Cl **33** *SC* **33.5.9** *P* **74** *L* **33** # **6**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Current drain at nominal voltage. What is 'nominal voltage'?
44-57v? we need to pick a number?
Also this does not apply to the PSE

SuggestedRemedy

Please insert the following text:

Power classification and power level in terms of maximum current
drain over the operating voltage range, 44v-57v. applies for PD only.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.2.4** *P* **77** *L* **25** # **7**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Table 33-18
Delivering powering?
do I speak Engleesh Good or what? :)

SuggestedRemedy

please
Replace 'powering' with power

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.7.3.4** *P* **87** *L* **12** # **9**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

We do not state that the 10mv would have to come from the application of power or when power is turned on.

A while back I showed that 10BT alone over a long cable can induce 10mv or more In differential noise on an adjacent pair, with power off.

SuggestedRemedy

please append the note:
'when power is applied '
(at the end of the description of this test.)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.8.1** *P* **52** *L* **1** # **13**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Page 52 table 33-6

we state in the title that this applies for all classes unless otherwise
Specified....
Yet in the rows of the table, a lot of spec applying to the midspan PSE is not flagged as such.
Now, I know what belongs to the Midspan but do we
want to be more reader friendly and append notes as promised?

SuggestedRemedy

15 applies to End point PSE only
17 Applies to Midspan PSE only
note there may be other places in the draft where such tables are set
this way too.. check out the PICS listing..

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This comment is invalid due to commentor misunderstanding but for clarity...

Change title of Table 33-6 from "for all classes" to "for all PD classes"

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.11** *P* **53** *L* **50** # **14**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The PSE shall disconnect....
Well look at line 52 we say remove power.
Reality is we remove power...

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text to say 'remove power' instead of
disconnect on line 50

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "disconnect" to "remove power from". Also in note 9. Also note 10.

Direct the editor to search the document for disconnect and replace, where applicable, with remove power.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.7.3.1** *P* **80** *L* **7** # **15**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Page 80 item g1
Reminds me of the student who copies the homework from his buddy,
Well 'compatible at mdi" ? huh? What is compatible -
No Comprende!

SuggestedRemedy

I do know the intent of the original content,
left up to me, it don't make no sense take it out,
unless the originator would step up and clarify it.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

resolved by the resolution of comment #217.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.7.3.6** *P* **90** *L* **4** # **16**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Page 90 MF13 and MF14

My understanding was that PSE was defined as detection classfication and power....
Here we are claiming the 'POWER enable' would make PSE function enabled
confusing ? we even have a PSE enable bit on page 76?
Our Esteemed Editors are confusing PSE-Enable with Power Enable?
gain, i would step aside for the originator to fix this
because it was not me.

of course now, if a remedy must be on the table:
please make sure that PSE Enable is about detection, Class and Power
and Power Enable is about well, Just Power...

SuggestedRemedy

Replace PSE Function Enabled
with Power Function Enabled in both items.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change Feature from 'power enable' to 'PSE Enable' in MF13, 14, 15. Cross check this with State Machine Ad Hoc.

Cl **33C** *SC* **33C.2.2** *P* **113** *L* **41** # **17**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

We refer to current Ix but I can not locate it on any figure?

SuggestedRemedy

change to Ix[mApp] as it is on line 40

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved with resolution of comment #70.

Cl **33C** *SC* **33C.1.3** *P* **99** *L* **12** # **19**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Missing a reference to the test circuit needed to do the noise measurements

SuggestedRemedy

Append a note saying that:
Please refer to page 68 and 69 for the test circuit needed to do this measurement

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

Cl **33C** *SC* **33C.5.1** *P* **120** *L* **54** # **21**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Set PD for Min load?
well i Ain't making a PD with a switch to lower its current...
the min Ipd is what we get...

SuggestedRemedy

add the words :
set PD to min load if applicable.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33C** *SC* **33C.3.1** *P* **115** *L* **21** # **22**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Rsig fir non valid signature
must be German for well, 'For'
that is the little text next to that expensive scope in
fig 33c.18

SuggestedRemedy

please replace fir with 'for'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33C** *SC* **33C.1.1** *P* **97** *L* **30** # **23**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

am I the only one to Notice?
we do not load the PSE with a 180uf? Never not even once?
yet the PSE must boot it up without enforcing inrush in the PD?
hello!

SuggestedRemedy

add a 180uf capacitor in parallel with Rmin so the PSE can have a shot
at things...

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

Editors Note: demoted from a TR to an E.

Cl **33** *SC* **Figure 33-7** *P* **45** *L* **38** # **24**
Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Figures 33-7 and 33-8

D1 is not a component it is a function of a diode.
D1 can be protection device with the polarity and functionality of a diode.
D1 can be a switch.
We need to explain that D1 is an example of a circuit preventing the problem described by adding the words "example of how" to line 38.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from: "In Figure 33-7 and Figure 33-8,diode D1 ensures a non-valid PD detection signature for a reversed voltage PSE to PSE connection."

to: "In Figure 33-7 and Figure 33-8, example of how diode D1 ensures a non-valid PD detection signature for a reversed voltage PSE to PSE connection."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

change: 'In Figure 33-7 and Figure 33-8, diode D1 ensures a non-valid PD detection signature for a reversed voltage
PSE to PSE connection.'
to
'In Figure 33-7 and Figure 33-8, the behavior of diode D1ensures a non-valid PD detection signature for a reversed voltage
PSE to PSE connection.'

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-3** *P* **49** *L* **9** # **27**
Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Table 33-3

In table 33-3 line 9 at the 3rd column it specify "Max power levels.." and it should be "Min power levels..".
The PSE min power is determined by the max PD power plus the power loss on the cable.
Table 33-11 defines the max power levels at the PD input.
Table 33-3 defines the min power levels at the PSE output.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the title of table 33-3 column 3 from the left from "Max power levels at output of PSE" to"Min power levels at output of PSE"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the title of table 33-3 column 3 from the left from "Max power levels at output of PSE" to
"Minimum power levels at output of PSE"

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-14** *P* **62** *L* **50** # **28**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Table 33-14

Item 3 defines the peak current and not the average or rms value.
It is true that the max dc current and/or rms current can be derived from the other data however in order to be idiot proof and keep the same level of elaboration as in the PSE requirements, it is required that the max numbers for the DC and/or RMS current shall be specified in the table at the worst case condition and under all Vport operating range.

SuggestedRemedy

(I have marked this comment as Editorial due to the fact that I didn't change numbers or data. Only add info that can be derived from the current info in the table as it was in draft 3.2.)

Add the following to table 33-14:
1. Add additional two lines after item 3 marked items 3.1 and 3.2.
Item 3.1 shall be "Iport (DC or RMS) Vport=37Vdc". Max value is 350mA.
Item 3.2 shall be "Iport (DC or RMS) Vport=57Vdc". Max value is 230mA.
Add to the notes column "See note 3"
2. In page 63 line 31 change note 3 from:
a)Ripple current content (Iac)superimposed on the DC current level (Idc)is allowed if the tota input power is less than or equal to Pport max.
Peak current is allowed to rise to Iportmax for 50ms max and 5% duty cycle max.
The RMS,DC and ripple current are bounded by the following equation ..."

to:
a)At any operating conditions the peak current is allowed to rise to Iportmax for 50ms max an 5% duty cycle max.
Ripple current content (Iac)superimposed on the DC current level (Idc)is allowed if the total input power is less than or equal to Pport max.
The RMS,DC and ripple current are bounded by the following equation ...
To generate the max Iport_dc and Iport_rms for all operating Vport range use the following equation: Iport_max [A] =12.95W/Vport."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add the following to table 33-14:
1. Add additional two lines after item 3 marked items 3.1 and 3.2.
Item 3.1 shall be "Iport (DC or RMS) Vport=37Vdc". Max value is 350mA.
Item 3.2 shall be "Iport (DC or RMS) Vport=57Vdc". Max value is 230mA.
Add to the notes column "See note 3"
2. In page 63 line 31 change note 3 from:
a)Ripple current content (Iac)superimposed on the DC current level (Idc)is allowed if the tota input power is less than or equal to Pport max.
Peak current is allowed to rise to Iportmax for 50ms max and 5% duty cycle max.
The RMS,DC and ripple current are bounded by the following equation ..."

to:
a)At any operating conditions the peak current is allowed to rise to Iportmax for 50ms max an 5% duty cycle max.
Ripple current content (Iac)superimposed on the DC current level (Idc)is allowed if the total input power is less than or equal to Pport max.
The RMS,DC and ripple current are bounded by the following equation ...
To generate the max Iport_dc and Iport_rms for all operating Vport range use the following equation: Iport_max [mA] =12950/Vport."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.6** *P* **64** *L* **40** # **30**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The modulation is only for the current not for the signature elements.
In addition table 33-6 item 7b page 52 line 23 need to be clarified too.

