

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 00 SC 00 P L # 467  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The current ballot claims that it is referenced against P802.3ay Draft 2.1.  
 As of the date of the close of this ballot, 2.1 is not longer the current draft

SuggestedRemedy

The next draft should be referenced against the draft of P802.3ay that is current at the time the next ballot is issued. Any changes to the P802.3at draft that are a result of changes to the P802.3ay since D2.1 should be marked with an editor's note saying as much.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Editor to check AY for changes that affect our draft.

CI 00 SC 00 P L # 484  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 00

The text provided for management via LLDP is not complete. I recognize that the IETF is no longer willing to do the SMNP and 802.3 will be doing that job.  
 As far as I know this change of situation has not lead to any change in requirements for 802.3 development projects, thus for the P802.3at draft to be complete, it needs to include the management material normally included in Annex 30A (OID registration arcs) and Annex 30B (enumerated values for syntax).

SuggestedRemedy

Add appropriate material for Annex A and Annex B  
 Since the WG Ballot was conducted (inappropriately) on an incomplete draft the Working Group Ballot should be reinitiated or (at a minimum) the recirculation should have an extended period AND open the entire draft for comment.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Geoff to work with Adhoc to add appropriate material for Annex A and Annex B.

WG chair to rule on recirc/reballot requirement.

CI 00 SC 00 P L # 254  
 Jody Williamson Leading Edge Diagnos

Comment Type T Comment Status X 4P

There is a large market for PDs that requires more power than allowed for 2P only.

There is a large market for PDs that requires more allowed over 2P only.

In addition PD users may enhance system efficiency even if they are using the maximum power allowed for 2P and delivering it simultaneously over all 4P. In this case the cable power loss is reduced by 50% and implementing it in the PD is relatively easy.

There are currently 4P PSEs and PDs that working well. From system point of view, each 2P PSE is driving 2P PD interface hence the 2P base specification is kept for each 2P.

The rest is implementation.

The current text precludes easy and well proven implementations that required to simultaneously operate ALT A and B over the same cable and from the same segment which doesn't make sense.

SuggestedRemedy

Explicitly specify what configurations the specification wants to prevent and allow those that use ALT A and B from the same segment or power supply OR delete this text.

In addition, delete the note in page 57 the preclude PD to get power from ALT A and B simultaneously.

This is implementation issue as long as each 2P meets the specification in this standard.

Proposed Response Response Status W

reviewed

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 00 SC 00 P L # 515  
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

We should state in the reference to Figures 33-4 through 33-7 that these are illustrative rather than have a note elsewhere.

SuggestedRemedy

[1] Change the text 'See Figure 33-4, Figure 33-5, Figure 33-6, and Figure 33-7.' to read 'The location of Alternative A and Alternative B Endpoint PSE and Midspan PSEs are illustrated in Figure 33-4, Figure 33-5, Figure 33-6, and Figure 33-7.'

[2] Delete the note on line 26 that reads 'NOTE-Figure 33-4, Figure 33-5, Figure 33-6, and Figure 33-7 are for illustrative purposes only.'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 00 P L # 141  
 Thomas Dineen Dineen Consulting

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Delete or modify Objectives 5, 9 10, 11, and 12! Objective should be clear, crisp, and concise thus making it straight forward for the reviewer of your draft to determine if they have been met! Keep in mind here that I consider this comment to be well within the proper scope of a WG Ballot in that part of the ballot review involves a determination of whether the draft meets the objectives.

Keep in mind here that I am not opposed to you project, I am concerned however that you objective list is bloated with non specific items that should be deleted of replaced with something more specific.

By this point in the project your "research", "vigorous pursuit", and "revisiting" should be concluded with concise results that can be boiled down to proper objectives.

"Objective 5 The enhanced standard will provide the maximum power to the PD as allowed within practical limits"

Objective 5 should be deleted because it is redundant to objective 6 and yet less specific thus offering no value. Also Objective 5 is in appropriate and non specific.

"Objective 9 Research potential extension of power classification to support PoEPlus modes"

Objective 9 is an inappropriate and non specific objective and should therefor be deleted or replaced. We do not specify "research" in an objective. How is the reader of the draft to determine if the research has been completed properly and thus the objective met? You either support the extension of power classification or you do not. No research Please delete or replace with something more specific.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

"Objective 10 PoE Plus will vigorously pursue supporting the operation of midspan PSEs for 1000BASE-T."

Objective 9 is an inappropriate and non specific objective and should therefor be deleted or replaced. We do not specify "vigorously pursue" in an objective. How is the reader of the draft to determine if the if the appropriate degree of vigor has been achieved and thus the objective met? You either specify operation with 1000BASE-T or you do not. No research. Please delete or replace with something more specific.

"Objective 11 Research the operations of midspan and endpoint PSEs for 10GBASE-T including providing cable heating data for evaluation by IEEE P802.3an."

Objective 11 is an inappropriate and non specific objective and should therefor be deleted or replaced. We do not specify "research" in an objective. How is the reader of the draft to determine if the research has been completed properly and thus the objective met? You either specify operation with 10GBASE-T or you do not. No research. Please delete or replace with something more specific.

"Objective 12 That IEEE 802.3af power over the MDI isolation requirements be revisited as part of the PoE Plus work"

Objective 12 is an inappropriate and non specific objective and should therefor be deleted or replaced. We do not specify "revisited" in an objective. How is the reader of the draft to determine if the revisiting has been completed properly and thus the objective met? You either specify MDI isolation requirements or you do not. No revisits. Please delete or replace with something more specific.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete or modify comments as discussed above.

*Response* *Response Status* **W**  
REJECT.

It is absolutely correct that it is in scope to comment on if the draft meets the objectives - it isn't in scope to comment on the objectives themselves - this is done during the adoption of the objectives by the Working Group.

The comment contents have been referred to the P802.3at TF and 802.3 WG chairs via e-mail for further disposition but as comment makes no specific recommendation for changes to the draft it is rejected.

---

<i>Cl</i> <b>00</b>	<i>SC</i> <b>00</b>	<i>P</i>	<i>L</i>	# <b>504</b>
Diab, Wael		Broadcom		

*Comment Type* **TR** *Comment Status* **A**  
Please resolve where the TLVs for 802.3at will reside. Will it be in 802.1, 802.3 at or somewhere else

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Please see comment

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

We intend to keep it in 802.1 hence, we have requested an IEEE Std 802.1AB "IEEE 802.3 subtype" (IEEE 802.3 organizationally specific TLV) from IEEE802.1 with the intent of including LLDP TLVs in 802.3at.

---

<i>Cl</i> <b>00</b>	<i>SC</i> <b>00</b>	<i>P3</i>	<i>L</i>	# <b>495</b>
Diab, Wael		Broadcom		

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **X**  
Please update the Frontmatter to match the generic FM provided to 802.3 Task Forces.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Generic FM can be found in the tools area or requested from the WG C or VC.

*Proposed Response* *Response Status* **W**  
Clause was set to '03'. Clause 03 not open for balloting, set to 00 to facilitate the import.

Reviewed

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 01 SC 01.1.4 P13 L18 # 48  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

"1000BASE-T midspan PSE" is defined as "A midspan that will result in a link that can support 10BASE-T, 100BASE-TX, and 1000BASE-T operation."  
 What is a "midspan"? This definition is different from that in 32.2.2

SuggestedRemedy

Change to be the same as the definition in 32.2.2 making the definition: "A midspan PSE that will result in a link that can support 10BASE-T, 100BASE-TX, and 1000BASE-T operation."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

See 49,365

CI 01 SC 01.1.4 P13 L21 # 49  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

"10BASE-T/100BASE-TX midspan PSE" is defined as "A midspan that will result in a link that can only support 10BASE-T and 100BASE-TX operation."  
 What is a "midspan"? This definition is different from that in 32.2.2

SuggestedRemedy

Change to be the same as the definition in 32.2.2 making the definition: "A midspan PSE that will result in a link that can only support 10BASE-T and 100BASE-TX operation."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

See 48, 365

CI 01 SC 01.1.4 P13 L28 # 50  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A

There are definitions for "Type 1" and "Type 2"  
 When inserted in to 802.3 these definitions will appear next to  
 "Type: A 2 octet value that indicates the nature of the MAC client protocol. Type values are assigned by the IEEE Registration Authority. (See: IEEE 802.3, 3.2.6.)" which will be confusing

SuggestedRemedy

Change these to "PSE or PD Type x" to become:

1.4.x PSE or PD type 1: A PSE or PD that is designed for IEEE Std 802.3™-2005 power levels.

1.4.x PSE or PD type 2: A PSE or PD that is designed for greater than IEEE Std 802.3™-2005 power levels.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We will submit a maintenance request to change Type to Ethertype throughout the rest of the document.

See 108

CI 01 SC 01.3 P13 L11 # 106  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

The ISO/IEC TR NWIP was approved (see liaison from March 2008), so the editor's note does not need to point out that it is up for vote.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the first sentence of the editor's note: "The vote on the NWIP for this Technical Report is currently taking place."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 478

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 01 SC 01.3 P13 L7 # 497  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

The editor's note is confusing. The only thing the note should state is that the reference will be updated upon publication of the TR

SuggestedRemedy

Please delete the language regarding the vote on the TR. Retain language to point to the TR name

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 478

Cl 01 SC 01.4 P13 L # 107  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The term "Midspan" should be capitalized.

SuggestedRemedy

Capitalize occurrences of "Midspan."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type blank, set to E as default.

Cl 01 SC 01.4 P13 L27 # 108  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The current definitions of "Type 1" and "Type 2" are rather vague and not too helpful. At best, they would encourage the reader to go look up an old, deprecated version of Clause 33 to get an idea of what the terms mean.

Tables 33-5 and 33-1 do an admirable job of capturing many of the Type 1/2 behaviors. They should be used as the basis for the definitions.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace definitions with some semblance of the following:

Type 1: A PSE or PD that meets the criteria for Type 1 in Table 33-1 and Table 33-5.

Type 2: A PSE or PD that meets the criteria for Type 2 in Table 33-1 and Table 33-5.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 274, 275

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 01 SC 01.4 P13 L 28 # 274  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status A power levels

"A PSE or PD that is designed for IEEE Std 802.3T-2005 power levels"

IEEE Std 802.3-2005 will shortly be replaced by a newer revision. That revision will, in turn be replaced by another revision (probably including this amendment).

Do not refer to a specific revision of 802.3. If you wish to specify a power level, then state the power level.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace

"A PSE or PD that is designed for IEEE Std 802.3T-2005 power levels"

with

"

A PSE or PD that is designed for power levels between 0.5 and 12.95W (at the PD)"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace

"1.4.x Type 1: A PSE or PD that is designed for IEEE Std 802.3™-2005 power levels."

with

"1.4.x Type 1 PD: A PD that advertizes a power draw less then or equal to 12.95W (at the PD).

1.4.x Type 1 PSE: A PSE that is designed to support a Type 1 PD."

See 275, 404

CI 01 SC 01.4 P13 L 30 # 275  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type ER Comment Status A power levels

"A PSE or PD that is designed for IEEE Std 802.3T-2005 power levels"

IEEE Std 802.3-2005 will shortly be replaced by a newer revision. That revision will, in turn be replaced by another revision (probably including this amendment).

Do not refer to a specific revision of 802.3. If you wish to specify a power level, then state the power level.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace

"A PSE or PD that is designed for IEEE Std 802.3T-2005 power levels"

with

"A PSE or PD that is designed for power levels greater than 12.95W (at the PD)"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace

"1.4.x Type 2: A PSE or PD that is designed for greater than IEEE Std 802.3™-2005 power levels."

with

"1.4.x Type 2 PD: A PD that advertizes a power draw greater than 12.95W (at the PD).

1.4.x Type 2 PSE: A PSE that is designed to support either a Type 1 or a Type 2 PD."

see 274, 404

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 01 SC 1.3 P13 L11 # 510  
 Law, David 3Com  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A cable  
 A draft of ISO/IEC TR 29125 has been issued designated ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25 N 874.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25 N XXXX.X. to read ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25 N 874.  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE 478 which removed the reference.

CI 01 SC 1.3 P13 L11 # 364  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A cable  
 As <http://iee802.org/3/at/public/mar08/3n864.pdf> says, there is an approved work item proposal (NWIP - like a PAR) for developing ISO/IEC TR 29125; the NWIP is at <http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/livelink/fetch/2000/2122/327993/755080/1054034/2541793/JTC001-N-8766.pdf?nodeid=6786149> but I could not see any sign that even a draft TR exists yet.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 As this TR is essential for Type 2 ???CHECK\*\*\*\*, a draft of P802.3at cannot be considered technically complete until it exists  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE 478

CI 01 SC 1.3 P13 L11 # 478  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A cable  
 The text: "Draft document number ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25 N XXXX.X." is inappropriate and insufficiently complete for a document to go to Working Group Ballot.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 There are several appropriate choices to remedy this, among them are:  
 - Admit that the document was not complete and thus, by rule, not qualified to go to Working Group Ballot and, therefore, withdraw the draft from Working Group Ballot until it is complete, then submit it again to 802.3 for WG Ballot.  
 - Provide an appropriately mature outside reference and access to copies of it so that the balloting group can judge the technical information.  
 - Drop the reference, establish the relevant parameters and their validity (with appropriate documentation) within 802.3 and then use the home grown numbers.  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Use option 3, remove the normative reference. We are not using the document as a normative reference; we are extracting information.

CI 01 SC 1.4 P13 L18 # 365  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Look at 1.4.223 and 1.4.224, for midspan and Midspan PSE respectively. Effectively, 'midspan' is an adjective, and it is distinct from 'Midspan PSE'.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Here, change 'A midspan that will' to 'A midspan PSE that will', twice.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 01 SC 1.4 P13 L19 # 366  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A ez  
 It's standard practice to give the reader a pointer to more information  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please add to the end of each definition, '(See IEEE 802.3, Clause 33.)' or as appropriate  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 01 SC 1.4 P13 L28 # 485  
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A power levels

Replace "IEEE Std 802.3-2005" to "IEEE 802.3", so we do not have to change this for every revision.

SuggestedRemedy

Type 1: A PSE or PD that is designed for IEEE 802.3 power levels

Type 2: A PSE or PD that is designed for greater than IEEE 802.3 power levels

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 274, 275

CI 01 SC 1.4 P13 L28 # 404  
 Booth, Brad AMCC

Comment Type TR Comment Status A power levels

Poor use of reference.

Considering 802.3at will become part of the 802.3 standard, having a reference to a past version of the standard as a means to determine between Type 1 and Type 2 is a poor choice.

SuggestedRemedy

Change reference to the standard to be a reference to the actual power level in IEEE Std. 802.3af.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 274, 275

CI 01 SC 1.4 P13 L30 # 470  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status A power levels

The text: "...for greater than IEEE Std 802.3T-2005 power levels." is not appropriate. It will be difficult for the normal user of the resulting standard to have access to this information. There is no need to make things that difficult for a normal user.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:  
 "for greater than the power levels specified in Table 33-6, class 3."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 274, 275

CI 01 SC 1.4 P13 L30 # 406  
 Zimmerman, George Solarflare Communicat

Comment Type E Comment Status A power levels

Type 2 is specified to be "greater than 802.3-2005" power levels. From this specification, I believe this should be "greater than 802.3-2005, but less than or equal to 802.3at-2xxx" power levels". Otherwise, we're classifying nonstandard devices as "Type 2".

SuggestedRemedy

Add ", but less than or equal to 802.3at-2xxx" power levels" to the type 2 description.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 274, 275

CI 30 SC 30 P15 L1 # 521  
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status D MGMT: Containment

Need to add the containment for the new LLDP objects.

