<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.16.1.1.12</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Comment Type**

- **E** - Editorial
- **T** - Technical

**Proposed Response**

- **W** - Written
- **O** - Open

**Comment Status**

- **D** - Dispatched
- **A** - Accepted
- **R** - Rejected

---

**Maguire, Valerie**
Copperopolis

**Suggested Remedy**

- Add the following words (in alphabetical order) to the Keyword list: MPD, MPSE, MPoE, Multidrop Power, TCI.

**Proposed Response**

- PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Maguire, Valerie**
Copperopolis

**Suggested Remedy**

- Reminder to Editor to change copyright date in footer to 2024 when producing the next draft.

**Proposed Response**

- PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Maguire, Valerie**
Copperopolis

**Suggested Remedy**

- "The value of this attribute is preserved across reset including loss of power." to the end of the aDPLCAWaitBeaconTimer "BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS:" text.

**Proposed Response**

- PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

---

**Jones, Chad**
Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**

- **E** - Editorial

**Suggested Remedy**

- Add a 1 in front of the 0 in three spots.

**Proposed Response**

- PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Jones, Chad**
Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**

- **E** - Editorial

**Suggested Remedy**

- "0MB/s single pair..." while the power portion might be 0Mbps, this is the 10Mbps project.

**Proposed Response**

-PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Jones, Chad**
Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**

- **E** - Editorial

**Suggested Remedy**

- "0MB/s single pair..." while the power portion might be 0Mbps, this is the 10Mbps project.

**Proposed Response**

-PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Jones, Chad**
Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**

- **E** - Editorial

**Suggested Remedy**

- "0MB/s single pair..." while the power portion might be 0Mbps, this is the 10Mbps project.

**Proposed Response**

-PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Jones, Chad**
Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**

- **E** - Editorial

**Suggested Remedy**

- "0MB/s single pair..." while the power portion might be 0Mbps, this is the 10Mbps project.

**Proposed Response**

-PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Jones, Chad**
Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**

- **E** - Editorial

**Suggested Remedy**

- "0MB/s single pair..." while the power portion might be 0Mbps, this is the 10Mbps project.

**Proposed Response**

-PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Jones, Chad**
Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**

- **E** - Editorial

**Suggested Remedy**

- "0MB/s single pair..." while the power portion might be 0Mbps, this is the 10Mbps project.

**Proposed Response**

-PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Jones, Chad**
Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**

- **E** - Editorial

**Suggested Remedy**

- "0MB/s single pair..." while the power portion might be 0Mbps, this is the 10Mbps project.

**Proposed Response**

-PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Jones, Chad**
Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**

- **E** - Editorial

**Suggested Remedy**

- "0MB/s single pair..." while the power portion might be 0Mbps, this is the 10Mbps project.

**Proposed Response**

-PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

**Jones, Chad**
Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**

- **E** - Editorial

**Suggested Remedy**

- "0MB/s single pair..." while the power portion might be 0Mbps, this is the 10Mbps project.

**Proposed Response**

-PROPOSED ACCEPT.
## IEEE P802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Jones, Peter</th>
<th>Cisco Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.16.1.1.12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>DPLCA</td>
<td>Editor's note says &quot;Comments are encouraged to determine value if not set&quot;. Set aDPLCAWaitBeaconTimer default value to the same value used for &quot;148.4.4.4 Timers invalid_beacon_timer. Timer used for BEACON validation. This timer is stopped any time rx_cmd = BEACON. Duration: 4000 ns. Tolerance: ± 400 ns.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 45 | 45 | 24 | 1 | 45 | E | DPLCA | It looks like clause 45 is all boilerplate. Why include it? If it stays, add editors note? | | |)

**Suggested Remedy**
- Remove or convert to editor's note

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Jones, Peter</th>
<th>Cisco Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>DPLCA</td>
<td>&quot;Change the text&quot; should become an editor's note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**
- Convert to Editors note

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Jones, Peter</th>
<th>Cisco Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>147.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>DPLCA</td>
<td>&quot;Change the text&quot; should become an editor's note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**
- Replace editorial instruction of "Change the text" with Editor's Note (to be removed prior to WG Ballot): If changes are necessary to clause 79, they would go here

