line #** 19   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   6.7.3.2

'SP" is used for clause 6 (6.7.3.2) PICS and clause 12 PICS (12.6.3.4) with overlapping numbering.

Suggested Remedy

Assign unique labels for PICS entries.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

There is no reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **14**   **Comment submitted by:**   Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type**   Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #**   217   **Starting Line #**   32   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   7.8.3.3

'PM" is used for clause 7 (7.8.3.3) PICS and clause 12 PICS (12.6.3.5) with overlapping numbering.

Suggested Remedy

Assign unique labels for PICS entries.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **15**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 233   **Starting Line #** 6   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 8.5.3

'C" is used for clause 8 (8.5.3) PICS and annex B PICS (B.4.3), and annex C PICS (C.7.3) with overlapping numbering.

Suggested Remedy

Assign unique labels for PICS entries.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **21**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 233   **Starting Line #** 34   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 8.5.4.2

'G" is used for clause 8 (8.5.3) PICS and annex B PICS (B.4.4.1) with overlapping numbering.

Suggested Remedy

Assign unique labels for PICS entries.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **22**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 233   **Starting Line #** 44   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 8.5.4.2

'X" is used for clause 8 (8.5.4.3) PICS and annex B PICS (B.4.4.2) with overlapping numbering.

Suggested Remedy

Assign unique labels for PICS entries.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **23**   **Comment submitted by:**   Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 234   **Starting Line #** 6   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   8.5.4.4

'S" is used for clause 8 (8.5.4.4) PICS and annex B PICS (B.4.4.2) with overlapping numbering.

Suggested Remedy

Assign unique labels for PICS entries.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

No reason to ensure unique labels for PICS entries across clauses.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **24**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 234   **Starting Line #** 6   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 8.5.4.4

Notation PM2:O.2 indicates that more than one if 'edge wrap' and 'center wrap' can be deployed.

Suggested Remedy

Change to PM2:O.1

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

No such thing is seen. Perhaps this refers to 7.8.3.3 on page 217. And the text there is correct as is. If the wrapping option is implemented (PM2), then one of the option group O.2 is selected.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Withdrawn**

Commentor present and withdrew the comment

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **16**   **Comment submitted by:**   Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 233   **Starting Line #** 6   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 8.5.3

PRS-1 is not 10 Gb/s PacketPHY reconciliation sublayer

Suggested Remedy

10 Gb/s PacketPHY reconciliation sublayer --> 1 Gb/s PacketPHY reconciliation sublayer

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **17**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 233   **Starting Line #** 33   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 8.5.4.2

Item G1 depends on C1, not C2.

Suggested Remedy

C2:M --> C1:M

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **18**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 233   **Starting Line #** 33   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 8.5.4.2

Item X1 depends on C2, not C3.

Suggested Remedy

C3:M --> C2:M

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **28**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 307   **Starting Line #** 4   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 10.6.3

RATE_BASED and SHAPER_BASED options are not specified in PICS.

Suggested Remedy

Add rows
FA15a SHAPER_BASED admission 10.4.3 Does the MAC deploy the SHAPER_BASED admission method? O.1 Yes [ ]
No [ ]
FA15b RATE_BASED admission 10.4.3 Does the MAC deploy the RATE_BASED admission method? O.1 Yes [ ]
No [ ]

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by**

Add rows
FA15a SHAPER_BASED admission 10.4.3 Does the MAC deploy the SHAPER_BASED admission method? O.2 Yes [ ]
No [ ]
FA15b RATE_BASED admission 10.4.3 Does the MAC deploy the RATE_BASED admission method? O.2 Yes [ ]
No [ ]

Reason for Recommendation

Option group 1 already used by FA7a/FA7b.

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

The PICs entries shall be added as option group 2 by adding rows

FA15a SHAPER_BASED admission 10.4.3 Does the MAC deploy the SHAPER_BASED admission method? O.2 Yes [ ]
No [ ]
FA15b RATE_BASED admission 10.4.3 Does the MAC deploy the RATE_BASED admission method? O.2 Yes [ ]
No [ ]

Unaminous: Comment Present and agrees

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **42**   **Comment submitted by:**   Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 399   **Starting Line #** 11   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   11.7.3.2

Conservative rate adjustment is already represented by the PICS entry FA7b.

