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Abstract

Resolutions to LB232 comments on elements: 1100, 1102, 1103, 1105, 1106, 1107

## Comment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1100 | Robert Stacey | 904.07 | 9.4.2.1 | The Element ID Extension field is not optional; it is present if the Element ID is a certain value. Having both a text description of the element format and a figure is redundent and unnecessary. | Repalce the first sentence with "Elements have a common format defined in Figure 9-136". Delete "See Figure 9-136 (Element format). The presence of the Element ID Extension field is determined by the Element ID field." Add a statement "The Element ID Extension field is present if the Element ID field is 255." Replace "Reserved for elements using the Element ID Extension field" in Table 9-87 with "Reserved" (2x). |
| 1102 | Robert Stacey | 904.09 | 9.4.2.1 | Incorrect plural | Element ID Extension fields -> Element ID Extension field |

## Proposed resolution for 1100 and 1102

REVISED – Reorganize 9.4.2.1 following the instructions in <this doc> associated with this comment. These changes:

* Correct the error where the Element ID Extension field is described as optional
* Remove redundancy and clarify the format description

## Editing instructions

9.4.2.1 General

*Change the first paragraph as follows:*

Elements have a common format shown in Figure 9-136.

***Insert the following after Figure 9-136:***

An element is identified by the Element ID field and, if present, the Element ID Extension field. If the Element ID field is 255 then the Element ID Extension field is present, otherwise the Element ID Extension field is not present.

The Length field indicates the number of octets in the element excluding the Element ID and Length fields.

The Information field carries information specific to the element.

***(for context)***

The set of valid elements is defined in Table 9-94 (Element IDs).

## Comment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1103 | Robert Stacey | 904.09 | 9.4.2.1 | The term "Extended Element ID" is not that useful. There is one incorrect use for the term in the standard (at P929L15). Incorrect because the term is defined to mean a combination of fields, but the use here is as a format type of element. Instead, define a term that refers to the elemet format. | Replace "An Extended Element ID is a combination of an Element ID and an Element ID Extension for those elements that have a defined Element ID Extension." with the definition for a new term as follows: "An extension element is an element where the Element ID feld is 255 and the Element ID Extension field is present". Replace the sentence at P929L15 with "The Request element is not an extension element." |

## Discussion

There is another reference in 6.3.3.2 at P289L56 (D1.0): “A list of (Extension) Element IDs”

## Proposed resolution:

REVISED –

Change the text at P289L56 from “A list of (Extension) Element IDs” to “A list of element identifiers”

Change the text at P929L15 from “The Request element does not support Extended Element IDs” to “The Request element does not support elements that contain an Element ID Extension field.”

Delete the following sentence at P904L10 “An Extended Element ID is a combination of an Element ID and an Element ID Extension for those elements that have a defined Element ID Extension.”

Alternate resolution:

Add the following statement to 9.4.2.1: “An extended element is an element where the Element ID Extension field is present.”

Change the text at P929L15 from “The Request element does not support Extended Element IDs” to “The Request element does not support extended elements.”

## Comment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1107 | Robert Stacey | 916.01 | 9.4.2.1 | "... may be fragmented" is not accurate. This is not an implementation option but dependent on the information content exceeding a threshold. | "A "Yes" in the Fragmentable column of Table 9-87 indicates that the element could have 255 in the Length field and be followed by one or more Fragment elements. A "No" in the Fragmentable column indicates that this is not possible. See 10.28.11." |

## Proposed resolution

REVISED – Change the paragraph following the instructions in <this doc> for CID 1107

## Editing instructions:

A “Yes” in the Fragmentable column listed in Table 9-87 (Element IDs) indicates that the element information might exceed the threshold that causes the element to be fragmented (see 10.28.11 (Element fragmentation)).

## Comment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1105 | Robert Stacey | 914.35 | 9.4.2.1 | Some entires in the table have blank cells for "Extensible" | Ensure that all entries (except "Reserved") have either "Yes" or "No" in the Extensible column. |

## Discussion

A cell in the “Extensible” column could be blank since the statement at P915L63 is clear on how this is interprented: “The element is not extensible otherwise (i.e., if not marked as “Yes” or “Subelements”).”

There is no equivalent statement for “Fragmentable,” so each row (other than the Reserved rows) needs a “yes” or “no” in the “Fragmentable” column. The specific row that is missing something is the Max Channel Switch Time element.

## Proposed resolution for 1105:

REVISED – Add a “No” to the Extensible column for all rows that currently have a blank cell (except for the reserved rows).