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

**Replace editorial instruction of "Change the text" with Editor's Note (to be removed prior to WG Ballot): If changes are necessary to clause 147, they would go here"**

## Type: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general

**Comment Status:** D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected **Response Status:** O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn

**Sort Order:** Clause, Subclause, page, line

**Page 2 of 21**

**1/18/2024 12:04:09 PM**
Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D
DPLCA formatting makes this text hard to parse. Lets be kind to the reader and improve it. It looks like it may have been bulleted when imported and the conversion was clunky. Also, there are three options and we only describe two. As we don’t describe NONE, it’s not clear what the difference is between SOFT and NONE.

Suggested Remedy
Change paragraph to:
Notifies the D-PLCA state diagrams whether the transmit opportunity indicated by dplca_txop_id was claimed by a node. Additionally, it specifies the type of claim:
- SOFT, meaning that a packet not including a COMMIT indication was received. SOFT claims may be issued implicitly by nodes not supporting D-PLCA.
- HARD, meaning that a packet including a COMMIT indication was received. HARD claims may be issued by D-PLCA enabled nodes, and occasionally by statically configured PLCA enabled nodes.
- NONE, (not sure what we write here as it’s not clear what the difference is between SOFT and NONE)
Values: NONE, SOFT, or HARD

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Commenter’s solution is good (formatting), TFTD the meaning of “NONE” and whether to delete it.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D
Page is blank.

Suggested Remedy
remove black page.

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED REJECT.
Page includes header for section containing state diagrams to be edited. Reformatting, if necessary, to align with pagination of IEEE Std 802.3-2022 best occurs at late stages of document production, as it will need to be redone should anything change...
Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  EZ  

Comment: The text says "It is recommended to keep the value of HARD_AGING_CYCLES much greater than the value of SOFT_AGING_CYCLES". "much greater than" is not very specific. Maybe we add something in the definition of HARD_AGING_CYCLES to say it's expected to be at least \((N \times \text{SOFT_AGING_CYCLES})\) (I'm not sure what \(N\) should be).

Proposed Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Worded to address comment, and remove the word "ensure", and to separate stability of the DPLCA algorithm from interoperability with static nodes. TFTD, particularly if we can provide more precise guidance on the relationship of the two values.

Replace: "It is recommended to keep the value of HARD_AGING_CYCLES much greater than the value of SOFT_AGING_CYCLES. This condition ensures both stability and interoperability with statically configured PLCA nodes."

with

"The value of HARD_AGING_CYCLES should be sufficiently greater than the value of SOFT_AGING_CYCLES to maintain stability of the DPLCA process as well as interoperability with statically configured PLCA nodes."

Proposed Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Move the text, but align with rewording in the resolution of comment 56.
Comment Type  E  Comment Status  D
Description of Variable should end with a "."

SuggestedRemedy
Replace, "Counter of BEACON cycles for the short aging time (SOFT claims)" with
"Counter of BEACON cycles for the short aging time (SOFT claims)." Check for this
formatting error in all other document Variable entries.

**Proposed Response**  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  D
Why is HARD_AGING_CYCLES in all-caps? The other variables aren't. We normally use
all-caps for constants.

SuggestedRemedy
Change variable name to match others.

**Proposed Response**  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  D
Why is SOFT_AGING_CYCLES in all-caps? The other variables aren't. We normally use
all-caps for constants.

SuggestedRemedy
Change variable name to match others.

**Proposed Response**  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type  T  Comment Status  D
"The medium supporting the operation of the 10BASE-T1M PHY is defined in terms of
performance requirements between the attachment points (TCI), ..." is ambiguous. Does it
mean, the medium is between two attachment points (so there is more than one medium in
the mixing segment), or does it mean a mathematical concatenation of all "cables"
between all TCIs.

