*Cl* **90**    *SC* **90.1**    *P* **38**    *L* **7**    # 213

Zimmerman, George    CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type* **T**    *Comment Status* **D**    *10BASE-T1S*

"The TSSI is defined for 10BASE-T1S (see Clause 147) in full- duplex and point-to-point half-duplex modes of operation, as well as Clause 168 in half-duplex operation, and for other PHY types in full- duplex mode." - if it works for clause 168, it works for clause 147 in multidrop mode; I believe the reason 802.3de did not add in multidrop here was because of the project being scope-limited to point-to-point.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change sentence to read "The TSSI is defined for 10BASE-T1S (see Clause 147) in full-duplex and point-to-point half-duplex modes
of operation, as well as 10BASE-T1S / M (Clause 147 and Clause 168) in half-duplex multidrop operation, and for other PHY types in full- duplex mode.."

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Editor's comment - TFTD
Response changed to align with usage of "half duplex" rather than "half-duplex" and spelling out of 10BASE-T1S / 10BASE-T1M

Change sentence to read "The TSSI is defined for 10BASE-T1S (see Clause 147) in full duplex and point-to-point half duplex modes of operation, as well as 10BASE-T1S and 10BASE-T1M (Clause 147 and Clause 168) in half duplex multidrop operation, and for other PHY types in full duplex mode.."

*Cl* **90**    *SC* **90.1**    *P* **38**    *L* **9**    # 251

Brandt, David    Rockwell Automation

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **D**    *10BASE-T1S*

Clause 168 ONLY operates in half-duplex.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change from "Clause 168 in half-duplex operations" to "Clause 168".

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Consider with comment 213.
OBE by new wording

*Cl* **168**    *SC* **168.1.1**    *P* **55**    *L* **16**    # 253

Brandt, David    Rockwell Automation

*Comment Type* **T**    *Comment Status* **D**    *10BASE-T1S*

Figure 168-1 shows no PMD in the stack, wheras Figure 22-1 shows a PMD. OPEN Alliance invented a PMD as a preferred implementation.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Group to discuss whether we want a PMD definition as an "enhancement" in Clause 168.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Group to discuss. This will involve draft reorganization and misalignment with clause 147 - without necessarily adding any functionality.

*Cl* **79**    *SC* **79.3.9.3**    *P* **37**    *L* **13**    # 248

Brandt, David    Rockwell Automation

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **D**    *DPLCA*

Table 79-21, Bit 3 should refer to DPLCA per 30.16.1.1.11

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Field definitions" for Bit 3 to: "Bit 3- DPLCA..."

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
(function is called D-PLCA in almost all places, not DPLCA. The management object omits the - (presumably for syntax).)

Change "Field definitions" for Bit 3 to: "Bit 3- D-PLCA..."

*Cl* **45**    *SC* **45.2.1.214.2**    *P* **29**    *L* **35**    # 209

Zimmerman, George    CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **D**    *Editorial*

The new text here is just a duplicate of the table. The change is good, as the paragraph is clunky, but perhaps we can do better. Suggest we do not duplicate the contents of Table 47-178.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace "The mapping of bits is as follows:..." (and subsequent list)" with "See description in Table 45-178 for the mapping of bits."

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
TFTD - Editor's comment

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general    *Topic* **Editorial**    Page 1 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected    RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn    6/12/2024  10:33:08 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

*Cl* **79**     *SC* **79.3.9.2**     *P* **36**     *L* **45**     # 211

Zimmerman, George       CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type* **T**     *Comment Status* **D**       *Editorial*

"of the local IEEE 802.3 LAN" - what is the "local LAN" I think this should say the "local IEEE 802.3 LAN station" as 79.3.9.1 says, but I'm still not sure what "local LAN station" is.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert "station" after LAN on line 45. Consider whether the word "local" (is needed on lines 41 and 45

