



Approved resolutions to comments received on BSR E1.37-5, General Purpose Messages for ANSI E1.20, RDM (document number CP/2014-1049r1)

Referenced document:

BSR E1.37-5, General Purpose Messages for ANSI E1.20, RDM (document number CP/2014-1049r1)

Public review period: 20 November 2015 through 4 January 2016
(Earlier responses will be accepted. Later responses may not be considered as part of this review.)

Question: Do you recommend that the standards committee accept BSR E1.37-5, General Purpose Messages for ANSI E1.20, RDM (document number CP/2014-1049r1), as an American National Standard? Please indicate "Yes" (accept it), "Yes with comments," or "No with reasons" (don't accept it).

Commenters:

Name	Representing	Yes	Yes with comments	No with reasons
Maya Nigrosh (ETC)	Electronic Theatre Controls, Inc.			X
Peter Willis (HEL)	Howard Eaton Lighting Ltd.			X

Full comment summary and resolutions begin on the next page. Resolutions were approved at the 6 October 2018 CPWG meeting.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
1	ETC	General	Accept
Comment			
We will be submitting a separate document to the task group, with suggestions for grammar and clarification, where needed.			
Resolution Comment			
Maya to send.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
2	ETC	General	Accept in Principle.
Comment			
It seems like it might be useful to add a definitions section for things like PID, responder, null start code.			
Resolution Comment			
Updated to be more consistent with using proper terminology and adding references to the proper documents that define terms where needed.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
3	ETC	General	Accept in Principle.
Comment			
Throughout the document, there are different words used to describe GET_COMMAND, SET_COMMAND, and their responses. Examples include "Get/Set parameter messages," " Just pick one and us it throughout the entire thing in place of all of the others			
Resolution Comment			
Updated to be more consistent with proper terminology throughout the document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
4	ETC	General	Accept in Principle.
Comment			

Some of the language in here is confusing. The use of the word "device," while not entirely problematic in this particular document, will lead to some confusion with anyone applying these PIDs to E1.33. It might make sense to standardize on "responder."

Resolution Comment

Have switched to using responder where appropriate.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
5	HEL	General	Accept

Comment

Notes re ACK_OVERFLOW In the previous Public Review I noted (under LIST_TAGS), adding a note regarding ACK_OVERFLOW behavior probably just a reminder to developers that the result of merging a number of ACK_OVERFLOWed messages should be the same as if they were sent in one (oversized) message, with the correct number of null terminations between message chunks. This was rejected on the basis that it might be dealt with in a revised E1.20 document. Unless it is proposed to HOLD this standard until AFTER the E1.20 revision, such a resolution is meaningless and in my view unacceptable. Some form of basic advice should be added to this document.

Resolution Comment

We've added some text.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
6	HEL	General	

Comment

Removal of PIDs to control splitter/endpoint operation The exclusion of any control over enable/disable of RDM and/or DMX traffic is unacceptable. At the very least, please allow a responder manufacturer to provide one or more configurations, numbered consecutively starting at 1, with an associated GET: DESCRIPTION PID. This does not require defining or allowing any specific filtering/masking, but does allow for a manufacturer to control and declare one or more operational methods using standard RDM commands. GET/SET START_CODE_TRAFFICSET GET START_CODE_TRAFFICSET_DESCRIPTION. TRAFFICSET #1 could be defined as NSC ONLY, all other combinations to be as deemed appropriate by the manufacturer. Could be modelled in a similar manner to the ENDPOINT_TIMIG PIDs.

Resolution Comment

The START_CODE_FILTER PID is now in the E1.37-7 document along with the rest of the Gateway/Splitter PIDs.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
7	HEL	General	Accept

Comment

General All references to PLASA and the PLASA Technical Standards Program need to be changed. These standards are no longer maintained by PLASA.