SuggestedRemedy

Change lines 40-41 from:
"The PD shall maintain a valid MPS for a minimum of 75ms followed by an optional MPS dropout for no longer than 250ms."
To:
"The PD shall maintain a valid MPS for a minimum of 75ms followed by an optional MPS dropout for no longer than 250ms for component a) of the MPS signal."
In page 52 table 33-6 item 7b:
Add to the notes column: "Apply only to the dc current component of the MPS signal as defined in paragraph 33.3.6.
The DC current should be higher or equal to 10mA for at least 60ms and may be lower than 10mA for 300ms max. Under this conditions the PSE should not remove power from the port"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change lines 40-41 from:
"The PD shall maintain a valid MPS for a minimum of 75ms followed by an optional MPS dropout for no longer than 250ms."
To:
"The PD shall maintain a valid MPS for a minimum of 75ms followed by an optional MPS dropout for no longer than 250ms for component a) of the MPS signal."

In page 52 table 33-6 item 7b:
Add to the notes column: "Applies only to the DC component of the MPS signal as defined in paragraph 33.3.6.
The PSE shall not remove power from the port when the DC current is greater than or equal to 10mA for at least 60ms every 360ms (sum of Tmps and Tmpdo)."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.9** *P* **54** *L* **1** # **31**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

It can be understood that the max current limitation is only for operating voltage range of 44V to 57V. Actually the current should be limited at any port voltage up to 60V.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text in line 1 from:
"Max value applies over operating voltage range as specified in Item 1."
To:
"Max value applies over any voltage up to the max voltage as specified in item 1."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change text in line 1 from:
"Max value applies over operating voltage range as specified in Item 1."
To:
"Max value applies for any DC input voltage up to the maximum voltage as specified in item 1

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3.5** *P* **40** *L* **18** # **32**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *sm*

We need to add to the state flow all the cases that the flow cannot continue in the normal operating procedure due to system decision for example:
1. The port is not performing detection.
2. The port is performing detection but choose not to continue the process.
3. The port is performing detection and classification but choose not to power on the port.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the state flow blocks that allow the above behaviour, or show that the current state flow supports those scenarios.
In addition, add to page 40 line 20:
"The PSE state diagram specifies the normal behavior of a single port under normal operating conditions"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved with revisions to the state machine.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3.5** *P* **43** *L* **18** # **33**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

In the state flow on the left side of the "DETECT_EVAL" block, the Power Turn on should be permitted if there is enough power left in the system as was done on the right side branch of this block.
The error should be corrected by completing the right conditions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the input conditions from:
(signature =valid)*(performs_classification =false)
To:(signature =valid)*(performs_classification =false)*((pd_requested_power <pse_available_power)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The state machine variables have been redefined. The transition in question is modified that statisfies commentors concerns. See PSE_SM_4_01.pdf.

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-7** *P* **55** *L* **21** # **34**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Table 33-7

The slew rate is defined for Ttrise and Tfall parts of the signal. We need to say it.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the note column for item 3c: "positive or negative" or change the max value to |0.1| .

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to the note column for item 3c: "positive or negative"

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.9** *P* **53** *L* **28** # **35**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Iport_max is a min value at the PSE side so we should say "min Iport_max..."

SuggestedRemedy

Change line 28 from :

"a) For Vport>44V, Iport_max=15.4/Vport"
to:

""a) For Vport>44V, min value for Iport_max is: Iport_max=15.4/Vport"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change line 28 from :

"a) For Vport>44V, Iport_max=15.4/Vport"
to:

""a) For Vport>44V, min value for Iport_max=15.4/Vport"

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5** *P* **63** *L* **44** # **36**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Table 33-14 item 5 defines the ripple and noise at the PD input.
It is not clear if it is the noise generated by the PD and reflected to the PD input or it is the nose generated by the PSE and present at the PD input.
We should specify both noise conditions.
Note 5 for item 5 in the above table says in line 44 that it is the definition for the "output noise at the input terminal of the PD" which can be understood either way.
The hole that I see is that we need to specify the noise generated by the PD (by its power supply as an example) is reflected to the PD input and present at the PD input and some of it at the PSE output.
In addition, we need to specify the noise that generated by the PSE and the PD has to leave with.
In order to keep the objectives of the spec which are to specify the requirements at the PD input and the PSE output and keep interoperability in good shape we need to specify the max noise generated by the PD in the same way we did for the PSE.
Actually the original intent in table 33-14 was to define the noise generated by the PD and reflected to the MDI port however it is easy to fix and define.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the first sentence in line 44 from:
"output noise at the input terminal of the PD"
to: "The noise at the PD input terminal generated by the PD circuits"
2. Add note c) after line 46:
"PD should handle ripple and noise generated by the PSE and present at the PD input terminal. Thease levels are specified in table 33-6 item 3.
It is advised to the system designer to assume the worst case condition in which both PSE and PD generate noise each at the max levels specified in table 33-6 and 33-14 and the at the port (PSE or PD) a higher noise level may be measured compared to the stand alone case as specified by this standard."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

1. Change the first sentence in line 44 from:
"output noise at the input terminal of the PD"
to: "The noise at the PD PI generated by the PD circuitry"
2. Add note c) after line 46:
"PD should tolerate ripple and noise generated by the PSE that appear at the PD PI. These levels are specified in table 33-6 item 3.
The system designer is advised to assume the worst case condition in which both PSE and PD generate the maximum noise allowed by Table 33-6 and Table 33-14, which may cause a higher noise level to appear at the PI than the standalone case as specified by this standard."

Cl **33C** *SC* **Figure 33C.21** *P* **118** *L* **42** # **38**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Figure 33c.21

The current offset can not be described on the voltage vs time graph.
The same comment apply to figure 33c.13.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Ioffset from figures 33c.13 and 33.c21.
Attached Visio files with the corrected figures.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace figure with file:TEST SETUP draft 3_1 figure 33-19 33C_11.vsd for draft 4.01.vsd

Fixed in two places, 33C13 and 33C21

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-7** *P* **55** *L* **28** # **39**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Table 33-7

Item 2b may look redundant in table 33-7 and we need to clarify why it is there.
The reason for item 2b is to make clear that the presence of the ac circuits will not impair the DC impedance measured from the MDI to the port during resistor detection mode.
This DC impedance should be 45K min as specified by figures 33-7 and 33-8.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the note in the note column for item 2b to:
"Specified in 33.2.5 and Figure 33-7.
Shown here to clarify that the presence of the ac circuits will not impair the DC impedance measured from the MDI to the port during resistor detection mode.
This DC impedance should be 45K min as specified by figures 33-7 and 33-8."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

Cl **33C** *SC* **Figure 33C.3** *P* **100** *L* **23** # **40**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Figure 33c.3

The 39V zener diode meant to test PSE with foldback current limit.I after more thinking, I believe that this alone is not enough to check this feature and make sure tat the PSE is capable of supplying 400-450mA current during startup (power on).We need to change also ir line 48 the text of Mode 2-2.So here is the deal:If the PSE is equipped with foldback current limit, we should expect the following behavior:the PSE current limit can be any number between Iport>0 to Iport<400mA.It means that the PD input cap will be charged at a slope of Iport/Cpd until the PSE port voltage has reached to 44V. After this point, The PSE must supply 400mA min, 450mA max current for 50ms min, 75ms max time frame. It means that now the slope will be change to 400ma/Cpd to 450ma/Cpd for 50ms min.This behavior shoulc be checked at mode 2-2 of the above test procedure.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Remove the 39V zener diode from figure 33c.32.
Replace the text from page 100 line 48 to the following new text:
"Mode 2-2:If the PSE is using foldback current limit, check that the voltage over time behavior is complying to figure 33c.3.1"
Attached the new figure 33c.3.1 (Visio file)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Test circuit modified per changes made in Yair's foldback comment (resolution added a 10V step and a 30V step).

Cl **33** *SC* **33.7.3.2** *P* **83** *L* **3** # **51**

Naganuma, Ken Toko America Inc.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Duplicate Item number PSE29

SuggestedRemedy

Correct Item number.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Changes PSE29 - 38

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.6** *P* **64** *L* **52** # **57**
Dwelley, Dave Linear Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

not clear what signature must do to ensure disconnect

SuggestedRemedy

Add text at the end of line 52: "To ensure power removal, the impedance at the PI must rise above Zac2 as specified in Table 33-7."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-2** *P* **46** *L* **27** # **58**
Dwelley, Dave Linear Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Item 12 is labeled differently from Items 7-9 where it belongs

SuggestedRemedy

Change Parameter to "Must accept signature capacitance", move between items 8 and 9. Change note numbers accordingly.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change name to Cgood and 'Parameter' to "Must accept" signature capacitance. Also change page 46, line 52 and 47, line 26. Also move up to line 9 in Table.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.3** *P* **49** *L* **44** # **60**
Dwelley, Dave Linear Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

error in value (table 33-4 is correct)

SuggestedRemedy

change 43mA to 45mA

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33C** *SC* **33C.3.1** *P* **116** *L* **33** # **62**
Karam, Roger CISCO

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

v) repeat step 4v with Rsig1=open

editorial: what is 4v? i would suggest a remedy but not sure here what the intent is

SuggestedRemedy

I beleive there is a typo here, please correct
and if you don't know either please remove the test.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

See #69

Cl **33C** *SC* **33C.3.1** *P* **115** *L* **47** # **63**
Karam, Roger CISCO

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

I am ok with a 'spec' but why is this in the test procedure?
talking about item d)
d) it is allowed to have no detection signals or to have single point detection if the pse identifies that the port is open.

