

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

CI 00 SC P L # 112

NoName

Comment Type E Comment Status X

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 0 P 0 L 19 # 12

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

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

SuggestedRemedy

Change the copyright date in the footer to 2024

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 0 P 3 L 8 # 13

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Missing some keywords

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI FM SC FM P 8 L 12 # 18

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

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

SuggestedRemedy

add a 1 in front of the 0 in three spots.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 22 SC 22.1 P 20 L 5 # 42

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"Change the text" should become an editor's note

SuggestedRemedy

Convert to Editors note

Proposed Response Response Status W

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 22, they would go here"

CI 30 SC 30.16.1.1.12 P 22 L 41 # 44

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D DPLCA

Editor's note says "Comments are encouraged to determine value if not set, and whether it is preserved across reset, including loss of power."

SuggestedRemedy

Add "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 Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(Discuss in TF - need at least to determine loss of power TO WHAT? DTE? All nodes on mixing segment? Managing device?)

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

CI 30 SC 30.16.1.1.12 P22 L41 # 43

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D DPLCA

Editor's note says "Comments are encouraged to determine value if not set".  
Set aDPLCAWaitBeaconTimer default value to the same value used for  
"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."

SuggestedRemedy

Change the aDPLCAWaitBeaconTimer "BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS:" text to  
Controls the time the D-PLCA state diagram waits for a node to indicate BEACON as  
defined by  
the wait\_beacon\_timer in 148.4.7.4 specified in nano-seconds. The default value is 4000. "

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 45 SC 45 P24 L1 # 45

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

It looks like clause 45 is all boilerplate.  
Why include it? If it stays, add editors note?

SuggestedRemedy

Remove or convert to editor's note

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Insert Editor's Note (to be removed prior to WG Ballot): Contributions are needed to make  
any necessary updates to clause 45 for the clause 168 PHY and clause 169 powering. Text  
shown here is boilerplate for editor's use in creating new text as added.

CI 78 SC 78.1 P26 L6 # 46

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X EZ

"Change the text" should become an editor's note

SuggestedRemedy

Convert to Editors note

Proposed Response Response Status W

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 78, they would go here"

CI 79 SC 79.1 P27 L6 # 47

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X EZ

"Change the text" should become an editor's note

SuggestedRemedy

Convert to Editors note

Proposed Response Response Status W

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 79, they would go here"

CI 147 SC 147.1 P29 L6 # 48

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status X EZ

"Change the text" should become an editor's note

SuggestedRemedy

Convert to Editors note

Proposed Response Response Status W

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"

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.2 P30 L43 # 19

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems

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 bulletized 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.

SuggestedRemedy

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.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.6 P32 L1 # 49

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Page is blank.

SuggestedRemedy

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...

Cl 148 SC 148.4.4.6 P33 L24 # 50

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

In the RESYNC state, the variable plca\_txop\_end should be dplca\_txop\_end.

SuggestedRemedy

Change plca\_txop\_end to dplca\_txop\_end

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P38 L11 # 51

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"over statically configured PLCA" does not read well.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "over statically configured PLCA" to "compared to statically configured PLCA"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P38 L15 # 52

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Delete "at a later time" unneeded text at end of first sentence of paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Change

D-PLCA allows nodes to start with a possibly non-unique PLCA node ID and autonomously select a unique node ID at a later time.

To

D-PLCA allows nodes to start with a possibly non-unique PLCA node ID and autonomously select a unique node ID .