Resolution Comment

Changed references to ESTA

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
8	ETC	1.1	Accept
Comment			
1.1 E1.20 Basic Features - It is unclear what the text "an EF 1.0 implementation of ANSI E1.11" means. Consider clarifying or striking this entirely.			
Resolution Comment			
Text has been updated.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
9	ETC	1.2	Accept in Principle
Comment			
1.2 Overview & Scope - "Get/Set parameter messages" is parenthetically defined as "(PIDs)." This is misleading. The messages themselves are not actually PIDs. Consider removing the parenthetical.			
Resolution Comment			
Text has been updated.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
10	HEL	1.2.1	Accept in Principle
Comment			
Section 1.2.1 To simplify implementations, this standard does not attempt to describe all possible RDM messages. Notably, Length-Value1 messages are not supported. Length—Value messages are not dis-allowed (as Manufacturer Specific commands), and therefore this approach does not help in all situations. This should be noted. Because I can legitimately have Manufacturer specific PIDs where the alignment of the data fields inside the message is determined by the value of the data in the message itself, the statement “To date, no present nor draft RDM PIDs use Length-Value messages” cannot be justified. Is not a manufacturer specific PID an RDM PID ?			
Resolution Comment			
The footnote has been removed.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
11	ETC	1.2.1	Accept
Comment			

1.2.1 Parameter Descriptors Scope - Perhaps "manufacturer-specific" should be added: "To simplify implementations, this standard does not attempt to describe all possible manufacturer-specific RDM messages...." {RT}

Resolution Comment

Text added

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
12	HEL	1.2.1	Accept in Principle

Comment

Section 1.2.1 The new parameter description PIDs defined in Section 6 obsolete the PARAMETER_DESCRIPTION message from [RDM]. I cannot accept that this standard can obsolete something in the E1.20 standard. That should require a revision of the E1.20 document. How can anyone reading E1.20 know that some other document may contradict what is stated in E1.20.

Resolution Comment

We've changed "obsolete" to "deprecates" since this new PID does not contradict E1.20, both mechanisms can exist in parallel.

The old PID will be marked deprecated in the next revision of E1.20.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
13	ETC	2	Accept

Comment

Does it matter that JSON-SCHEMA is not an official standard? This is the Normative References section and not the Standards Only section.

Resolution Comment

Removed text.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
14	ETC	2	Accept

Comment

2 Normative References - There needs to be a reference here for [DMX]. It's discussed in section 1, 4.9, 4.17, and in other places in the document.

Resolution Comment

Reference Added.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
-----------	-------------	---------	------------

15	ETC	4.1-4.3	Accept
Comment			
4.1, 4.2, 4.3 - The phrase "as required" in "This URL may be used by controllers to build user friendly interfaces providing links as required to further information about a product" suggests that this standard is making those requirements. A rewrite could be "This URL may be used by controllers to build user-friendly interfaces that provide links, as necessary, to further information about a product."			
Resolution Comment			
Text changed.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
16	HEL	4.1-4.3	Accept
Comment			
Section 4.1 thru 4.3 Use of the term Perma-Link is not clearly defined. For example Wikipedia uses the term Permalnk, and the article is shown as having issues. This article has multiple issues. Please help improve it or discuss these issues on the talk page. This article or section may contain misleading parts. Please help clarify this article according to any suggestions provided on the talk page. (August 2009) This article needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. (July 2007) Is there a normative reference that can be cited ?? https://codex.wordpress.org/Using_Permalinks ??			
Resolution Comment			
<p>Changed text to</p> <p>“ Manufacturers should make every effort to ensure this link does not change”</p> <p>Removed mentions of permalinks.</p>			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
17	HEL	4.5	Accept
Comment			
Section 4.5 If a response supports the SELF_TEST_LIST parameter, it shall also support the PERFORM_SELF_TEST and SELF_TEST_DESCRIPTION parameters from [RDM]. Text should read “if a responder ..”			
Resolution Comment			
Text changed.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
18	ETC	4.6	Accept
Comment			

4.6 Get/Set Shipping Lock (SHIPPING_LOCK) - As obvious as their descriptions may seem, the Data Description section needs to contain information about Unlocked, Locked, and Partially Locked, rather than just talk about the single value ("Partially Locked") of the SHIPPING_LOCK enumeration.