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Editor's comment - TFTD

---

*Cl* **90**     *SC* **90.1**     *P* **38**     *L* **7**     # 163

Maguire, Valerie       Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting

*Comment Type* **E**     *Comment Status* **D**       *Editorial*

"Half duplex" appears 282 times in 802.3-2022 and "half-duplex" appears 37 times.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Grant Editor's license to replace all occurances of "half-duplex" with "half duplex". Locations found with a search include: P38 - L8, P38 - L9, P54 - L24, P56 - L10 (2 locations)

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **148**     *SC* **148.4.4.6**     *P* **42**     *L* **4**     # 265

Baggett, Tim       Microchip

*Comment Type* **E**     *Comment Status* **D**       *Editorial*

Cl 1.2: Qualifiers described by short phrases are enclosed in parentheses. The Term "!dplca_en" should be enclosed in parenthesis.
More examples are identified in the PDF related to this comment.

*SuggestedRemedy*

See Baggett_3da_D1p2_CL148_StateDiagrams.pdf and enclose highlighted terms with parenthesis.

This change applies to:
Fig 148-3 P42
Fig 148-4 P43
Fig 148-8 P50

In general, if the transition contained only a single boolean term such as "!variable" or "variable = CONST" I then left it alone and unhighlighted as this seemed to be consistent and more readable.

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

PROPOSED REJECT.
While the commenter is correct that this is the guidance in clause 1.2, the style in most of IEEE Std 802.3 does not follow this. This goes way back, see, e.g. Figures 33-9, 36-5, 36-7, 46-11, 48-8, 55-15, 97-12, etc..

---

*Cl* **148**     *SC* **148.4.4.6**     *P* **42**     *L* **26**     # 166

Jones, Chad       Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type* **E**     *Comment Status* **D**       *Editorial*

off page connectors are not consistent. On page 42, they have arrows into the pentagon, on page 43 they do not. Looking at Clause 145, the convention should be to have the arrow head. Therefore, they need added to Figure 148-4 part b in 4 places
We could decide to remove the arrows, but that means all my follow on comments will have to be AIP and swapped to give instructions to remove the arrowheads that I am not commenting on.

*SuggestedRemedy*

add arrowheads to the lines going to the off page connectors in 4 places:
pg 43, line 18 ("C"); line 22 ("B"); line 29 ("D"); line 52 ("B")

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

PROPOSED REJECT.
This is in the base standard. Convention is arrowhead into inverted pentagon. (point up).
See, e.g., clause 82 (40GBASE-R) or similar optical "Pete Anslow" clauses…

Suggest we don't change, but can do it on revision, or if figure is redrawn.

---

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general     *Topic* **Editorial**     Page 2 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected    RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn     6/12/2024  10:33:08 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

---

*Cl* **148**    *SC* **148.4.7.1**    *P* **47**    *L* **8**    # 264

Baggett, Tim                Microchip

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **D**        *Editorial*

Second sentence of paragraph should probably refer to "nodes" in plural.
"D-PLCA enables node to select a unique node ID..."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change: "D-PLCA enables node to select a unique node ID..."

To: "D-PLCA enables nodes to select a unique node ID..."
Or: "D-PLCA enables a node to select a unique node ID..."

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
(first option, but correcting plural construction)

Change: "D-PLCA enables node to select a unique node ID..."

To: "D-PLCA enables nodes to select  unique node IDs..."

---

*Cl* **168**    *SC* **168.4.2.7**    *P* **65**    *L* **4**    # 168

Jones, Chad               Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **D**        *Editorial*

this off page connector is a circle. Should be a pentagon? Does the circle mean something different?
Also, the pentagons on this page "point" the wrong way. The tip of the pentagon should point the same way as the arrow?