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P38 L19 # 53

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Typo

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change:  
 the current state of activity (transmit opportunities claims) of the nodes  
 To :  
 the current state of activity (transmit opportunity claims) of the nodes

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P38 L21 # 54

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Remove unneeded text.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change:  
 the D-PLCA capable nodes eventually select IDs  
 To :  
 the D-PLCA capable nodes select IDs

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P38 L22 # 55

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D DPLCA

Simplify language.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change:  
 PHYs may detect collisions until every node eventually selects a unique ID.  
 To :  
 PHYs may detect collisions until the end of node ID selection.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 (avoid the use of "may" which is reserved for "are permitted to", and correct meaning)  
 Change:  
 PHYs may detect collisions until every node eventually selects a unique ID.  
 To:  
 PHYs detect collisions which may occur until the every node selects a unique ID.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P38 L29 # 56

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D DPLCA

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 x SOFT\_AGING\_CYCLES) (I'm not sure what N should be).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Clean up language to provide clear guidance.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 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."

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.1 P38 L30 # 57

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D DPLCA

I think we should move the last sentence of the paragraph (see below) to the definition of HARD\_AGING\_CYCLES in 148.4.7.2 Variables  
 This condition ensures both stability and interoperability with statically configured PLCA nodes.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move the text

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Move the text, but align with rewording in the resolution of comment 56.

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.2 P38 L45 # 17  
Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis  
Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
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.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.2 P39 L51 # 58  
Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial  
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.

Cl 148 SC 148.4.7.2 P40 L3 # 59  
Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial  
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.  
(note - align with comment 58)

Cl 148 SC 148.5.3.7 P44 L20 # 60  
Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ  
Both DP1 and DP2 are mandatory if DPLCA is supported.  
SuggestedRemedy  
For both DP1 and DP2.  
Change:  
O:DP  
To :  
DP:M  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 168 SC 168 P45 L46 # 1  
Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
Comment Type T Comment Status D Mixing Segment  
"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)"

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 168 SC 168 P45 L 52 # 61

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Mixing Segment

The text says "the mixing segment is compliant with 147.8.". I think it should be 168.7.

*SuggestedRemedy*

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

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

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).

Cl 168 SC 168.1 P46 L 9 # 20

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** AutoNeg

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?

*SuggestedRemedy*

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 Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Accomodated by comment 62.

Cl 168 SC 168.1 P46 L 28 # 62

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** AutoNeg

AN is not supported for 10BASE-T1M

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove AN from Figure 168-1 figure and delete "NOTE 2—Auto-Negotiation is optional"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 168 SC 168.1.1 P46 L 43 # 63

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** Editorial

Cause 147 has "147.1.1 Relationship of 10BASE-T1S to other standards" and "147.1.2 Operation of 10BASE-T1S" before the "Conventions" subclause. Seems like we should have similar subclauses.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Need someone to write "Relationship" and "Operation" subclauses.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 (Relationship subclause exists)  
 Insert Editor's note (to be removed prior to WG ballot), "Comments are encouraged for short description of the operation of 10BASE-T1M. Commenters are discouraged from explicitly describing applications, node counts, and lengths, as these cause confusion with the actual specifications."

Cl 168 SC 168.2.1.3 P48 L 32 # 64

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** Editorial

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.

*SuggestedRemedy*

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 Response Status **W**

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

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 168 SC 168.2.3 P49 L13 # 21

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

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.

SuggestedRemedy

change to: Differential Manchester Encoding (DME)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 168 SC 168.3.1 P50 L22 # 65

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

In Figure 168-3—PCS reference diagram, there is a floating dot to the left of "COLLISION DETECTION".

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the dot.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 168 SC 168.3.2.1 P51 L2 # 22

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

SSD stands for something? Also on line 6, ESD too? I was unable to locate what these stand for.

SuggestedRemedy

help the reader and provide the full text before using the abbreviation. Could put this in 168.3.2.5.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This document is part of IEEE Std 802.3-2022, and those terms are widely used prior to this clause.

SSD is Start of Stream Delimiter and ESD is End of Stream Delimiter. See clause 1 (1.4.304, 1.4.542, and abbreviations at 1.5)

Cl 168 SC 168.3.2.9 P57 L34 # 66

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

In the sentence "During the descrambler locking time, the special value 5 is conveyed to the MII via the RXD variable in order to rebuild the original preamble transmitted by the MAC.", why don't we use a named & defined constant with a value of 5 rather than using the numeral directly?