Resolution Comment

Moved to enumerated values.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
19	HEL	4.6	Reject.
Comment			
4.6 Get/Set Shipping Lock (SHIPPING_LOCK) Further enumeration should allow “Partially Locked – No movement allowed” and “Partially Locked – Restricted movement allowed”. A unit might be partially locked but allow PAN but not Tilt etc.			
Resolution Comment			
This is a physical shipping lock. We've added text describing the various cases (locked / unlocked / partially locked).			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
20	HEL	4.6	Accept.
Comment			
4.6 Get/Set Shipping Lock (SHIPPING_LOCK) I would prefer to have the enumerations shown in a table rather than buried in the PID layout			
Resolution Comment			
Done			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
21	HEL	4.6	Reject
Comment			
4.6 Get/Set Shipping Lock (SHIPPING_LOCK) In the interests of simplicity, this PID should be restricted to root devices.			
Resolution Comment			
This may be useful for sub devices. e.g a multi head moving head.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
22	HEL	4.7	Accept in Principle
Comment			
4.7 Get Serial Number (SERIAL_NUMBER) The response data contains the string with the serial number,			

which may be alpha-numeric, of up to 231 octets I have no particular issue with use of the term octets, but the document should be consistent. In other sections (for example 4.8, use of the term bytes prevail). Pattern Length The number of bytes that shall be returned in the GET_RESPONSE parameter data (PD) field. Valid values are 0 to 231 inclusive. I suggest sticking to whatever term was used in E1.20, and be consistent throughout the document.

Resolution Comment

Scott and Maya discussed at the Oct meeting:

Maya: as long as we add 'byte' to the glossary we can use it.

Replaced octets with bytes.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
23	ETC	4.8	Accept

Comment

4.8 Get/Set Test Data (TEST_DATA) Data Description Pattern Data - "The first byte of the pattern data shall be 0. Each additional byte shall increment by 1." This line is confusing. Is it talking about the payload of the pattern data? Is it talking about the numbering of the of the bytes? What is being incremented?

Resolution Comment

Text changed.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
24	HEL	4.9	Reject

Comment

4.9 Get/Set Null Start Code Communication Status (COMMS_STATUS_NSC) I reiterate that for some responders, maintaining a 32bit count of packets received is too difficult, and that manufacturers should have the option of roll over at either 16bit or 32bit. I am fine with the field size being fixed as 32bit, all it needs is a flag in the supported fields definitions. A recommendation that 32bits is preferred would be acceptable. This should be for the responder manufacturer to decide on. The rollover at 27 minutes is perfectly acceptable for many scenarios, and when I want longer I'd use a processor that allowed maintenance of the 32bit counter

Resolution Comment

This has been addressed in previous public reviews.

A 16 bit value will roll over in ~27 minutes. The task group decided this was too short.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
25	ETC	4.9	Reject

Comment
NSC Error Count - Is the intent that the counter essentially repeat 0xFFFFFFFF indefinitely until it is reset? Can that be written explicitly?
Resolution Comment
The current text remains “When the counter reaches 4,294,967,294 (0xFFFFFFFF) the counter shall not roll over and shall not change until reset.”

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
26	ETC	4.9	Accept
Comment			
Data Description, Supported Fields - Should also specify that controllers should ignore bits 6 and 7.			
Resolution Comment			
Changed.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
27	ETC	4.9	Accept
Comment			
What is the intent of the comment about "abnormal conditions"? Maybe this sentence should just end after the word occurs?			
Resolution Comment			
Removed			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
28	ETC	4.9	Accept
Comment			
NSC Maximum Slot Count (16-bit) - As it is written, the text about "all three slot counters" appears to be part of "NSC Maximum Slot Count (16- bit)." Maybe this segment can be reformatted so that this helpful text appears before the three counters are mentioned? Or maybe this text could just appear for each slot counter.			
Resolution Comment			
Text changed.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
29	ETC	4.9	Reject
Comment			

Suggest adding "all supported fields shall be set to 0 following device reset." {RT}