*SuggestedRemedy*

fix the off page connectors in Fig 168-5, part a (pg 65): B (line 4) is a pentagon pointing in, C (line 22) and A (line 51) are pointing out
part b (pg 66): A (line 1) and C (line 9) pentagon pointing in, B (line 34) pentagon pointing out

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

PROPOSED REJECT.
Convention is arrowhead into inverted pentagon. (point up).  See, e.g., clause 82 (40GBASE-R) or similar optical "Pete Anslow" clauses…

---

*Cl* **168**    *SC* **168.4.3.7**    *P* **70**    *L* **6**    # 169

Jones, Chad               Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **D**        *Editorial*

off page connectors, circles and pentagons pointing the wrong way

*SuggestedRemedy*

fix the off page connectors in Fig 168-7, part a (pg 70): B (line 6) is a pentagon pointing in, D (line 17) and A (line 48) are pointing out
part b: A (line 1) and D (line 26) pentagon pointing in, B (line 22), B (line 35), B (line 44) pentagon pointing out

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

PROPOSED REJECT.
Convention is arrowhead into inverted pentagon. (point up).  See, e.g., clause 82 (40GBASE-R) or similar optical "Pete Anslow" clauses…

---

*Cl* **168**    *SC* **168.6.3**    *P* **77**    *L* **32**    # 256

Brandt, David             Rockwell Automation

*Comment Type* **T**    *Comment Status* **D**        *Editorial*

Figure 168-13 measurement should be confirmed at both TC1 and TC2. See NOTE in Figure 168-17.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add note similar to line 21 at line 31 "Testing at TC2 shown, Balun connections interchange with load for testing at TC1)"

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **168**    *SC* **168.12.4.6**    *P* **94**    *L* **16**    # 244

Zimmerman, George       CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **D**        *Editorial*

No need for TBD in Value/Comment since the section is referenced.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete TBD from Value/Comment.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general    *Topic* **Editorial**    Page 3 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected    RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn    6/12/2024  10:33:08 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

*Cl* **169**    *SC* **169.1**        *P* **96**        *L* **9**        # 175

Jones, Chad                    Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **D**            *Editorial*

"MPoE is intended to provide a single pair Ethernet Physical Layer device with an interface to both the power and data." - we have a way to power SPE devices in clause 104. This is powering multidrop SPE devices, so we need to add multidrop to this sentence.

*SuggestedRemedy*

add multidrop to sentence: MPoE is intended to provide a MULTIDROP single pair Ethernet Physical Layer device with an interface to both the power and data.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
(remove statement of intent, and also fix case of MULTIDROP in suggested remedy)

Change "MPoE is intended to provide a single pair Ethernet Physical Layer device with an interface to both the power and data."

to "MPoE provides a multidrop single pair Ethernet Physical Layer device with an interface to both the power and data."

*Cl* **169**    *SC* **169.1.2**        *P* **96**        *L* **41**        # 176

Jones, Chad                    Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **D**            *Editorial*

"MPoE is an optional power entity to be used in conjunction with supported single pair Ethernet Physical Layers." - do we need multidrop in this sentence?

*SuggestedRemedy*

add multidrop to sentence: MPoE is an optional power entity to be used in conjunction with supported MULTIDROP single pair Ethernet Physical Layers.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
(correct case in response)

Change "supported single pair" to "supported multidrop single pair"

*Cl* **169**    *SC* **169.1.2**        *P* **96**        *L* **43**        # 177

Jones, Chad                    Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **D**            *Editorial*

We've added MPI and the first appearance is in Fig 169-1 but we don't define it.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a new second-to last-sentence in the first paragraph of 169.1.2: The power is applied to the Multidrop Power Interface (MPI).

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
(add cross reference to definition, if comment 178 is accepted).

Add a new second-to last-sentence in the first paragraph of 169.1.2: The power is applied to the Multidrop Power Interface (MPI)"

If new definition is added by comment 178, also add "(See 1.4.405b)"

*Cl* **169**    *SC* **169.1.2**        *P* **97**        *L* **19**        # 229

Zimmerman, George        CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type* **T**    *Comment Status* **D**            *Editorial*

The Editor's note should be represented in the figure.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete editor's note at P97 L18-22, add a note similar to that on Figure 169-2 to Figure 169-1, "NOTE - The MPI may not be exposed. If it
is not exposed, limits are calculated from values at TC1 and TC2."

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
(improved language)
Delete editor's note at P97 L18-22, add a note similar to that on Figure 169-2 to Figure 169-1, "NOTE - The MPI may not be exposed. If it is not exposed, specified values are calculated from values observed at TC1 and TC2."

