Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Editorial **Starting Page #** 477 **Starting Line #** 45 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** D

Extra space in:
size Stq

Suggested Remedy

Change:
size Stq
==>
sizeStq

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 502 **Starting Line #** 51 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** D

The rprOamRequestCount no has meaning within the current definition, but appears to
be from the history of when we assumed the MAC would support some sort of auto-retry and timeouts.
Furthermore, there is no cross-reference to an RPR variable, which reinforced the aforementioned thoughts.

Suggested Remedy

Delete:
page 502, line 51
to
page 503, line 6

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 502 **Starting Line #** 51 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** D

The rprOamTimeout has no meaning within the current definition, but appears to
be from the history of when we assumed the MAC would support some sort of auto-retry and timeouts.
Furthermore, there is no cross-reference to an RPR variable, which reinforced the aforementioned thoughts.

Suggested Remedy

Delete:
page 503, line 6
to
page 503, line 17

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 502 **Starting Line #** 51 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** D

The rprOamControl has no meaning within the current definition, but appears to
be from the history of when we assumed the MAC would support some sort of auto-retry and timeouts.
Furthermore, there is no cross-reference to an RPR variable, which reinforced the aforementioned thoughts.

Suggested Remedy

Delete:
page 503, line 17
to
page 503, line 33

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 502 **Starting Line #** 51 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** D

The rprOamResponseCount has no meaning within the current definition, but appears to
be from the history of when we assumed the MAC would support some sort of auto-retry and timeouts.
Furthermore, there is no cross-reference to an RPR variable, which reinforced the aforementioned thoughts.

Suggested Remedy

Delete:
page 503, line 33
to
page 503, line 40

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 502 **Starting Line #** 51 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** D

The rprOamAvResponseTime has no meaning within the current definition, but appears to
be from the history of when we assumed the MAC would support some sort of auto-retry and timeouts.
Furthermore, there is no cross-reference to an RPR variable, which reinforced the aforementioned thoughts.

Suggested Remedy

Delete:
page 503, line 40
to
page 503, line 48

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 502 **Starting Line #** 51 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** D

The rprOamResponseStatus has no meaning within the current definition, but appears to
be from the history of when we assumed the MAC would support some sort of auto-retry and timeouts.
Furthermore, there is no cross-reference to an RPR variable, which reinforced the aforementioned thoughts.

Suggested Remedy

Delete:
page 503, line 50
to
page 504, line 12

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 556 **Starting Line #** 9 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** D

Wrong name:
toClientUcastClassBCirAFrames

Suggested Remedy

Delete:
toClientUcastClassBCirAFrames
to
toClientUcastClassBCirFrames

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 558 **Starting Line #** 27 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** D

There is an entry for broacast counts, but not multicast.

Suggested Remedy

Insert something like the following:

```
rprClientStatsInMcastFrames OBJECT-TYPE
    SYNTAX        Counter64
    MAX-ACCESS    read-only
    STATUS        current
```

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 561 **Starting Line #** 31 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** D

There is an entry for broacast counts, but not multicast.

Suggested Remedy

Insert something like the following:

```
rprClientStatsOutMcastFrames OBJECT-TYPE
    SYNTAX       Counter64
    MAX-ACCESS   read-only
    STATUS       current
```

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 164 **Starting Line #** 38 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** 7

I believe the Transmit states will send all topo frames to the single connected datapath on a center wrapped ring. This should not be forced to be the case.
Also, its unclear how fairness frames go across the wrapped center-wrapped station.

Suggested Remedy

1) Provide text that clarifies how control frames are processed, so the intent is clear.
2) Revise state machines to track the text of (1).

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 164 **Starting Line #** 20 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** 7

This code appears to send a bidirectional flooded frame on both ringlets.
This will not work on a center-wrapped station.
Instead, they should be sent through the same datapath, but with distinct frame.ri identifiers.

Suggested Remedy

1) Provide text that clarifies how bidirectional frames are processed on a center-wrapped station, so the intent is clear.
2) Revise state machines to track the text of (1).

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: S802.17 June 24, 2004 **Ballot Number:** 3 **Comment Date**

Comment # **Comment submitted by:**

Comment **Type** Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 157 **Starting Line #** 16 **Fig/Table#** **Clause** 7

I was looking over the ringlet selection, with simplifications
(in my judgment) appropriate for RBR. A few questions arose.

The text (page 157, line 16) notes that:
>>For wrapping rings, if the frame is not replicated, the we field is set.
>>For wrapping rings, if the frame is replicated, the we field is not set.

Suggested Remedy

Either:
1) Correct the wording.
2) Clarify the wording.

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

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions**

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items