Resolution Comment

This is an implementation detail. The COMMS_STATUS PID on which this is based does not specify reset triggers.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
30	ETC	General	Accept in Part
Comment			
NSC Packet Count states "This counter shall start at 0," while other counters do not. {RT}			
Resolution Comment			
Slot counts don't have an initial value. We've added text for the error counter.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
31	ETC	4.9	Accept
Comment			
4.9 Get/Set Null Start Code Communication Status (COMMS_STATUS_NSC) - Nowhere in this document are "Null Start Code packets" defined. At least reference another document where they are, if nothing is to be put in here.			
Resolution Comment			
Added reference.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
32	ETC	4.10	Accept
Comment			
<p>"Manufacturers are reminded to handle non-printable characters correctly and to allow tags with nonprintable characters to be removed easily" Responders are not required to do anything other than bitwise-comparison unless they choose to display them to the user in some way. Controller and Responder displays may not be able to properly show all characters available in the encoding defined in [RDM 10.1]. For example, imagine a display that can show only UPPERCASE, but the tag contains unprintable characters, etc. How about this text instead:</p> <p>"Manufacturers who wish to display the tag data are reminded that it may contain non-displayable characters and that these must be handled appropriately. Controller manufacturers are reminded that the user must be able to easily remove any tags they desire, including tags containing nondisplayable characters." {RT}</p>			
Resolution Comment			
Switched to the replacement text.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
33	ETC	4.10	Accept
Comment			
Maybe put the hex return data that is in the same order as the example tags in the first response, and then make the second response the one where they are out of order? This avoids the confusion that might arise from translating hex to text but not reading carefully enough.			
Resolution Comment			
Done			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
34	ETC	4.10	Accept
Comment			
The list of example tags does not belong on page 21. It seems fine (and more useful) when it appears in the Data Description section.			
Resolution Comment			
Done.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
35	ETC	4.10	Reject
Comment			
4.10 Get Responder Tags (LIST_TAGS) - This is not the only place this occurs, but we should be careful to use "octets" instead of "bytes."			
Resolution Comment			
See comment #22.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
36	ETC	4.10	Accept in Principle.
Comment			
4.10 Get Responder Tags (LIST_TAGS) Manufacturers are reminded to handle non-printable characters correctly and to allow tags with non-printable characters to be removed easily. Responders are advised to support at least 6 tags. Example tags include “Front Truss”, “Floor” or “Faulty”. As no definition of “correctly” is provided, this test is unhelpful.			
Suggested change to “Tags are text strings of variable length in accordance with section 10.1 of [RDM]. “Manufacturers are reminded to handle non-printable characters in accordance with [RDM] and to allow tags with non-printable characters to be removed easily. Responder Manufacturers are advised to support at least			

six tags. ”

New paragraph The text strings “Front Truss #1”, “Floor”, “Faulty” are examples of acceptable Tags. Avoid any inference that the 6 supported tags must include the text shown as the example. Makes it clear these are text strings. If you really DID mean to allow non-ascii characters above 0x80 this needs to be more clearly spelt out.

Resolution Comment

Accepted part of the text. The ASCII vs Unicode issue is not being addressed in this document and will be updated in a revised E1.20.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
37	HEL	4.11	Accept

Comment

4.11 Add Responder Tag (ADD_TAG) Responders shall not modify tag values in any way, for example by truncating or converting to lower case. Suggested text change to Responders shall not modify tag data in any way. For example, actions such truncating or converting to lower case are not permitted. Reason : better presentation of simple “shall” statement, and use of data rather than value, as tags are not necessarily numeric

Resolution Comment

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
38	ETC	4.11-4.13	Reject.

Comment

4.11-4.13 - In the SET_COMMAND, consider replacing "bytes" with "octets."

Resolution Comment

See comment #22.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
39	HEL	4.12	Accept in Part.