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general    *Topic* **Editorial**    Page 4 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected    RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn    6/12/2024  10:33:08 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

*Cl* **169**    *SC* **169.3**    *P* **98**    *L* **4**    # 195

Jones, Chad    Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type*  **T**    *Comment Status*  **D**    *Editorial*

"An MPSE may transition between Type 0 and Type 1 during IDLE". no reason to enumerate type 0 and type 1 in this sentence. Genericizing this prepares the text for added types, in case we expand votlage or current.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change: "An MPSE may transition between Type 0 and Type 1 during IDLE"
to: "An MPSE may transition between types during IDLE"

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **169**    *SC* **169.4.4.5**    *P* **103**    *L* **52**    # 181

Jones, Chad    Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type*  **E**    *Comment Status*  **D**    *Editorial*

More off page transitions without arrowhead on the connecting lines.

*SuggestedRemedy*

add arrowhead in 5 places: Pg 103 A (line 52) and C (line 52); page 104 A (line 41), D (line 43), D (line 52)

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Per convention, editor to ensure all entry blocks are circles, pentagons are inverted (point up), arrowheads  go into the pentagons' points

---

*Cl* **169**    *SC* **169.4.5**    *P* **105**    *L* **14**    # 182

Jones, Chad    Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type*  **E**    *Comment Status*  **D**    *Editorial*

Should we point the readers where to find info about overload, short circuit, or other fault? Additionally, we remove power because of the absence of MPS (or TPS). Add that here too.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to: "Additionally, while voltage is applied, the MPSE monitors the current drawn and removes power if it detects an overload (see 169.4.9), short-circuit or other fault (see 169.4.10), or for the absence of MPS (See 169.4.11)" [or TPS - dependent on other decisions].

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
(align with TPS/MPS comment)

---

*Cl* **169**    *SC* **169.4.8**    *P* **106**    *L* **51**    # 186

Jones, Chad    Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type*  **E**    *Comment Status*  **D**    *Editorial*

P{MPSE_16U} is awfully specific. Do we need to be that specific? Can it just be P{MPSE}?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change P{MPSE_16U} to P{MPSE}. Also on pg 107, line 9 and line 30. further, editors given license to fix any other occurrences (search finds one more on page 98, line 30)

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **169**    *SC* **169.5.3.2**    *P* **109**    *L* **37**    # 233

Zimmerman, George    CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type*  **T**    *Comment Status*  **D**    *Editorial*

V_Discovery_th is missing from the constants

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add V_Discovery (in alphabetic order) to 169.5.3.2 with definition "Mark discovery threshold voltage (see Table 169-7)"

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **169**    *SC* **169.5.3.3**    *P* **110**    *L* **51**    # 241

Zimmerman, George    CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type*  **E**    *Comment Status*  **D**    *Editorial*

MPD TC should be MPD MPI.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change MPD TC to MPD MPI.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general    *Topic*  **Editorial**    Page 5 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected    RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn    6/12/2024  10:33:08 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

*Cl* **169**　　*SC* **169.5.3.6**　　　*P***113**　　　*L***51**　　　# 191

Jones, Chad　　　　　　　　Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type*　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*Editorial*

More off page transitions without arrowhead on the connecting lines.

*SuggestedRemedy*

add arrowhead in 56 places: part a page 113, C (line 51), A and B line 53;
part b page 114, A (line 47), B (line 52);
part c page 115, B (line 38)

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **169**　　*SC* **169.5.5.3**　　　*P***118**　　　*L***24**　　　# 194

Jones, Chad　　　　　　　　Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type*　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*Editorial*

last cycle we changed MPS to TPS (likely an attempt to prevent confusing MPS and
MPSE). I don't mind either term but we need to pick one and be consistent. The PSE
section had MPS.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Either search document for MPS and replace with TPS, with editorial license to adjust any
text around (i.e. to replace "maintain" with "transmit" as needed)
OR
replace transmit with maintain and TPS with MPS in this section, with editorial license to
adjust any other occurrences of TPS outside of 169.5.5.3. (search implies TPS is only
found in 169.5.5.3)