SuggestedRemedy

Update Figure 30-3 and 30-4 and related text as required.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add figures 30-3, 30-4 and related text to draft. Specific updated will be discussed in the meeting.



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 30 SC 30.12 P16 L41 # 458  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D Naming Convention

I don't think I like the naming convention for the attributes and the resulting order that they appear in the standard. I believe it makes it difficult to understand the structure and flow of information.

The current naming convention structure seems to be  
 [o/a][LLDP]{PoEP}[Null/PLoc/PRem][Null/Requested/Actual][ParameterName]  
 This seems to not group parameters together as they should be for (a) easier understanding and (b) sharing of syntax (c) sharing of root names of attributes and their containing objects

SuggestedRemedy

Change to the form of:  
 [o/a][LLDP]{PoEP}[Loc/Rem][ParameterName][Null/Requested/Actual]  
 and rearrange attributes within an object so that root names are grouped together.  
 (If this is turned down, and I hope that it isn't then references would be put in to link other attributes of the related request/response set.)  
 (This will also require some editorial clean up in the attributes for consistency)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. CommentType empty, set to E as default.

This changes the naming convention used. As it does not materially change the content of the document, a quick poll of the room on preference could be done.

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.1 P17 L3 # 479  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D MGMT: Containment

The term or diagram being referred to by the text:  
 "...among the subordinate managed objects of the containing object."  
 is not at all obvious to me.

I find no text or diagram that gives me any guidance whatsoever as to what would be an appropriate object containment structure for a device of this type. It seems to me that some commonality of object containment is appropriate for interoperable systems.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a reference containment diagram (or text) and provide a pointer to it from this text.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comment 521

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.10 P18 L54 # 462  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"non-acknowledge" BEHAVIOR is not clear and insufficient

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: "The change request is acknowledged as received but the request for change is denied."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.10 P19 L5 # 473  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Grammar, currently says:  
 "...response to a requested changes to the power value.;"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to one of:  
 "...response to a requested change to the power value.;"  
 -OR-  
 "...response to requested changes to the power value.;"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.10 P19 L6 # 279  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: GET-SET

aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge

Needs a SET definition

SuggestedRemedy

After the "GET" line, insert

"A SET operation asserts "loss of communication", "acknowledge" or "non-acknowledge" for the local system to the indicated value.;"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This variable is SET by the state machine (which a result of the remote end and the local state). We do not want a network manager to set the value randomly. Therefore it is read-only (GET).

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.11 P19 L 12 # 175  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: Loss Communication

aLostCommunication is defined at 10Mb/s data rate but this does not provide a clear indication of how it works

SuggestedRemedy

Please modify to provide more thorough explanation of how this variable works.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Please refer to comment 477. We normalize to a 10Mb/s link rate and then adjust per link speed (refer to 30.2.1). There is a comment regarding the behaviour of LLDP that is independent of link speed.

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.11 P19 L 12 # 111  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D MGMT: Loss Communication

What does it mean to say that, "this counter has a maximum increment rate of 1 count per second at 10Mb/s?" Is this an implication that the counter should increment at a rate proportional to the link throughput?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify intent, or strike "at 10Mb/s."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Please refer to comment 477. We normalize to a 10Mb/s link rate and then adjust per link speed (refer to 30.2.1). There is a comment regarding the behaviour of LLDP that is independent of link speed.

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.11 P19 L 12 # 372  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: Loss Communication

Do you want this counter to increment at 100 counts per second for a 1000BASE-T link?

SuggestedRemedy

If not, delete 'at 10 Mb/s'?

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Please refer to comment 477.

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.11 P19 L 12 # 284  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: Loss Communication

The counter for aLostCommunication has a maximum count rate of 1 per second at all link speeds.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete

"at 10 Mb/s"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Please refer to comment 477.

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.11 P19 L 12 # 477  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: Loss Communication

Question:

Isn't the rate of LLDP frames independent of what the link speed is?  
 If so, then the maximum counter increment rate is independent of the link rate

SuggestedRemedy

Change increment rate to:

"This counter has a maximum increment rate of 1 count per second."

-OR-

"This counter has a maximum increment rate of 1 count per second independent of link rate."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This counter has a maximum increment rate of 1 count per second.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.3 P17 L 22 # 472  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

There seems to be something wrong in the syntax vs. the behaviour.  
 You are putting in a "request" but the syntax is not that of a request but rather what the state already is (What is the meaning of "is"? It is what the state is currently "being", not what is being requested.)

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the term "being" from the syntax so that it can be used by both request and response.

E.g.: "A PD powered locally only", yields:  
 REQUEST: A PD powered locally only  
 RESPONSE: A PD powered locally only"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove "being" from the first 5 variables listed

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.3 P17 L 29 # 277  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: GET-SET

aLLDPPoEPLocRequestedPowerSource

Needs a SET definition

SuggestedRemedy

After the "GET" line, insert

"A SET operation changes the requested priority of the local system to the indicated value.;"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This variable is SET by the current state of the device. We do not want a network manager to set the value randomly. Therefore it is read-only (GET).

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.5 P18 L 3 # 278  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: GET-SET

aLLDPPoEPLocRequestedPDPowerValue

Needs a SET definition

SuggestedRemedy

After the "GET" line, insert

"A SET operation changes the requested power value of the local system to the indicated value.;"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This variable is SET by the current state of the device. We do not want a network manager to set the value randomly. Therefore it is read-only (GET).

Cl 30 SC 30.12.1.1.6 P18 L 12 # 280  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: DEFINITION

The behavior for aLLDPPoEPLocActualPowerType needs definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert before the "GET" statement:

"This reflects the local power type that has been acknowledged by the link partner."

The "GET" statement remains below this, separated by a line.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This is being deleted. See comment 516

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 30 SC 30.12.1.1.7 P18 L 21 # 281  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: DEFINITION  
 The behavior for aLLDPPoEPLocActualPowerSource needs definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert before the "GET" statement:

"This reflects the local power source that has been acknowledged by the link partner."

The "GET" statement remains below this, separated by a line.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

This is being deleted. See comment 516

CI 30 SC 30.12.1.1.8 P18 L 30 # 282  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: DEFINITION  
 The behavior for aLLDPPoEPLocActualPowerPriority needs definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert before the "GET" statement:

"This reflects the local power priority that has been acknowledged by the link partner."

The "GET" statement remains below this, separated by a line.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

This is being deleted. See comment 516

CI 30 SC 30.12.1.1.9 P18 L 40 # 283  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: DEFINITION  
 The behavior for aLLDPPoEPLocActualPDPowerValue needs definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert before the "GET" statement:

"This reflects the local power value that has been acknowledged by the link partner."

The "GET" statement remains below this, separated by a line.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

This is being deleted. See comment 516

CI 30 SC 30.12.2.1.10 P21 L 16 # 373  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 the remote system response to a requested changes

SuggestedRemedy

the remote system's response to a requested change ?

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 30 SC 30.12.2.1.10 P21 L 17 # 285  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 The definition for aLLDPPoEPRemAcknowledge is incomplete.

SuggestedRemedy

Change

"A GET attribute that returns the remote system response to a requested changes to the power value.;"

to:

"A GET attribute that returns the remote system loss of communication indicator or the response to a requested changes to the power value.;"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 30 SC 30.12.2.1.9 P21 L 6 # 488  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
This attribute returns the PD power value of the remote system, hence change the following sentence as suggested

"where X is the decimal value of aLLDPPoEPLocActualPDPowerValue"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:

where X is the decimal value of aLLDPPoEPRemActualPDPowerValue

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Do not see any change in the suggested remedy that is different from the text in the draft.

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P15 L 19 # 369  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
'LLDP Power Classification Local Basic Package' is a very long title. There is no non-basic package here.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 'Basic'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete on both local and remote

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P15 L 20 # 110  
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Columns should have headings.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Object Name," "Object Type," and "Operations Supported" column headings.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P15 L 33 # 276  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MGMT: GET-SET  
Table 30-5a

The following objects should all be GET-SET

aLLDPPoEPLocRequestedPowerSource  
aLLDPPoEPLocRequestedPDPowerValue

aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge

SuggestedRemedy

The change GET to GET-SET for the following objects

aLLDPPoEPLocRequestedPowerSource  
aLLDPPoEPLocRequestedPDPowerValue

aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

See comments 277, 278, 279

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P15 L 39 # 109  
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Inadvertent font mismatch in Object Type column.

SuggestedRemedy

Reformat with Arial font as needed.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.2.5 P15 L 41 # 461  
Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Table break in wrong place

SuggestedRemedy

Table should have page break between objects, one attribute further down.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.2.5**                      **P15**            **L 8**                      # **368**  
Piers Dawe                                      Avago Technology

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
LLDP: new abbreviation for 802.3

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Add to abbreviations list, probably also need to add whatever-it-stands-for to definitions list. Copy from 802.1?

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Need to get definition from 802.1

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.2.5**                      **P15**            **L 8**                      # **367**  
Piers Dawe                                      Avago Technology

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
Why Table 30-5a? Why not Table 30-6? And are you just abandoning Table 30-4-PSE Capabilities?

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Put the new entries in Table 4, or put them in Table 6 and deprecate Table 4.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Editor was following guide to add with an alphanumeric lettering.

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.2.5**                      **P16**            **L 36**                      # **486**  
Ganga, Ilango                                      Intel

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
Repetition of aLLDPPoEPRemAcknowledge in table 30-5a

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Delete last row from table 30-5a on page 16

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.2.5**                      **P16**            **L 36**                      # **471**  
Geoff, Thompson                                      Nortel

**Comment Type**    **ER**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
Duplicate entry in table on last 2 lines  
Didn't look to see if it was just a duplicate or whther something was left out. (presumably a cut and paste error.)

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Delete if just a duplicate  
Correct if it is a place holder for a missing attribute

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment 486

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.2.5**                      **P291**            **L 39**                      # **371**  
Piers Dawe                                      Avago Technology

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
I expect some of Figs 30-3, 30-4 and 30-5 will need revision

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Per comment

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 521

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.2.5**                      **P293**            **L 39**                      # **370**  
Piers Dawe                                      Avago Technology

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
I expect the text on this page will need revision. In particular, Table 30-5a claims that LLDP Power Classification Local Basic Package is mandatory, but I could not see a justification for that.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Per comment

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The L2 function is mandatory per the classification requirement in Clause 33. We can add some informative text if deemed helpful.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 30 SC 30.9 P L # 483  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

It appears that the draft is not complete with respect to appropriate changes to the existing management clauses in 30.9, 30.10 and their respect annexes.  
 It looks like there was no attempt whatsoever to consider the impact of PoE+ on the existing management. For example, there has been no attribute nor enumeration added within 30.9.1 to indicate whether the PSE is a Type 1 or Type 2 PSE. Also, (at an absolute minimum) P802.3at has moved a number of the references to clause 33 in the current clause 30, these should have been brought up to date.  
 Further, the new attributes created for LLDP of PoE+ don't seem to have particularly aligned to the existing attributes in terms of behaviour or syntax.

SuggestedRemedy

Redo the proposed new management attributes for maximum alignment with the existing Layer Management and amend the existing Layer Management for PoE so that it can appropriately cover both PoE and PoE Plus.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Welcome specific changes from the balloter

Cl 33 SC 33 P23 L1 # 469  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Given the inadequacy of the compare documents referenced in the cover letter, the balloting instruction, the referenced documents which are: "...to assist in your review compare documents..."  
 The balloting instruction to:  
 "Please DO NOT submit comment against the above documents"  
 is completely inappropriate!  
 A editorial instruction that says: "Replace Clause 33:" (PDF Page 1, line 1) is of no use "to assist..."

SuggestedRemedy

Where the draft switches modes from editorial instructions to major section replacement (e.g. pg 23, line 1) insert an editorial instruction that says:  
 Editorial note, to be removed prior to publication.  
 The precise delete/insert instructions against what is taken as the base standard (P802.3ay/D2.1 draft of 802.3REV expected to be published as Std 802.3-2008) can be found in a compare document which can be accessed at:  
[http://www.ieee802.org/3/at/private/D3.0/P802d3at\\_D3p0-8023\\_33\\_CMP.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/at/private/D3.0/P802d3at_D3p0-8023_33_CMP.pdf)  
 (This will be even more important in Sponsor Ballot where you have less control over the packaging of the ballot material.)

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1 P23 L15 # 301  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status R

There could be a problem with the structure of this sentence. I could be wrong also.

SuggestedRemedy

Please check the structuring of this sentence.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

It says "a single interface to both the data it requires and the power to process this data"

This was carefully worded in AF. It is a single interface to:

1. the data
- AND
2. the power to process the data.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1 P23 L 32 # 176  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type E Comment Status R cable  
 The paragraph starting with "The detection and powering..." should have a "NOTE:" comment in front of it.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Insert the word "Note: "

Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.

This is informative introductory text. There are no 'shalls'. In essence, this text is all a note.

See 375

Cl 33 SC 33.1 P23 L 33 # 375  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status R cable  
 unpredictable performance and possibly damaged equipment': I wonder if there might be a risk of overheating also and a stronger warning, caution or whatever should be made

SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment

Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.

Insufficient detail to satisfy commenter. Need editorial suggestions.

Cl 33 SC 33.1 P23 L 33 # 374  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status A cable  
 Text says 'The detection and powering algorithms are likely to be compromised by cabling that is multipoint as opposed to point-to-point, resulting in unpredictable performance and possibly damaged equipment.' while Fig 33-1 and 33-2 shows a medium running past the MDI, shared-medium style.

SuggestedRemedy  
 First, is 'multipoint' the right word? Isn't that how PONs are? Second, if DTE Power should not be used on shared-medium Ethernet, show the medium coming to but not past the MDI/PI in Fig 33-1 and 33-2

Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

PONs are not an issue as we don't support power over optics.

Fig 33-1, 33-2 and 33-3 need updated with 'zig-zag' lines running off to the right and by moving the left hand end of the medium line closer to the MDI.

176, 375

Cl 33 SC 33.1 P25 L 52 # 300  
 Frank , Yang CommScope

Comment Type T Comment Status A cable  
 ... shall consist of Category 5e components as specified...  
 This paragraph indicates that users shall cat5e cord or connectors even if the horizontal cabling is cat6 or better. This isn't desirable from cabling perspective.

SuggestedRemedy  
 ... shall consist of Category 5e or better components as specified...

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 519



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P23 L 23 # 511  
 Law, David 3Com  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A cable  
 We normally say beyond the scope of the standard.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change '... beyond the scope of the clause.' to read 'beyond the scope of the standard.'  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P23 L 40 # 496  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status X  
 Please change "The following are the objectives of Power via MDI:" to "The following are objectives of Power via MDI:" yo differentiate from .3af and .3at project objectives  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 See comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 comment wants to remove 'the' from the sentence. How does this differentiate af from at?

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P23 L 44 # 376  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A ez  
 A PD ... need no  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 A PD ... needs no  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P23 L 47 # 377  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 'Clause 33 utilizes the existing MDIs of 10BASE-T, 100BASE-TX, and 1000BASE-T without modification.': it doesn't matter if the MDIs exist or are newly built. When incorporated into the base standard, one piece of text is not 'older' than another (or at least, the reader cannot know which is older just from the standard, because material can be revised).  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete 'existing'  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 This is baseline text.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P23 L 48 # 412  
 Zimmerman, George Solarflare Communicat  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 Objective for compatibility states that the standard uses 100BASE-TX MDI without modification. Imbalance currents for this standard go beyond the OCL current specifications in the ANSI FDDI specification referenced by the 100BASE-TX MDI spec. Modification or assumption of modifications common in teh market is implied.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Either: include the assumptions made about compatible equipment (i.e., lower OCL due to core saturation, with the recommendation that to be compatible 100BASE-TX units be designed to tolerate xxx baseline wander), or modify the MDI specification for compatible 100BASE-TX equipment to specify the signal presented at the MDI. - a parallel comment will be submitted to maintenance to work this issue at the MDI.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P23 L 50 # 2  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company  
 Comment Type E Comment Status X cable  
 Reference to minimum category of TIA cabling required to support Type 2 operation is missing. Format Standards references to match Objectives text.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Incorporate text such as, "Type 2 operation requires ISO/IEC 11801:1995 Class D / ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2 category 5 (or better cabling)..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P23 L 52 # 463  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D cable

Change the text for full clarity from:  
 "Type 2 operation over other cabling systems is beyond the scope of the clause."