Comment

4.12 Remove Responder Tag (REMOVE_TAG) ” When removing tags, comparison shall be byte-wise compared Provide text to avoid use of term “byte-wise compared” Suggested text : A tag shall only be removed if it is an exact match byte for byte with the offered tag. (Plus add text to allow simple * wild chard matching)

Resolution Comment

Replaced text. Wildcard matching is not supported.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
40	HEL	4.12	Reject.
Comment			
<p>4.12 Remove Responder Tag (REMOVE_TAG) There needs to be a simple wildcard mechanism that allows removal of tags. There does NOT have to be extensive pattern matching support. At the very least allow the use of * to allow the removal of FRED001,FRED002 etc by use of FRED* Reason ; Far too brute force to only allow a Clear all PID. Reason : If there are no wild cards allowed, it is hard to see how it is going to be “easy” to remove tags with non-printable characters as required by the comment (#25) resolution in the previous pubic review. It was argued in the previous comment rejection that “The more complex the PID becomes, the less likely manufacturers will implement the PID. For this reason we decided not to support wildcard or regex matching.” This is a very subjective argument. The task group should be concentrating on ease of use functionality, not ease of implementation.</p>			
Resolution Comment			
<p>This has been discussed previously.</p> <p>The more complex the PID becomes, the less likely manufacturers will implement the PID. For this reason we decided not to support wildcard or regex matching.</p>			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
41	HEL	4.13	Accept.
Comment			
<p>4.13 Check Responder Tag (CHECK_TAG) Question use of the term “byte-wise compare”. From Wikipedia – there is no definition of byte-wise compare The page "Byte-wise compare" does not exist. You can ask for it to be created, but consider checking the search results below to see whether the topic is already covered. The text When comparing tags,comparison shall be byte-wise compared. Would read better as To be marked as present, Tags shall match byte by byte This section also needs to address whether the seed tag must be NULL terminated or not. (Suggest that NULL termination is optional, but it needs stating).</p>			
Resolution Comment			
<p>Revised text to remove byte comparison.</p>			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
42	HEL	4.13	Accept in part
Comment			
<p>4.13 Check Responder Tag (CHECK_TAG) “Is Present” should be called Tag Status, with appropriate enumerations Not Present 0x00 Present 0x01</p>			
Resolution Comment			
<p>Changed to 'Tag Status'</p>			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
43	HEL	4.15	Reject
Comment			
4.15 Get / Set Device Unit Number Device unit numbers need to be alpha-numeric references, as lighting plans are not restricted to referencing units by Integer values. This was previously rejected (as comment #31)with a rather varied set of reasons. Maya: if we keep this, we should use a term that isn't overloaded. TG Mar 2015: Prefer to remove this PID entirely. TG May 2015: Keep the PID, but it's numeric only. Users that want alphanumeric can use tags. The TG has failed to give a reason why alpha-numeric device numbers should not be considered. If, as is claimed, users that want alphanumeric can use tags, then users that want numeric (which is surely a subset of alphanumeric) could also use tags and this PID is redundant.			
Resolution Comment			
Eric: This is intended to allow a guest console to obtain the house patch. Most consoles use a numeric fixture number. There is already an alphanumeric label available in the form of DEVICE_LABEL. This is a separate use case. October 2015: Settled on “Device Number”			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
44	HEL	4.15	Accept
Comment			
4.15 Get / Set Device Unit Number (DEVICE_UNIT_NUMBER) In the context of RDM, what is a fixture mode ?? Do we not mean DMX PERSONALITY ??			
Resolution Comment			
Changed text to 'personality'			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
45	HEL	4.15	Accept
Comment			
4.15 Get / Set Device Unit Number (DEVICE_UNIT_NUMBER) Currently the only way to identify a fixture is with the DMX512 address This is poorly worded, as you identify a fixture with the RDM IDENTIFY command, which has nothing to do with the DMX Address. Perhaps use the word “reference” instead of “identify”			
Resolution Comment			
Changed to reference			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
46	ETC	4.16	Reject

