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Abstract

Resolutions to LB232 comments on elements: 1100, 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). |

Look at 1102 which is related to intro paragraph

## Proposed resolution for 1100

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.

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.

## 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." |

## Proposed resolution:

REVISED – Since there is only one reference, change the text at P929L15 from “The Request element does not support Extended Element IDs” to “The Request element does not support elements with Element ID field equal to 255”

## 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

ACCEPTED

## Resulting text:

A “Yes” in the Fragmentable column listed in Table 9-87 (Element IDs) 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 (Element defragmentation).

## Comment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1106 | Robert Stacey | 915.41 | 9.4.2.1 | Is it Extensible? Is it Fragmentable? | Fill in columns for this entry |
| 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:

REJECTED – The statement at P915L63 clearly defines how empty cells are interpretation.

## Proposed resolution for 1106:

REVISED – Add “No” to the “Fragmentable” column for the row “Max Channel Switch Time element” (255/34).