SuggestedRemedy
In case 1: "... is defined in terms of performance requirements between two attachment
points (TCI)...
In case 2: "The medium supporting the operation of the 10BASE-T1M PHY
is defined in terms of performance requirements between all TC3 of all attachment points
of the TCI"

**Proposed Response**  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The descriptive sentence here is imprecise and it is neither meaning. While there is one
medium (one mixing segment for all nodes), the full meaning is that performance is defined
at the TCI and between the edge terminators. This is described in detail in 168.7 which is
already referenced, and is best left to that section (as it might change). Best to simplify the
overview text.

Delete "between the attachment points (TCI)"
Comment: The text says "the mixing segment is compliant with 147.8.". I think it should be 168.7.

Suggested Remedy:
Change:
the mixing segment is compliant with 147.8.
To:
the mixing segment is compliant with 168.7.

Proposed Response: PROPOSED REJECT.
This statement refers to the condition under which a clause 168 PHY is expected to work with a clause 147 PHY. Therefore, the requirements are those under which a clause 147 PHY is expected to work (which are expected to be a subset of the 168 mixing segment requirements).

Comment: Line 9 states that autoneg is not available, NOTE 2 on line 37 states that it is optional. Which is it, not available or optional?

Suggested Remedy:
Assuming the text is correct that the NOTE is a copy/paste error, delete NOTE 2 on line 37. also, does this mean we delete AN on line 37 and the AN box on line 29?

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accomodated by comment 62.

Comment: In 36.3.1.2.3 & 51.2.2.3 it says "The effect of receipt of this primitive by the client is unspecified by the PMA sublayer." which makes more sense. It's defined somewhere.

Suggested Remedy:
Change:
"The effect of receipt of this primitive by the client is unspecified."
To:
"The effect of receipt of this primitive by the client is unspecified by the PMA sublayer."

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
(the PMA wouldn't specify what the PCS does with a primitive that the PMA sends out - it is specified in the PCS receive section. See Clause 101 as an example - FYI, this language shows up in many clauses and is wrong - a (number of) maintenance request(s) should be considered.)

Change to:
The effect of receipt of this primitive is specified in 168.3.3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 168 SC 168.2.3</th>
<th>P49 L13</th>
<th># 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Chad</td>
<td>Cisco Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type: E</td>
<td>Comment Status: D EZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First appearance of DME in our doc, and we don't define it. Actually, I don't find it anywhere in our doc. I assume it stands for Differential Manchester Encoding, but that's not confirmed in the draft. Therefore, add confirmation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td>change to: Differential Manchester Encoding (DME)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status: W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 168 SC 168.3.1</th>
<th>P50 L22</th>
<th># 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Peter</td>
<td>Cisco Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type: E</td>
<td>Comment Status: D EZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Figure 168–3—PCS reference diagram, there is a floating dot to the left of &quot;COLLISION DETECTION&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td>Remove the dot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status: W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 168 SC 168.3.2.1</th>
<th>P51 L2</th>
<th># 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Chad</td>
<td>Cisco Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type: E</td>
<td>Comment Status: D Editorial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD stands for something? Also on line 6, ESD too? I was unable to locate what these stand for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td>help the reader and provide the full text before using the abbreviation. Could put this in 168.3.2.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status: W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED REJECT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 168 SC 168.3.3.3</th>
<th>P58 L24</th>
<th># 57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Peter</td>
<td>Cisco Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type: E</td>
<td>Comment Status: D EZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aren't constants supported to be upper case?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td>Change: fc_supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To: FC_SUPPORTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status: W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
68
Comment Type TR
Comment Status D Management
45.2.3.1.2 Loopback (3.0.14) doesn't include behavior definitions for 10BASE-T1L/T1L/T1M. For all these PHYs I think it should match the first case defined for "100BASE-T1, any MultiGBASE-T, or the 5/10GBASE-R".

SuggestedRemedy
Change:
When bit 3.0.14 is set to a one, the 100BASE-T1, 5/10GBASE-R, or any PCS in the MultiGBASE-T set shall accept data on the transmit path and return it on the receive path.
To:
When bit 3.0.14 is set to a one, the 10BASE-T1S, 10BASE-T1L, 10BASE-T1M, 100BASE-T1, 5/10GBASE-R, or any PCS in the MultiGBASE-T set shall accept data on the transmit path and return it on the receive path.
OR:
When bit 3.0.14 is set to a one, the 100BASE-T1, 5/10GBASE-R, or any PCS in the MultiGBASE-T or 10BASE-T set shall accept data on the transmit path and return it on the receive path.