SuggestedRemedy

Add a constant for this and update text accordingly.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Text is clear as is. Adding a constant just requires the user to go look up the value.

Cl 168 SC 168.3.3.3 P58 L24 # 67

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Aren't constants supported to be upper case?

SuggestedRemedy

Change:  
fc\_supported  
To :  
FC\_SUPPORTED

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 168 SC 168.3.4 P62 L34 # 68

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 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 Response Response Status W

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 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-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.

Cl 168 SC 168.3.7 P63 L12 # 23

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

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 Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 168 SC 168-10 P63 L20 # 2

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

Cl 168 SC 168.4 P63 L22 # 69

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

In "Figure 168-10—PMA functional block diagram", there is lots of open space where the "LINK MONITOR" was deleted.

SuggestedRemedy

Adjust the figure.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 168 SC 168.4.2 b) P64 L29 # 3

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TCI

"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 Response Response Status W

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"



'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

CI 168 SC 168.4.2 P64 L30 # 24  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 extra period at the end of the sentence. Delete it.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 delete the extra period.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 168 SC 168.5.2 P66 L29 # 25  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 missing comma: "If MDIO is not implemented a similar functionality shall be provided by equivalent means"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to: "If MDIO is not implemented, a similar functionality shall be provided by equivalent means."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 168 SC 168.5.2 P66 L30 # 4  
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Test modes  
 "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  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "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 Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 168 SC 168.5.2 P66 L48 # 70  
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Test modes  
 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 ..."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 If yes, then add or update editor's note.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 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.

CI 168 SC 168.5.3 P67 L1 # 5  
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Test modes  
 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.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Redraw the figures and provide the required descriptive text.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Commenter is correct, but a replacement figure is needed. This is not something purely for the editor.  
 TFTD.

CI 168 SC 168.5.3 P67 L36 # 26  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Test modes  
 "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.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to: "To allow an easy synchronization of the measurement equipment, it is recommended that the PHY provide access to TX\_CLK."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 (FYI, this same text shows up all over IEEE Std 802.3-2022, maintenance?)

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 168 SC 168.5.4.2 P68 L10 # 6  
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Test modes  
 "When tested using the text fixture"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "When tested using the test fixture"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Not clear what the commenter wants...

Cl 168 SC 168.5.4.2 P68 L12 # 27  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 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.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 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.

Cl 168 SC 168.5.4.4 P68 L40 # 28  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial  
 The flow of these two paragraphs is off, I recommend we swap the order.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 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.

Cl 168 SC 168.5.4.5 P69 L44 # 29  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 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.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 after TC3 on line 44 add: "(See figure 168-17)"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 168 SC 168-16 P70 L19 # 7  
 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."

Cl 168 SC 168.5.6 P70 L40 # 30

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

this sentence is awkward. I think it needs to be broken into two sentences.

*SuggestedRemedy*

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."

Cl 168 SC 168.7 P71 L5 # 31

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Flow problem. TCI is used before being introduced.

*SuggestedRemedy*

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)

Cl 168 SC 168.7 P71 L16 # 32

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 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 (168.7)

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.") so that it reads "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)

Cl 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.

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

CI 168 SC 168.7 P71 L27 # 110

Fischer, Peter BKS Kabel-Service AG  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Mixing Segment

The maximum length for the cable to the DTE has to be specified in terms of losses (IL, R) and delay.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add after 'may attach':  
 The example stub comprises a maximum of TBD m of 1.02 mm (18 AWG) 100 Ω cabling, with a DTE attached.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 An example cannot have a maximum. The mixing segment is specified according to performance parameters. The addition of physical dimensions has often been confused with those dimensions being requirements.