SuggestedRemedy

To: "Type 2 operation over other cabling systems which meet their data transmission requirements is beyond the scope of the clause."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Extra text doesn't change the implication of the sentence.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P23 L 52 # 51  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D cable

Currently says "Type 2 operation over other cabling systems is beyond the scope of the clause." for consistency with previous text, this should be "this clause"

SuggestedRemedy

change text to "Type 2 operation over other cabling systems is beyond the scope of this clause."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

511 (OBE)

Cl 33 SC 33.1.1 P24 L 1 # 499  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Please delete objective (d). I am not sure that it adds any value and/or that it is entirely accurate at this point.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.2.4 P26 L 6 # 509  
 DiMinico, Chris MC Communications

Comment Type T Comment Status D cable

The type 2 cable derating requirement is not clearly addressed in the statement "Type 2 operation requires a 10°C reduction in the maximum ambient operating temperature of the cable". This requirement is a severe constraint to 802.3at deployment. Detailed guidance should be provided including PoE implementation considerations. Either address these considerations in reference documents and point to the reference ( e.g., ISO/IEC TR 29125 or TR42-TSB) or create and 802.3 Annex

SuggestedRemedy

Delete: Type 2 operation requires a 10°C reduction in the maximum ambient operating temperature of the cable (see ISO/IEC TR 29125).

Add: Considerations for the ambient operating temperature of Type 2 cable for 802.3ap applications are addressed in ISO/IEC TR 29125 or TBD appropriate reference.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25/WG 3 Liaison report to IEEE 802.3 on telecommunications cabling to support IEEE 802.3at PoEP approved by SC 25/WG 3 (Barcelona 2008-02-22) announcing approval of new work item proposal (NWIP) for developing technical report ISO/IEC TR 29125 "Telecommunications cabling guidelines for remote powering of data terminal equipment".

17, 18, 102

Cl 33 SC 33.1.3 P24 L 13 # 112  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

The dependent clause, "as a non-data entity" should be followed by a comma.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "as a non-data entity it does not ..." with "as a non-data entity, it does not ..."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.1.3 P24 L 18 # 379  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Font too small  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 7 point to 8 point - three figures here  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 What does the style guide say? Also, baseline.

CI 33 SC 33.1.3 P24 L 18 # 378  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Don't use ALL CAPITALS  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to upper and lower case as appropriate - three figures here  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 What does the style guide say? Also, baseline.

CI 33 SC 33.1.3 P24 L 50 # 113  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A ez  
 The words "endpoint" and "midspan" in the Figure 33-2 an Figure 33-3 titles, respectively, are not capitalized.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Capitalize "endpoint" in the the Figure 33-2 title and "midspan" in the Figure 33-3 title.  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.1.3 P25 L 10 # 332  
 Young, George AT&T  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 In Figure 33-3, the depiction of the PI interface is misleading. The arrow associated with the PI identification is pointing to the medium.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 The PI labeled arrow should rather be pointing to the connection from the PSE to the medium, in the same manner as the MDI identification arrow appears in the left side of this figure.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The definition of PI is "The mechanical and electrical interface between the Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE) or Powered Device (PD) and the transmission medium."  
 This is a Midspan diagram and the segment noted by the arrow is correctly identified as the interface between the PSE and the PD.

CI 33 SC 33.1.3 P25 L 19 # 177  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 The paragraph starting with "Any device..." essentially excludes mid-span devices as they do not contain an MDI compliant with Clauses 14,25 or 40.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Just thought I would mention it. You might want to insert "with the exception of midspan PSEs"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 If they aren't compliant, how do they work?  
 Baseline text

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.1.3 P25 L 8 # 380  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Fig 33-3 shows a medium running through a "midspan" and attached to a midspan PSE. The implication is that both AC signals and DC voltages and currents flow through past the midspan PSE. Figure 33-6 shows the PSE powering one side only, and the other isolated by transformers.

SuggestedRemedy

Change one or the other diagram to be consistent, and review the text. If one-sided powering is the norm, then the midspan PSE has two interfaces, a MDI and a MDI/PI.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Don't agree that the diagram implies "that both AC signals and DC voltages and currents flow through past the midspan PSE"

CI 33 SC 33.1.3 P25 L 8 # 29  
Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Figure 33-3. The drawing for the medium infers that it begins before the PHY.

SuggestedRemedy

Recommend squaring hte medium box off to form an elbow to the phy.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changes shown in landry\_fig33-1-fig33-3\_v01.pdf

CI 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L 32 # 381  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

A system? What does that mean? A switch? Or just that portion powered/powering via a single MDI?

SuggestedRemedy

Be clearer

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change

"A system defined as either Type 1 or Type 2..."

to

"A power system, consisting of a single PSE, link segment and a single PD, defined as either Type 1 or Type 2..."

CI 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L 40 # 391  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status A cable

Maximum DC cable current, about half an ampere? is that per cable (bundled) as it says, or per conductor, or per MDI (two conductors each way)?

SuggestedRemedy

Be clearer

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add footnote: I<sub>cable</sub> is the maximum output current per PI in normal powering mode.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L41 # 355  
 Pavlick Rimboim Microsemi corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status R  
 Table 33-1 uses "A" for maximum DC cable current, as other tables (33-9) and past standard used "mA" to describe current, it will be better to keep the same units all over the standard

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change units from "A" to "mA"

Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.

There is an effort to change all mA references to A to remove the 1000 factor from all the equations.

69

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L41 # 69  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status R  
 We are using "mA" units in Table 33-9 and other locations so it is better to use mA in Table 33-1 as well to prevent confusion.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change Units to mA and change numbers to 350 and 600.

Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.

There is an effort to change all mA references to A to remove the 1000 factor from all the equations.

355

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L43 # 517  
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status R cable  
 I believe that a Type 1 and Type 2 system are only defined by the maximum DC cable current. The two other parameter provided in Table 33-1, 'Channel DC loop resistance' and 'Cable type' don't define Type 1 and Type 2, instead they are requirements to support Type 1 and Type 2 operation.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete the 'Channel DC loop resistance' and 'Cable type' rows from Table 33-1 as these aren't parameter that define Type but are instead requirements.

If there is a desire to summarize the cabling requirements for both Type 1 and Type 2 operation please create a new Table 33-2 and include it in subclause 33.1.4.1 which would have to be changed to be titled 'Cabling requirements'. If this is done more accurate description of cable type will be required.

Response Response Status W  
 REJECT.

Opposite of 518, which is accept  
 320, 518, 28, 500, 413

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L43 # 518  
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status A cable

If my other comment to delete the rows 'Channel DC loop resistance' and 'Cable type' from Table 33-1 is not accepted the entries for 'Cable type' need to be corrected.

SuggestedRemedy

[1] Make it clear that these cable entries provide the minimum cabling requirements - since the other two rows in this table provide maximum values.

[2] Is it really correct that we require the use of Cat 3 cabling for Type 1 operation, remember that 10BASE-T operates over DIW as well as Cat-3. In addition we should fully specify Cat-3.

[3] We should fully specify what we mean by Class D since ISO/IEC 11801:1995 Class D is Cat 5 whereas ISO/IEC 11801:2002 is Cat 5e. Further even meeting ISO/IEC 11801:1995 Class D is not enough - we place an additional requirement that the loop resistance has to be 25 Ohms of less. This fact should be footnoted.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change Table 33-1 to  
 Parameter | Symbol | Units | Type 1 value | Type 2 value  
 Maximum DC cable current | ICable | A | 0.35 | 0.6  
 Maximum Channel DC pair loop resistance | RCh | Ω | 20 | 12.5  
 Minimum Cable type | | UTP per Clause 14 | Class D

500, 413

CI 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L43 # 320  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A cable

Table 33-1  
 The second row in the table shows parameter "Channel DC loop resistance".

SuggestedRemedy

This parameter should read "Maximum Channel DC loop resistance"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 518

CI 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L44 # 28  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type E Comment Status A cable

Table 33-1 mixes TIA/EIA and ANSI terms for the cable type.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest changine the CAT3 reference to Class C.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 518

CI 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L44 # 500  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status A cable

Table 33-1  
 The cabling type in this table is ambiguous.

SuggestedRemedy

Please use the nomenclature in Clause 1 for Cat 3 (see 1.4.89). Also, pls add a footnote to Table 33-1 indicating where Cat 3 and Class D are defined so there is no ambiguity.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 518

CI 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L45 # 526  
 Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status A cable

The IEEE normally references international standards.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace CAT-3 with class C.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 518

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L45 # 413  
 Zimmerman, George Solarflare Communicat

Comment Type TR Comment Status A cable

Table 33-1, Row "cable type" should be "minimum cable type". (I assume 802.3at either Type 1 or Type 2 will work on Class E or Class Ea cabling). Note that line 50 goes on to say in the text that Type 2 works on Class D or better. The table is inconsistent AND there is no similar statement I see for Type 1.

SuggestedRemedy

Either: replace "Cable Type" row heading by "Minimum Cable Class", OR, add "or better" to the row entries (prefered for clarity, if not for wordiness).

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 518

CI 33 SC 33.1.4 P25 L52 # 474  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status A cable

There is no such thing as Category 5e components specified in 11801:2002. the term "5e" is a TIA term, not an ISO/IEC term

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to read:  
 "...shall consist of Category 5e components as specified in ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2 and Category 5 components as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:2002.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 519

CI 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P25 L50 # 138  
 Alan Flatman LAN Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status A cable

Type 2 operation requires Class D or better cabling as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995 but then Category 5e components are required. This does not make sense.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 2nd sentence ("When Class D . . . . ISO/IEC 11801:2002").

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 519

also, 300, 474, 392

CI 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P25 L50 # 405  
 Booth, Brad AMCC

Comment Type TR Comment Status A cable

Confusing conflict of references. ISO/IEC 11801:1995 Class D cabling is different than ISO/IEC 11801:2002 Class D cabling. The statement that Type 2 requires ISO/IEC 11801:1995 Class D, but that all the components of the cabling system shall comply with ISO/IEC 11801:2002 Class D cabling.

SuggestedRemedy

Change paragraph to read:  
 Type 2 operation shall require Class D or better cabling as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:2002.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 519

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P25 L 50 # 519  
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status A cable

It is necessary, but not sufficient, to state that Type 2 operation require ISO/IEC 11801:1995 Class D cabling or better. ISO/IEC 11801:1995 Class D specifies a maximum loop resistance of 40 Ohms - see SC25/WG3 response 1 in ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25/WG 3 N 807 [ <http://www.ieee802.org/3/at/public/nov06/3n807.pdf> ]. We need to also state that we are placing an additional requirement that the loop resistance has to be less that 25 Ohms.

SuggestedRemedy

Change '.. Class D or better cabling as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995.' to read '.. Class D, or better, cabling as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995 with the additional requirement that channel DC loop resistance shall be 25 Ohms or less.'

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change: "Type 2 operation requires Class D or better cabling as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995. When Class D cabling is used, the cabling system components (cables, cords, and connectors) used to provide the link segment shall consist of Category 5e components as specified in ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2 and ISO/ IEC 11801:2002."

to: "Type 2 operation requires Class D, or better, cabling as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995 with the additional requirement that channel DC loop resistance shall be 25 Ohms or less. These requirements are also met by Category 5e or better cable and components as specified in ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2."

Also, 405

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P25 L 50 # 3  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status X cable

Reference to minimum category of TIA cabling required to support Type 2 operation is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Edit text to include a reference to TIA category 5 such as,

"Type 2 operation requires Class D as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:1995 / category 5 as specified in ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2 or better cabling."

Proposed Response Response Status W

This can be found in the note after the section.

501

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P25 L 52 # 489  
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

PICS missing for 33.1.4.1 Type 2 cabling requirement

SuggestedRemedy

Add PICS for 33.1.4.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

This is covered in the new PICS COM2 proposed to the editor.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P25 L 52 # 447  
 McCormack, Michael Texas Instruments

Comment Type T Comment Status A cable

Category 5e can be bettered,

SuggestedRemedy

Catrgory 5e or better

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 519

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P25 L 52 # 392  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status A cable

Normative text says 'Type 2 operation requires Class D ... the cabling system components ... shall consist of Category 5e components as specified in ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2 ... while NOTE says 'ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2 provides a specification (Category 5e) for cabling that meets the minimum requirements for Type 2 operation.'

SuggestedRemedy

Is this a distinction between cabling system components and cabling? Or can the NOTE be deleted?

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete the note on page 26 line 1

See new text in 519



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P26 L1 # 501  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D cable

I am not sure what value the note is adding here. We are either saying that the cabling meets (a) ISO Class D 1995 AND TIA 568-B.2, in which case the note is redundant OR (b) ISO Class D 1995 and the note there is informative about the TIA 5e cabling

SuggestedRemedy

If we are doing (b) then please delete the TIA reference in the body of the section and retain the NOTE. If we are doing (a) then please delete the note.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 124

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P26 L1 # 520  
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status D cable

I believe that ISO/IEC 11801:1995 Class D cabling, including a channel DC loop resistance of 25 Ohms, is equivalent the Cat 5 cabling, not Cat 5e. I'm not sure why we seem to be precluding the use of Cat 5 when it is sufficient to support Type 2 operation.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'NOTE-ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2 provides a specification (Category 5e) for cabling that meets the minimum requirements for Type 2 operation.' to read 'NOTE-ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-A-1995 provides a specification (Category 5) for media that meets the minimum requirements for Type 2 operation.'

Also change Page 25, line 52 from '5e' to '5'.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 124

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P26 L1 # 124  
Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D cable

The note that appears at the top of page 26 is redundant. The content of the note is already captured in the normative text that appears in the second sentence of 33.1.4.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the note. Notes are informative, and this note adds nothing to the normative text.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

3, 140, 447,501, 507, 520

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P26 L1 # 140  
Alan Flatman LAN Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D cable

note should provide an alternative TIA reference for Cat 5, not Cat 5e.

SuggestedRemedy

Change TIA reference to Cat 5 cabling.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 124

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P26 L12 # 507  
DiMinico, Chris MC Communications

Comment Type E Comment Status D cable

The information in the note is provided in 33.1.4.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete Note

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 124

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P26 L 10 # 514  
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type ER Comment Status D cable

We don't use the term PoE in this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Change '.. and PoE system ..' to read '.. and DTE Power Via MDI system ..' and '.. alternate PoE system ..' to read '.. alternate DTE Power Via MDI system ..'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

If not OBE by 507

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P26 L 10 # 52  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D cable

PoE is not in the list of abbreviations

SuggestedRemedy

Add PoE to the list of abbreviations

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 514, 507

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P26 L 10 # 475  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status X cable

It is an insult to us to call non-compliant systems "these alternate PoE system implementations."

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to read: "these alternate power system implementations."

Proposed Response Response Status W

resolve with 514; same sentiment, different words

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P26 L 6 # 18  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type TR Comment Status D cable

TIA has not completed their homework to provide specific currents at various de-rating temperatures. Furthermore there is a concern that, if plotted out, the ISO numbers from which 10°C value was selected do not follow the I^R profile. This indicates that there may be an error in the ISO analysis.