SuggestedRemedy

please spec this on page 47 section 33.2.5.1 or 2.6.3 as the editor decides. of course we need to see if this affects anything else.
i do not recall it being discussed.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

Editors Note: demoted from a TR to an E

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5** *P* **62** *L* **46** # **66**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Table 33-14

We need to clarify that item 1 in table 33-14 is defined after startup and items 6a and 6b on page 63 are defined during startup.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the notes section of table 33-14 in page 63 line 26 the following note:
"Note 1: Input voltage range after startup. The PD should turn on at voltage lower than specified by item 6a. After PD turns on, the PD should stay on at the operating voltage range as specified by item 1. The PD shall turn off at voltage greater than specified by item 6b."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to the notes section of table 33-14:
"Note 1: Input voltage range after startup. The PD shall turn on at a voltage less than Von. After PD turns on, the PD shall stay on over the entire Vport range . The PD shall turn off at a voltage less than Vport minimum and greater than Voff."

Cl **33C** *SC* **33C.3.1** *P* **115** *L* **37** # **68**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

V1=5V may be to low if internal diode forward voltage is more than 1V and less than 2.8V. Need to increase V1 to 10V.

SuggestedRemedy

Change line 37 from "set V1 to 5V..." to "set V1 to 10V".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33C** *SC* **33C.3.1** *P* **116** *L* **33** # **69**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Error in line 33.
It should be "Repeat steps ii to v with Rsig1=open" and not "...step 4v.."

SuggestedRemedy

Change text in line 33 to: "Repeat steps ii to v with Rsig1=open"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33C** *SC* **33C.2.2** *P* **113** *L* **39** # **70**

Darshan, Yair PowerDsine

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

We need to update the test procedure for measuring AC source short circuit current per the last updates in table 33-7.
(Note to the editor: Merge all comments on this subject with this comment)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete lines 39-40 page 113. "2) ...."
In line 41 replace "Ix" with "5mA"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.3** *P* **59** *L* **33** # **71**

Jones, Chad Cisco Systems, Inc

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

This first paragraph is not as clear as it can be. It took me five reads to get the point. The second paragraph (starting at line 38) is much more direct.

SuggestedRemedy

For clarity, make the first paragraph like the second paragraph. Something like this:

A PD shall present a valid detection signature at the PI ... while it is a state where it will accep power from the PI.

The confusion (for me) arises from the part in the commas, 'but not powered via the PI'. This state is covered in the third paragraph (at line 42).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Chad and John to craft text.

A PD shall present a valid detection signature at the PI ... while it is a state where it will accep power from the PI, but is not powered via the PI.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.8.1** *P* **51** *L* **14** # **78**
Goldis, Mordechai Avaya

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

This clause talks about alternative A and B but doesn't tell alternative of what.
in line 22 and 29 it even worse ,it talks about alternative A detection .
whic may be understood as we have two detections.
I think it is confusing.

SuggestedRemedy

specify alternative of what

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

add subclause reference in parenthesis next to Alternative A, Alternative B.

Cl **33** *SC* **Figure 33-10** *P* **56** *L* **15** # **79**
Goldis, Mordechai Avaya

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

The Table in the label have to be 33-7

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **Figure 33-11** *P* **56** *L* **33** # **80**
Goldis, Mordechai Avaya

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

The Table in the label have to be 33-7

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **57** *L* **49** # **81**
Goldis, Mordechai Avaya

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

From the sentence "the PD... in at least one of ...A..B.."
it can be understood that only one mode is enough ,which is wrong
(or it is just my poor English)

See also in page 84 in 33.7.3.3 line 10(pics)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

the PD shall be able to operate per the PD Mode-B column and per at least one of the PD Mode-A columns in Table …

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.4** *P* **61** *L* **35** # **82**
Goldis, Mordechai Avaya

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

This clause is full of tables that devide the sentences in the middle.
in next page 62 line 1 the table 33-13 come in a middle of a word.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See #328

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-14** *P* **63** *L* **15** # **83**
Goldis, Mordechai Avaya

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The unit in this table of Von is Volts which is basically Ok but it is the only place .Throughout the draft we used other terms for Vlots as V ,Vcd

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will coordinate with the style manual.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.7.3** *P* **79** *L* **53** # **84**
Goldis, Mordechai Avaya

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Move the heading to next page

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **00** *P* **1** *L* **1** # **86**
Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Original 802.3 Standard uses the US spelling of "behavior"

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest to change "behaviour" to "behavior" in all cases.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.4.1** *P* **65** *L* **16** # **87**
Burke, Thomas Underwriters Laboratori

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The sub-clause references to IEC 60950 in this sub-clause (and 33.5.1) are not accurate with the latest version of the Standard for Safety of Information Technology Equipment, IEC 60950 1, First Edition. The present sub-clause references (i.e., 5.3.2) are to the Second Edition of IEC 60950. The Second edition has superseded by IEC 60950 Third Edition in April 1999 and IEC 60950-1 First Edition in October 2001. (IEC TC108 has changed the structure of IEC 60950 to include a general Part 1 Standard, IEC 60950-1, with additional (pending) Part 2 Standards (e.g., IEC 60950-xx) to cover specific products. This is why IEC 60950-1 First Edition supersedes IEC 60950 Third Edition.) For the tests in parts a) and b) of 33.4.1, the correct reference in IEC 60950-1 is Sub-clause 5.2.2 instead of 5.3.2. Also, the word "section' is incorrectly used in place of standard IEC terminology "sub-clause."

SuggestedRemedy

The concluding phrases of parts a) and b) of 33.4.1 (lines 16-17), and the middle of the last sentence of 33.4.1 (line 22) should be changed from "...in Section 5.3.2 of IEC 60950" to "...in Sub-clause 5.2.2 of IEC 60950-1, First Edition."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Added to database on 1/31/2003, 3:30PM:

See response to comments #88 and 89.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.5.1** *P* **73** *L* **5** # **89**
Burke, Thomas Underwriters Laboratori

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The current version of IEC 60950 is IEC 60950-1, First Edition, which was issued in October 2001.

SuggestedRemedy

The references to IEC 60950 in the first two sentences of 33.5.1 should be changed from "IEC 60950" to "IEC 60950-1, First Edition."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Added to the database 1/31/2003 at 3:20PM:

33.5.1 General safety

All equipment meeting this standard shall conform to IEC publication 60950-1:2001. In particular, the PSE shall be classified as a Limited Power Source in accordance with IEC publication 60950-1:2001.

See response to comment # 88.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1** *P* **36** *L* **11** # **91**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Need definition of PD and PSE on their first use in this clause

SuggestedRemedy

In the last sentence of the first paragraph, replace

"within the PSE and PD" with
"within the powered device (PD) and the power sourcing equipment (PSE)"

Also, in the last sentence in this subclause, replace

"the power sourcing equipment (PSE) and the powered device (PD)" with
"the PSE and PD"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Correct capitalization:

replace "within the PSE and PD" with
"within the Powered Device (PD) and the Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE)"

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.2** *P* **40** *L* **6** # **92**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
extra word

SuggestedRemedy
Replace "statement that it applies" with "statement that applies"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The requirements of this document shall apply equally to
Endpoint and Midspan PSEs unless the requirement contains an explicit statement that only applies to one
implementation.

Cl **33** *SC* **Figure 33-6** *P* **44** *L* **13** # **95**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
bad timer name in overload state diagram

SuggestedRemedy
In states MONITOR_OVLD and DETECT OVLD, replace "start tolvd_timer" with "start tovld_timer"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-17** *P* **75** *L* **18** # **96**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Why is the bit number dulpicated in the bit name cell?

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the bit numbers from the name cells. Same comment applies to Table 33-18.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.1.4** *P* **9** *L* **8** # **98**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*
The changes to subclause 30.1.4 appear after the changes to 30.2.2.1 which is not the correc numerical order.

SuggestedRemedy
Move 30.1.4 changes to appear between 30.1.2 and 30.2.2.1 changes.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **Figure 30-4** *P* **11** *L* **19** # **100**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*
While the title of the figure has been updated correctly the text in the figure that states 'Mid Span PSE System' needs to be updated to reflect the change from a Midspan PSE to a generic Midspan management model. Also need to correct the spelling of Midspan in this cas

SuggestedRemedy
In the figure change the text 'Mid Span PSE System' to read 'Midspan system'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **Table 30-4** *P* **12** *L* **6** # **102**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Need to update the very top line of this table. The PSE Basic and recommended package is PSE management, the PD Basic package is PD management and Basic Capability is Midspan management (see other comment on this).

SuggestedRemedy
Add 'PSE' in bold vertical text above the two columns PSE Basic Package. Add 'PD' in bold vertical text above the PD Basic Package column. Add 'Midspan' in bold vertical text above the Basic Capability column.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove the text 'MAU' from the top row. Keep the blank row for format consistency with other equivalent tables. Add thick black line in top row extended to top of Table as the other thick black lines.