CI 168 SC 168.7.1 P72 L2 # 8

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Mixing Segment

The insertion loss is specified including any through-path insertion loss for the TCIs. Additionally, the mixing segment insertion loss shall be met without any DTEs attached. With the 4 wire interface on TCI TC3, there will be through path without something attached. The TCI figures indicates, that the DTE will provide the required through path. Thus, the DTE ( or the sum of all DTEs) will cause a significant influence to the insertion loss of the over all segment. If the dummy load should act as through connection, the dummy load needs to be specified in accordance to provide the worst channel conditions when impedance constraints of 168.4.2 are met

*SuggestedRemedy*

"The mixing segment insertion loss, with DTEs or representative dummy loads attached, shall meet the values determined using Equation (168-3) between the edge termination attachment points"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD  
 (The 2-wire to 4-wire nature of the TCI is an issue to be resolved. Some discussion is required, there are multiple ways to go with this).

CI 168 SC 168.7.1 P72 L11 # 16

Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Equations should be indented, left justified (not centered)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Fix justification of equations (168-3), (168-4), (168-5), (168-6), and (168-7)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 168 SC 168.7.1 P72 L13 # 33

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

two extraneous periods floating in the doc.

*SuggestedRemedy*

delete the two decimal points.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 168 SC 168.7.2 P72 L21 # 9

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TCI

"The mixing segment at each point TC3, without any DTEs attached, shall meet ..." By having the 4 wire interface on TCI TC3, the measurement on the TC3 interface will cover only the link segment to the right or left side up to the next TCI. At this position - without a DTE attached, the link might be open.

*SuggestedRemedy*

"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.

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

CI 168 SC 168.8 P73 L 22 # 34  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D TCI  
 Need a TCI definition in 1.4.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 TCI (Trunk Connection Interface): an MDI for shared transmission medium for single pair Ethernet.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 168 SC 168.8.1.2 P74 L 39 # 71  
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 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.

CI 168 SC 168.8.1.1 P74 L 20 # 10  
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TCI  
 This specification can't be met if through connection is provided by DTE, which is suggested by the TCI 4 wire interface on TC3.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the first paragraph (without PMA...), because a measurement with the PMA (or PMA load...) is sufficient  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD  
 Resolve with comment 8

CI 168 SC 168.11.3 P78 L 8 # 72  
 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.

CI 168 SC 168.8.1.2 P74 L 27 # 11  
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TCI  
 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  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove this paragraph  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD  
 Resolve with comment 8

CI 168 SC 168.11.4.1 P78 L 40 # 73  
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial  
 Consistency/readability  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace PCST4 Value/Comment formula with a link to 168.3.2.8 to match PCSR3.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 169 SC 169 P85 L1 # 14

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.

Cl 169 SC 169.1 P85 L5 # 90

Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

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.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the word optional from the sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.1 P85 L8 # 74

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

The text says "for use with supported single pair Ethernet Physical Layers.". Where do we state what they are? Should we list the supported PHYs?

SuggestedRemedy

Change:  
 for use with supported single pair Ethernet Physical Layers.  
 To :  
 for use with the 10BASE-T1M Physical Layer.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.1 P85 L13 # 75

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

Consistency/readability

SuggestedRemedy

Change:  
 The characteristics of a power source to add power to the cabling system.  
 To :  
 The characteristics of an MPSE to add power to the cabling system.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.1 P85 L16 # 76

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Editorial

Text says "an MPD" where it should be "one or more MPDs"

SuggestedRemedy

Change:  
 an MPD  
 To :  
 one or more MPDs

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.1.1 P85 L26 # 35

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"Compliant implementations of PD and PSE systems are defined as compatible..." this sentence is about MPSEs and MPDs. Add the Ms.