The commenter will be ready to approve the draft when the TIA analysis is complete and harmonization between TIA and ISO occurs. Note: the next TIA meeting is scheduled for the first week of June, 2008.

SuggestedRemedy

Until this issue is resolved between ISO and TIA, change the reduction factor back to 15 degrees C as follows:

"Type 2 operation requires a 15°C reduction in the maximum ambient operating..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 509

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P26 L 6 # 464  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status D cable

The text: "Type 2 operation requires a 10°C reduction in the maximum ambient operating temperature of the cable (see ISO/IEC TR 29125)." is not true except at maximum current.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to read:

"Type 2 operation at up to maximum current requires a 10°C reduction in the maximum ambient operating temperature of the cable (see ISO/IEC TR 29125)."

-OR-

"Type 2 worst case operation requires a 10°C reduction in the maximum ambient operating temperature of the cable (see ISO/IEC TR 29125)."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The whole spec is written around what happens at the maximum current. Are we to add derating curves for operation not at maximum?

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P26 L 6 # 102  
Cobb, Terry Commscope

Comment Type T Comment Status D cable

Derating of the cable is not necessary for cables that are not bundled together.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the end of the sentence:

when multiply cables that carry power are bundled together.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 509

see 464.

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P26 L 8 # 508  
DiMinico, Chris MC Communications

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The note does not provide useful information

SuggestedRemedy

Delete Note

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See 507

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P26 L 9 # 309  
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status X cable

The NOTE on this page does not add any value. The job of a standard is to define interoperability. This note is not required to achieve interoperability.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the NOTE

Proposed Response Response Status W

507, 508, 503

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P26 L 9 # 503  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D cable

This note has some innacuracy and does not add any value. Moreover, it is restructuring in terms of what implementations out of the scope can and cannot do. For instance it talks about cables not cabling systems which would include connectors. Furthermore, I would expect the TR being referenced to discuss the parameters underwhich the derating points were given.

SuggestedRemedy

Please delete the NOTE.

Proposed Response Response Status O

507, 508

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P26 L 9 # 114  
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status X cable

There are several issues with the NOTE:

- 1) The NOTE identifies some parameters which will allow an implementor to create compliant by incompatible PoE systems;
- 2) The NOTE is not even exhaustive in listing parameters relevant to boosting power delivery;
- 3) Except in specific cases, it is generally quite redundant to list "out of scope" items.

The NOTE fails to fulfill its apparent purpose in pointing the reader toward means of achieving higher power delivery. It seems counter to the spirit of a standard to tacitly encourage conformance without performance by enumerating methods. In short, the NOTE is inappropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the NOTE.

Proposed Response Response Status W

507, 508, 503, 309

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P26 L9 # 17  
Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type T Comment Status D cable

It is not outside the scope of this Standard to provide guidance on media that will support improved heat dissipation performance. In fact, it is almost negligent not to provide guidance to end-users installing new cabling infrastructures on the selection of media types that will provide improved performance for a performance condition (elevated temperature) that is difficult to assess and mitigate in the field.

Note - It is not the commenter's intention that increased PoE Plus currents can be allowed when alternate media is used. This recommendation is just to provide a pointer to media with better heat dissipation properties for the end-user.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise note as follows:

"NOTE - Cable current carrying capacity is a function of cable type, cable installation practices, environmental conditions, and PoE system architecture. In environments where the ambient temperature is above 45 degrees C, consider installing cabling with improved heat dissipation characteristics (e.g. category 5 F/UTP, category 5e F/UTP, category 6 F/UTP, category 6A F/UTP, and category 7 S/FTP). In addition, different levels of power delivery can be accomplished with different supply voltages and different cable lengths. It is out of the scope for this standard to address these alternate supply voltage and reduced cable length implementations."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 509

507, 508, 503, 309

CI 33 SC 33.12.1.1.4 P17 L40 # 66  
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"priority unknown or PSE" are tied to a single value. It will be useful to split it to two separate values.

SuggestedRemedy

Separate to:  
- unknown1 priority  
- Unknown2 PSE

Proposed Response Response Status W

This is Clause 30, not 33.

Defer to Wael.

CI 33 SC 33.2 P27 L10 # 125  
Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This sentence:

Characteristics, such as the losses due to overvoltage protection circuits, or power supply inefficiencies, after the PI connector are not accounted for in this specification.

makes no sense. 33.1.3 makes it clear that the PI is the demarcation between the PSE (or the PD) and the medium.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Disagree. It directly follows "A PSE is electrically specified at the point of the physical connection to the cabling." and adds further clarification of what is not included.

This is baseline text.

CI 33 SC 33.2 P27 L10 # 480  
Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The text:

"A PSE is electrically specified at the point of the physical connection to the cabling. Characteristics, such as the losses due to overvoltage protection circuits, or power supply inefficiencies, after the PI connector are not accounted for in this specification." ...is nonsensical. None of the items mentioned are appropriately placed "after the PI connector" the only thing that is appropriate after the PI would be cabling and the PD. I believe that "overvoltage protection circuits, or power supply inefficiencies" are to be included with the PSE spec and belong on the PSE side of the PI

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the second sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

125

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P27 L11 # 19  
Marris, Arthur Cadence  
Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Punctuation - commas incorrectly placed  
SuggestedRemedy  
Change  
"Characteristics, such as the losses due to overvoltage protection circuits, or power supply inefficiencies, after the PI connector are not accounted for in this specification."  
to  
"Characteristics, such as the losses due to overvoltage protection circuits or power supply inefficiencies after the PI connector, are not accounted for in this specification."  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
If not OBE by 125, 480

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P27 L11 # 393  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
Comment Type T Comment Status X  
In 'Characteristics, such as the losses due to overvoltage protection circuits, or power supply inefficiencies, after the PI connector are not accounted for in this specification.', are the losses/inefficiencies in the cabling or in the PSE? Which direction is 'after'?  
SuggestedRemedy  
Be clearer  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
125, 480

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P27 L3 # 459  
Geoff, Thompson Nortel  
Comment Type E Comment Status D  
The text:  
"The PSE's main functions are to search the link section for a PD, supply power to the link section (only if a PD is detected), monitor the power on the link section, and scale power back to the detect level when power is no longer requested or required."  
needs a little tuning up for accuracy  
SuggestedRemedy  
Change to:  
"The PSE's main functions are to search the link section for a PD, supply power to the link section if various requirements are met, monitor the power on the link section, and scale power back to the detect level when power is no longer requested or required."  
  
(The various requirements would be: (a) a qualified PD is detected, (b) power is requested (c) PSE management decides to supply power.)  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. CommentType empty, set to E as default  
  
need help to wordsmith the proposed text.

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P27 L3 # 122  
Frazier, Howard Broadcom  
Comment Type E Comment Status D  
"PSE" is an abbreviation or more properly, an initialism, not an acronym, unless it is pronounced to rhyme with sissy, and I don't think that is the intent.  
SuggestedRemedy  
Change "acronym" to "abbreviation". Alternatively, change "acronym" to "initialism".  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
  
"acronym" to "abbreviation"

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P27 L3 # 512  
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D

We don't really supply power to the link section, well a wee bit due to cable heating I guess, but the real purpose is to provide power to the PD.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider rephrasing where we state that power is supplied to the link section.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

resolve with 459

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P27 L3 # 142  
 John Abbott Corning Incorporated

Comment Type E Comment Status D

the acronym PSE can stand for many things and only Stands for "power sourcing equipment" in this standard. The sentence should be reworted.

SuggestedRemedy

Substitute "The power sourcing equipment (PSE) provides the power...."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add (PSE) to 33.2 heading

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P27 L5 # 33  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

Wording is not exactly correct - this is .af text.

..., and scale power back to the detect level when power is no longer requested or required.  
 also line 11  
 ... or power supply inefficiencies, after the PI connector are not accounted for in this specification.

SuggestedRemedy

..., and remove power when no longer requested or required, returning to the searching state.

...or power supply inefficiencies, within the PSE are not accounted for in this specification.

Proposed Response Response Status W

459 and 125 - two topics in comment

Cl 33 SC 33.2 P27 L6 # 407  
 Zimmerman, George Solarflare Communicat

Comment Type E Comment Status X

"link section" is defined as the section from a PSE to a PD. If there is no PD (PD is unplugged), this definition fails, and becomes confusing. Further, it's not clear why PoE needs its own definition of what other 802.3 clauses call a "link segment"

SuggestedRemedy

I must admit, I don't fully understand the distinction being made here, but it clearly breaks down when the PD is unplugged (because it is no longer on the "section"). Recommend at a minimum that the definition to be modified as well to indicate where a PD may be attached. At a maximum, consider using link segment terminology where appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status W

If there is no PD, there is no link section so the definition does not apply if there is no PD. I recall this being heavily wordsmithed in AF, it is not equivalent to a link segment as the link section need not have data (I think this was the reason for the difference in terms).

Cl 33 SC 33.2.1 P27 L19 # 394  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status R editorial

Inappropriate 'shall', I think; requiring them to apply whenever is an action on the editor, not on the implementor of a PD or PSE.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 'shall'

Response Response Status C

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

frs: This statement is in the legacy text and should produce text that is concise that ensures how subsequent shalls are applied. Recommend rejecting this.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.1 P27 L 24 # 42  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The following requirement from .af was removed:

While a PSE may be capable of both Alternative A and Alternative B, PSEs shall not operate both Alternative A and Alternative B on the same link segment simultaneously.

So as to not make existing market solutions seem outdated, insufficient, or incomplete, this requirement should remain for type 1 PSEs.

SuggestedRemedy

add sentence:

PSEs can be compatible with 10BASE-T, 100BASE-TX and/or 1000BASE-T. PSEs may support either Alternative A or Alternative B, or both. Type 1 PSEs shall not operate both Alternative A and Alternative B on the same link segment simultaneously.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

frs: The text does exist on p32.

CI 33 SC 33.2.1 P30 L 7 # 481  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

This comment relates to Figure 33-6, Alternative A.

The through connections shown on the midspan on pins 4/5 and 7/8 are out of scope for this standard and are not compatible with many existing compliant implementations of legacy midspans.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the shown through connections with boxes which are labeled "Out of Scope"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make the lines in question dashed and add "OPTIONAL" label to them.

frs: A note exists on p27:

"NOTE-Figure 33-4, Figure 33-5, Figure 33-6, and Figure 33-7 are for illustrative purposes only."

The figures aid the reader because they provide information on how something may be done.

CI 33 SC 33.2.10 P53 L 42 # 128  
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The text of the second paragraph predates L2 classification, and seems to ignore it. At the very least, there should be a forward pointer to the subclause on L2 classification.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the end of the second paragraph:  
 See 33.7 for a description of Data Link Layer classification.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.11.1 P54 L14 # 199  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"The PSE may optionally monitor the AC MPS component only, the DC MPS component only or both the AC and the DC MPS components."

This statement is ambiguous, as it can be interpreted such that the PSE does not have to monitor any MPS component at all -- the whole list of options are "optional."

SuggestedRemedy

If the intent is that no MPS is needed at all, then by all means, leave it as is, but please update the PICS.

Otherwise, change the sentence so that it forces the selection of at least one MPS:

"The PSE shall monitor either the DC MPS component, the AC MPS component, or both."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.11.1.2 P56 L16 # 180  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type T Comment Status A

Figure 33-15  
 The language "Cpd\_d may be located either before or after the diode bridge" is not sufficiently clear. What does before mean? What does after mean?

SuggestedRemedy

I recommend illustrating the optional location of the capacitor so that it is clear.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

frs: Suggest that the text be modified as follows:

Cpd\_d may be located either in parallel with Zac1 or as shown in Figure 33-15.

CI 33 SC 33.2.2 P27 L28 # 502  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The BLW issue with 100BASE-TX was avoided in 802.3af by disallowing Alternative A solutions. I support work to allow 1000BASE-T and Alternative A 100BASE-TX to work on condition that it does not compromise the integrity of the channel or modify the characteristics of the signal that the PHY sees at its receive MDI from the link partner.

SuggestedRemedy

Either disallow Alternative A midspans or show that the constraints placed on an Alternative A midspan yield a channel and receive characteristics that is identical to that without a midspan for a 100BASE-TX link or a 1000BASE-T link.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add Note: See Section 33.4.8.2 for Alternative-A Midspans.

frs: Suggest referencing section 33.4.8.2, p81 for alternative-A midspans.

CI 33 SC 33.2.2 P27 L34 # 395  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Midspan

SuggestedRemedy

Midspan PSE (or midspan entity)

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace  
 "Note that this limitation is due to the presence of the Midspan regardless if it is supplying power or not."

with:  
 Note that this limitation is due to the presence of the Midspan PSE whether it is supplying power or not.



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.3 P32 L 49 # 331  
 Young, George AT&T

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The sentence "Implementors are free to implement either alternative or both." is superfluous considering the preceding sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Eliminate this sentence.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.3 P32 L 49 # 445  
 McCormack, Michael Texas Instruments

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The phrase "provided the PSE meets the constraints of 33.2.4" is misleading, there are other PSE shall statements in the document

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the phrase

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

frs: 33.2.4 references the PSE state diagrams. Removing the text does not change the need to support that clause.

A PSE shall implement Alternative A or Alternative B, or both.

CI 33 SC 33.2.3 P32 L 50 # 72  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status X 4P

Draft 3.0

The standard should not preclude implementations that are using both alternative A and B due to the following reasons:

- a) It is out of scope of the standard to limit implementations that meets standard requirements.
- b) There are no interoperability issues if PD gets power from 2x 2 pairs power source especially if all pairs are coming from the same port/segment/PSE type 2. It is the load responsibility (PD) to meet the 2P specification for each 2P. Implementation methods are out of scope of the standard.
- c) It is economically and technically feasible as shown in numerous presentations and current products at the market, however these criteria's is not required for allowing 2x2P operation due to the fact that there are other alternatives allowed by the standard and the vendor has choices...
- e) There are products in the market that already are using the 2 x 2P implementation.
- f) There is huge market for higher power then 30W over 2P.
- g) There is no additional cost issue. The \$/watt cost is even lower then in 2P system as shown in previous meeting presentations.
- h) For outdoor applications, temperature rise issues of the cables when using 60degC cabling system grade can be solved if the same power is delivered over 2 x 2P which is an easy solution for thermal issues.
- i) Users will do it any way to utilize the full capability of the existing infrastructure.
- J) In previous meeting switch and PHY vendors wanted the ability to use the same cable which consists of 4 pairs to support two PDs that each one of them is connected to a 2P system. The current text precludes using this feature.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:

"A PSE shall implement Alternative A or Alternative B, or both, provided the PSE meets the constraints of 33.2.3. Implementers are free to implement either alternative or both. While a PSE may be capable of both Alternative A and Alternative B, PSEs shall not operate both Alternative A and Alternative B on the same link segment simultaneously."

To:

"A PSE shall implement Alternative A or Alternative B, or both, provided the PSE meets the constraints of 33.2.3. Implementers are free to implement either alternative or both.

Note: Configurations in which simultaneous operation of ALT A and ALT B are achieved when ALT A and ALT B are coming from different PI segments are specifically not allowed by this standard".

In addition, in 33.3.1 page 33 line 42 modify the text to be:

"NOTE-PDs that implement only Mode A or Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard. PDs that may simultaneously receive power from both Mode A and Mode B are out of scope of this standard."

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

*Proposed Response*      *Response Status* **W**  
 frs: This needs to be discussed in the task force.

**Cl 33**      **SC 33.2.3**      **P32**      **L 50**      # 126

Frazier, Howard      Broadcom

*Comment Type* **TR**      *Comment Status* **A**

This sentence:

Implementors are free to implement either alternative or both.

is redundant. The freedom conveyed in this sentence is stated in the preceding sentence, as well as in 33.2.1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the sentence.