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
802.3da can't add the other projects - a maintenance request is suggested.

Add 45.2.3.1.2 to the draft, and change:
When bit 3.0.14 is set to a one, the 10BASE-T1, 5/10GBASE-R, or any PCS in the MultiGBASE-T set shall accept data on the transmit path and return it on the receive path.
To:
When bit 3.0.14 is set to a one, the 10BASE-T1S, 10BASE-T1L, 10BASE-T1M, 100BASE-T1, 5/10GBASE-R, or any PCS in the MultiGBASE-T set shall accept data on the transmit path and return it on the receive path.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
802.3da can't add the other projects - a maintenance request is suggested.

Note says to delete HB from table and state diagrams. Searching the PDF yields no returns for "HB". Therefore, this note can be deleted.

SuggestedRemedy
delete the note

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

"Present the minimum impedance described in 168.8.1 at the TCI" does not contain the position (TC1 - TC3) where the minimum impedance should be presented. Because the TCI introduces a more ports than the common MDI, the port needs to be defined. Additionally, a differential impedance can only be defined on one differential port. The TCI will have 4 differential ports (TC1, TC2, TC3-pair one, TC3-pair two). How to handle the remaining ports during the measurement.

SuggestedRemedy
"Present the minimum impedance described in 168.8.1 at all pairs of TCI TC3"

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
(the impedance is presented across the pairs of the interface, in differential mode)

Change "Present the minimum impedance described in 168.8.1 at the TCI" to:
"Present the minimum impedance described in 168.8.1 across TC3"
IEEE P802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review comments

Comment Type: E Comment Status: D

missing comma: "If MDIO is not implemented a similar functionality shall be provided by equivalent means."

Suggested Remedy:

change to: "If MDIO is not implemented, a similar functionality shall be provided by equivalent means."

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: T

These test modes shall change only the data symbols provided to the transmitter circuitry and ..." contradicts the sentence page 66, line 48-49: "When test mode 4 is enabled, the transmitter shall present a high impedance termination to the line as specified in 168.4.2 for the 'I' symbol.", because high impedance termination is not only a data symbol provided to the transmitter.

Suggested Remedy:

"These test modes shall not alter the electrical and jitter characteristics of the transmitter and receiver from those, which can appear in normal (non-test mode) operation.

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: T

Is this paragraph also affected by question raised in the editor’s note in 168.4.2?

This specification either needs to be changed to reflect maintaining the TCI RL specification approach ..."

Suggested Remedy:

If yes, then add or update editor’s note.

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TFTD. Whether this needs to be updated depends on whether we add a minimum impedance or we describe the TCI RL.

Comment Type: T

The test fixtures 168-12 and 168-13 represents the measurement setups for measurements with a MDI. The introduction of the TCI, which has more ports and wire pairs requires a different measurement setup.

Suggested Remedy:

Redraw the figures and provide the required descriptive text.

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Commenter is correct, but a replacement figure is needed. This is not something purely for the editor.

Test modes

Comment Status: D

Response Status: W

Test modes

Schreiner, Stephan
Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type: T

"To allow an easy synchronization of the measurement equipment, the PHY shall provide access to TX_CLK." - this is an untestable shall. We specify at the connector interface, it’s impossible to know that you’ve complied with this shall at the connector.

Suggested Remedy:

"To allow an easy synchronization of the measurement equipment, it is recommended that the PHY provide access to TX_CLK."

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

(FYI, this same text shows up all over IEEE Std 802.3-2022, maintenance?)

Comment Type: E

"When tested using the text fixture"

Suggested Remedy:

"When tested using the test fixture"

Proposed Response: PROPOSED REJECT.

Not clear what the commenter wants...
Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  EZ
we've labeled the droop as Vd in the figure but make no mention of this in the text.