SuggestedRemedy

change to "Compliant implementations of MPD and MPSE systems are defined as compatible..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 169 SC 169.1.1 P85 L27 # 91  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "PD and PSE" should be "MPD and MPSE"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix typo  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. (see comment 35)

Cl 169 SC 169.1.1 P85 L29 # 92  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "PD and PSE" should be "MPD and MPSE"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix typo  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT. (see comment 35)

Cl 169 SC 169.1.2 P85 L34 # 77  
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial  
 Compared to PoDL, this sub-clause is missing some of the "non-data" and "OSI reference model" discussion compared to 104.1.2, and the related figures 104-1 and 102-2? Should these be added?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Need new text submitted  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Need contribution with text. TFTD

Cl 169 SC 169.1.2 P85 L38 # 93  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 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.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 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.

Cl 169 SC 169.1.2 P86 L1 # 94  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 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.

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See comment 74 - we need to say which PHYs are compatible in one place. Right now we only have one. When we add the second, we can consider a table or other simple means.

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 169 SC 169.1.2 P86 L3 # 95

Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Editorial

This picture is not a good representation of the system interfaces as we have discussed several times in the task force. We need to update it.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to a new picture. I don't have a solution today but we need presentations and to keep this as an item on the future work list.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD - need contributions with a new figure. (hand drawn is OK for now, but the editor needs something to work with)

Cl 169 SC 169.2 P86 L27 # 36

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 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?

SuggestedRemedy

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 TCI though...

Cl 169 SC 169.3 P86 L37 # 37

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

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.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.3 P86 L39 # 96

Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Voltage classes

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

SuggestedRemedy

Change label to "30V Nominal MPSE"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Incorporate commenters remedy & do a global check for 24V nominal MPSE

Cl 169 SC 169.3 P86 L40 # 78

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial

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?

SuggestedRemedy

Harmonize Table 169-1 and Table 104-1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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.

Cl 169 SC 169.3 P86 L44 # 79

Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Voltage classes

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?)

SuggestedRemedy

Consider changing 30V to 36V.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD



'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 169 SC 169.1.2 P86 L46 # 111  
 Fischer, Peter BKS Kabel-Service AG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Power levels  
 Add missing values to the table 169-1  
 (There might be a presentation during the interim)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Ipi@24V MPSE= 889 mA  
 Ipi@50V MPSE= 941 mA  
 Ptype@24V MPSE = 23 W  
 Ptype@50V MPSE = 42 W  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD - need presentation and discussion.

Cl 169 SC 169 P86 L51 # 86  
 Chauve, Vincent Schneider Electric  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Power levels  
 1W to low for or application See V.CHAUVE Presentation  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change Pmpd(max) from 1W to 16W for type 0  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD with contribution

Cl 169 SC 169 P86 L51 # 87  
 Chauve, Vincent Schneider Electric  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Power levels  
 1W to low for or application See V.CHAUVE Presentation  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change Pmpd(max) from 2W to 32W for type 1  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD with contribution

Cl 169 SC 169.3 P87 L2 # 97  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Power - TCI  
 Try to remove references to TC3  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "TC3 Interface" to "TCI"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.3 P87 L6 # 98  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Power - TCI  
 Try to remove references to TC3  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "TC3" to "TCI"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.3 P87 L7 # 38  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Power levels  
 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 Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD  
 Need an agreed value.

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

CI 169 SC 169.3 P87 L 8 # 99  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Power - TCI  
 Try to remove references to TC3  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "TC3" to "TCI"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 169 SC 169.4 P87 L 14 # 15  
 Maguire, Valerie Copperopolis  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 The lettered list is not incrementing from a) to b), etc.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix lettered list formatting so that letters increment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 169 SC 169.4 P87 L 15 # 101  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Power levels  
 This text was copied from point to point system.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change from: "To supply power to an MPD through the mixing segment." to: "To supply power to at least 16 MPD unit loads through the mixing segment."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD - need to discuss whether 16 MPD unit loads becomes the requirement, as this seems to imply.