Cl **30** *SC* **Table 30-4** *P* **12** *L* **6** # **103**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The title of the 'Basic Capability (Mandatory)' column doesn't seem to have been updated when we changed from a Midspan PSE to a generic Midspan model.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that 'Basic Capability (Mandatory)' should be renamed 'Midspan Basic Capability (Mandatory)'. If this change is accepted the related Annex 30A text will also need to be updated.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **Table 30-4** *P* **12** *L* **35** # **104**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Since oPSE is not part of PD management column 3 should be shaded in the oPSE block. Since oPD is not part of PSE management columns 1 and 2 should be shaded in the oPD block.

SuggestedRemedy

Shade column 3 in the oPSE block. Shade columns 1 and 2 in the oPD block.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.9.1** *P* **13** *L* **7** # **105**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Typo - remove the comma after the word object, the subclause defines the managed object class attributes and actions, not the object class, attributes and actions as it reads currently.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... object class, attributes and ...' to read '... object class attributes and ...'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.9.2** *P* **16** *L* **28** # **106**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Remove the and between object and attributes, the subclause defines the managed object class attributes, not the object class and attributes as it reads currently. Also the PD Managed object includes an action as well as attributes - add to list.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... object class and attributes.' to read '... object class attributes and action.'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.9.1.1.2** *P* **13** *L* **25** # **107**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Bit 11.0 has been renamed PSE Enable so this subclause should be updated to reflect this.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... to the Power Enable bit ...' to read '... to the PSE Enable bit ...'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.9.1.1.2** *P* **13** *L* **26** # **108**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Suggest that 'enable' and 'disable' should be changed to 'enabled' and 'disabled' to match similar attributes (30.4.3.1.2) within Clause 30.

SuggestedRemedy

Throughout this subclause change 'enable' to 'enabled' and 'disable' to 'disabled'.
Note that Annex30B will have to be changed to match this if this change is made.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.9.1.1.5** *P* **14** *L* **31** # **110**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

The name of the bits referenced in this subclause is not correct, 'Detection Control' should read 'Detection Test Control'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... Detection Control bits specified in 33.6.1.1.2.;' to read '... Detection Test Control bits specified in 33.6.1.1.2.;'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.9.1.1.8** *P* **15** *L* **35** # **116**
Law, David 3Com

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

The cross reference to subclause 33.3.6 in the case of this attribute probably isn't the best as the attribute is PSE related yet the cross reference is to the PD MPS text. Suggest the cross reference is changed to the PSE MPS text.

SuggestedRemedy

Seggest the text '... (see 33.3.6) ...' should be changed to read '... (see 33.2.11) ...'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

Withdrawn.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.2.2** *P* **76** *L* **38** # **118**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Suggest that the symbols for overload current limit and overload time limit be included in this text. In addition note that 'overload current limit' is actually called 'Overload current detection range' in Table 33-6.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... overload current limit for a duration greater than the overload time limit (see Table 33-6).' to read '... overload current limit (ICUT) for a duration greater than the overload time limit (TovId) (see Table 33-6).'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3.3** *P* **42** *L* **7** # **119**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Reaching the specification for the timer tdbo takes three levels of indirection. From this definition to 33.2.8.1 which then points to 33.2.8 which then points to Table 33-5 altought ther is no direct refernce to tdbo being in the table it can be found in item 17. In addition the remainder of the timer refernces are rather indirect not refering directly to the entry in Table 33-5 but simply just pointing to the table.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text to read 'A timer ... ..., see Tdbo in Table 33-5.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.9.1.2.1** *P* **16** *L* **24** # **121**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Typo - ';' missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... to alter aPSEAdminState.' to read '... to alter aPSEAdminState.;'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.9.2.1.2** *P* **17** *L* **1** # **122**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Incorrect attribute cross refernce to acPSEAdminControl, should read acPDAdminControl.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... the acPSEAdminControl action.' to read '... the acPDAdminControl action.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3** *P* **57** *L* **3** # **125**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

The text 'For the purpose of Clause 33' seems unnecessary and besides it is for the purpose of 802.3 and not just Clause 33 that a PD is as defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the above text so that 'For the purposes of Clause 33, a PD is a ...' is change to read 'A PD is a ...'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **57** *L* **14** # **126**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Can we please now remove the 'Without implying a preference'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'Without implying a preference, the two ...' to read 'The two ...'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **57** *L* **23** # **127**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

I belive there are some concerns with using the word compliance within 802.3 and it is usual t use 'shall' and 'shall not' to define manditory requiremnts to implement and not implement something.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the text 'PDs that implement only Mode A or Mode B are specifically not in compliance with this standard.' since this is covered by the text '... the PD shall be able to operate in at least one of the PD Mode-A columns and in the PD Mode-B column in Table 33-8.' following Table 33-8.

Change the text 'PDs that simultaneously require power from both Mode A and Mode B are specifically not in compliance with this standard.' to read 'A PD shall not simultaneously draw power from both Mode A and Mode B'. Also suggest that this text be moved to the end of the paragraph after Table 33-8, after the text in the first part of the suggest remedy.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change:
PDs that implement only Mode A or Mode B are specifically not in compliance with this standard. PDs that
simultaneously require power from both Mode A and Mode B are specifically not in compliance with this
standard.
To:
Note: PDs that implement only Mode A or Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard. PDs that simultaneously require power from both Mode A and Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.1** *P* **39** *L* **50** # **135**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Can we please now remove the 'The ordering of the alternatives should not be construed as a preference of implementation.' text.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the text 'The ordering of the alternatives should not be construed as a preference of implementation.'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.2** *P* **40** *L* **4** # **137**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Suggest the definition of a Midspan PSE be aligned with the definition of Midspan in the updates to 1.4 which reads 'An entity located within a link segment that is distinctly separate from and between the end-points.'

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'A PSE which is located on the link between connected DTEs is a "Midspan PSE".' to read 'A PSE which is located within a link segment that is distinctly separate from and between the MDIs is a "Midspan PSE".'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3.1** *P* **40** *L* **32** # **138**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Suggest that the text related to the timer operation be moved to the start of the timer subclause, as is the case with other clauses, and that the text there is removed.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the text 'All timers operate in the manner described in 14.2.3.2 with the following addition. A timer is reset and stops counting upon entering a state where "stop x_timer" is asserted.' from subclase 33.2.3.1.
In subclause 33.2.3.3 replace the text 'All timers use a start command (e.g., start tbdo_timer), and each timer indicates expiration of the time value with a done signal (e.g., tdbo_timer_done).' with the text 'All timers operate in the manner described in 14.2.3.2 with the following addition. A timer is reset and stops counting upon entering a state where "stop x_timer" is asserted.'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **Figure 33-5** *P* **43** *L* **7** # **142**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

While the use of '!' for a logical inversion is indeed defined in 21.5 the rest of the state machine has used the style of x = true and x = false rather that x and !x therefore suggest the instances of error_condition be changed to this style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances of 'error_condition' to 'error_condition = true' and '!error_condition' to 'error_condition = false'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved with resolution to comment # 182

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4** *P* **44** *L* **36** # **148**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The third paragraph states that 'PD detection is independent of data link status.' however is it the entire PSE operation that's independent of data link status, not just PD detection. Suggest that the entire third paragraph is reworded and moved to the PSE introduction in subclause 33.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the third paragraph of this subclause. Add the text 'PSE operation is independent of data link status.'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

'Delete the third paragraph of this subclause. Add the text 'PSE operation is independent of data link status.'

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4** *P* **44** *L* **31** # **149**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Typo - '... in this section.' should read '... in this subclause'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... in this section.' to read '... in this subclause'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **Figure 33-6** *P* **44** *L* **16** # **151**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

There should be a way of getting to the definitions of ICUT and ILIM.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that a 'constants' subclause be added, probably 33.2.3.5, and this should include ICUT and ILIM. These definitions then would simply point back to Table 33-6.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1** *P* **36** *L* **7** # **153**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The first sentence of this subclause states that the clause defines '... an optional power (non-data) entity ...' however doesn't the Clause actually define two, the PSE and the PD. In addition, suggest it is stated that this Clause specifies the functional and electrical characteristics and remove the reference to 'existing' PHY Clauses as this will not make sens once Clause 33 is published as part of a combined document.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest the text 'This clause defines an optional power (non-data) entity for use with existing physical layers as defined in Clauses 14, 25 and 40.' is changed to read 'This clause defines the functional and electrical characteristics of two optional power (non-data) entities for use with the physical layers defined in Clauses 14, 25 and 40.'. Alternativly if a refence to the two entities is prefered change the sentance to read 'This clause defines the functional and electrical characteristics of two optional power (non-data) entities, a Powered Device (PD) and Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE), for use with the physical layers defined in Clauses 14, 25 and 40.'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This clause defines the functional and electrical characteristics of two optional power (non-data) entities, a Powered Device (PD) and Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE), for use with the physical layers defined in Clauses 14, 25 and 40. These entities allow devices to supply/draw power using the same generic cabling as that used for data transmission.