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
(we did agree to go with TPS)
search document for MPS and replace with TPS, with editorial license to adjust any text
around (i.e. to replace "maintain" with "transmit" as needed)

---

*Cl* **168**　　*SC* **168.8**　　　*P***81**　　　*L***28**　　　# 219

Zimmerman, George　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type*　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*Editors Note*

Editor's note has been answered by text, no longer needed.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete editor's note below 3rd paragraph of 168.8 (lines 27-32)

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **168**　　*SC* **168.8.2**　　　*P***83**　　　*L***3**　　　# 223

Zimmerman, George　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type*　**T**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*Editors Note*

147.7.2 is no longer starting point - delete note

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete editor's note at P83 L2-6

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **168**　　*SC* **168.8.2**　　　*P***83**　　　*L***3**　　　# 172

Jones, Chad　　　　　　　　Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type*　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*Editors Note*

Didn't we agree to delete this editors note last cycle?
Regardless, this note has served it's purpose and is no longer needed. Delete

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the editors note on pg 83, line 3

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **30**　　*SC* **30.16.1.1.14**　　　*P***26**　　　*L***33**　　　# 208

Zimmerman, George　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type*　**T**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*Editors Notes*

Editor's note has served its purpose of evaluation by several cycles.

*SuggestedRemedy*

delete editors note

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **168**　　*SC* **168**　　　*P***54**　　　*L***7**　　　# 214

Zimmerman, George　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type*　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*Editors Notes*

After having reviewed the draft, Delete item 3 in editor's note - no longer needed.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete item 3 in editor's note

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general　　　*Topic*　**Editors Notes**　　Page 6 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn　　6/12/2024  10:33:08 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

*Cl* **168**   *SC* **168.2**   *P* **56**   *L* **3**   # 165

Maguire, Valerie   Copperopolis; aff'l w/ CME Consulting

*Comment Type* **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Editors Notes*

A short description of the operation of 10BASE-T1M is provided.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete Editor's note on line 3-7.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **168**   *SC* **168.2**   *P* **56**   *L* **3**   # 215

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type* **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Editors Notes*

Note has been answered with text and is no longer needed

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete Editor's note at 168.2

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **168**   *SC* **168.5**   *P* **73**   *L* **35**   # 217

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type* **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Editors Notes*

Note has served its purpose for several cycles

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete editor's note at 168.5 below Figure 168-10.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **168**   *SC* **168.5**   *P* **73**   *L* **35**   # 170

Jones, Chad   Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type* **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Editors Notes*

Didn't we agree to delete this editors note last cycle?
Regardless, this note has served it's purpose and is no longer needed. Delete

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the editors note on pg 73, line 35

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **169**   *SC* **169.1.2**   *P* **96**   *L* **35**   # 227

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type* **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Editors Notes*

Editor's note has been answered by text, no longer needed.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delte editor's note at 169.1.2 (P96 L35-39)

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **168**   *SC* **168.8.1**   *P* **82**   *L* **33**   # 270

Schreiner, Stephan   Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik

*Comment Type* **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *Loading*

Text uses the word "dummy load". However, 168.9.1 introduces the word PMA load for the same type of load.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace "dummy load" by PMA load within document

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Loading is not just the PMA, but the DTE as a whole.  Suggest global replacement of "dummy load" and "PMA load" with "Simulated DTE load"

---

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: Topic

*Topic* **Loading**   Page 7 of 10
6/12/2024  10:33:08 AM

*Cl* **168**   *SC* **168.4.4**   *P* **36**   *L* **36**   # 216

Zimmerman, George                    CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type*   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**                    *Management*