Comment
Why include the text "The INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION position of the fixture shall not be subject to pan/tilt invert"? How do we know the device in question is a fixture? What does it matter if the pan and tilt are inverted? Perhaps this was done for a reason and using INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION will cause, at best, some confusion and, at worst, a hardware malfunction (such as a moving projector being smashed into the metal pole being avoided by the pan/tilt invert). If we're ignoring the invert, does that mean the device will always go to the same place? Or does it mean it should not move at all?
Resolution Comment
INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION has been removed from this document.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
47	ETC	4.16	Reject
Comment			
Left/right seems insufficient for a media server. Projection screens probably need at least "top left" / "bottom right," but other forms of media display (e.g.: pixel mapping) often require much more. {RT}			
Resolution Comment			
INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION has been removed from this document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
48	ETC	4.16	Reject
Comment			
Suggest we change the media server text to say "A media server may display an orientation test pattern." {RT}			
Resolution Comment			
INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION has been removed from this document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
49	ETC	4.16	Reject
Comment			
The informative section needs to be more clearly delineated.			
Resolution Comment			
INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION has been removed from this document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
50	ETC	4.16	Reject
Comment			

4.16 Get/Set Device Orientation Indicator (INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION) - Appendix A does not list this PID and has, instead, IDENTIFY_DEVICE_ORIENTATION. Text further down in this section refers to this as "indicate orientation mode," but the title seems more apt, so maybe this should be "Orientation Indicator" mode?

Resolution Comment

INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION has been removed from this document.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
51	HEL	4.16	Reject

Comment

4.16 Get / Set Device Orientation Indicator (INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION) What response if the unit is still locked ?? Better to show enumerations of possible responses in a table, and allow for the "unavailable" case to be reported.

Resolution Comment

INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION has been removed from this document.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
52	HEL	4.16	Reject

Comment

4.16 Get / Set Device Orientation Indicator (INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION) Replace "necessary" with "desirable". If it were truly necessary then this PID should be mandated, and it is not. (and should not be!)

Resolution Comment

INDICATE_DEVICE_ORIENTATION has been removed from this document.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
53	ETC	4.17	Accept

Comment

Suggest simply using 0xFFFF for "User-Defined," informing the controller that it cannot rely on its own existing library of DMX personality information and must ask the responder or the user. {RT}

Resolution Comment

Text has been changed.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
54	ETC	4.17	Accept

Comment

The "User-Defined" values are unlikely to be informative. If the devices offer limited user customization (e.g.: enable/disable features), then they should return a different manufacturer-defined value for each unique

combination. If the device offers user-defined DMX personalities, then the address space 0x8000 - 0xFFFF seems insufficient to give a different result for each, and, thus, the values are relatively meaningless. The controller could only detect if a specific responder has changed since last seen. However, this seems of limited value, as it cannot compare it to other devices of the same model.

Resolution Comment

Text has been changed.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
55	ETC	4.17	Accept

Comment

"Each manufacturer is responsible for ensuring the DMX Personality Identifiers for all their products are unique." This sentence can be misread to mean the exact opposite of its intent.

Resolution Comment

Text has been changed.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
56	ETC	4.17	Accept in part.

Comment

4.17 Get DMX512 Personality ID (DMX_PERSONALITY_ID) - Need to pick one of "Personality ID," "Personality identifier," or "personality ID"

We cannot guarantee that the manufacturer has a website, or, if they do, that it has "personality documentation" on it.

Resolution Comment

Agreed

'The text says 'should publish', it's not a requirement

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
57	ETC	4.18	Accept.

Comment

4.18 Get All Sensors (ALL_SENSORS) - In the GET_COMMAND_RESPONSE, for the PDL, 0xE7 is not easily divisible by 4. Is the intent to overflow in the middle of describing a sensor's data?