Suggested Remedy
Change: "...the initial peak, depicted by Figure 168–14, shall be less than..." to: "...the initial peak, depicted as Vd in Figure 168–14, shall be less than..."

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  Editorial
The flow of these two paragraphs is off, I recommend we swap the order.

Suggested Remedy
change section to:
The upper and lower limits OF THE TRANSMITTER POWER SPECTRAL DENSITY (PSD) are given in Equation (168–1) and Equation (168–2), and shown in Figure 168–15. When measured using test mode 3 and the test fixture shown in Figure 168–13, or equivalent, the transmitter Power Spectral Density (PSD) shall be between the upper and lower masks specified in Equation (168–1) and Equation (168–2).

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  Editorial
another problem with flow in the doc. We are referencing TC3 and we haven't introduced the concept yet as it happens a couple of pages later. Absent a way to reorder the text such that things get introduced before we use them, we have to give a pointer for the reader.

Suggested Remedy
after TC3 on line 44 add: "(See figure 168-17)"

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  Editorial
this sentence is awkward. I think it needs to be broken into two sentences.

Suggested Remedy
Change to: "The PMA and PCS Receive functions shall pass to the MII RX the data decoded from the signal. This data is normally received during a transmission for the purpose of detecting collisions."

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
(a little more clarity in the first sentence)
Change "The PMA and PCS Receive functions shall pass to the MII RX the data decoded from the signal which is normally received during a transmission for the purpose of detecting collisions."
to:"The PMA and PCS Receive functions shall pass the data decoded from the signal to the MII RX. This data is normally received during a transmission for the purpose of detecting collisions."

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  Editorial
Flow problem. TCI is used before being introduced.

Suggested Remedy
replace "TCI" with "Trunk Connection Interface (TCI, see 168.8)"

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED REJECT.
TCI is introduced and defined in the first paragraph of clause 168. (page 45 line 40)
 Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  TCI
this paragraph is redundant to 168.8. delete

SuggestedRemedy
delete the paragraph. If not deleted, take out the extra spaces after TCI on line 17.

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The text here has parts that are not in 168.8 (and are not appropriate for that). As such,
cleanup is a little more complex, and 168.7 should discuss only what needs to be
discussed for specification of the mixing segment, while 168.8 specifies those things that
are related to the TCI. As such:

Delete "A TCI may be physically implemented... of a DTE to the trunk." at P71 line 17
Delete extra spaces after TCI on line 17.
Move sentence: "TCIs with compensation... service loop" at page 71 lines 18-19 (168.7)
to replace similar sentence at page 74 line 5 ("TCIs with compensation are expected to be
matched to a particular PMA/DTE implementation, including any associated stub or service
loop." (168.7 to 168.8)

CI 168  SC 168.7  P71  L26  # 109
Fischer, Peter  BKS Kabel-Service AG
Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D  Mixing Segment
Length should be specified according to the goal.

SuggestedRemedy
Change TBD to 50

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
TFTD.
Suggest leave this as TBD until the mixing segment is done and validated.
IEEE P802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review comments

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  EZ
Maguire, Valerie  Copperopolis
Equations should be indented, left justified (not centered)
Suggested Remedy
Fix justification of equations (168-3), (168-4), (168-5), (168-6), and (168-7)
Proposed Response  Response Status: W  PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  EZ
Jones, Chad  Cisco Systems
two extraneous periods floating in the doc.
Suggested Remedy
delete the two decimal points.
Proposed Response  Response Status: W  PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D  TCI
Schreiner, Stephan  Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
"The mixing segment at each point TC3, without any DTEs attached, shall meet …" By
having the 4 wire interface on TC1 TC3, the measurement on the TC3 interface will cover
only the link segment to the right or left side up to the next TC1. At this position - without a
DTE attached, the link might be open.
Suggested Remedy
"The mixing segment return loss, with DTEs or representative dummy loads attached, shall
meet…”
Proposed Response  Response Status: W  PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
TFTD
Resolve with discussion on 2-wire to 4-wire issue on comment 8.