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 331.

**Cl 33**      **SC 33.2.3**      **P32**      **L 51**      # 230

Sanita', Gianluca      Nokia Siemens Networ

*Comment Type* **TR**      *Comment Status* **X**      4P

This comment tries to address all the PoE system that are not covered by the Power budget delivered over two pairs especially after that this budget has been reduced down to 30W at the PSE side.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace:  
 PSEs shall not operate both Alternative A and Alternative B on the same link segment simultaneously  
 With:  
 Simultaneous operation of Alternative A and Alternative B is out of scope of the standard

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

frs: also see 72

This needs to be discussed.

**Cl 33**      **SC 33.2.3**      **P32**      **L 51**      # 145

Prof. Dr. Christian Kargel      Bundeswehr University

*Comment Type* **T**      *Comment Status* **X**      4P

One large market of PoE is the smart home technology which we are currently investigating in our own smart home. we have found that PoE is highly suitable for powering sensors, actuators and other smart home components in addition to communicating with them.

In order to reduce the amount of cabling and cost of installation for these components we have found that using all 4 pairs provides an optimized way in terms of the power required to operate a group of sensors and the number of cables needed to connect these sensors.

The current text in 802.3 precludes the simultaneous use of Alternative A and B. We are not aware of any technical, economical or reasons especially if the PSEs are coming from the same box/power system. As far as we know there are already systems available that deliver power over all 4 pairs while at the end of each 2P is a "2P PD interface" connected or even a single PD gets two 2P systems for applications that request higher power.

Those systems seem to be working well due to the fact that each 2P is independent in its functionality and orthogonal to the other 2P output.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the text in line 51 to allow the PSE to operate both Alternative A and Alternative B on the same link segment simultaneously.

Add a text in the PD specification (33.3.1) that requires the PD to meet the specifications of 2P system for any number of 2P system connected to it or delete the Note in page 57 line 42.

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

frs: also see 72.

This needs to be discussed.

The change suggested to the PD may break legacy PDs because not all of them will accept power on all pairs.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.3 P32 L 52 # 409  
Zimmerman, George Solarflare Communicat

Comment Type ER Comment Status D 4P

Here "link segment" is used rather than link section, for apparently the same meaning that a PoE-specific term "link section" was needed elsewhere in this clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Consistently use link segment wherever possible, or add text to the definitions section or first-usage in clause 33 explaining why it is appropriate to use link segment here for the connection between a PSE and PD, but you need to use link section in the other places.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Deferred to be considered during 4P discussion

frs: Task the editor to locate "link segment" and "link section." Then determine which phrase is appropriate.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4 P33 L 3 # 75  
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Draft 3.0:  
The text that was deleted from previous drafts is correct and helpful.

SuggestedRemedy

Add after line 3:  
"Equivalent implementations that present the same external behaviour are allowed"

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Covered in clause one.

frs: The state diagrams show what is required for external behavior and not the required implementation.

The text does not change the specification but adds unnecessary text. This was removed previously after a similar discussion.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P33 L 13 # 30  
Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Wording is awkward

The PSE shall turn on power after a valid detection in less than Tpon as specified in Table 33-9, if power is to be applied.

SuggestedRemedy

IF the PSE decides to turn on power after a valid detection, it must occur in less than Tpon as specified in Table 33-9.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

If power is to be applied, the PSE shall turn on power after a valid detection in less than Tpon as specified in Table 33-9.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P33 L 24 # 115  
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type T Comment Status A

The sentence, "a PSE that is performing Alternative B detection shall not resume detection mode until at least one backoff cycle has elapsed," is redundant to the first sentence of the paragraph. Worse, both sentences are normative, but use differing negative construction to stipulate the same behavior ("SHALL back off no less than" and "SHALL NOT resume ... until at least").

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the sentence.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change paragraph P33, L22 to:  
A PSE performing detection using Alternative B may fail to detect a valid PD signature. When this occurs, the PSE shall back off for at least Tdbo as specified in Table 33-9 before attempting another detection. During this backoff, the PSE shall not apply a voltage greater than 2.8Vdc to the PI.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P33 L 24 # 529  
 Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Repeating numerical values that are already variables may lead to errors.

SuggestedRemedy

Scan this document for numerical values that have variables alternatives. Replace the numerical values with the appropriate variable. For 2.8Vdc replace this with Voff.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

For 2.8Vdc replace this with Voff.

Editor given license to go find other examples and replace with variable.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P33 L 25 # 26  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Backoff is referred to as a cycle even though it is defined as a period.

A PSE that is performing Alternative B detection shall not resume detection mode until at least one backoff cycle has elapsed.

SuggestedRemedy

A PSE that is performing Alternative B detection shall not resume detection mode until at least one backoff period has elapsed.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment Type blank, set to E as default.

OBE 115

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P33 L 34 # 403  
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It seems that what you are trying to say here is that the PSE using Alternative A needs to complete a second detection before the Alternative B PSE. The Alternative B PSE waits Tdbo seconds between attempts, and the Alternative A PSE should complete a second attempt within 2 seconds. Since both of these values are the same, I suggest using Tdbo in both locations. For those unfamiliar with this clause, it makes it easy to understand the behavior if Tdbo is used in both places. Otherwise, you need to go 16 pages away to see that the two values are the same.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "2 seconds" with Tdbo.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Same as 31.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P33 L 34 # 31  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The backoff period is referred to as a fixed time rather than a variable defined in a table - we changed to the later method for other sections.

If a PSE performing detection using Alternative A detects an invalid signature, it should complete a second detection attempt within 2 seconds after the beginning of the first detection attempt.

SuggestedRemedy

If a PSE performing detection using Alternative A detects an invalid signature, it should complete a second detection in less than Tdbo (minimum) after the beginning of the first detection attempt.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to:

If a PSE performing detection using Alternative A detects an invalid signature, it should complete a second detection in less than Tdbo min as specified in Table 33-9 after the beginning of the first detection attempt.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.3 P33 L51 # 27  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Definition is confusing. Also, adding the relationship between the defined variables would be helpful.

Current during inrush period of startup

SuggestedRemedy

Current during startup

I propose adding:

$I_{cable} \leq I_{cut} \leq I_{lim}$

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Comment Type blank, set to E as default.

Change to:

Output current during startup (See Table 33-9, Figure 33-14)

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P34 L13 # 32  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Wording is confusing.

specifications in Table 33-9 and that require the PSE not to source power. These error conditions are not the same conditions monitored by the state diagrams in Figure 33-11.

SuggestedRemedy

specifications in Table 33-9 and that require the PSE not source power. These error conditions are different from those monitored by the state diagrams in Figure 33-11.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to:

... specifications in Table 33-9 and that require the PSE not to source power. These error conditions are different from those monitored by the state diagrams in Figure 33-11.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P34 L4 # 70  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Draft 3.0:

We had allowed the PSE to turn power to OFF if Vport is out of operating range per 33.2.9.1. Therefore the state diagram in figures 33-9 should reflect it as well.

The way to do it is to create new variable which will be optional. When the conditions of this variable are met, the PSE will remove power at any  $t < TLIM\_MIN$ .

SuggestedRemedy

Remedy steps:

1) Add new variable option\_vport\_lim to 33.2.4.4. It will be an optional variable:

"option\_vport\_lim

This variable is indicating If PSE port voltage is out of operating range during normal operating mode.

Values:

False: Vport is within the Vport normal operating range as defined by table 33-9.

True: Vport is above or below normal Vport operating range as defined by table 33-9."

2) Change state diagram (figure 33-9 per the attached drawing by changing the inputs to ERROR\_DELAY\_SHORT state coming from POWER\_ON state, from:  
 $tlim\_timer\_done$

to:

$tlim\_timer\_done + !tlim\_timer\_done * option\_vport\_lim * power\_applied$  )

Effect on legacy equipment: None since the variable is optional.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remedy steps:

1) Add new variable option\_vport\_lim to 33.2.4.4.

"option\_vport\_lim

This optional variable indicates if Vport is out of operating range during normal operating mode.

Values:

False: Vport is within the Vport normal operating range as defined by table 33-9.

True: Vport is above or below normal Vport operating range as defined by table 33-9."

Editor given license to edit text to improve clarity.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

2) change transition from POWER\_ON state to ERROR\_DELAY\_SHORT state  
to:  
Tlim\_timer\_done + option\_vport\_lim

**Cl 33**      **SC 33.2.4.4**                      **P34**      **L 45**                      # 408  
Zimmerman, George                      Solarflare Communicat

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **R**  
option\_detect\_ted is likely to cause confusion verbally with the english "detected".  
Recommend searching for another name.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
find another name - this may involve changing also the ted\_timer.

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**  
REJECT.

Group agrees with the sentiment but disagree that the read will be confused.

**Cl 33**      **SC 33.2.4.4**                      **P34**      **L 46**                      # 67  
Darshan, Yair                      Microsemi Corporation

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **R**  
We need to synchronize between the text in "option\_detect\_ted" variable and the additional information for item 25 table 33-9, error delay timing.

**Rational:**  
The purpose of Ted is to preven from consecutive startup to happen in a duty cycle that can cause heating issues.  
Therefore we specified minimum time between startups of 750msec.  
It is also the minimum time between consecutive detection attemps after fault.  
The text in these two locations are a bit different but the end result is the same.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Change the text from:  
"This variable indicates if detection can be performed by the PSE during the ted\_timer interval."

to :  
"This variable indicates if detection or consecutive startups (per Table 33-9 items 6 and 7) can be performed by the PSE during the ted\_timer interval."

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**  
REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

**frs:**  
This variable was created during a maintance request to permit detection and classification by delaying power-on until Ted expires. This limits power dissipated of the pass element.

It does not permit the PSE to optionally startup (power-on).

"This variable indicates if detection or consecutive startups (per Table 33-9 items 6 and 7) can be performed by the PSE during the ted\_timer interval."

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P35 L45 # 446  
 McCormack, Michael Texas Instruments

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Could we break the page and have the table start the beginning of the next page? The Table referenced is seperated by just a few lines but is entirely on another page.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Reformat the text

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

OBE 465

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P35 L47 # 490  
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status A PICS  
 PICS missing for PSE shall meet at least one allowable variable..

SuggestedRemedy  
 Add corresponding PICS

Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE submission from Gerry Nadeau.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.5 P35 L50 # 465  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Frame editing and pagination problem.  
 Table 33-3 should appear immediately after line 47 and before the header and text of 33.2.4.5

SuggestedRemedy  
 Put a page break immediately in front of heading for 33.2.4.5 or a "keep together" command that does the same thing

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

Same as 302 use this solution.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.5 P36 L47 # 302  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Referece to Table 33-9 for tpd timer (Tpd). This parameter is actually defined in Table 33-8

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change reference to Table 33-8

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.6 P37 L2 # 94  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A  
 det\_pd\_type function returns multiple variables i\_lim\_type and i\_lim\_tymer.  
 The values for both variables may be Type 1 or Type 2.  
 We agree to allow Type 2 PSE to use Type 2 Ilim/Tlim curves for Type 1 PD too.  
 This fact is not covered by the function details.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Add after line 8:  
 "Type 2 PSE may assign Type 2 value for i\_lim\_type and i\_lim\_tymer regardles of the actual class readings"

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

A Type 2 PSE may assign a Type 2 value for i\_lim\_type and i\_lim\_timer independent of the actual class read.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.6 P41 L3 # 533  
 Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

A PD is not permitted to consume ICUT for more than 5% of the time over a 1 second sliding window. A PSE does not need to provide more than what a PD may use.

SuggestedRemedy

An allowance for removing PI power needs to be provided without forcing a design requirement. All state diagrams shown in figure 33-11 have a concept of duty cycle. To avoid forcing design and in order to keep state diagrams simple, create a generic threshold and duty cycle monitor that can be used at any time to monitor PD allowances.

From reset, at any time the statemachine can be used to test the PD allowance. This generic state diagram would count Tover when the system operates above the threshold. The monitoring period, Tp, starts when the threshold is exceed. If Tover/Tp exceeds the duty cycle before Tp expires, a FAULT condition exists.

To monitor Tovid, Ton counts Tovid counts and Tp = 1 second.

Response ACCEPT. Response Status C

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P38 L8 # 466  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status A

It looks like the size of Figure 33-9 is such that it will guarantee that the heading "33.2.4.7 State Diagrams" and Figure 33-9 will inevitably be on separate pages

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a page break immediately before: "33.2.4.7 State Diagrams"  
 AND  
 Reduce the size of Figure 33-9 such that the heading and the figure can fit on a single page.

Response ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Response Status C

Editor to make best effort.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P39 L17 # 304  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D david

"do\_detection\_done" used for state transition from "START\_DETECTION" to "DETECT\_EVAL" is not defined anywhere

SuggestedRemedy

define "do\_detection\_done" in section 33.2.4.6

Proposed Response PROPOSED ACCEPT. Response Status W

frs: We eagerly await your remedy.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P39 L38 # 34  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type ER Comment Status R

Term UCT is not defined. It is used in a number of subsequent diagrams.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide definition.

Response REJECT. Response Status C

UCT is defined in clause 1.2. We direct the reader to clause 21.5 which points to 1.2 (33.2.4.2)



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P39 L 38 # 79  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A wael

Draft D3.0:  
 PD may request from PSE lower power through L2 than was advertised by its hardware classification i.e. if PD is Type 1 PD with class 3, after powerup it can request less power by using L2 but it can't ask more then class 3 and convert to Type 2...this is not interoperable behaviour (we already agree to this fact).  
 If PD is type 2 which must be class 4, it can request lower power after powerup by using L2 and it can't ask for more then class 4 through L2.  
 These requirement ensures interoperability between PDs and PSE with or without L2.  
 This was our baseline and the results of all our discussions.

In many locations in Draft D3.0 the editing work generate the impression that all the above may be violated by bad interpretation of the current text.

Due to the fact that the state diagram determines the behaviour and not the text we need to fix the state diagram accordingly and align the text to it.

SuggestedRemedy

- Figure 33-9: add input to the "POWER\_DENIDE" state which is true when the requested power from the PD through L2 is higher then mr\_pd\_class power equivavlent. (equivalent solution is good too)
- Add to 33.7 page 89 after line 10 the following text: "Type 1 PD that request more then 12.95W through data link layer classification is specifically not compliant to this standard"
- Use the same conceptual restrictins (of step 1) in 33.7 figures 33-28 and 33-27.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Ask the L2 adhoc to reflect the permutations in Table 33-5 on p45 in the state diagram.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P39 L 46 # 327  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco Systems

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

pse\_enable does not exist.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace pse\_enable with mr\_pse\_enable.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P39 L 47 # 310  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status R

One of the criterion for state transition from "POWER\_ON" state to "IDLE" state is (pse\_enable = force\_power). This means that if no timers expire and force\_power is asserted when the port is already on the port goes to IDLE state and then transits to TEST\_MODE. What is the rationale behind this.

SuggestedRemedy

Please check this transition. Should this be \*(pse\_enable = force\_power)?

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P39 L 48 # 321  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The transition from the state "POWER\_UP" to "ERROR\_DELAY\_SHORT" meets the transition from "POWER\_ON" to "ERROR\_DELAY\_SHORT". This used to be true in AF since the parameters for monitoring Tinrush and TLIM were the same. Now they have been defined differently.