Resolution Comment

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
-----------	-------------	---------	------------

Second Public Review BSR E1.37-5

58	ETC	4.19	Accept
Comment			
4.19 Get All Sensors Extended (ALL_SENSORS_EXTENDED) - In the GET_COMMAND_RESPONSE, for the PDL, 0xE1 is not evenly divisible by 10. Is the intent to overflow in the middle of describing a sensor's data?			
Resolution Comment			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
59	ETC	4.20	Accept In Principle
Comment			
Since the Device Info properties appear here, it may make sense to group them together and label them as such in the packet drawing.			
Resolution Comment			
This now just refers directly to the PD fields as defined in E1.20.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
60	ETC	4.20	Accept
Comment			
In the Data Description, the section labeled "Personality" should probably be "Sub-Device Personality Requested" to match the picture of the response packet.			
Resolution Comment			
Changed			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
61	ETC	4.20	Accept
Comment			
4.20 Get Device Information Blind - Strike the sentence "There is no corresponding SET parameter). In all of the other PIDs, we've been able to figure this out from context. Whatever we do, it should be consistent. Since no SET_COMMAND appears in this description, and the title says only "Get," I think there are a lot of clues.			
Resolution Comment			
Done			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
62	ETC	5.3	
Comment			

5.3 Observational Discovery - There are links to 6.11 and 6.12', but those don't match the PIDs they are associated with in this text.

Resolution Comment

This message has been removed from this document.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
63	ETC	5.4	

Comment

5.4 Get Endpoint List (ENDPOINT_LIST) - "The List Change Number is detailed in Section 5.5." But it's not! - There needs to be a Data Description for the packets in this section

Resolution Comment

This message has been removed from this document.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
64	ETC	5.5	

Comment

"monotonically increasing" While true, this seems unnecessary. What needs to be said is *by what* it is monotonically increasing. Suggest, instead "The Endpoint List Change Number is used by controllers in order to track if the list of endpoints has changed. The Endpoint List Change Number shall be incremented by 1 each time the set of endpoints..."

Resolution Comment

This message has been removed from this document.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
65	ETC	5.5	

Comment

5.5 Get Endpoint List Change (ENDPOINT_LIST_CHANGE) - There needs to be a Data Description for the packets in this section

Resolution Comment

This message has been removed from this document.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
66	ETC	5.5	

Comment

5.6 Get/Set Identify Endpoint (IDENTIFY_ENDPOINT) - The Identify Endpoint field is not described in the Data Description (which is also not labeled)

Resolution Comment

This message has been removed from this document.

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
67	ETC	5.8	
Comment			
In the Data Description section, the second field should be entitled "Text Label" and not "Label" as it currently appears.			
Resolution Comment			
This message has been removed from this document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
68	ETC	5.8	
Comment			
5.8 Get/Set Endpoint Label (ENDPOINT_LABEL) - Strike the second sentence. It doesn't seem like the job of the standard to specify what it's used for. People may read this and anchor on the text of the suggestion and then not think about other uses.			
Resolution Comment			
This message has been removed from this document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
69	ETC	5.9	
Comment			
5.9 Get/Set Discovery State (DISCOVERY_STATE) - The final sentence in the first paragraph seems too prescriptive. At least reconsider the wording "only of use," if not rewrite it entirely.			
Resolution Comment			
This message has been removed from this document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
70	ETC	5.10	
Comment			
5.10 Get Discovery State List - In the GET_COMMAND_RESPONSE, change "Packed group of repeated discovery states indices" to "Packed group of discovery state indices," as the word "repeated" implies that a single data item is duplicated over and over in the response.			
Resolution Comment			
This message has been removed from this document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
-----------	-------------	---------	------------