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D  TCI
Schreiner, Stephan  Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
The NOTE indicates clearly what the purpose of the paragraph is. However, a meaningful
physical implementation with a 4 wire TCI TC3 interface might not be able to fulfill the
paragraph from line 28 to line 32
Suggested Remedy
Remove this paragraph
Proposed Response  Response Status: W  PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
TFTD
Resolve with comment 8.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  TCI
Jones, Chad  Cisco Systems
Need a TCI definition in 1.4.
Suggested Remedy
TCI (Trunk Connection Interface): an MDI for shared transmission medium for single pair
Ethernet.
Proposed Response  Response Status: W  PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D  EZ

Given we have the following text in the intro, why can't we just delete this note.
 "The TCI is an MDI for the shared transmission media".

SuggestedRemedy
Delete the note.

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Jones, Peter  Cisco Systems

Comment Type: TR  Comment Status: D  PICS
INS-P2P is not relevant to 10BASE-T1M.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove INS-P2P.

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED REJECT.
For the time being, we do not know whether there will be installation requirements.
Suggest the commenter reconsider this comment on initial WG ballot, when the draft
should be technically complete.

Jones, Peter  Cisco Systems

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D  Editorial

SuggestedRemedy
Replace PCST4 Value/Comment formula with a link to 168.3.2.8 to match PCSR3.

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Schreiner, Stephan  Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D  TCI
The TCI interface defines a 4 wire interface on TC3, and a left side (TC1) and a right side
(TC2) both having two wires. The graphic only indicates a 2 wire interface (BI_DA+, BI_DA-)
to the PMA. Thus, the figures 168-10 and 168-18 are not well aligned.

SuggestedRemedy
Redraw the figure, showing how the PMA and the TCI is supposed to work

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
TFTD - resolve with comment 8

Schreiner, Stephan  Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D  PMA
Figure includes the MDI interface, which should be replaced by TCI

SuggestedRemedy
Provide a new figure by replacing the MDI by TCI. This might also require a generally
different measurement procedure.

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change editor's note at P70 L6 to read:
"Editor's Note (to be removed prior to WG Ballot): - The text below represents an alien
crosstalk noise rejection test for point-to-point systems. The test needs to be updated to
better reflect the multidrop environment, at least including the TCI, and the location of the
transmitter relative to the mixing segment. Contributions are encouraged."

Maguire, Valerie  Copperopolis

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  EZ
Clause 169 introduces "multi-drop" with a hyphen. For consistency, it should be "multidrop".

SuggestedRemedy
Replace all occurrences of "multi-drop" with "multidrop"