SuggestedRemedy

Separate the two transitions. Add a new branch from "POWER\_UP" to "ERROR\_DELAY\_SHORT". The condition for this transition is "tinrush\_timer\_done". Add "tinrush\_timer" section 33.2.4.5 as A timer used to monitor the duration of in-rush condition, see Tinrush in Table 33-9.  
 Add a new state diagram to figure 33-11 to monitor and time Tinrush. This takes the same form as the existing middle diagram of figure 33-11, but replace tlim\_timer with tinrush\_timer, and only monitors linrush. In the existing middle diagram, remove the reference to linrush. This diagram then only monitors ILIM.  
 On figure 33-9, move tlim\_timer\_done to the TLIM monitoring branch.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 frs: Looks correct. Review.

## IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P39 L 50 # 116  
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The states ERROR\_DELAY\_SHORT and ERROR\_DELAY\_OVER behave identically and have the same egress. Their ingress conditions are very similar. The state diagram could be simplified.

## SuggestedRemedy

Modify state diagram as recommended in attachment "landry\_fig33-9\_v01.pdf"

Proposed Response Response Status W

frs: The attachment is not available to me. Assume that both branches end up in one state that does the same thing.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P39 L 51 # 137  
Johnson, Peter Sifos Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The PSE State Diagram makes no provision for the PSE's right to remove power when static port voltage drops below Vport(MIN) as described in paragraph 33.2.9.1.

## SuggestedRemedy

Solution #1:

Add an "ERROR DELAY Static Vport" state added along side of the other ERROR DELAY states with state transition along the lines of (Vport < Vport(MIN) + Vport > Vport(MAX)) \* Iport < Icut. This is preferred if the condition is to be treated as an error condition.

Solution #2:

Equate the static voltage out-of-range condition with a the state variable power\_not\_available in Figure 33-9.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
frs: same as 79.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P39 L 8 # 303  
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The variable "dll\_enabled" in the state "IDLE" should be "pse\_dll\_enabled"

## SuggestedRemedy

Change "dll\_enabled" to "PSE\_dll\_enabled"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
frs: dll\_enable does not exist.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P40 L 11 # 448  
McCormack, Michael Texas Instruments

Comment Type T Comment Status D

What if mr\_pd\_class\_detected is 5? Not an allowed return but then why compare at line 20 if mr\_pd\_class\_detected is less than 4? I would prefer that the state machine seem somewhat consistant and either use equal and not equal or drop the first qaulification and then check if less than.

## SuggestedRemedy

Remove "\*" (mr\_pd\_class\_detected = 4)" as that is the only thing that it can be since the other vector contains all other valid return codes.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

frs: Class is determined in state CLASS\_EV2 and only classes < 4 have an exit. Therefore, the remedy would work.

However, the comment statement points out a better solution.

Change the CLASS\_EV2 exit condition mr\_pd\_class\_detected < 4 with mr\_pd\_class\_detected != 4.

This makes the system do what is required and permits any other value for the variable.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P40 L 32 # 328  
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Variable do\_classification\_done is not defined.

## SuggestedRemedy

Define do\_classification\_done.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
frs: We eagerly await your solution.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

**Cl 33**    **SC 33.2.4.7**                      **P40**            **L 34**            # **530**  
 Schindler, Fred                              Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Variable do\_classification\_done is not defined.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Define do\_classification\_done.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Need to craft the text

**Cl 33**    **SC 33.2.4.7**                      **P40**            **L 35**            # **311**  
 Vetteth, Anoop                              Cisco

**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The variable "do\_classification\_done" has not been defined

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Define "do\_classification\_done" in section 33.2.4.6

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 frs: We eagerly await your solution.

**Cl 33**    **SC 33.2.4.7**                      **P41**            **L 13**            # **76**  
 Darshan, Yair                              Microsemi Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **X**

**Draft D3:**  
 1. Figur 33-11 specifying the behavior of startup mode in addition to overload, short and MPS.  
 2. The behavior of short and startup are different in many aspects while it was similar in terms of ILIM and TLIM for type 1 legacy PSE.  
 Now we have to separate the state diagram to reflect current changes in type 1 and type 2 PSE.  
 We already specified Tinrush, linrush for startup and ILIM/TLIM for short circuit.  
 I believe that this differentiation will help to make clearer standards.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
**Steps:**  
 1. Replace figure 33-11 with the attached modification.  
 Changes are: Startup and short circuit behavior has separate drawing and the same behavior of the old drawing.  
 1.1 Add to 33.2.4.5:  
 "tinrush\_timer  
 A timer used to monitor the duration of the inrush current condition during startup, See Tinrush in Table 33-9."  
 (Table 33-9 was already updated in previous drafts)

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 frs: attachement not available.

**Cl 33**    **SC 33.2.4.7**                      **P41**            **L 15**            # **117**  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW                              SILICON LABS

**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 "LIM" and "Inrush" should be subscripts of "I," per the constants defined in 33.2.4.3.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Fix formatting.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 frs: subscript LIM and Inrush for current variables.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P41 L16 # 178  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The term "lport > ILIM \* power\_applied" makes no sense. If lport > ILIM, by definition, power is applied.

SuggestedRemedy

remove the term "power\_applied" or use it everywhere with an "\*" whenever power should be applied.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 frs: lport > ILIM can only be monitored after moving past pi\_powered.

Remove "\*power\_applied."

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P41 L19 # 136  
 Johnson, Peter Sifos Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The PSE State Diagram Figure 33-11 makes no mention of the Tinrush timer in Table 33-9, Item 7. Tinrush Timer is not defined in 33.2.4.5 either where other state diagram timers are defined. Paragraph 33.2.9.6, Output current in startup mode, makes reference to Tlim in Item c), not Tinrush.

SuggestedRemedy

Tinrush timer definition should be added to 33.2.4.5 and Figure 33-11 should be modified to separate short circuit processing from inrush overload processing. Paragraph 33.2.9.6 Item c) should also reference Tinrush, not Tlim.

Proposed Response Response Status W

frs: We eagerly await your solution.  
 Same solution as 76.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.5 P41 L39 # 305  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

PSE operation is now dependent on Link

SuggestedRemedy

Strike this sentence

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 frs:

Cl 33 SC 33.2.5 P41 L39 # 524  
 Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The sentence "PSE operation is independent of dat link status." is no longer valid.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6 P42 L43 # 118  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

A normative statement requiring equivalence to a couple of schematics is inappropriate for several reasons.

- 1) Electrical characteristics presented by a PD are well specified (see Tables 33-12, 33-13);
- 2) Electrical characteristics measured by PSE are well specified (see Table 33-4);
- 3) One cannot provide Thevenin equivalence to an ideal, unspecified circuit element like a diode;
- 4) The necessity of conforming to the schematics has not been shown;
- 5) These schematics unnecessarily limit implementation.

SuggestedRemedy

Make Figures 33-12, 33-13 illustrative. Strike the statement, "the PSE shall exhibit Thevenin equivalence to one of the detection circuits shown ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

frs: A Thevenin circuit will not result in a diode. Text on line 37 explains why the diode is required, but does not mandate the its use.

If the diagrams are illustrative the diode is no longer required.

This needs to be discussed.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P42 L46 # 194  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

This subsection continues the inappropriate trend of overspecifying the method by which a PSE detects a valid PD. While it does describe a method that mostly works (and it is by no means close to foolproof!), it excludes other methods that satisfy the goal of correctly identifying the presence of a device presenting a valid detect signature, as defined in Table 33-4 items 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Loosen the strict nature of the current language. Separate the Valid and Invalid detection signature characteristics into their own tables.

Replace 33.2.6.1 and Table 33-4 with suggested replacement text in landry\_33.2.6.1\_v01.pdf.

Proposed Response Response Status W

frs: Separating valid and invalid requirements will make the specification more readable.

I can not see attachments.

CI 33 SC 33.2.6.1 P43 L29 # 38  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Table 33-4. 1) Neither of the signature offsets (Vos, los) are defined.  
 2) The PSE current offset is inconsistent with the PD offset Table 33-12, p62, l 12.

This is a problem with the .af standard.

*SuggestedRemedy*

- 1) reference figure 33C.20 in Table 33-4 "additional information" column
- 2) edit figure 33C.20 (section 33C.4.1, P143 top) to show loffset. If this would be the I axis intercept of the projected line, it is clearly negative (this is correct by calculation and measurement), if it is the I axis intercept of the actual current, then it approaches 0.
- 3) remove los min from table 33-4 to be compatible with Table 33-12.

The choice of the loffset definition will make a difference on how this is handled.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

frs: Table 33-4 items 12, and 13 provide the PSE Vos and los requirements, respectively. They differ from the PD in order to provide system margin.

Normative text should not reference informative information.

A normative figure could provide a graphical view of the system PSE and PD detection requirements. The axis could reference variables from Table 33-4 and Table -12.

- 1) reference figure 33C.20 in Table 33-4 "additional information" column
- 2) edit figure 33C.20 (section 33C.4.1, P143 top) to show loffset. If this would be the I axis intercept of the projected line, it is clearly negative (this is correct by calculation and measurement), if it is the I axis intercept of the actual current, then it approaches 0.
- 3) remove los min from table 33-4 to be compatible with Table 33-12.

The choice of the loffset definition will make a difference on how this is handled.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.7.2 P44 L11 # 47  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 The behaviour of the PSE for parallel signature capacitance between Cgood max and Cbad min is not defined

SuggestedRemedy  
 Add "A PSE may accept or reject a parallel signature capacitance in the band between Cgood max and Cbad min."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 frs: The region between must-detect and must-reject should be undefined.

CI 33 SC 33.2.7.3 P43 L19 # 193  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 Reference to Table 33-2 is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "Table 33-2 item 9" with "Table 33-4."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 frs: Assume this is p44.  
 Replace "Table 33-2" with "Table 33-4."

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P44 L25 # 59  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status R class pse  
 Draft D3.0

Interrogation is not defined in the standard however detection does.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace Interrogation with detection

Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

See comment 174.

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P44 L25 # 127  
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pse  
 Where is "mutual identification" defined? What constitutes mutual identification? Does it correspond to a state in a state machine?

SuggestedRemedy  
 Provide an unambiguous definition of mutual identification

Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Mutual Identification is partially defined on page 44, L 27.

"Mutual identification is the mechanism that allows a Type 2 PD to differentiate Type 1 PSEs from Type 2 PSEs."

Add this sentence afterward: "Additionally mutual identification allows Type 2 PSEs to differentiate between Type 1 and Type 2 PDs."

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P44 L25 # 174  
 Reshef, Tamir Microsemi Corp

Comment Type ER Comment Status R class pse  
 The word interrogation does not appear in any other place in the standard and therefore it is undefined, however detection is part of the mutual identification between a PSE and a PD

SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the word interrogation and put detection instead

Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

The intent of the word interrogation in this paragraph is to describe the probing portion of the classification mechanism. It does not mean detection.

If not defined in the standard, one should use an English dictionary as a basis for definition of a term.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P44 L 30 # 460  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type E Comment Status A class pse

The text:  
 "Physical Layer classification occurs before power-on when the PSE asserts a voltage onto the PI..."  
 is confusing as just what is powered on and what is not.

SuggestedRemedy

change text to:  
 "Physical Layer classification occurs before a PSE supplies power to a PD when the PSE asserts a voltage onto the PI..."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CommentType empty, set to E as default

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P44 L 33 # 396  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

Table 33-6 is mentioned here, before Table 33-5 and again on line 44 yet it does not appear until the end of page 46

SuggestedRemedy

Move its anchor earlier

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Editor to swap table physical locations of tables 5 and 6. This will put table 6 ahead of table 5.

Editor to swap table names and references to such tables.

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P44 L 36 # 476  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status A ez

The text:  
 "With Data Link Layer classification, the PSE and PD communicate using the Data Link Layer Protocol (see 33.7) after the PD is powered."  
 ...is not technically correct because LLDP can be established as soon as data transmission is enabled without regard to the state of the PSE/PD elements. Also powering the PD does not guarantee that LLDP can come up. See 33.2.5 para 3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:  
 "With Data Link Layer classification, the PSE and PD communicate using the Data Link Layer Protocol (see 33.7) as soon as the data link is established."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P44 L 47 # 195  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status A ez

The normative statement, "a PSE shall meet one of the allowable classification permutations listed in Table 33-5," is sufficient for defining what a Type 1 or Type 2 PSE must implement. Further normative text, redundant in meaning to this first statement, should be moderated.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:  
 "Subsequent to successful detection, all Type 2 PSEs shall perform classification. A Type 2 PSE performs classification using ..."

With:  
 "Subsequent to successful detection, all Type 2 PSEs perform classification using at least one of the following: ..."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P44 L 53 # 455  
 Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pse

"If a PSE successfully completes detection of a PD, but the PSE fails to complete classification of a PD, then a Type 1 PSE shall assign the PD to Class 0; the operation of a Type 2 PSE is implementation dependent."

We are making the same mistake that we made in AF all over again. The reason we couldn't use Class 4 by itself is because we allowed the PSE to power a poorly behaved PD, and we are doing it again here. The proper way to future proof the standard is define this as a non-powered state.

Additionally, classification is no longer optional for Type 2 PSEs; you have to complete some sort of classification to complete the whole discovery process for Type 2 devices. If classification has failed, discovery has failed. We certainly don't let a device that has failed discovery get power anyway - and certainly not 30W!

SuggestedRemedy

Operation for Type 1 PSEs is grandfathered in and cannot be corrected but it can be fixed for the Type 2 PSE.

Change: "the operation of a Type 2 PSE is implementation dependent."

to: "the Type 2 PSE shall restart the Detection Cycle"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The proposed change aligns text with existing PSE state machine, however PSE should return to the IDLE state prior to detection.

Change: "the operation of a Type 2 PSE is implementation dependent."

to: "the Type 2 PSE shall return to the IDLE state."

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P44 L 54 # 95  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D class pse

"In previous draft (D2.0, 3.2.8 PAGE 48 LINE 35) we had the text that allow PSE to remove power to a PD that violates the max. power required for its advertized class."

SuggestedRemedy

Restore the text:

"A PSE may remove power to a PD that violates the maximum power required for its advertized class"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

That test was not in draft 2.0 or 1.0.

Draft 1.0 shows that text crossed out. (Referencing the draft with edits shown, page 36, line 53.)

However, D3.0 does have the same intent in two places:

p51, L5: If IPort in Table 33-9 exceeds ICUT for longer than Tovld, the PSE may remove power from the PI.

P51L19: After time duration of Tovld as specified in Table 33-9, the PSE may remove power from the PI.

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P45 L 12 # 457  
 Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status X class pd discuss

Table 33-5

The task force should encourage compliant behavior and discourage noncompliant behavior. Presently, the draft allows PSEs to power PDs as class 4 even if it fails classification. This is a loophole for dumb PDs and even allows dumb PSEs.

If the task force permits PSEs to power PDs that do not present a valid class then the task force should similarly permit PSEs to power PDs that ask for higher power than presented on L1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Type 2 1-Event PD allowed?" entry in Table 33-5 to Yes

Proposed Response Response Status W

Requires group discussion.



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P45 L14 # 203  
 Tziony, Noam Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

Table 33-5  
 For the following Permutation:  
 PD Type: Type-2  
 Physical Layer classification: None  
 Data Link Layer classification: No  
 The Table says that:PD allowed?: N/A which doesnt make sense due to the fact that this is a Type 2 PD and it must support L1 and L2.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:  
 PD allowed?: No OR explain what does it mean N/A or explain how to read this Table?

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

N/A is confusing.

Change table as follows:

PD Allowed?  
 N  
 Y  
 N  
 N  
 N (Was N/A)  
 N (Was N/A)  
 Y  
 Y  
 Y  
 Y  
 N (Was N/A)  
 N (Was N/A)

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P45 L16 # 204  
 Tziony, Noam Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

Table 33-5  
 For the following Permutation:  
 PD Type: Type-2  
 Physical Layer classification: None  
 Data Link Layer classification: Yes  
 The Table says that:PD allowed?: N/A which doesnt make sense due to the fact that this is a Type 2 PD and it must support L1 and L2.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:  
 PD allowed?: No OR explain what does it mean N/A or explain how to read this Table?