Suggested Remedy

Remove row from table.
FF4 status FF3:M --> FA7b:M
FF5 status M --> FA7b:M

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, we previously changed this from FA7b to avoid cross clause PICS references where not needed.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation (no changebars). Additionally, we previously changed this from FA7b to avoid cross clause PICS references where not needed.

Unanimous: commentor was present

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **43**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 401   **Starting Line #** 12   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 11.7.3.4

Either:
1. PP3 and PP4 are dependent on PM1 and PM2 in Clause 7 PICS
2.   and PM2 are dependent on PP3 and PP4
3. These requirements are duplicates.

Suggested Remedy

Remove or show dependencies as appropriate.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, we are avoiding cross clause PICS references where not needed.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, we are avoiding cross clause PICS references where not needed.

Unanimous: Commentor present and agrees

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # 44   **Comment submitted by:**   Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 401   **Starting Line #** 29   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   11.7.3.5

TD1
Topology discovery in maximum size ring
Station can complete topology discovery for stable ring of MAX_STATIONS

Can any individual station (implementation) make this guarantee?

Suggested Remedy

Remove, or amend so this can be verified.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, we see no reason why this can't be accomplished.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation (non changebar). This PICS states that stations must support a ring
of size MAX_STATION and is believed to be clear.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **45**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 401   **Starting Line #** 29   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 11.7.3.5

Adding/dropping data to/from the ring may be impacted after 10 seconds of topology inconsistency

'May be impacted' makes it sound like something that happens (e.g., a performance impact) rather than
an option for handling an extended instability.

Suggested Remedy

Change to:
The add/drop of data is to/from the ring is suspended by the station when a topology inconsistency persists for more
than ten seconds.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, the PICS entry comment is meant to be a quick overview, not to repeat the details provided i
the subclause reference.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation (non changebar text). Additionally, the PICS entry comment is meant to be a quick overview, not to repea
the details provided in the subclause reference.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **34**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 357   **Starting Line #** 30   **Fig/Table#** 11.14   **Clause** 11.6.4.4

Page 315 indicates:
When another station appears to have changed its location, TP frame transmission is triggered to
facilitate fast rediscovery of the topology and restoration of strict mode traffic.

Rows 14-5 and14-6 indicate that edge removal also results in triggering TP frame transmission. It
should be explained why edge removal is treated in the same way as a station location change (and
why this is not the case for edge formation). This can be added to the explanation above and/or the
appropriate row descriptions.

Suggested Remedy

Add explanation as to why edge removal is treated in the same way as a station location change (and
why this is not the case for edge formation).

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, there is no need to provide explanations for why some treatments are the same.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation (non changebar text). Additionally, there is no need to provide explanations for why some treatments are
the same.

Unanimous: Commentor present and agrees

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **35**   **Comment submitted by:**   Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 357   **Starting Line #** 41   **Fig/Table#** 11.14   **Clause**   11.6.4.4

In row 11.14-11 it appears that the sequence number could have changed, requiring execution of
row 11.14-16 before RETURN.

Suggested Remedy

Fix as indicated above or explain.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by**

Add row before row 11 with condition of "old.sequenceNumber != new.sequenceNumber", action of "--", and next state of "EXEC".
Add row description for new row of "If the sequence number has changed due to a jumbo preference or protection configuration change, continue with the
topology database update.".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Add row before row 11 with condition of "old.sequenceNumber != new.sequenceNumber", action of "--",
and next state of "EXEC".

Add row description for new row of "If the sequence number has changed due to a jumbo preference
or protection configuration change, continue with the topology database update.".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **33**   **Comment submitted by:**   Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 355   **Starting Line #** 46   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 11.6.4.3

Missing references
ClearAtdInfo(rid, hops)
See .
ComputeTc()
See .