See #317

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1** *P* **36** *L* **9** # **154**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Not sure what the statement 'This clause is optional only in the sense that systems may or may not employ powering via the MDI.' in the third sentence of this subclause is trying to say. Implementation of any Clause within IEEE Std. 802.3 is optional and this is covered by the boilerplate statement at the front of IEEE standards which states 'Use of an IEEE Standard is wholly voluntary.'. As for the requirement that if the option to implement this Clause is made then it must conform to this standard then this is covered by the Compatibility Considerations statement.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove third sentence.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The offending sentence has been removed.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1** *P* **36** *L* **10** # **155**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

The Compatibility Considerations text in the fourth and fifth sentences should be promoted to be a separate subclause as is similar text in 14.1.3.2 & 15.1.3.2 for example. In addition reference to compatibility at the 'twisted-pair link' and the 'MDI' seems to be a copy and paste from 10BASE-T and not relevant here. A better subclause to copy would be 15.1.3.2 with MDI modified to be PI.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the text 'All implementations of the twisted-pair link shall be compatible at the MDI. Designers are free to implement circuitry within the PD and PSE (in an application-dependent man-ner) provided the MDI specifications are met.' from subclause.
Insert subclause 33.1.3 as follows and renumber remaining subclauses as required.
'33.1.3 Compatibility Considerations
All implementations of PD and PSE systems shall be compatible at their respective PIs when used in accordance with the restrictions of Clause 33 where appropriate. Designers are free t implement circuitry within the PD and PSE in an application-dependent manner provided that the respective PI specifications are satisfied.'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.1** *P* **36** *L* **31** # **156**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

While this subclause is titled 'Terminology', the majority of text seems to be a is a description of the location of the PI. In the one case where a term is defined, the MPI, this definition should be moved to the changes to subclause 1.4 contained in the 'Changes to Clause 1' pages elsewhere in the IEEE P802.3af draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the title of the subclause to be 'PI Location'.
Note: See my additional comments to remove the first paragraph of this clause and to remove the MPI definition as MDI.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete 33.1.1 and move text in this section to the end of 33.1.3. Then renumber sections accordingly.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.1** *P* **36** *L* **33** # **157**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

I must be missing something here but this seems to say that to conform to this Clause a device must conform to this Clause. Is this trying to say the DTE Power via MDI must be associated with a Clause 14, 25 or 40 PHY although I guess that can be correct as this would exclude a Midspan. Please clarify or delete the first paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete first paragraph of this subclause.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change: 'Without regard to this clause's name "DTE Power via MDI", any device which contains an MDI compliant
with Clause 14, Clause 25 and/or Clause 40, and sinks and/or sources power in accordance with the specifi-cations
of this clause is permitted.'
to:
'Any device which contains an MDI compliant with Clause 14, Clause 25 and/or Clause 40, and sinks and/or sources power in accordance with the specifications of this clause, is permitted.'

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1** *P* **36** *L* **14** # **159**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Just checking, but should the word 'simple' actually be 'single' in the text '... with a simple interface to both the data it ...'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'simple' to be 'single' if it needs to be.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Replace "simple" with "single"

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.3** *P* **37** *L* **22** # **162**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

In Figure 33-1 add PD to the exiting expansions of PHY and MDI. In Figure 33-2 & 33-3 add PSE to the exiting expansions of PHY and MDI.

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 33-1 add PD to the exiting expansions of PHY and MDI. In Figure 33-2 & 33-3 add PSE to the exiting expansions of PHY and MDI.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **2** *L* **18** # **165**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The Midspan definition reads '... within a link segment that is distinctly separate from and between the end-points.' however the link segment definition doesn't reference end-points but instead MDIs (see 1.4.159 'link segment: The point-to-point full-duplex medium connection between two and only two Medium Dependent Interfaces (MDIs)'. Consider replacing the term 'end-points' with the term 'MDIs'.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the term 'end-points' with the term 'MDIs' in this definition.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **2** *L* **21** # **166**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The Link Section definition reads '... link segment from the PSE to the PD.'. Suggest that 'from' should be replaced with 'between' to align with the similar Link Segment definition. Note: This term is not used elsewhere in the document. If my comments to use this term elsewhere in the document are rejected consideration should be given to deleting this definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the word 'from' with 'between' in the Link Section definition.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See resolution to comment 303.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **2** *L* **26** # **167**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Typo - Shouldn't the P and I of Power Interface be uppercase ?

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... in a PD the power interface is the MDI.' to read '... in a PD the Power Interface is the MDI.'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **2** *L* **7** # **168**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Typo - in two cases, the change instruction text use the word 'section' rather than 'subclause'.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '... definition in section 1.4 ...' on line 7 and 16.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **2** *L* **21** # **173**
Thaler, Pat Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The acronyms PSE and PD should be expanded in the definitions for Link Section and PSE Group.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change text to: The portion of the link segment from the Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE) to the Powered Device (PD).

Cl **30** *SC* **30.9.1.1.7** *P* **15** *L* **8** # **174**
Thaler, Pat Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

It would be helpful to add a statement to behavior that class 0 indicates that the PSE doesn't detect class.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The commenters assertion is not correct. A Class 0 result can also indicate the PSE detectec a PD that does not implement class.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.2** *P* **36** *L* **52** # **175**
Thaler, Pat Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Sentence for item a is a little unclear as one may read "may require no additional connection" as a permissive statement or a restrictive one. Making this a positive statement will make it more clear.

SuggestedRemedy

"Powered Devices designed ... can obtain both powere and data for operation through the MDI and therefore need no additional connections."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.3** *P* **37** *L* **19** # **176**

Thaler, Pat — Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Suggest a small tweak to the model pictures, Fig 33-1 and Fig 33-2.

SuggestedRemedy

The bottom edge of the box around Physical Interface circuitry should be moved a bit lower to be below where the MDI splits as there is only a single MDI connector and any split is internal to the physical interface circuitry.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3.2** *P* **41** *L* **46** # **178**

Thaler, Pat — Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

It would be more reader friendly to have the value match the class number that is supported. I also isn't clear why Classes 3 and 4 are lumped together. Also, it isn't clear why the last value isn't simply Class 3 since the text says it is the highest power supported. Class 4 is currently undefined but the table says it is limited to the same max power as Class 3. Class 0 means that the power will be less than or equal to Class 3. Therefore the highest power would be Class 3.

Same comment applies to do_classification on page 42 line 44

SuggestedRemedy

Values: 1 Class 1
2 Class 2
3 Class 3

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

After long and careful deliberation, the group could not reach a concensus for any change. The TF decided that the text will not change.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.9** *P* **53** *L* **12** # **180**

Thaler, Pat — Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Not clear why the sentence on overshoot peak current is here.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete it or move it to a more appropriate place

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Offending sentence was removed in D4.01.

Cl **33** *SC* **Global** *P* *L* # **200**

Thaler, Pat — Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

<= is often used instead of the less than or equals symbol. It also seems to be used some times when measuring analog quantities (Vclass for instance). The < can be used instead for analog quantities as there is an insignificant difference between < and less than or equals for measured analog quantity.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the less than or equals symbol or < as appropriate rather than <=.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Globally replace <= with the 'less than or equal' symbol.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.9** *P* **53** *L* **43** # **203**

Thaler, Pat — Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

"may" means one may do something but is not required to. Therefore, one is also allowed to not do the thing. Saying "may or may not" instead of "may" does not add any content and is therefore undesireable.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "may or may not" with "may" here and in the other places it occurs.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

We have looked at the style manual and understand the usage of the word may and the group feels strongly that or may not adds emphasis to the sentence.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.4** *P* **65** *L* **1** # **210**

Thaler, Pat — Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Section should be entitled "Additional electrical specifications" because many electrical specifications appear in 33.2 and 33.3

SuggestedRemedy

Modify title as suggested above and add "additional" to the first sentence.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.7.3.4** *P* **86** *L* **18** # **221**

Thaler, Pat — Agilent Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

PSE34, EL5 and ES3 are the same requirement. One might also consider removing the redundant statements in the draft that produced these.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete PSE34 which applies only to PSEs and leave either EL5 or ES3 which cover both PSEs and PDs.

The PICS should be checked for other unnecessary duplications.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Have editors pick one place to make this shall statement.

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-2** *P* **46** *L* **44** # **224**

Law, David — 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Note 5 states that '... before measuring the port.'. Suggest that 'port' should be 'PI' in this case. Also suggest that '... before performing the next measurement at the PI.' would read better. In addition isn't this note redundant as it duplicates the shall statement at the end of th first paragraph of 33.2.5.1 which reads 'The PSE shall wait for at least T settle as specified in Table 33-2 before measuring the port.'.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that either the text '... before measuring the port.' be changed to read "... before performing the next measurement at the PI.' or better still delete Note 5 from Table 33-2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The offending text has been totally rewritten.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5.1** *P* **47** *L* **7** # **226**

Law, David — 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

The word 'port' is used twice in the subclause but it appears that the term 'PI' should be used instead. Note that the in 802.3 a port only exists on a repeater (1.4.215 port: A segment or Inter-Repeater Link IRL) interface of a repeater unit.).