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 203.

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P45 L23 # 205  
 Tziony, Noam Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

Table 33-5  
 For the following Permutation:  
 PD Type: Type-1  
 Physical Layer classification: None  
 Data Link Layer classification: No  
 PD allowed?: N/A

Type-1 PD without Physical Layer classification is not allowed. Class 0 is a class and PD without special classification hardware, if it presents 0 to 4mA it is class zero. So in this case PD is not allowed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:  
 PD allowed?: No OR explain what does it mean N/A or explain how to read this Table?

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 203

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P45 L 25 # 206  
 Tziony, Noam Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

Table 33-5  
 For the following Permutation:  
 PD Type: Type-1  
 Physical Layer classification: None  
 Data Link Layer classification: Yes  
 PD allowed?: N/A

Type-1 PD without Physical Layer classification is not allowed. Class 0 is a class and PD without special classification hardware, if it presents 0 to 4mA it is class zero. So in this case PD is not allowed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:  
 PD allowed?: No, OR explain what does it mean N/A or explain how to read this Table?

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 203

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P46 L 37 # 322  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

Table 33-6 shows minimum power level at output for Class 0 as Ptype.  
 Ptype for a type-2 PSE is 30W with 600mA of cable current. But Class 0 minimum power level is 15.4W irrespective of the type of the PSE.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Ptype for Class 0 to 15.4W

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.8 P46 L 44 # 356  
 Hopwood, Keith Phihong

Comment Type E Comment Status R class pd

Class 4 Power refers to a table 33-9. This is not clear  
 Lets make it easy and make it 30W (600mA 50V)

SuggestedRemedy

Replace reference to Table 33-9 to 30W

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Group could not form a concensus to resolve comment.

CommentType field empty, set to E as default

Amend table as below:

CLASS	Pmin Type 1	Pmin Type 2
0	Pclass=15.4W	Pclass=15.4W
1	Pclass=4W	Pclass=4W
2	Pclass=7W	Pclass=7W
3	Pclass=15.4W	Pclass=15.4W
4	Pclass=15.4W	Pclass=30W
4	Pclass = Vportmin * Icable	

see 322

CI 33 SC 33.2.8.1 P45 L 44 # 179  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type ER Comment Status A ez

The language "assume it is powering a Type 2 PD" is not appropriate. We have a shall statement with the word "ass-u-me" behind it. What does that mean and how do you measure it?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "assign Class 4 classification to the PD"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See 196

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.8.1 P45 L44 # 196  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status A ez

The language, "a Type 2 PSE shall assume it is powering a Type 2 PD," is rather vague. Anyway, the behavior is captured in the state diagram, so this normative textual restatement is not necessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:  
 "a Type 2 PSE shall assume it is power a Type 2 PD."

With:  
 "a Type 2 PSE will treat the PD as Type 2."

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.8.1 P45 L46 # 23  
 Delveaux, Bill Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

Substitutue variable name for number

SuggestedRemedy

Change 51mA to lclass\_lim Min

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P46 L10 # 219  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status A class pd

Add requirement to wait 6ms in order to ignore startup transients.

Additions shown in [square brackets].

SuggestedRemedy

EXISTING TEXT:  
 When the PSE is in the state CLASS\_EV2, the PSE shall provide to the PI VClass, subject to the TCLE2 timing specification, as defined in Table 33-8. The PSE shall measure IClass and classify the PD based on the observed current according to Table 33-7.

APPEND TO THIS PARAGRAPH:  
 [Measurement to be taken after TCLE2\_MIN to ignore initial transients.]

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

See 105

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P46 L13 # 224  
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

Because of capacitance on the port, Mark timing needs clarification.

Add text to clarify.

Additions shown in [square brackets].

*SuggestedRemedy*

TEXT IS:

When the PSE is in the state MARK\_EV2, the PSE shall provide to the PI VMark as defined in Table 33-8.

The timing specification shall be as defined by TME2 in Table 33-8.

APPEND TO THIS PARAGRAPH:

[The MARK\_EV2 event commences when the PI voltage falls below VClass\_min and ends whe the PI voltage exceeds VClass\_min.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The MARK\_EV2 event commences when the PI voltage falls below VClass\_min and ends when the PI voltage exceeds VClass\_min.

CI 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P46 L16 # 456  
Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

"If any measured IClass is equal to or greater than IClass\_LIM min as defined in Table 33-8, the PSE shall classify the PD as Class 4."

Same as previous comment:

We are making the same mistake that we made in AF all over again. The reason we couldn't use Class 4 by itself is because we allowed the PSE to power a poorly behaved PD, and we are doing it again here. The proper way to future proof the standard is define this as a non-powered state.

Additionally, classification is no longer optional for Type 2 PSEs; you have to complete some sort of classification to complete the whole discovery process for Type 2 devices. If classification has failed, discovery has failed.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change: "If any measured IClass is equal to or greater than IClass\_LIM min as defined in Table 33-8, the PSE shall classify the PD as Class 4."

to: "If any measured IClass is equal to or greater than IClass\_LIM min as defined in Table 33-8, the PSE shall restart the Detection Cycle by allowing the voltage at the PI to drop below Vmarkmin."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change text to:

"If any measured IClass is equal to or greater than IClass\_LIM min as defined in Table 33-8, the Type 1 PSE shall classify the PD as Class 0, the Type 2 PSE shall return to the IDLE state."

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P46 L17 # 105  
 Vladan, Ionel Marius ON Semiconductor

Comment Type T Comment Status R class pd

The text suggests that all measurements of Iclass shall be taken after 6 ms to ignore initial transients, but the minimum class event timing is 6 ms. Since the PD classification time Tclass = 5ms ( see table 33-17 and subclause 33.3.7.8 ), would be better to recommend taking Iclass measurements after 5 ms.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "All measurements of Iclass shall be taken after 6 ms to ignore initial transients." in "All measurements of Iclass shall be taken after 5 ms to ignore initial transients."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

PD required to settle within 5ms. PSE required to start after 6ms. No problem found.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P46 L3 # 218  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status A class pd

Add requirement to wait 6ms in order to ignore startup transients.

Additions shown in [square brackets].

*SuggestedRemedy*

EXISTING TEXT:

The PSE in the state CLASS\_EV1 shall provide to the PI VClass as defined in Table 33-8. The timing specification shall be as defined by TCLE1 in Table 33-8. The PSE shall measure IClass and classify the PD based on the observed current according to Table 33-7.

APPEND TO THIS PARAGRAPH:

[Measurement to be taken after TCLE1\_MIN to ignore initial transients.]

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

See 105

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P46 L31 # 220  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status A ez

In table 33-8, we specify a Classification Reset (15ms minimum with Vport<2.8V). We do not however discuss it in the text. Add text.

Additions shown in [square brackets].

*SuggestedRemedy*

TEXT IS:

All class event voltages and mark event voltages shall have the same polarity as defined for VPort in 33.2.3. The PSE shall complete 2-Event Physical Layer classification and transition to the POWER\_ON state without allowing the voltage at the PI to go below VMark min.

APPEND TO THIS PARAGRAPH:

[If the PSE returns to the IDLE state (Figure 33-9), it shall maintain the PI voltage at VReset for a period TReset before starting a new detection.]

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P46 L 36 # 443  
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd discuss

Table 33-6  
Pclass has fixed values for the different classes. We changed the overload current on page 50 (lpeak) to be dependent on Ppd\_peak, Vport and Rch. We should do the same here

SuggestedRemedy

Use parameter "Pclass\_pd" for the values in table 33-14 page 63

Replace the table 33-6 with the following equation

$$Pclass = Vport \times [Vport - \sqrt{Vport^2 - 2 \times Rch \times Pclass\_pd}] / Rch$$

A type 1 PSE can treat Class 4 as Class 0 so I don't think we need to differentiate between type 1 and type 2 PSEs for class 4

Replace Rch in eq 33-1 with Rch/2

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Append "Pclass\_pd" to the title of Table 33-14 page 63

add this equation and text :

$$Pclass = Vport \times [Vport - \sqrt{Vport^2 - 4 \times Rch \times Pclass\_pd}] / (2 \times Rch)$$

"PSE implementations may optionally use Vpse = Vport\_min and Rch = Rch\_max to arrive at the values in Table 33-6."  
before Table 33-6

Change Rch in table 33-1 to 12.5 | 20

and add note after Table 33-1:

"Note: Rch is the net result of the loop resistance of a single twisted pair."

CI 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P46 L 38 # 135  
Johnson, Peter Sifos Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status A class pd

Table 33-6 suggests that the Minimum Power Level at the PSE Output for Class 0 would be Ptype from Table 33-9. Ptype can be 30W for Type 2. Since classification is purely a property of a PD, a class 0 PD should never draw more than 15.4 Watts at the PSE interface.

SuggestedRemedy

Change minimum power level at the PSE to 15.4 W for Class 0.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 322

CI 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P46 L 48 # 77  
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status R class pd

Draft 3.0:

Add clarification that Data Link Layer takes precedence over physical layer classification only when system requires using lower power than advertised by the physical layer classification.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace

"NOTE-Data Link Layer classification takes precedence over Physical Layer classification."

With:

"NOTE-Data Link Layer classification takes precedence over Physical Layer classification only when system requires to use lower power than advertised by the physical layer classification."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Update text as follows:

"NOTE-Data Link Layer classification takes precedence over Physical Layer classification when system requires lower power than advertised by the Physical Layer classification."

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.8.2 P46 L 6 # 223  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

Because of capacitance on the port, behavior during the transition from Class to Mark may be confusing to the observer. Additionally, this complicates Mark timing. Add text to clarify.

Additions shown in [square brackets].

SuggestedRemedy

TEXT IS:

When the PSE is in the state MARK\_EV1, the PSE shall provide to the PI VMark as defined in Table 33-8.

The timing specification shall be as defined by TME1 in Table 33-8.

APPEND TO THIS PARAGRAPH:

[The MARK\_EV1 event commences when the PI voltage falls below VClass\_min and ends whe the PI voltage exceeds VClass\_min.

The PI VMark requiremnet is to be met with load currents in the range of 0.25 to 2mA. In a properly operating PoE system, the port may or may not discharge to the VMark range due to the combination of channel capacitance and PD current loading. This is normal and acceptable PoE system operation. For compliance testing, it is necessary to discharge the port in order to observe the VMark voltage. Discharge can be accomplsihed with a 2mA load for 3ms, after which Vmark can be observed with minimum and maximum load current.]

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L 15 # 482  
 Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type TR Comment Status X deferred

Table 33-9, also line 20 and other resulting places in the draft.

The proposed 50 volt minimum value, while admittedly allowing for more delivered power to the PD, is a significant hit in system cost relative to the carefully chosen equivalent value of Vport for 802.3af.

The new voltage means that PSEs can no longer be operated directly from battery systems (48 volt nominal) commonly found in telephone installations and DC communications UPS systems. Also, line operated power supplies with 48 volt nominal are a commonly available commodity product whose cost is driven by markets larger than that of PoE+. The new voltage level would require new power supplies for both boost conversion from 48 Vnom and from line voltage to the input side requirements of the porposed PoE+ PSEs. This will be a significant cost handicap, additional energy inefficiency and specialty supply handicap to implementation as well as negative hit to the five criteria.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Vport Min for PSE Type 2 operation to 44 volts.

Make the requisite changes to the rest of the draft including delivered power to the PD that would result from this change.

Proposed Response Response Status W

frs: This should be discussed.

Defer for resolution proposal from Darshan and Thompson

During the May 2006 Interim, the IEEE 802.3at task force voted to adopt 50 V as the minimum Vport.

Y: 37 N:0 A: 1

This was done after extensive evaluation of the system tradeoffs.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L31 # 255  
 Frosch, Richard Pihong USA

Comment Type E Comment Status A

1. Reference for I<sub>cable</sub> in table 33-9 is incorrect. Referencing section 33.1.4.2 is incorrect.
2. Having table 33-1 values on a separate page from the values listed in Table 33-9 is confusing for the casual designer.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Section referenced should be 33.1.4 to include cable parameters, cable requirement and cable derating.
2. Move 33-1 values into table 33-9 including cable derating information and remove reference back to 33.1.4

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

1: OBE 212, 312

2: in Table 33-1, after class D add "See 33.1.4.1 and 33.1.4.2"

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L31 # 312  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status A

Table 33-9 item 5  
 Maximum output current in POWER\_ON mode I<sub>port\_max\_min</sub> is not I<sub>cable</sub>. It is dependent on the class of the PD.

SuggestedRemedy

Change I<sub>cable</sub> to P<sub>class</sub>/V<sub>port</sub>

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L31 # 211  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Table 33-9, Item 5 Parameter is labeled "Maximum", but the entry is a minimum. Remove Maximum from Parameter name.

SuggestedRemedy

Table 33-9, ITEM 5 PARAMETER

IS:

Maximum output current in POWER\_ON mode

SHOULD BE:

Output current in POWER\_ON mode

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to:

Output current capability in POWER\_ON mode

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L31 # 212  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Table 33-9, Item 5 Additional Information references 33.1.4.2. This references cable derating and seems in error. I think it should reference 33.1.4 Type 1 and Type 2 system paramters. (33.1.4 is were I<sub>cable</sub> is specified.)

SuggestedRemedy

Table 33-9, Item 5 Additional Information

IS:

See 33.1.4.2, 33.2.9.5

SHOULD BE:

See 33.1.4, 33.2.9.5

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove 33.1.4.2 reference



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L 38 # 416  
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Pport and Pclass are used in spec and there is little difference between them.

It appears Pport is the Parameter (table 33-9, item 12) and Pclass is the Result of classification and the minimum value of Pport.

To add additional confusion, there is yet another term Ptype, in which Pclass = Ptype.

SuggestedRemedy

Editor to search document and establish consistent usage of Pport, Pclass, and Ptype.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Pport min = Pclass

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L 42 # 324  
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Table 33-9 Item 11  
TLIM\_min is defined as 50ms irrespective of the PSE type

SuggestedRemedy

Split the item according to PSE type. Use 50ms for type 1 and 10ms for type 2

Change 10ms in Section 33.2.9.9 lines 28-29 to TLIM min

Change 10ms with TLIM min in Figure 33-14

Change 10ms with TLIM min in the inequality on page 52 line 37 and 39

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Split the item according to PSE type. Use 50ms for type 1 and 10ms for type 2

Change 10ms in Section 33.2.9.9 lines 28-29 to "TLIM min as specified in Table 33-9"

Change 10ms with "TLIM min" in Figure 33-14

Change 10×10<sup>-3</sup> with "TLIM min" in the inequality on page 52 line 37 and 39

frs: This supplies the correct values and replaces numbers with the equivalent variable.  
This helps prevent specification errors.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L 42 # 326  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Table 33-9 Item 10  
 The upper bound for Ilim is not defined. It points to "see info" in section 33.2.9.9  
 Section 33.2.9.9 does not differentiate between type 1 and type 2 PSEs. The section also  
 does not clearly state that a type 2 PSE can limit the current anywhere between  
 (400/350)xlcable and PSE upper bound template

SuggestedRemedy

Split the Max cell for item 10 for type 1 and type 2. Type 1 value should be 0.45A as per  
 802.3AF specification. Use "see info" for type 2 MAX value and point to section 33.2.9.9  
 In 33.2.9.9 clearly state that the value maximum value of ILIM is the PSE upper bound  
 template.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add the following sentence to 33.2.9.9: The maximum value of Ilim is the PSE upper bound  
 template described by equation 33-2 and Figure 33-14.

frs: related to 324.  
 Adds need to clearly state that ILIM may extend to the PSE upperbound template of Figure  
 33-14.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L 42 # 420  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 33-9, errors in Ilim entry.

