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Abstract

Proposed alternative resolutions to LB232 comments on elements: 1100, 1102, 1104

With credit to Robert Stacey, for the original version of this document (11-18/0702).

R0 – initial version

R1 – updates, after review discussion at Portland ad hoc F2F session

R2 – more updates, per further discussion at Portland ad hoc F2F session, and on Aug 24 telecon

R3 – minor changes as agreed at Waikoloa F2F

## 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 |
| 1104 | Robert Stacey | 915.48 | 9.4.2.1 | Aren't these just "Reserved"? We need a statement that Element ID 255 means a format with the Element ID Extension field present (I have another comment on this). And then we just need to state "Reserved" here | As commented |

## Proposed resolution for 1100, 1102 and 1104

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
* Correct errors identified in CIDs 1102 and 1104 in the direction proposed by the commenter

## Editing instructions

9.4.2.1 General

*Change the first paragraph as follows:*

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

***Replace the text following Figure 9-136 with:***

An element is identified by the Element ID field and, if present, the Element ID Extension field.

The set of valid elements is defined in Table 9-87 (Element IDs).

If an Element ID value has an entry in Table 9-87 in the Element column of "Element ID Extension present", 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.

***In Table 9-87, modify the entry for 255/0, from:***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reserved for elements using the Element ID Extension field | 255 | 0(11ai) |  |  |

***to the following two rows:***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Used for elements that contain an Element ID Extension field | 255 |  |  |  |
| Reserved | 255 | 0 |  |  |

***In Table 9-87, change the last row (at 915.48 in D1.0) from:***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reserved for elements using the Element ID Extension field | 255 | 45-255 |  |  |

***to:***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reserved | 255 | 45-255 |  |  |

***Note to Editor: The change just above assumes CID 1283 changes are already completed.***