Suggested Remedy

Provide references.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by**

Change "See ." to "See 11.2.7." for both entries. Repeat also for MismatchedProtection() on page 352, line 8, FindIndex() on page 356, line 22, ClearAtdInfo
on page 363, line 6, ChecksumStep() on page 371, line 21, ComputeTc() on page 371, line 23, MismatchedProtection() on page 373, line 24, FindIndex() on
page 379, line 4, and FindIndex() on page 386, line 47.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change "See ." to "See 11.2.7." for both entries. Repeat also for MismatchedProtection() on page 352, line 8, FindIndex() on page 356, line 22, ClearAtdInfo
on page 363, line 6, ChecksumStep() on page 371, line 21, ComputeTc() on page 371, line 23, MismatchedProtection() on page 373, line 24, FindIndex() on
page 379, line 4, and FindIndex() on page 386, line 47.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Some weird character where the crossreference was supposed to be, in each case. Like a 0-width crossreference to nothing.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **36**   **Comment submitted by:**   Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 359   **Starting Line #** 10   **Fig/Table#** 11.14   **Clause** 11.6.4.4

The terms 'major topology change' and 'minor topology change' are used in the ParseTpFrame state table but
not explained in the document.

Row 11.14-3: If the previous entry was invalid, a major topology change is possible.
Row 11.14-4: If the MAC address changed, a major topology change is possible.
Row 11.14-5: If the ringlet0 edge was removed, a major topology change is possible.
Row 11.14-6: If the ringlet1 edge was removed, a major topology change is possible.
Row 11.14-7: If the ringlet0 edge was formed, a minor topology change is possible.
Row 11.14-8: If the ringlet1 edge was formed, a minor topology change is possible.
Row 11.14-9: If the ringlet0 protection-state changed, a minor topology change is possible.
Row 11.14-10: If the ringlet1 protection-state changed, a minor topology change is possible.

Suggested Remedy

Provide an explanation.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. While this explanation might be useful, at this time it is not advisable to perturb the document unless
needed.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. While this explanation might be useful, at this time it is not advisable to perturb the document unless
needed.

Unanimous: Commentor was present

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **31**   **Comment submitted by:** Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 350   **Starting Line #** 14   **Fig/Table#** 11.12   **Clause** 11.6.2.3

P325 line 49 indicates LINK_STATUS[ri] defined in clause 8, but it does not appear there.

Suggested Remedy

Provide reference to LINK_STATUS[ri] definition.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The reference is already present. See page 224, line 36 and following.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The reference is already present. Start from page 224, line 36 and the following text.

Unanimous: Commentor present and agrees

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **32**   **Comment submitted by:**   Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 352   **Starting Line #** 15   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 11.6.3.3

The term 'regular' for 'non-jumbo' could be improved.

Suggested Remedy

How about 'standardFrame' or 'nonJumbo'? i.e., standardFramePreferredStation, nonJumboPreferredStation?

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **39**   **Comment submitted by:**   Robert   Sultan   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 379   **Starting Line #** 36   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 11.6.8.4

Page 316 indicates:
Information received on a given ringlet from other stations is parameterized by the topology database ringlet
index rid. For example, topoEntry[rid][hops].spanProtState[ri] contains the protection state reported in a TP
frame received on ringlet rid from a distance of hops.
Local station information that has scope beyond a span of the station is also parameterized by rid. For
example, myTopoInfo.reservedRate[rid] contains the bandwidth reserved by the station on ringlet rid.
When the context of a state machine is based on the ringlet from which a TP frame is received, as opposed to
a current ringlet context, rid is used to identify the ringlet. An example of this is the ParseTpFrame state
machine (see 11.6.4).

Row 11.18-8 appears to violate this convention:
topoEntry[ri][hops].valid &&
topoEntry[ri][hops].macAddress == frame.sa &&
topoEntry[ri][hops].sequenceNumber == frame.seq

Suggested Remedy

Fix this and check for other instances (or explain why it's correct).

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. While this consistency change might be useful, at this time it is not advisable to perturb the document
unless needed.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. The text is technically correct, the change for consistency is
complex as the use of ri in this case is consistent with its use in other parts of the clause where the
ringlet id is known. Elsewhere in the clause, ri was used throughout in state machines where the state machine
is tied to a single side. In this case, once the state machine reaches this point, the side is known and is
consistent with the use of ri.

Unanimous

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **65**   **Comment submitted by:**   James   Frysinger   Other

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 509   **Starting Line #** 5   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** D

In most of the document, bit rates are stated as Gb/s, for example, but on page 509 at about line marker 5 the unit Mbps is used instead of Mb/s. Similar occurances of Gbps and kbps occur in the program listing shown there. These seem to occur only in the program listing. Of course, I'm not familiar with this program but if possible it would be nice to change those to replace the "p" with "/". These all seem to be text strings and perhaps they are not essential to proper running of the code so they might be emmended without dire consequences.