Register 45.2.3.1.2 doesn't reference clause 168 or even clause 147.  This needs fixing.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add 45.2.3.1.2 to the draft, with an instruction to change as follows: (<UL> indicates underline start or stop)
"When the <UL>10BASE-T1M/S, <UL>100BASE-T1, any MultiGBASE-T, or the 5/10GBASE-R mode of operation is selected for the
PCS using the PCS type selection field (3.7.3:0), the PCS shall be placed in a loopback mode of operation
when bit 3.0.14 is set to a one. When bit 3.0.14 is set to a one, the <UL>10BASE-T1M/S, <UL>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. The speed
of the loopback is selected by the PCS control 1 (register 3.0) defined in 45.2.3.1.
<UL>The specific behavior of the 10BASE-T1S PCS during loopback is specified in 147.3.4.
The specific behavior of the 10BASE-T1M PCS during loopback is specified in 168.4.4.<UL>
the 100BASE-T1 PCS during loopback is specified in 96.3.5. The specific behavior of the 5/10GBASE-R
PCS during loopback is specified in 49.2. The specific behavior for the 10GBASE-T PCS during loopback is
specified in 55.3.7.3. The specific behavior for the 25GBASE-T and 40GBASE-T PCS during loopback is
specified in 113.3.7.3. The specific behavior for the 2.5GBASE-T or 5GBASE-T PCS during loopback is
specified in 126.3.7.3. For all other port types, the PCS loopback functionality is not applicable and writes to
this bit shall be ignored and reads from this bit shall return a value of zero."

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Editor's comment - TFTD
DEFER - EDITOR TO CHECK PREVIOUS MEETINGS ACCEPTED STUFF

---

*Cl* **168**   *SC* **168.6.2**   *P* **76**   *L* **9**   # 218

Zimmerman, George                    CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, Marvell, OnSem

*Comment Type*   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**                    *Management*

TBDs are not needed, name of the register is 10BASET1M/S test mode register, and the location should be 45.2.1.236

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete TBDs (2 places), change "10BASE-T1M test mode control" to "10BASE-T1M/S test mode control", and change 45.2.1.186f.1 to an active xref to 45.2.1.236

Make same changes in PICS PMAE2 (168.12.4.5.2, P92 L9)

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Commenter's resolution, but align with other comment on 10BASE-T1M/S, if they are accepted.

Delete TBDs (2 places), change "10BASE-T1M test mode control" to "10BASE-T1M / 10BASE-T1S test mode control", and change 45.2.1.186f.1 to an active xref to 45.2.1.236

Make same changes in PICS PMAE2 (168.12.4.5.2, P92 L9)

---

*Cl* **169**   *SC* **169.3**   *P* **98**   *L* **26**   # 198

Jones, Chad                          Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type*   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**                    *Power - General*

Table 169-1. See related presentation.
With the change to 1A for both types, several items in this table change.

*SuggestedRemedy*

for 26V min PSEs, VMPDmin is 14V, PMPSE(min) is 14W, new item PMPSE(max) is 24.8W
for 45V min PSEs, VMPDmin is 33V, PMPSE(min) is 33W, new item PMPSE(max) is 43.8W

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
for 26V min PSEs, VMPDmin is 14V, PMPSE(min) is 14W, new item PMPSE(max) is 24.8W
for 45V min PSEs, VMPDmin is 33V, PMPSE(min) is 33W, new item PMPSE(max) is 43.8W

DEFER - NEED TO CHECK NUMBERS

---

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general          *Topic*  **Power - Genera**     Page 8 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected     RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn                                      6/12/2024  10:33:08 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

*Cl* **169**   *SC* **169.6.1**          *P* **119**       *L* **5**       #  260

Potterf, Jason                                Cisco

*Comment Type* **T**        *Comment Status* **D**                *Power - Missing section*

Isolation clause is absent. The proposed isolation clause is adapted from 4-Pair PoE Clause 145.4.1 Electrical isolation and PoDL 104.6.1 Isolation.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Adopt isolation clause in attached document - SPMD_Potterf_D1P2_Comment_Sub-Clause_169p6p1_Isolation_2024-06-07.docx

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
TFTD.
Recommend accept with minor edits.
On 169.6.1.1.2, 2nd paragraph, where it says:

The shape of the impulses is 10/700 (10 µs virtual front time, 700 µs virtual time to half value), as defined in ITU-T Recommendation K.44." class

It looks like there is an extra " and the word class is hanging.

