Cl **168** *SC* **168.1** *P* **55** *L* **23** # 101

Schreiner, Stephan — Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *Mixing Segment*

"…mixing segment is compliant with 147.8 AND 168.8. " The definition of the mixing segment is very different. The measurement points, the values and the topology with the new TCI are different. For my point of view, this "AND" constraint seems not to be feasible.

SuggestedRemedy

Because T1M and T1S have the same PMA and PCS, I would assume that a T1M is interoperable with a T1S on a 147.8 link segment. Thus remove "and 168.8"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
DEFER - until Tues AM1 to look at RL curves

The proposed remedy only works if a 147.8 mixing segment is a strict subset of 168.8 mixing segments (that is, all 147.8 mixing segments comply with 168.8). If that is true, then the AND works. However, that has yet to be shown, and is probably not true. As the commenter points out, the definitions are different.

Cl **168** *SC* **168.6.5.2** *P* **81** *L* **15** # 61

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting/ADI,APLGp,CSCO,MRVL,ONSmi,S

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *PMA Electrical*

The alien crosstalk rejection test needs to be inserted. The figure needs to show and be adjusted for the terminations on the mixing segment, and the noise level shouldn't change, because the alien crosstalk coupling is the same, but reference to the receive DUT's TCI and impedances need to be cleaned up.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete Editor's note at P81 L15-20, change figure 168-16 and text as per attached: zimmerman_alienxtalk.pdf. At the end of the first sentence change "present at the TCI" to "present at the receive DUT's TCI".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
DEFER
defer until after the break -
insert (3) breaks: between terms & DTE, and between DTE
consider noise source coupling shown.
New figure to come back.

Cl **168** *SC* **168.9.3** *P* **86** *L* **37** # 96

Paul, Michael — Analog Devices

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *General Safety*

"The DTE shall withstand without damage the application of any voltages between 0 V dc and 60 V dc with the source current limited to 2000 mA" ... 2000mA may not be a good idea for DTE. DTE shouldnt be able to pass the requirement by shunting 2A with an S1B diode at the TCI. 2000mA exception is only for MPSEs

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the text "with source current limited to 2000mA"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
DEFER
There appears to be a hidden requirement that non-clause 169 DTE not shunt current. Consider how to clearly state that.

Cl **169** *SC* **169.4.8** *P* **109** *L* **13** # 5

Jones, Chad — Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *TBDs*

TBDs in the output slew rate entry for Table 169-5. If we want to move to WG ballot, we need numbers here. I'm hoping we get a presentation or comment with reasons for replacing the TBDs with numbers, but this comment is here in case we don't. I'd ask the chair to charter an ad hoc to derive numbers to put in during this meeting.

SuggestedRemedy

If there is a comment to replace the TBDs with numbers, happy to withdraw this comment. If not, please charter an ad hoc to bring numbers back to the group to replace the TBDs.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Big Ticket Item - Technical Completeness
DEFER

Cl **169** *SC* **169.5.5.2** *P* **120** *L* **10** # 105

Schreiner, Stephan
Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *Unit Loads*

For mixed Types, having a difference in the unit load equivalent power may cause confusion.

e.g. A device requires 4W and is a mixed type device it would have 4 unit loads on a type 0 segment and 2 unit loads on a type 1 segment. Thus the device would be described with two unit loads - depending on the type.

SuggestedRemedy

Assign 1W to one unit load.
Type 0 is capable of providing 16 unit loads, type 1 is capable of providing 32 unit loads.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
DEFER
Group needs to consider possible impacts elsewhere in the draft.