Suggested Remedy

Fix the above inconsistencies.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

No idea what "program listing" means. No such occurences in Annex H. Only bps occurrences in Annex D were Mbps. No Gbps or kbps. No bps occurrences found outside of Annex D.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **12**   **Comment submitted by:**   James   Frysinger   Other

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 126   **Starting Line #** 36   **Fig/Table#** 7.7   **Clause** 7.5.3.4

In the row descriptions for table 7.7 on page 126 the word "bite" appears. Is that a typo, meant to by "byte"? In that same area "PPM" occurs. Is that supposed to signify "parts per million" (ppm)? Current practice and SI guidance is to avoid using ppm since "million" is ambiguous. A simple decimal fraction would be preferred.

Suggested Remedy

Fix the above issues.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Fix typos. Replace "250 PPM" with "0.025%" or with "0.00025" or with "250/1000000ths".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Fix typos - "bite" changes to "bits" in 7.7-3, "bytes" changes to "bits" in 7.7-4, first occurance only. Replace "250 PPM" with "0.025%" or with "0.00025" or with "250/1000000ths".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Changed to 0.025% and 0.05%.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **2**   **Comment submitted by:**   Michelle   Turner   Other

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 0   **Starting Line #** 0   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 0

On 30 December 2003, Jennifer Longman made the following recommendation it appears that these items have not yet been addressed: The Annexes should be reordered so that all normative annexes appear together followed by information annexes. As a result of this reordering, the Bibliography should appear as
Annex K.

Suggested Remedy

Reorder the annexes.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Rejected**   **Recommendation by**

Jennifer had assented to the present annex ordering as of Jan 28th 2004.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Rejected**

Email exchanged with Michelle and Jennifer agreeing to maintaining the draft as it is.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**

                                                                                                                                Comment Da

Comment # 3   **Comment submitted by:**   Michelle   Turner   Other

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 0   **Starting Line #** 0   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   0

At the time of RevCom submittal please remember to supply a separate electronic file for each graphic in TIFF, GIF, EPS, or WMF formats. At this same time, please be sure to supply a list of names and addresses for all members of the working group. This will ensure that each member gets a complimentary copy of the standard upon publication

Suggested Remedy

Provide the above graphics and list.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by**

We will supply a list of names. There are no graphics in TIFF, GIF, EPS or WMF formats in the entire 688-page draft.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

We will supply a list of names. There are no graphics in TIFF, GIF, EPS or WMF formats in the entire 688-page draft.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The group likes to follow IEEE staff advice.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   I) none needed

This list will be supplied at the time the draft goes to RevCom. The final list of voting members will be obtained from Mike Takefman.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   Comment Da

Comment # **61**   **Comment submitted by:** John   Lemon   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 489   **Starting Line #**   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** D

I got email from Bert about the RPR-MIB and I suggested that the IEEE
should in general move to a scheme where IEEE owned MIB modules are
prefixed with IEEE- (like Cisco prefixes modules with CISCO- and so
on). The idea is to reduce the likelihood of name clashes. In this
particular context, I suggest to change the MIB module name to
IEEE-RPR-MIB. (Note that I am not suggesting to change existing
MIB module names.)

/js

--
Juergen Schoenwaelder   International University Bremen

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by**

I suggest we adopt this one change by changing to be consistent with how 802.1 is naming their new MIB, such that our MIB changes from "rprMib" to
"ieee802dot17rprMIB".

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change to be consistent with 802.1 practice, i.e. from "rprMib" to "ieee802dot17rprMIB" and also
RPR-MIB to IEE-802DOT17-RPR-MIB

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Changed on page 496, lines 1 and 25, and page 498, lines 2 and 14.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **62**   **Comment submitted by:**   John   Lemon   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 489   **Starting Line #**   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** D

The descriptions of rprFairnessAgeCoef, rprFairnessRampCoef, and rprFairnessLpCoef need to be changed to indicate that the values (and therefore the range and default) are the power of 2 for the actual value to be used. Then the default value for rprFairnessRampCoef and rprFairnessLpCoef should be se to 6 (to yield the real value of 64).