71	ETC	5.14	
Comment			
There needs to be a Data Description following the packets			
Resolution Comment			
This message has been removed from this document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
72	ETC	5.14	
Comment			
5.14 Get Endpoint Device List Change (ENDPOINT_DEVICE_LIST_CHANGE) - "monotonically increasing" While true, this seems unnecessary. What needs to be said is *by what* it is monotonically increasing. Suggest, instead "The Endpoint Device List Change Number is used by controllers in order to track if the list of device UIDs for a given Endpoint ID has changed. The Endpoint Device List Change Number shall be incremented by 1 each time the set of endpoints..."			
Resolution Comment			
This message has been removed from this document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
73	ETC	5.15	
Comment			
5.15 Get Endpoint Devices (ENDPOINT_DEVICES) - The Data Description should define Endpoint ID, List Change Number, and the list of UIDs. It suggests that the former two have been defined in 5.14, yet they have not.			
Resolution Comment			
This message has been removed from this document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
74	ETC	5.16	
Comment			
5.16 Get Binding and Control Fields (BINDING_AND_CONTROL_FIELDS) - "Gateway" is used beneath the Binding UID heading, yet we have not seen this term before in this document. Can it be added to a Definitions section, or, at least, defined here, or referenced from somewhere else?			
Resolution Comment			
This message has been removed from this document.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
75	ETC	6	Accept In Principle
Comment			
6 Message Description Languages - This chapter just jumps right into everything, but doesn't really explain what it's for, how we use it, or even what problem it is solving. It is hard to even understand that this is laying out a whole new concept and not just more PIDs. I question whether this belongs in this document, or if it should end up having its own, entirely. At least include some explanatory text, either in this chapter, or in the opening introduction. - Several of the subsections in this chapter have PID titles, but no descriptive text definitions.			
Resolution Comment			
There has been introductory text added explaining the background, concept and purpose of what follows in the rest of the section.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
76	ETC	6.9	Accept
Comment			
6.9 Descriptor Versioning - What's "Option III"?			
Resolution Comment			
Removed.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
77	HEL	6.9	Accept
Comment			
6.9 Descriptor Versioning For Option III, the PARAMETER_VERSION PID allows a controller to determine the version of the parameter description supported by a responder, without having to fetch the full JSON information. This text is now obsolete ? There is no Option III and no PARAMETER_VERSION PID			
Resolution Comment			
Removed.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
78	HEL	6.10	Accept
Comment			
6.10 PLASA PID Descriptions This clause should really be “Manufacturer Specific PID Descriptions.			
Resolution Comment			
Changed.			

Second Public Review BSR E1.37-5

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
79	HEL	6.12	Reject
Comment			
6.12 DESCRIBE_PARAMETER_MESSAGE Consider adding note that if the JSON Data exceeds the payload allowed in single RDM packet, use should be made of ACK_OVERFLOW in accordance with [RDM]. Worth noting since I don't think the examples provided fit a single RDM packet!			
Resolution Comment			
The response type indicates this with "ACK / ACK_OVERFLOW"			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
80	HEL	6.12	Accept in Principle
Comment			
6.12 DESCRIBE_PARAMETER_MESSAGE The name of this PID is too similar to DESCRIBE_PARAMETER, Suggest change to DESCRIBE_PARAMETER_JSONDATA, since that is what it gets.			
Resolution Comment			
Changed to PARAMETER_METADATA & PARAMETER_METADATA_JSON .			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
81	ETC	Appendix A	Accept.
Comment			
Table A-5 - Not everyone supports Wingdings. Consider using only UTF-8 emoji, or PACL (http://www.fonts2u.com/pacl.font).			
Resolution Comment			
Fixed Table A-5			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
82	ETC	Appendix A	Accept
Comment			
Appendix A - IDENTIFY_DEVICE_ORIENTATION appears here, but no corresponding PID appears anywhere else in the document.			
Resolution Comment			
This has been removed as has STORE_ORIENTATION_STATE.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
-----------	-------------	---------	------------

Second Public Review BSR E1.37-5

83	HEL	Appendix A	Accept.
Comment			
Table A-6: Field Types Might as well allow for IPV6 before this gets published, given the interest in such things in E1.33			
Resolution Comment			
Added, but this table is now in the revised E1.20			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
84	ETC	Appendix B	Accept.
Comment			
Appendix B: Examples (Informative) - The first subsection is labeled "D.1"			
Resolution Comment			
Changed.			

Comment #	CommenterID	Section	Resolution
85	ETC	Appendix B	Accept
Comment			
Appendix C - Again, it is understood why this has been added, but it does not seem like the standard, read in a vacuum, quite explains what it is for or why we need it.			
Resolution Comment			
Maya: thinks this was B not C. Introductory text added for Appendix B.			