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 169</th>
<th>P86</th>
<th>L 51</th>
<th># 86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chauve, Vincent Schneider Electric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change Pmdp(max) from 1W to 16W for type 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFTD with contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 169</th>
<th>P101</th>
<th>L 17</th>
<th># 59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chauve, Vincent Schneider Electric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change Pmdp(max) from 2W to 32W for type 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFTD with contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 169</th>
<th>P85</th>
<th>L 5</th>
<th># 82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chauve, Vincent Schneider Electric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change Pmdp(max) from 1W to 16W for type 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFTD with contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 169.1</th>
<th>P101</th>
<th>L 17</th>
<th># 59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chauve, Vincent Schneider Electric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change Pmdp(max) from 2W to 32W for type 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFTD with contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 169.1</th>
<th>P85</th>
<th>L 8</th>
<th># 74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chauve, Vincent Schneider Electric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change Pmdp(max) from 1W to 16W for type 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFTD with contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 169.1</th>
<th>P85</th>
<th>L 8</th>
<th># 74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chauve, Vincent Schneider Electric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editorial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first sentence says that the MPSE and MPDs are optional. When I wrote that, I meant 'optional' in terms of 802.3da defining a standard where power is an option. MPSEs and MPDs are not optional for Clause 169.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strike the word optional from the sentence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 169.1</th>
<th>P85</th>
<th>L 8</th>
<th># 74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chauve, Vincent Schneider Electric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editorial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The text says &quot;for use with supported single pair Ethernet Physical Layers.&quot;. Where do we state what they are? Should we list the supported PHYs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for use with supported single pair Ethernet Physical Layers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for use with the 10BASE-T1M Physical Layer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 SC 169.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Comment Type: E, Comment Status: D, Consistency/readability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Peter, Cisco Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistency/readability: Change: The characteristics of a power source to add power to the cabling system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To: The characteristics of an MPSE to add power to the cabling system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 SC 169.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Comment Type: TR, Comment Status: D, Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Peter, Cisco Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial: Text says &quot;an MPD&quot; where it should be &quot;one or more MPDs&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: Change: an MPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To: one or more MPDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 SC 169.1.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Comment Type: E, Comment Status: D, EZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Chad, Cisco Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EZ: &quot;Compliant implementations of PD and PSE systems are defined as compatible...&quot; this sentence is about MPSES and MPDs. Add the Ms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: change to &quot;Compliant implementations of MPD and MPSE systems are defined as compatible...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 SC 169.1.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Comment Type: E, Comment Status: D, EZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul, Michael, Analog Devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EZ: &quot;PD and PSE&quot; should be &quot;MPD and MPSE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: Fix typo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: Proposed Accept. (see comment 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 SC 169.1.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Comment Type: E, Comment Status: D, EZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul, Michael, Analog Devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EZ: &quot;PD and PSE&quot; should be &quot;MPD and MPSE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: Fix typo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: Proposed Accept. (see comment 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 SC 169.1.2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Comment Type: T, Comment Status: D, Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Peter, Cisco Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial: Compared to PoDL, this sub-clause is missing some of the &quot;non-data&quot; and &quot;OSI reference model&quot; discussion compared to 104.1.2, and the related figures 104-1 and 102-2? Should these be added?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: Need new text submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: Proposed Accept IN PRINCIPLE. Need contribution with text. TFTD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Type E  Comment Status D  Power - TCI
TC3 is probably not the right place to specify compliance and may not even be accessible in final products. I think we need to stick to TC1 and TC2 as the interface specification points.

**Suggested Remedy**
For now change the sentence From: "Compliance is specified on each pairset at the TC3 interface" to: "Compliance is specified at the trunk connection interfaces (see Figure 169-1)."

**Proposed Response**  **Response Status** W

**Proposed Accept.**

---

Comment Type E  Comment Status D  Editorial
This line should be removed. "MPSEs and MPDs are compatible with 10BASE-T1M PHYs (see Clause 168)." The first sentence in subclause 169.1.2 says "MPoE is an optional power entity to be used in conjunction with supported single pair Ethernet Physical Layers." - which allows compliance with future single pair standards. I don't think clause 168 needs to be specifically addressed at the end of this subclause and I don't think we want to edit this text every time a new clause is compatible with clause 169.

**Suggested Remedy**
Remove this sentence: "MPSEs and MPDs are compatible with 10BASE-T1M PHYs (see Clause 168)."

**Proposed Response**  **Response Status** W

**Proposed Accept.**

---

Comment Type T  Comment Status D  Power levels
Add missing values to the table 169-1 (There might be a presentation during the interim)

**Suggested Remedy**
Ipi@24V MPSE=889 mA
Ipi@50V MPSE=941 mA
Phype@24V MPSE = 23 W
Phype@50V MPSE = 42 W

**Proposed Response**  **Response Status** W

**Proposed Accept in Principle.**
TFTD - need presentation and discussion.

---

Comment Type T  Comment Status D  Power - TCI
we never mention the allowed DC resistance of the stubs. Is this something we need ot specify?

**Suggested Remedy**
add a specification for max DC resistance of the stub if needed.

**Proposed Response**  **Response Status** W

**Proposed Reject.**
TFTD
The stub is considered part of the DTE. The power entity interfaces at TC1 or TC2, beyond the stub. We MAY need to specify the DC resistance on the through-path of the TC1 though…
Table 169-1 has a bunch of notes below referenced via superscript. Much easier to parse if these notes are in an "additional info" column in the table.