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest a global search and replace of the term 'port' with 'PI' or 'MDI' if required.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5.1** *P* **47** *L* **10** # **227**

Law, David — 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Suggest that '... before performing the next measurement at the port.' would be better than '... before measuring the port.'.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the text '... before measuring the port.'. with the text '... before performing the next measurement at the port.'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6.3** *P* **47** *L* **38** # **229**

Law, David — 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The text within the subclause 'Other criteria' doesn't seem to state a PSE detection of PDs criteria but instead what is a mandatory requirement against the supply of power to the PD once successful PD detection is complete.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that this subclause be moved to be a subclause of 33.2.9 'Power supply output' or the text of subclause 33.2.6.3 be moved to be a new paragraph of 33.2.9.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Move the sentence: 'The PSE shall turn on power only on the same pairs as those used for detection.' to section 33.2.9.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.1** *P* **49** *L* **8** # **231**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

This subclause seems to be a PD rather than PSE related subclause. In addition the first paragraph seems to be trying to give an overview of PD Classes however that is already provided in the first paragraph of subclause 33.2.7. Table 33-2 is a duplicate of Table 33-11 except for the addition of column four - and it would seem a bad idea from a draft, and further standards, maintenance point of view to duplicate such information.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that Tables 33-3 and 33-11 are somehow merged to avoid the duplication of information Also consider deleting subclause 33.2.7.1 and placing the duplicate text in the surrounding subclauses.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete column 4.

Change note to: This is the maximum power at the PSE PI. For maximum power available to PDs, see Table 33-10.

Change title of 33.2.7.1 to Classification Power Levels

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.2** *P* **49** *L* **32** # **233**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The text reads '... specifications shall be as defined in Table 33-6.' however this table defines specifications for the Power supply as well as the classification probing. Suggest that either text be added to clarify which specifications are being referenced or the related specification be broken out into a separate table for clarity.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that either text be added to clarify which specifications are being referenced or the related specification be broken out into a separate table for clarity.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

timing specifications shall be as defined by Tpdc in Table 33-5.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.3** *P* **49** *L* **44** # **235**
Law, David 3Com

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

Just checking but is it correct that Class 0 is defined for an IClass from 43mA to 47mA as table 33-5 doesn't define an applied Iclass of 43 to 47mA but instead defines it as from 45 to 47mA. Why define a action for an applied IClass that doesn't appear in Table 3305.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See #60

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.3** *P* **49** *L* **43** # **237**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Not to sure of the style 'If .. shall not ... or shall ...' and suggest that 'If .. shall either not ... or .. as this will match the PICS better which should be of the form O/<n> [See subclause 21.6.2] optional filed/function, but one and only one of the group of options labeled by the same numeral is required.

SuggestedRemedy

On line 43 and 44 Change the text '... PSE shall not power the PD or shall power the PD as Class 0.' to read '... PSE shall either not power the PD or power the PD as Class 0.' Update the PICS as required.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.8** *P* **51** *L* **1** # **238**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

This subclause would seem to be describing the operation of the State Diagram giving a overview of the operation of the entire PSE.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that subclauses 33.2.8 and 33.2.8.1 to be moved to be 33.2.3 and 33.2.3.1 respectively to be prior to the state diagrams which provide the normative specification of the behaviors described here. Re-number other subclauses as required.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This text has been moved to the 'General' area suggested by another comment.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.8.1** *P* **51** *L* **29** # **239**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The text 'The ... is not subject to ... , nor is it exempt from ...' seems odd as it seems to mean 'The .. is exempt from ..., nor is it exempt from ...'.

SuggestedRemedy

Sugest the text '.. A detection is not subject to the detection backoff, nor is it exempt from the Ttot timing as specified in Table 33-6.' is change to read '.. A detection is not subject to the detection backoff, and exempt from the Ttot timing as specified in Table 33-6.'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

'A detection is not subject to the detection backoff, and is not exempt from the Ttot timing as specified in Table 33-6.'.

Ttot was removed by other comments. Text inserted in document does not include the lasy phrase after the comma including Ttot.

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-18** *P* **77** *L* **3** # **242**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

In the Name column remove the Bits text such as (12.8) as this is a duplicate of the column 1 information. This should also be done for Table 33-17. In addition both Tables seem to have an odd font and the note should be against a superscript a as in a footnote.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Bits text such as (12.8) from the 'Name' column. Do the same for Tabel 33-17. Check the font used for these tables and correct the note to be a footnote to the table.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.2** *P* **76** *L* **24** # **243**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Delete all mention of PD as there are not PD register bits remaining. Note that if MIB comment adds a PD register bit back this change should be rejected.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete all mention of PD as there are not PD register bits remaining.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.2.3** *P* **76** *L* **34** # **244**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Suggest the bit is called 'MPS Absent' rather than 'MPSabsent'. It is normal to include space in bit names.

SuggestedRemedy

Globally search and replace 'MPSabsent' with 'MPS Absent' in relation to this bit.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.2.4** *P* **76** *L* **51** # **245**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

If during the realignment of the bits with the MIB the 'detecting' value is removed from the Detection Status bits (12.3:1) then this bit will also need upadted.

SuggestedRemedy

If required change the text '... Detected or Delivering Power.' to read '... Delivering Power.'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-17** *P* **75** *L* **30** # **246**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

LH is listed in the notes but not used in the Table.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove LH from the Table 33-17 notes.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.1** *P* **75** *L* **6** # **247**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The text 'The default value for each bit of the PSE Control register should be chosen so that the initial state of the PSE upon power up or reset is a normal operational state without management intervention.' conflicts with the fact the Table 33-17 now has a defaults column (which in the case of 11.3:2 gives both possible options).

SuggestedRemedy

Either remove the introductory text, update it to match the provision of defaults with something like 'the recommended default values are provided in Table 33-17' or delete the defaults column.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove 'default' column in table 33-17

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.1.2** *P* **75** *L* **41** # **248**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Incorrect cross reference, 33.2.3 is the state diagram, the PD Detection function is specified in 33.2.4.

SuggestedRemedy

Chage the text '... 33.2.3 ...' to read '... 33.2.4 ...'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1** *P* **74** *L* **47** # **250**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The the title and first paragraph of this subclause needs to be reworded. It was written while prior to full agreement on the architectural model for DTE Power via MDI and has not been updated since. While Clause 33 is not a PHY it still seems reasonable to use Clause 22 'PHY specific' registers for PSE operation. In addition it contains a typo where it states that register 12 is used by PDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest the text is updated to simply read :
'PSE registers
A PSE shall use register address 11 for its control and register address 12 for its status functions. A PSE shall use register address 12 for its status functions.' [Note typo correction and removal of PD now it requires no registers]

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Change text to:

'PSE registers
A PSE shall use register address 11 for its control and register address 12 for its status functions.'

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6** *P* **74** *L* **40** # **251**
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Need to remove mention of PD now that it has no registers. Also need to predicate the existence of a MII and GMII with the PSE being integrated with a PHY - PSE would not normally have a MII/GMII.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest the text 'Management of the PSE or PD is optional. If a Clause 22 MII or a Clause 35 GMII is physically implemented ...' is changed to read 'Management of the PSE is optional. If the PSE is instantiated in the same physical package as a PHY and a Clause 22 MII or a Clause 35 GMII is physically implemented ...'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **00** *P* **1** *L* **1** # **257**
Berger, Catherine IEEE

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

"Supplement" will be changed to "Amendment" throughout, even in the running heads.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See #300

Cl **22** *SC* **22.2.4** *P* **4** *L* **16** # **258**
Berger, Catherine IEEE

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

On page 6 of the PDF, delete the period and the words "the last" from the editing instructions that read, "Change the last Table 22-6 as follows:."

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **Figure 30-3** *P* **10** *L* **1** # **259**
Berger, Catherine IEEE

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

For Figure 30-3 (pg 12 of the PDF), are you just changing the title of the figure, or is there nev material in the figure? If you are just changing the title, I would reword the editing instructions to read, "Change the title of Figure 30-3 as follows:" If there have been changes made to the figure, they should be underlined.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace: "Change the Figure 30-3 as follows:" with "Delete existing Figure 30-3 and insert the following figure:"

Also, remove the change bars from the title.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5** *P* **46** *L* **44** # **260**
Berger, Catherine IEEE

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Page 48 of the PDF-Why do the notes for Table 33-2 begin numbering with Note 5 instead of Note 1? (Table 33-14 has a similar issue.)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Items 1 thru 4 do not require additional notes. Notes have been moved into subclauses.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.3** *P* **59** *L* **1** # **261**
Berger, Catherine IEEE

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

In Table 33-9, the top cell under conditions uses a dash to indicate "through" (I believe), but cells two and three under that heading use a "to." If they mean the same thing, please pick one and use throughout. (Other tables have similar issues. The same style should be used in every table.)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.7** *P* **78** *L* **30** # **262**
Berger, Catherine IEEE

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

In the PICS proforma for Clause 33, you include IEEE Std 802.3af-2002. I suggest changing the year to 200x.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33A** *SC* **33A** *P* **92** *L* **9** # **263**
Berger, Catherine IEEE

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

For the annexes- You may delete the sentence "This annex is informative only and not part of the standard." The "informative" label says all that.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

We will conform to the IEEE style.

Cl **00** *SC* **00** *P* **1** *L* **1** # **264**
Berger, Catherine IEEE

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Please make sure all figures and tables have the appropriate permissions and identifications i any have been taken from another source.

At the time of submission to the Board, or just prior to publication, you will need to supply a mailing address for each member of the working group that worked on the document. This will ensure that all members of the working group receive a complimentary copy of the standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

The figures and tables were all generated within the WG. There are no copyrighted figures or tables in the document.

