## comments

Cl 33 SC 2.7.2a								
Diab, Wael	P 38 Broadcom	L 48	# 173	CI 33 SC LANDRY, MATT	<b>2.8.14</b> HEW	P <b>45</b> SILICON LABS	L <b>41</b>	# 5
around it. The way it st	Comment Status <b>D</b> and 161, this text needs to be retands, it says you shall implement ound. I believe that the editor is tr	t this and you ma	ay then omit. This	Comment Type Is this a prop SuggestedReme If not, change	edy	Comment Status <b>D</b> the 'CAUTION' statement?  OTE.		editorial
•	ragraph with a state machine			Proposed Respo	onse	Response Status O		
Proposed Response	Response Status O			see 29				
also see 196, 272  Cl 33 SC 2.8	P <b>40</b>	L <b>23</b>	# 134	Cl 33 SC Schindler, Fred	2.8.2a	P <b>42</b> Cisco Systems	L 17	# 135
Schindler, Fred	Cisco Systems	L 2J	π 134	Comment Type	TR	Comment Status D		editorial
Comment Type E Consider using "k" or s SuggestedRemedy Suggest using "KTran_ Proposed Response	Comment Status <b>D</b> something other than "V" to conve	ey that a constan	editorial t is being used.	action to tak SuggestedReme Modify the e than VTran_	e when a section of the section of t	e does not convey the intent for F short circuit condition exists. hence to: "A Type 2 PSE shall m port min for transient conditions the requirements of section 33.2	naintain an ou lasting more	utput voltage of no less
	Nesponse Status U			Proposed Respo	onse	Response Status O		
Cl 33 SC 2.8 Schindler, Fred	P40 Cisco Systems	L <b>4</b>	# [131	, ,		Response Status <b>0</b> sadding this:		
Schindler, Fred  Comment Type TR	P <b>40</b>	·	editorial	comment re	commends	s adding this: nents of section 33.2.8.8"		
Schindler, Fred  Comment Type TR  Combine the two senters	P 40 Cisco Systems Comment Status D	·	editorial	comment re	commends	s adding this: nents of section 33.2.8.8"		
Schindler, Fred  Comment Type TR  Combine the two sente sentence.  SuggestedRemedy  Use the sentence: "Whelectrical requirements	P 40 Cisco Systems Comment Status D	intent is conveyed at PD, the PSE se to meet the e	editorial ed within one shall meet the	comment re "and meet the to the end of the See 247	commends	s adding this: nents of section 33.2.8.8"	L 23	# [136

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

CI **33** SC **2.8.5**  Page 1 of 3 11/19/2007 9:50:28 AM

#### comments

CI 33	SC 2.9	P <b>45</b>	L <b>51</b>	# 140
Schindler,	Fred	Cisco Systems		-

Comment Type TR Comment Status D editorial

The text, "The PSE may manage .... the attached PD.", removed from the legacy standard is still valid.

SuggestedRemedy

Restore the text.

Proposed Response Status O

this is baseline text we pulled out after D0.9. comment 148 from D0.9 struck it. D0.9 Comment 148:

The text states that '.. and the mechanism for obtaining that additional information, is beyond the scope of this standard ..'. I do not believe that is true anymore due to the link layer classification protocol.

Remedy:

Reword to acknoledge link layer classification.

Response:

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete 2nd paragraph of 33.2.9

not much help here...

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

editorial

This section does not accurately reflect the decisions we made in October. Specifically, it mandates that a Type PD implement classification, which breaks 802.3-2005. Moreover, it rules out certain combinations that the table in diab\_2\_1007.pdf allows, like classifying a Type 2 PD using one event classification and DLL.

It is very difficult to retain this wording here as it is without getting into classification.

# SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite this section as follows:

PDs can be categorized as either Type 1 or Type 2 (refer to 1.4). PDs may also implement Physical Layer Classification and/or Data Link Layer Classification. Permutations allowed by the standard are covered in section 33.3.4.

A Type 2 PD is required to achieve mutual identification with a Type 2 PSE as described in section 33.4. A Type 2 PD that does not achieve mutual identification shall conform to Type 1 PD power restrictions. Such a PD shall provide the user with local external notification that it is underpowered. The external notification mechanism is left to the implementor.

Proposed Response Response Status O

The new text is missing the shall that mandates the Type 2 PD to implement 2-event and DLL. For sure this is still a requirement. 202 points to 33.3.4 - the shalls are there. Maybe this text needs to have all shalls removed and be informative.

Cl 33 SC 3.3 P54 L23 # 253
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D editorial

The parameter name was changed from VI to slope.

Table 33-8 still uses V-I slope.

Pick a consistent name.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Status O

#### comments

CI 33 SC 3.4 P56 L2 # 168

Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D editorial

Please insert a copy of the Table and associated text from diab\_2\_1007.pdf in this section with introductory text, prior to the text present as the table covers both PSE and PD implementations.

SuggestedRemedy

Please insert a copy of the Table and associated text from diab\_2\_1007.pdf at the begining of this section with the following introductory text:

"An 802.3at PD implementing classification shall meet one of the permutaiuons lsted in Table 33-2a"

Proposed Response Response Status **O**set to T by CE.

Cl 33 SC 3.5.2 P61 L3 # 162

Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D editorial

"NOTE—Duty cycle shall be calculated using any sliding window with a 1 s width."

This note contains a shall and the note is in the wrong place.

There is no mention of duty cycle in 33.3.5.2 where it is located.

Lastly can we spell out second?

### SuggestedRemedy

change it to "Duty cycle is calculated using any sliding window with a 1 second width." move it to section 33.3.5.4 just after the first paragraph.

Proposed Response Status O