**Suggested Remedy**

add an additional info column to table 169-1 and move the footnotes into this column.

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

24V nominal MPSE is an odd label because 24V is below VMPSE(min) for system type 0.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change label to "30V Nominal MPSE".

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Incorporate commenters remedy & do a global check for 24V nominal MPSE

---

Comparing Table 169–1 to Table 104–1,, Table 104-1 has the max voltage for the 24 V regulated PSE (class 6&7) as 36V, why are we only at 30V (class 10/11/12)?

**Suggested Remedy**

Consider changing 30V to 36V.

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

---

Comparing Table 169–1 to Table 104–1, Table 104-1 uses "regulated" and "unregulated" where Table 169–1 uses "Nominal" and "Max". Why are these different?

**Suggested Remedy**

Harmonize Table 169–1 and Table 104–1.

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Suggest we make Table 169-1 as good as we can rather than forcing it to look like clause 104. The nomenclature in 169-1 is clearer.
footnote d: we say Pmpd(max) is the average allowed power draw, but I don't find that we bound the average. I can average 1W if I draw 100W for 10ms once a second. Surely, that's not compliant.

SuggestedRemedy
define the bounds and add them to the text. Then add (see 169.x to this note to point the reader there).

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TFTD
Need an agreed value.

Paul, Michael Analog Devices

try to remove references to TC3

SuggestedRemedy
Change "TC3" to "TCI"

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Published: Chad

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis

The lettered list is not incrementing from a) to b), etc.

SuggestedRemedy
Fix lettered list formatting so that letters increment

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Paul, Michael Analog Devices

try to remove references to TC3

SuggestedRemedy
Change "...as seen at the TC3 Interface" to "...as seen at the MPSE Trunk Connection Interface (TCI)"

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review comments

**Comment Type**: E  **Comment Status**: D

The list items are all "a)"

**Suggested Remedy**
Enumerate the list properly

**Proposed Response**
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment Type**: E  **Comment Status**: D

"equal to or greater" should be "less than"

**Suggested Remedy**
change from: "equal to or greater" to "less than"

**Proposed Response**
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment Type**: E  **Comment Status**: D

Typo - double colon.

**Suggested Remedy**
Change:
open_circuit::The MPSE has detected an open circuit
To:
open_circuit:The MPSE has detected an open circuit

**Proposed Response**
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Comment Type: E  Consistency/readability
Suggested Remedy
Change:
An MPSE may successfully discover but then opt not to power the link.
To:
An MPSE may successfully complete discovery but then opt not to power the link.

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: T  DC MPS current is defined as 4A min and 9A max. this seems to be an error. I don't know what the numbers were supposed to mean (perhaps mA?), but we need to fix this.
Suggested Remedy
find the right values and replace them in the table.
Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
TFTD to discuss - needs proposal

Comment Type: E  Typo, PD should be MPD.
Suggested Remedy
Typo, PD should be MPD.
Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E  Subscripts are missing from all constants in this subclause
Suggested Remedy
Subscript all text in the constant names after the first character.
Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 169</th>
<th>SC 169.5.5</th>
<th>P 101</th>
<th>L 5</th>
<th># 106</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, Michael</td>
<td>Analog Devices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type**: E  **Comment Status**: D  **Response Status**: W  **Proposed Response**: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 169</th>
<th>SC 169.5.5.1</th>
<th>P 101</th>
<th>L 42</th>
<th># 107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, Michael</td>
<td>Analog Devices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type**: E  **Comment Status**: D  **Response Status**: W  **Proposed Response**: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 169</th>
<th>SC 169.5.5.1</th>
<th>P 101</th>
<th>L 45</th>
<th># 108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, Michael</td>
<td>Analog Devices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type**: E  **Comment Status**: D  **Response Status**: W  **Proposed Response**: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

- **SuggestedRemedy**: Try to remove references to TC3
- **Proposed Response**: change "TC3" to from the "MPD Trunk Connection Interface."
- **Proposed Response**: change "TC3" to "the TCI"
- **Proposed Response**: change "TC3" to "TCI"