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-3** *P* **49** *L* **10** # **265**
Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Column 4 in Table 33-3 heading is misleading. Maximum power
implies a single number not a range of power levels.
suggested_remedy = "Power Level Range at input of PD" or something similar..

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved by resolution of #231

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-11** *P* **61** *L* **18** # **266**
Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Third column heading is misleading.

SuggestedRemedy

Power consumed by PD. or something similar

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Range of maximum power used by the PD

Cl **00** *SC* **Cover** *P* *L* **2** # **269**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

This is an amendment, we no longer do supplements.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace supplement with amendment on: cover line 2, all page headers, page 1 line 4, page 3 line 4, page 7 line 4, page 21 line 4. Document title should read
"Information Technology ...
"physical layer specifications
"Amendment: Data Terminal Equipment (DTE) Power via Media Dependent Interface (MDI)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See #300

Cl **00** *SC* **Cover** *P* *L* **39** # **270**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Just a reminder that the next draft will be published in 2003.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the copyright year to 2003. Also needs to be updated in all footers.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.1.4** *P* **9** *L* **12** # **271**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

The list is getting rather long.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace list of subclauses with "30.3 through 30.10".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.5** *P* **11** *L* **42** # **272**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Another growing list.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace list of tables with "30-1 through 30-4".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.9.1.1.4** *P* **14** *L* **12** # **273**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

References the wrong bit and has a bad cross reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read: "map to the Pair Control bits specified in 33.6.1.1.3.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.9.1.1.5** *P* **14** *L* **31** # **274**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Name of bit has changed ("Test" has been added).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Detection Test Control".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.2** *P* **37** *L* **5** # **278**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

"this specification" is vague.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "specification" with "this clause".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.3** *P* **37** *L* **16** # **279**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Improve formatting.

SuggestedRemedy

Center figure and align text under the figure. Add "PD = Powered Device" and delete "(PD)" from the figure title. Apply jagged edge to left side of medium for consistency with other 802.3 architectural pictures (e.g., Figure 44-1).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **38** *L* **9** # **280**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Improve formatting. Stub length has grown uncomfortably long.

SuggestedRemedy

Truncate the Medium on the left closer to the MID. Add "PSE = Power Sourcing Equipment" to the definition list and delete "(PSE)" from the figure title. Apply jagged edge to right side of medium for consistency with other 802.3 architectural pictures (e.g., Figure 44-1).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **38** *L* **26** # **282**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Inconsistent style with other architectural figures in Std 802.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "PSE = Power Sourcing Equipment" to the definition list and delete "(PSE)" from the figure title.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3.2** *P* **40** *L* **42** **#** **283**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

"error_condition" should have defined values.

SuggestedRemedy

Add: "Values: FALSE: No fault condition TRUE: A fault condition exists"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **General** *P* *L* **#** **284**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *sm*

The state diagrams do not take advantage of the definitions of 21.5, nor are they consistent. Variables do not need to be tested against TRUE or FALSE if they are defined as having these boolean values. The state diagrams also use lower case "true" and "false" which is not consistent with conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

In Figures 33-5, 33-6, 33-13, delete all instances of "= true", and for all instances of "="false" precede the variable name with "!" and delete "false". Where an assignment is made, replace "true" with "TRUE" and "false" with "FALSE".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved with resolution to comment # 182

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3.1** *P* **40** *L* **30** **#** **285**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The reference should be one more level down, though the usage of Table 33-19 is in my opinion undesirable. It is an unnecessary level of indirection, and is ambiguous in its interpretation for at least two variables (ambiguity is reflected in differing variable treatment in the state diagram).

SuggestedRemedy

Preferred: remove the table (details in another comment).
Alternate: move 33.6.1.3 to become 33.2.3.5 and modify the sentence with the cross reference.
At a minimum: change cross reference to 33.6.1.3

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

change cross reference to 33.6.1.3

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3.4** *P* **42** *L* **28** **#** **288**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X** *eze*

The function definitions include variable definitions. All variables should be defined in the same section (33.2.3.2)

SuggestedRemedy

Move definitions of signature, do_classification, and mr_pd_class_detected to the variable section. Add text to describe the variables that the functions set values. Add a reference to the relevant section for the function (do_classification is described in 33.2.7 and apply_probes is described in 33.2.5 and 33.2.6).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **57** *L* **50** **#** **290**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Bad grammar. Use of hyphens is inconsistent (e.g., Mode-A).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read: ". . . able to operate in either the PD Mode A or the PD Mode B column in Table 33-8."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3.2** *P* **41** *L* **50** **#** **291**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Residual usage of "state machine".

SuggestedRemedy

Change definition to read: "Control that unconditionally resets the PSE state diagram to the IDLE state."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.2.2** *P* **58** *L* **19** # **292**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Cut and paste error.

SuggestedRemedy

Change definition to read: "Control that unconditionally resets the PD state diagram to the NOT_MDI_POWERED state."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.1.2** *P* **75** *L* **42** # **295**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

PD Dectection function is not the best capitalization or wording.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read ". . . of PD dectection specified in ..."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.2.3** *P* **76** *L* **41** # **297**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Typos (space and capitalization).

SuggestedRemedy

Change title to MPS Absent as well as three occurrences in the paragraph, also correct capitalization in Table 33-18 (p. 77, l. 9).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **PICS** *P* **78** *L* **35** # **299**
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

The document will not be published in 2002.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 2003 or 200x and make consistent with p. 79, l. 26.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See # 262 - 200x

Cl **00** *SC* *P* *L* **1** # **300**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Title is incorrect. The IEEE-SA no longer does "supplements". The current term is "amendment"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Supplement to..." in title to "Amendment to..."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* *L* # **301**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Copyright date of 2002 will be obsolete for the next roll of the draft

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances of "Copyright 2002" to "Copyright 2003"
(Both cover page and page footers)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **2** *L* **21** # **303**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Note that the term "Link Section" here is not the same as a "section" as used in clause 50 (the WIS) where "section" is used in the SONET sense. I don't see any problem there but there is likely to be confusion between terms in clause 30.

SuggestedRemedy

??

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

Withdrawn. Use aligns with section in the coaxial cable sense. See 1.4.74 and uses in claus 10.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **2** *L* **23** # **304**

Thompson, Geoff — Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

While there is nothing wrong with the current text I would prefer to change it to align to the existing definition of "Group".
(1.4.137 group: A repeater port or a collection of repeater ports that can be related to the logical arrangement of ports within a repeater.)

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read:
1.4.x PSE Group: A PSE or a collection of PSEs that can be related to the logical arrangement for management within an encompassing system.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **2** *L* **25** # **305**

Thompson, Geoff — Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

At this point the capitalized term "Endpoint PSE" has been used twice but it does not appear in the definitions.

SuggestedRemedy

Either:
Change to (lower case) endpoint PSE
- or -
Add the term "Endpoint PSE" to the list of defined terms.
(I somewhat prefer the first solution)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add Endpoint PSE definition. Additionally, add Midspan PSE definition.

Endpoint PSE: Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE) that is located at an endpoint.

Midspan PSE: Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE) that is located in the Midspan.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **2** *L* **29** # **306**

Thompson, Geoff — Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

The "e.g." is in the wrong place for sentence construction
1.4.x Twisted Pair Medium Dependent Interface (TP MDI): The mechanical and electrical interface between the transmission medium and the Medium Attachment Unit (MAU), e.g., (10BASE-T) or PHY (100BASE-TX or 1000BASE-T).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
1.4.x Twisted Pair Medium Dependent Interface (TP MDI): The mechanical and electrical interface between the transmission medium and the Medium Attachment Unit (MAU) or PHY, e.g., (10BASE-T, 100BASE-TX or 1000BASE-T).
(Also, note for maintenance: The title of Table 25-2 should be changed from "UTP MDI..." to "TP-MDI...". Shielded cabling is not excluded. Whether or not "balanced cabling" is or not is arguable.)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **Figure 30-3** *P* **10** *L* **30** # **307**

Thompson, Geoff — Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

In the oMAU objects in the diagram it looks like the center digit (i.e. the "5" in the "30.5.1") is i a smaller font.
(BTW: Question to David: I thought the WIS was equivalent to a MAU not below it WRT relationship. Please explain)

SuggestedRemedy

Change the "5" font size to match others.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Have the editor inspect the font size to ensure they are the same.

Cl **30** *SC* *P* *L* **#** **309**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

General editorial comment:
There seem to be a lot of lines hanging across page breaks within the attribute descriptions.

SuggestedRemedy

Set the paragraph attributes to keep together.
Consult w/ C.K. Berger to determine proper paragraph templates for this clause and re-attribute.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This will be done by the IEEE editorial staff at document submission.