CI 169 SC 169.4 P87 L 20 # 80  
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D State diagrams  
 The text says "To remove power when no longer requested or required, returning to the idle state.", but I don't see how the MPD determines the difference between requested or required.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change:  
 "To remove power when no longer requested or required, returning to the idle state."  
 To :  
 "To remove power when no longer required, returning to the idle state."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 169 SC 169.4 P87 L 22 # 102  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Power - TCI  
 Try to remove references to TC3  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change from "...as seen at the TC3 Interface" to "...as seen at the MPSE Trunk Connection Interface (TCI)"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 169 SC 169.4 P87 L 14-20 # 100  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 The list lables are all "a)"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Enumerate the list properly  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 169 SC 169.4.3.2 P88 L27 # 103  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "equal to or greater" should be "less than"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change from: "equal to or greater" to "less than"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.4.3.4 P90 L6 # 39  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 missing space after colon for mpd\_type\_discovered  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 add space after the colon.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.4.3.4 P89 L42 # 81  
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Typo - double colon.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 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.

Cl 169 SC 169.4.4 P92 L38 # 83  
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D State diagrams  
 The text says "the MPSE shall remove full operating voltage in response to a command from the management entity."  
 Which variable is used for this? Is it mpse\_enable?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change:  
 "the MPSE shall remove full operating voltage in response to a command from the management entity."  
 To :  
 "the MPSE shall remove full operating voltage in response to a command from the management entity that results in mpse\_enable being set to disable."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 TFTD

Cl 169 SC 169.4.3.4 P89 L53 # 82  
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Formatting error "Discovery" should be a subscript.  
 Fix formatting  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Formatting error "Discovery" should be a subscript.  
 Fix formatting  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.4.5 P92 L53 # 84  
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Editorial  
 Consistency/readability  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 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.

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

Cl 169 SC 169.4.6 P94 L27 # 40  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Power levels  
 DC MPS current is defined as 4A min and 9A max. this seems to be an error. I don't know what the numbers wer supposed to me (perhaps mA?), but we need to fix this.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 find the right values and replace them in the table.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD to discuss - needs proposal

Cl 169 SC 169.4.8 P94 L44 # 41  
 Jones, Chad Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Power - misc.  
 "sliding window of TDB second width". The other PoE sections use a 1 second sliding window. Is this not also appropriate here?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 replace "TBD" with "1"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.4.10 P95 L4 # 85  
 Jones, Peter Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Typo, PD should be MPD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change:  
 in the absence of the PD MPS,  
 To :  
 in the absence of the MPD MPS,  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.5 P95 L28 # 104  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Power - TCI  
 Try to remove references to TC3  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change from: "specified at the TC3 interface." to: "specified at the MPD Trunk Connection Interfaces."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.5.3.2 P96 L17 # 105  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Subscripts are missing from all constants in this subclause  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Subscript all text in the constant names after the first character.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169.5.5 P101 L5 # 106  
 Paul, Michael Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Power - TCI  
 Try to remove references to TC3  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "TC3" to from the "MPD Trunk Connection Interface."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 169 SC 169 P101 L16 # 88  
 Chauve, Vincent Schneider Electric  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Power levels  
 1W to low for or application See V.CHAUVE Presentation  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change Pmdp(max) from 1W to 16W for type 0  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TFTD with contribution

'802.3da D1.0 10 Mbps Single Pair Ethernet Multidrop Segment Enhancements 1st Task Force review cor

---

Cl 169 SC 169 P101 L 17 # 89

Chauve, Vincent Schneider Electric

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Power levels

1W to low for or application See V.CHAUVE Presentation

*SuggestedRemedy*

change Pmdp(max) from 2W to 32W for type 1

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
TFTD with contribution

---

Cl 169 SC 169.5.5.1 P101 L 42 # 107

Paul, Michael Analog Devices

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** Power - TCI

Try to remove references to TC3

*SuggestedRemedy*

change "TC3" to "the TCI"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

Cl 169 SC 169.5.5.1 P101 L 45 # 108

Paul, Michael Analog Devices

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** Power - TCI

Try to remove references to TC3

*SuggestedRemedy*

change "TC3" to "TCI"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.