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Superseded**

Superceded by comment 63

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **1**   **Comment submitted by:** **John**   **Lemon**   **Member**

Comment   **Type** **Editorial**   **Starting Page #** **ii**   **Starting Line #**   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** **0**

In addition to removing page ii and possibly updating pages iii and iv, there is an omission on page iii that needs to be corrected. Only 2 of the 3 officers are listed.

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Add Vinay Bannai as Secretary
Change Mo Li to Li Mo
Move Annex K from Fan / Kao to Parsons/ Bruckman / Mor

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Page ii will be removed by the IEEE staff editors.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **64**   **Comment submitted by:** John   Lemon   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 496   **Starting Line #** 26   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** D

The MIB LAST-UPDATED and latest REVISION dates should match the date on the document header.

Suggested Remedy

Change to match document date.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified**   **Recommendation by**

Revision date should be Wednesday the 21st.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

The revision date will be set to Wednesday the 21st.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **63**   **Comment submitted by:**   Glenn   Parsons   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #**   489   **Starting Line #**   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause**   D

SMICng tells me:

  W: f(p802.17_D3_2_MIB.mi2), (24,5) MODULE-IDENTITY rprMib should have at least one REVISION clause
  E: f(p802.17_D3_2_MIB.mi2), (1423,14) Default value for "rprFairnessRampCoef" is outside allowed range
  E: f(p802.17_D3_2_MIB.mi2), (1442,14) Default value for "rprFairnessLpCoef" is outside allowed range

SMIlint tells me:

E:\smi\mibs\ietf>..\..\bin\smilint -l 6 -m -s -inamelength-32 RPR-MIB
.\RPR-MIB:1413: [2] {defval-range} default value does not match range restriction of underlying type
.\RPR-MIB:1426: [2] {defval-range} default value does not match range restriction of underlying type

I see various reference lines that are MUCH longer than 80 characters.
MIB tools can often deal with it... but in RFCs we try to keep stuff within 72 columns suggested_remedy = Modify MIB to ensure it compiles without error.

Suggested Remedy

Add REVISION and DESCRIPTION clauses for this current (first) revision.
Correct the default values.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

All of the requested changes except for the 80 character lines will be implemented.
The changes made will include adding REVISION and DESCRIPTION clauses for
this current (first) revision and correct the default values.

Insuring no lines over 80 characters could cause too much churn / work at this
stage in the process and is not a technical problem but an editorial one.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **27**   **Comment submitted by:** John   Lemon   Member

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Starting Page #** 297   **Starting Line #** 37   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 10

There are several incorrect references that I think we should fix.

Suggested Remedy

On page 297, change line 37 to reference Equation 10.15, line 44 to reference Equation 10.16, and line 51 to reference Figure 10.17.
On page 405, line 1 and page 406, line 2 change to reference Annex K.
On page 419, line 51, page 420, line 7, and page 420 line 43 change from referencing "An RPR alarm (see 12.1.5)" to referencing "A miscabling defect (see 11.6.8)" and "A keepalive timeout (see 11.6.2)", as separate list items.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Might want to strike page 420, lines 38-45. They seem to repeat lines 6-9. Ask Glenn and Peter. (Leon said he'd agree with whatever Glenn says on this.)

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Include changes in reason for recommendation, i.e. removal of lines 38-45 since they are redundant.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Corrected references. Struck last lines.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**   **Ballot Number:** **3**   **Comment Da**

Comment # **67**   **Comment submitted by:** Necdet   Uzun   Member

Comment   **Type** Technical, Non-binding   **Starting Page #** 265   **Starting Line #** 30   **Fig/Table#**   **Clause** 10.2.2

This comment was submitted at the CRG session and accepted by WG motion.

The units of FRTT has a typo. FDD interval on line 17 of the same page is defined in mS.
FRTT should use the same units, otherwise there would be an issue with range. As the
current default value is 1000, the correct equivalent default value would be 1 ms.

Suggested Remedy

Change uS to mS. Change default to 1 ms.

Proposed Resolution   **Recommendation:** **Accepted**   **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group   **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Unanimous

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**   k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items