Delete " class from the response to read:

The shape of the impulses is 10/700 (10 µs virtual front time, 700 µs virtual time to half value), as defined in ITU-T Recommendation K.44.

---

*Cl* **169**   *SC* **169.7**          *P* **119**       *L* **19**       #  261

Potterf, Jason                                Cisco

*Comment Type* **T**        *Comment Status* **D**                *Power - Missing section*

Environmental Clause is absent. The proposed isolation clause is adapted from 4-Pair PoE Clause 145.6 Environ,ental and PoDL 104.8 Enivronmental.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Adopt environmental clause in attached document - SPMD_Potterf_D1P2_Comment_Sub-Clause_169p7_Environmental_2024-06-07.docx

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Accept text with editorial license as indicated in the referenced submission.

---

*Cl* **169**   *SC* **169.4.8**          *P* **107**       *L* **9**       #  200

Jones, Chad                                Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type* **T**        *Comment Status* **D**                *Power - Types*

PMPSE_16U is specific to only allowing 16 unit loads per mixing segment. A previous comment recommended changing this. If that was rejected, this should also be rejected.

*SuggestedRemedy*

if comment against pg 98 line 22 was accepted, change Type column: "0" to "26-1", "1" to "45-1"
item 2: change P{MPSE_16U} to P{MPSE}
item 2: change 26 to 14, change 42 to 33, change 100 for type 0 to 24.8, change 100 for type 1 to 43.8

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change P{MPSE_16U} to P{MPSE},
do not change types (unless comment 199 is accepted)
item 2: change 26 to 14, change 42 to 33, change 100 for type 0 to 24.8, change 100 for type 1 to 43.8

DEFER - NEED TO CHECK NUMBERS ON ITEM 2

---

*Cl* **169**   *SC* **169.5.5**          *P* **117**       *L* **10**       #  202

Jones, Chad                                Cisco Systems, Inc.

*Comment Type* **T**        *Comment Status* **D**                *Power - Types*

Table 169-1 needs updates if previous comments were accepted.

*SuggestedRemedy*

change Type column: "0" to "26-1", "1" to "45-1"
Item 1: change "16" to "14"; "34" to "33"
item 2: change 1 and 2 to one merged cell of 0.5
item 6:  change "16" to "14"
item 7: change "34" to "33"
item 4: change min to 0.5W. Change max from "16" and "32" to "14" and "33"

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See resolution of comment 199 - do not change types if rejected, but align other parameters per other comments.

Item 1: change "16" to "14"; "34" to "33"
item 2: change 1 and 2 to one merged cell of 0.5
item 6:  change "16" to "14"
item 7: change "34" to "33"
item 4: change min to 0.5W. Change max from "16" and "32" to "14" and "33"

DEFER

---

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general        *Topic* **Power - Types**    Page 9 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected     RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn        6/12/2024  10:33:08 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic

*Cl* **168**        *SC* **168.6.4**                    *P* **77**            *L* **45**            #  257

Brandt, David                                    Rockwell Automation

*Comment Type*    **T**        *Comment Status*  **D**                                        *Testing*

It is not clear that it is required to test transmitter electrical specifications at both TC1 and TC2 for PMAE11 through PMAE14

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest adding at line 45: "Transmitter electrical specifications shall be measured at both TC1 and TC2."

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Commenters suggestion expanded to indicate that the 50 ohm load specified is not 50 ohms at each TC, but 100 ohms on each, which are in parallel.

Add at line 45: "Transmitter electrical specifications shall be measured at both TC1 and TC2.
When both TC1 and TC2 are terminated, the 50 /Ohm resistive differential load should be implemented as a 100 /Ohm termination on each of TC1 and TC2."

(/Ohm is ohm-symbol)

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general        *Topic*  **Testing**        Page 10 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected      RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  Z/withdrawn        6/12/2024  10:33:08 AM
SORT ORDER: Topic