Cl **30A** *SC* **30A.16.1** *P* **22** *L* **49** **#** **310**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The terminology used here is "GET-REPLACE"
The terminology used in Table 30-4 is "GET-SET"
This should be made consistent

SuggestedRemedy

Fix here and all other appropriate places in the draft.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

GET-SET is consistent with Clause 30. No changes to the document required

Cl **30B** *SC* *P* **35** *L* **#** **316**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Blank page keeps Clause 33 from starting on face up page.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove extra (2nd of 2 in a row) almost blank page from draft.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1** *P* **36** *L* **7** **#** **317**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The sense of the 1st paragraph is incorrect in that it discusses only one entity where 2 are being specified:

SuggestedRemedy

This clause defines optional power (non-data) entities for use with existing physical layers as defined in Clauses 14, 25 and 40. These entities (i.e. PSE and PD) allow devices to supply/draw power using the same generic cabling as that used for data transmission. This clause is optional only in the sense that systems may or may not employ powering via the MDI. All implementations of the twisted-pair link shall be compatible at the MDI. Designers are free to implement circuitry within the PD and PSE (in an application-dependent manner) provided the MDI specifications are met.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved with the resolution to comment #153

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1** *P* **36** *L* **7** **#** **318**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Note: There is no requirement for systems to be compatible at the non-MDI PI.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text of paragraph 1 to fix this or leave as is which will allow for broad variatitions i Mid Span interfaces such a punch-downs, proprietary connectors and various other low-crosstalk/insertion loss connection schemes.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Resolved with resolution of comment #154

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1** *P* **36** *L* **21** **#** **319**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The following text is technically inaccurate:
e) a method for removing power when a PD is disconnected or power is no longer requested.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
e) a method for scaling supplied power back to the detect level when power is no longer requested or required.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.1** *P* **36** *L* **42** # **320**

Thompson, Geoff — Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Sentence construction is clumsy and unclear or not true:
"Specifications that are defined at the MDI that is a PI apply to an Endpoint PSE."
..is not quite true because they might apply instead to a PD

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
Specifications that are defined at the MDI that is a PI apply to an Endpoint PSE.
to:
PSE power interface specifications that are defined at the MDI apply to an Endpoint PSE.
(and add for clarity if you wish: "They may or may not apply to a Midspan PI.")

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.3** *P* **36** *L* **42** # **321**

Thompson, Geoff — Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Page break error. There is plenty of room left on this page (25 lines) for the next figure which requires only about 16 lines.
As a rough estimate it lookls like that with a little graphics editing that all 3 figures could make it onto the lead page. This would be a good thing to do

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
Move 1 or possibly 2 of the figures onto the opening page of the clause.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

This reformatting happened as a result of resolution of comment 156.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2** *P* **38** *L* **38** # **322**

Thompson, Geoff — Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Ed Note: This comment did not have a CommentType assigned by the author. The comment editor assigned it a value of 'E'.

I would propose to change the following text for improved technical accuracy: The PSE's main functions are to search the link segment for a PD, optionally classify the PD, supply power to the link segment only if a PD is detected, monitor the power on the link segment, and remove power from the link segment when a PD is disconnected or no longer requests power.

SuggestedRemedy

Propose changing to: The PSE's main functions are to search the link segment for a PD, optionally classify the PD, supply power to the link segment only if a PD is detected, monitor the power on the link segment, and scale power back to the detect level when power is no longer requested or required. (Optional sentence: Disconnection is one instance when power is no longer required.)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The PSE's main functions are to search the link segment for a PD, optionally classify the PD, supply power to the link segment only if a PD is detected, monitor the power on the link segment, and scale power back to the detect level when power is no longer requested or required. An unplugged link segment is one instance when power is no longer required.

see #319 - doesn't really apply except that we agreed to change to scale back power elsewhere - Chad

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.1.3** *P* **39** *L* **3** # **323**

Thompson, Geoff — Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The text: "A PSE device may provide power via one of two valid four-wire connections. In each four-wire connection, the two wires associated with a pair carry the same nominal current in each conductor."
does not specifically differentiate between a phantom circuit and two unbalanced circuits. I would prefer that the text more specifically denote our use of a phantom circuit.

SuggestedRemedy

How about:
"A PSE device may provide power via one of two valid four-wire connections. In each four-wire connection, the two conductors associated with a pair each carry the same nominal current in both magnitude and polarity."
...or I am open to suggestion.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3.3** *P* **42** *L* **7** # **324**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Space missing at the end of the line, also unecessary line break in the middle of a word.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "A timer used to regulate backoff upon detection of an invalid signature, see 33.2.8.1and Table 33-
6.
To:
"A timer used to regulate backoff upon detection of an invalid signature,
see 33.2.8.1 and Table 33-6."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4** *P* **44** *L* **31** # **325**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Editorial, somewhat vague antecedent.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: In an operational mode the PSE shall not apply operating power to the PI until it has successfully detected a PD requesting power as described in this section.
To: In an operational mode the PSE shall not apply operating power to the PI until the PSE has successfully detected a PD requesting power as described in this section.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.4** *P* **62** *L* **1** # **328**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

Editorial. Table placement error.
There should not be a single line of text above the table. the table should be at the end of the sub-clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the table anchor to the end of the sub-clause text

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.5.3.1** *P* **64** *L* **3** # **329**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

I think there is a Style Manual problem with this sub-clause. It appears taht the entire text of the clause is a note.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "Cautionary note: When..."
To: "Caution, when..."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.4.7** *P* **69** *L* **44** # **331**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The reference to X3.263:1995 should be updated.
Oops, I just checked the ISO web site and it never has been approved at ISO.

SuggestedRemedy

We should get our Working Group Chair (Mr. Grow) who is nearly the sole survivor of X3T9.5 to get the convenor of SC25/WG4 (Mr. Robinson) to clean this up and get CD9314-10 approved.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.1** *P* **75** *L* **11** # **333**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

There seems to be minor style problems with the table.
1. Footnote designator "a" should be superscripted at bottom of table and period should be removed (ref Style Manual: 15.1).
2. It looks like the digits in 11.15:5 are not all othe same font size.
3. The line break in "Force Power Test Control" should be forced so that a word is not split.
4. The line wrap in "Test mode enabled to force power sourcing" should be indented so the 2nd line starts justified to "Test". An alternative would be to shorten the text to: "Test mode: Force power sourcing"

SuggestedRemedy

Fix. Also add parens to "11.3" and "11.2" in row 3, cell 3.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.1.1** *P* **75** *L* **33** # **334**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R** *eze*

The title and text of this subclause refer to the bits in plural.
There is only one reserved bit.

SuggestedRemedy

Re-edit to the singular.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

There are 11 bits, thus the plural reference.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.1.1.5** *P* **76** *L* **22** # **336**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The note: "This bit can not be used to force power onto the PI, but merely to enable the PSE to provide power onto the PI if a PD is detected."
...seems unnecessary given the text immediately above on lines 12-14.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the note

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

this will be fixed with the change to an enumerated type.

Cl **33** *SC* **Table 33-18** *P* **77** *L* **11** # **337**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *eze*

There seems to be minor style problems with the table.
1. Footnote designator "a" should be superscripted at bottom of table and period should be removed (ref Style Manual: 15.1).

2. Page line 34 is unclear as to whether it is a table footnote or lost and wandering text that is part of 33.6.1.2.4

SuggestedRemedy

Fix. Also add parens to bit designating column headers in table col. 3

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.7.3.2** *P* **81** *L* **9** # **338**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *PICS*

Ed Note: This comment did not have a CommentType assigned by the author. The comment editor assigned it a value of 'T'.

The PICS provides no information as to which options are chose for implementation. In addition to being a statement of conformance, a completed PICS should also be a statement of which implementation options have been chosen by the manufacturer.

SuggestedRemedy

Amend PICS pro forma to provide for indication of which implementation options have been chosen. In this particular case PSE1 would indicate which of the 3 was chosen, not just that one of the 3 was chosen. PSE2 would be conditional on PSE1 not being both and would indicate "A" or "B".

The same requirements should be applied throughout the PICS pro forma.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Ask Gerry Nadeau, the PICS editor, to perform the changes.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.7.3.2** *P* **81** *L* **44** # **339**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Not clear what the asterisk refers to. Is it a footnote designator or an arithimetic operator.

SuggestedRemedy

Edit for clarity.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make symbol line centered.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.7.3.2** *P* **81** *L* **50** # **340**
Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Not clear what the plus sign refers to. Is it a footnote designator or an arithimetic operator.

SuggestedRemedy

Edit for clarity.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make symbol line centered.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.7.3.2** *P* **85** *L* **34** # **341**

Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Not clear what the asterisk refers to. Is it a footnote designator or an arithimetic operator.

SuggestedRemedy

Edit for clarity or put onto list for specific editing instructions to pubs editor for replacement with a multiplier symbol

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make symbol line centered.

Cl **33** *SC* **00** *P* **36** *L* **1** # **342**

Thompson, Geoff Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

I am somewhat concerned that we have no reasonable overall diagram of what a DTE Power system looks like. There is no illustration in the draft that we can show folks so they can say, "Oh, that's what you mean!"

SuggestedRemedy

Generate appropriate diagram for 33.1

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Editor to replicate diagrams provided by Geoff Thompson titled Cl-33-BlkDiag-as_sent.ppt with instructions provided in TextForComment342.txt.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **2** *L* **16** # **344**

Thaler, Pat

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Powered Device and Power Pourcing Equipment have not been added to the definitions. When other clauses use PD and PSE, a reader should be able to go to the definitions section for a breif definitions of the terms (after they have decoded then with the acronyms section)..

SuggestedRemedy

Add to definitions section 1.4:

1.4.x PSE: Power Sourcing Equipment

1.4.x PD: Powered Device

Proposed Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

See section 1.5