For type 1 PSEs, current limit should match .af spec.  
 For type 2 PSEs, lower limit is a function of lcable and not Pport/Vport.

SuggestedRemedy

Table 33-9  
 Item 10 | Output current - at short circuit condition

TEXT IS:

Type 1: 0.4A to "See info"  
 Type 2: (400/350) × (PPort/VPort) to "See info"

TESX SHOULD BE:

Type 1: (400/350) × lcable to .45A  
 Type 2: (400/350) × lcable to "See info"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Reviewed and could not come to concensus.

frs: This specifies what Figure 33-14 intends.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L 42 # 323  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Table 33-9 Item 10  
 ILIM\_min for type 2 PSE is defined as (400/350)x(Pport/Vport). This implies that the current  
 limit is variable. The baseline for defining the current limit uses a fixed value of ILIM\_min at  
 (400/350)xlcable

SuggestedRemedy

Change (400/350)x(Pport/Vport) to (400/350)xlcable

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Current limit is not supposed to scale with Pport so lcable is the proper choice.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L45 # 523  
 Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A  
 The value for TLIM depends on the PSE type.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace the 50 with a type specific value or reference section 33.2.9.8.  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE 324

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L48 # 256  
 Frosch, Richard Phihong USA  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R  
 need definition for max  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 add see info in max column  
 Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 frs: Table 33-6 provides the values that are dependent on the class negotiated. 33.2.9.12 describes averaging method and also points to Table 33-6.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L5 # 133  
 Johnson, Peter Sifos Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 References in Table 33-9, Items 5 and 13, to paragraph 3.1.4.2 should actually refer to paragraph 3.1.4 where Icable is defined.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Modify references in 33-9, Items 5 and 13.  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE 212, 213.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L50 # 213  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Table 33-9, Item 13 Additional Information references 33.1.4.2. This references cable derating and seems in error. I think it should reference 33.1.4 Type 1 and Type 2 system paramters. (33.1.4 is were Icable is specified.)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Table 33-9, Item 13 Additional Information  
 IS:  
 See 33.1.4.2

SHOULD BE:  
 See 33.1.4  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L50 # 96  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A  
 In Table 33-9 item 13, the additional information "See 33.1.4.2" is not the correct reference.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "See 33.1.4.2" with "See 33.1.4"  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE 213

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L51 # 35  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status A  
 Additional Information reference for Ptype references temperature derating table.  
 This also applies to lport\_max, item 5, line 32.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Reference Table 33-1 for Icable.  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE 213

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P48 L51 # 271  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Draft D3.0:  
 Note to comment editor: Please delete my previous comment on this subject. This one contains improved remedy.

The additional information should be:  
 See 33.1.4, 33.1.4.1 and 33.1.4.2 due to the fact that all subclasses contain relevant information.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to:  
 See 33.1.4, 33.1.4.1 and 33.1.4.2

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

frs: related to 213, and 96.  
 Is a pointer to the first section--33.1.4--enough? The all expand on the same thing. One key point should work.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9 P49 L18 # 431  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status R

Comment reference \*\*HB-05\*\*

Table 33-9

The "duty cycle" method of minimizing the PD power (below 500mW) is impractical and may lead PoE devices to be seen as wasteful. Especially when compared with external power supplies that are required to have a standby power less than 500mW.

It would be very useful to define a static current that allows a PD to draw much less power without using the duty cycle method.

Other comments (reference \*\*HB-07\*\*) introduce the idea of a PD low power state that may be negotiated between the PD & PSE. The low static current can be defined to be valid only in the low power state. That way the PD will only be allowed to use the low static current if the PSE is capable of measuring the smaller current or using an alternative disconnect method.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add two rows, under item 18:

- c) LOW POWER state current 1 Iip1 mA 0 1 Relevant for 33.2.11.1.2.  
 PSE removes power
- d) LOW POWER state current 2 Iip2 mA 1 2 Relevant for 33.2.11.1.2.  
 PSE may power

Also add the following paragraph at the end of 33.2.11.1.2

If PD\_low\_power state has been negotiated then the PSE shall consider the DC MPS component to be present if the DC current is greater than or equal to Iip2 max. A PSE may consider the DC MPS component to be present or absent if the DC current is in the range Iip2. A PSE shall consider the DC MPS component to be absent when it detects a DC current in the range Iip1. Power shall be removed from the PI when DC MPS has been absent for a duration greater than TMPDO.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Vote to accept:

Y: 2 N: 15 A: 9

No support to change in the TF.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

frs: This needs to be reviewed.

The operating range of this system would extend from 2 mA to over 600 mA.  
 Many system use integrating ADC to eliminate AC-coupled electrical noise.  
 Reducing the sensed signal level further will increase noise problems.

Using the "duty cycle" approach address these concerns.

We should discuss which method is better or whether multiple options of the same function is required.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P49 L 26 # 534

Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The "Transformer and Channel" ad hoc is still working with the task force on an appropriate value for I<sub>unb</sub>.

SuggestedRemedy

Update this value using the accepted recommendation.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See 64

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P49 L 7 # 41

Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Table 33-9, item 15, Turn on ramp rate (10V/us max).

This contradicts .af table 33-9 item 12, rise time of 15us min (10-90%).

SuggestedRemedy

To be equivalent/similar, the rate should be 44V/15us = 2.9V/us max.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 531 --

CI 33 SC 33.2.9 P49 L 8 # 531

Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Why did this change from Trise?  
 I assume this was changed to accommodate easier measurements.

This was 15 us minimum from 10% to 90%.

$57\text{ V} \times 0.8 = 45.6\text{ V}$

$45.6/10 = \text{time} = 4.6\text{ us}$

The new value speeds up the voltage ramp.

SuggestedRemedy

Decrease the maximum from 10 to

$57\text{V} \times 0.8 / 15\text{us} = 3\text{ V/us}$

Proposed Response Response Status W

reviewed and could not come to consensus

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.12 P53 L 19 # 528

Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The definition used in the PSE and PD section (page 67, line 37) should be made the same.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "over 1 second" with "using and sliding window with a width of 1 second."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.12 P53 L 22 # 82  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status R  
 Draft D3.0:

The text is confusing.  
 In 33.28 the relevant data is Table 33-6.  
 In 33.7 Pclass value may be updated by Data Link Layer Classification.  
 Pclass value must be the minimum value between these two.  
 As a result, Type 1 PD that advertises L1 Class 3 Can not request more power and became Type 2 PD! It is not interoperable with PSEs that uses only L1.  
 Type 2, PD may require lower power then class 4 and this is interoperable behavior therefore it is allowed.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change from:  
 "Pclass is the class power defined in 33.2.8 (see Table 33-6) or the results of Data Link Layer classification as defined in 33.7."

to:  
 "For Type 1 PD, Pclass is the maximum value between the class power defined in Table 33-6 and the results of Data Link Layer classification as defined in 33.7."

Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 frs: This is already concisely covered by Table 33-5.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.13 P53 L 25 # 192  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 "The values are based on a simulated output current unbalance of 3%."

This statement is unnecessary, because the numbers in Table 33-9 have been replaced with an equation: 3% x ICable.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Strike the sentence.

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.13 P53 L 25 # 415  
 Zimmerman, George Solarflare Communicat

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

3% unbalance current may require assumptions on compatible 100BASE-TX transceivers (beyond the standard) with regards to baseline wander. Imbalance currents for this standard go beyond the OCL current specifications in the ANSI FDDI specification referenced by the 100BASE-TX MDI spec. Modification or assumption of modifications common in teh market is implied.

(also in Table 33-9, line 21)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Either, restrict higher currents to 100BASE-TX which meet additional requirements or (preferred) modify the MDI specification for compatible 100BASE-TX equipment to specify the signal presented at the MDI. - a parallel comment will be submitted to maintenance to work this issue by providing a specification of the 100BASE-TX signal at the MDI.

Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Recharter the 350uH adhoc and pass this information on.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.13 P53 L 31 # 83  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A  
 Draft D3.0:

The 3% unbalanced current was not based on simulation.  
 It was based on 3% specification of the channel.  
 The simulated unbalanced current was much higher then 3% and we preferred to ignore its value and leave it to the implementer to decide how to handle it.  
 The informative section supllises the basic information for that matter.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to: "The values are based on channel output current imbalance of 3% of Icable as specified in Table 33-9."

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 192.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.2 P49 L51 # 197  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The 0.44W minimum power figure comes from  $44V * 10mA$ .

This is the accurate minimum power subject to VPort min and IMin2 max for a Type 1 PD. It is not accurate for a Type 2 PD, which would be  $50V * 10mA = 0.5W$ .

This can be fixed by either changing the minimum power ( $0.44W \rightarrow 0.5W$ ) or IMin2 ( $10mA > 8.8mA$ ). Rather than reducing the low current design margin, it makes more sense to increase the minimum power for Type 2 PSEs.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace occurrences of 0.44W with "IMin2 max x VPort min."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.4 P50 L13 # 313  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status A

Iport\_max min x Vport min has been defined in Table 33-9 item 13 as Ptype min.

SuggestedRemedy

Use Ptype min

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Ptype min as defined in Table 33-9

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.5 P50 L17 # 214  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Paragraph 33.2.9.5 is titled "PSE Maximum output current in POWER\_ON mode", however the value is a minimum. Remove "Maximum" from title. Remove "max" referene in IPort\_max.

Also note that in section 33.2.9.7 (p51, line 2) we reference Iport. Unless we accept this comment, 33.2.9.7 refereces a parameter that doesn't exist.

SuggestedRemedy

TEXT IS:

33.2.9.5 PSE Maximum output current in POWER\_ON mode

For VPort > VPort min, the minimum value for IPort\_max in Table 33-9 shall be (PPort / VPort). The current IPort\_max ensures PPort min output power.

TEXT SHOULD BE:

33.2.9.5 PSE output current in POWER\_ON mode

For VPort > VPort min, the minimum value for IPort in Table 33-9 shall be (PPort / VPort). The current IPort min ensures PPort min output power.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change title to:

Output current capability in POWER\_ON mode

and delete the second sentence of 33.2.9.5 (314 deletes first sentence).

And on P51 L5, delete Table 33-9 reference.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.5 P50 L19 # 522  
Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Many PSEs are policing power using a sampled data system. Accurate results depend on PD power demand bandwidth permitted. The power bandwidth (BW) is not defined but measured data shows most PDs stay at an approximately constant power value. Because power conservation is becoming more important, PoE plus PDs are more likely to change power values compared to their predecessors. This will may lead to increased data corruption and sampled data errors.

SuggestedRemedy

Place a power frequency restriction on PDs. This information needs to be tied to any PD surge allowance. Significant PD power ripple should be discouraged because this leads to problems with interoperability.

The PD may draw 15 mA/us at a 350 mA average current, this allowance permits ripple currents that could exceed the "power feeding ripple and noise" limits of the PSE. PSE common mode ripple results due to the impedance in series with the PSE supply.

For example, the OCL required for 100 Mb/s data rates is 350 uH. Half this inductances is in series with one-end the PSE supply. This impedance component alone exceeds the ripple allowance.

The PSE output impedance should be analyzed and then the PD power BW should be specified to ensure system interoperability.

Proposed Response Response Status W

reviewed and no consensus

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.5 P50 L19 # 314  
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status A

One of my earlier comments is to change item 5 in table 33-9 Iport\_max min from I cable to Pclass/Vport. If this comment is accepted by the group then first sentence of section 33.2.9.5 does not add any value.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete first sentence.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.5 P50 L25 # 527  
Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Repeating numerical values that are already variables may lead to errors.

SuggestedRemedy

Scan this document for numerical values that have variables alternatives. Replace the numerical values with the appropriate variable. Replace 50 ms with the variable tovlid.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace 50 ms with the variable Tovld.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P50 L46 # 80  
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Draft D3.0  
We differentiated between TLIM and Tinrush.  
TLIM is for short circuit conditions and Tinrush is for startup.  
We did it all over the specification.  
See separate comment that address the state machine in this regard.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace TLIM with "Tinrush as specified in Table 33-9".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace TLIM in 33.2.9.6 item-c with Tinrush.



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P50 L 49 # 225  
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status D deferred

Spec states:

During startup, for PI voltages between 0 V and 10 V, the MAX Inrush requirement is as specified in Table 33-9, item 6. (i.e. <400mA)

This statement is true, but what is important is the MINIMUM current. Minimum current is needed to drive the worst-case PD past 10V. Worst-case PD is 2mA while in Mark.

Change the statement from maximum to minimum and choose a value.

SuggestedRemedy

IS:

During startup, for PI voltages between 0 V and 10 V, the MAX Inrush requirement is as specified in Table 33-9, item 6.

SHOULD BE:

During startup, for PI voltages between 0 V and 10 V, the [minimum] Inrush requirement is 10mA.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Reviewed and no consensus

frs: See 39.

I believe this is an interpretation problem.

If something draws significantly less than x, then providing (x+y) would be the maximum you required to supply satisfy at least x.

This assumes y > 0.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P50 L 49 # 39  
Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The requirements for inrush between 0V to 10V appear to require a current of inrush (0.4 - 0.45A) by referring to Table 33-9 item 6. This is inconsistent with the desired foldback. Also, the references to the figures should be isolated from item f, as they are helpful to the requirement as a whole, but not the foldback.

SuggestedRemedy

f) During startup, for PI voltages between 0 V and 10 V, the max Inrush requirement is 60mA.

See Figure 33C.4, Figure 33C.6, and Figure 33C.23 for additional information.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

frs: The text in item-f was added after the legacy specification release.

It seems unlikely that a PD would draw significant current at voltages below Vvalid (detection).

I suspect this was a typo. Agree with referencing Tables at the bottom of this section.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P50 L50 # 97  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A  
 Draft 3.0, Figure 33C.6

Figure 33C.6 that was in the informative section need to be deleted.  
 In order to cover some of the maintainance requests, we need to add some normative text as additional information.

The issues are:

1. During overload per 33.2.9.7 the PSE is required to stay in normal voltage operating range as defined by Table 33-9 item 1.
2. During short circuit condition specifically when the port is current limited, The port voltage may be lower then Vport\_min.

*SuggestedRemedy*

1. Delete Figure 33C.6
2. Delete "Figure 33C.6" from 33.2.9.6 item f.
3. Add the following text after item f: "During startup Vport may be lower then Vport\_min when the port is within Tinrush range"
4. Delete "Figure 33C.6" from 33.2.9.7 line 6 and from 33.2.9.8 line 19.
5. Add the following text at the end of 33.2.9.7: "If Iport<Icut, Vport shall be as specified in Table 33-9 item 1. If Iport>Icut for t>=Tcut, Vport may be lower then Vport\_min."

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

1. Delete Figure 33C.6
2. Delete "Figure 33C.6" from 33.2.9.6 item f.
3. not required because e, f already specifies the operating voltage.
4. Delete "Figure 33C.6" from 33.2.9.7 line 6 and from 33.2.9.8 line 19.
5. P52, L50 add:"If Iport exceeds the "PD upperbound template" as specified in Figure 33-14, the PSE output voltage may drop below Vport min." Also, add to Table 33-9 item 1, additional information "See 33.2.9.9"

frs: This is related to 39, 225.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P50 L50 # 73  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 Draft 3.0, Figure 33C.4

In many ocasions the normative text send the reader to see figures 33C.4  
 These drawings should be at the normative text as it was in early drafts of 802.3af and were moved to the informative section due to editing considerations. Please find attached updated 33C.4 that integrates all changes made up to Draft D3.0.

The updaes made to 33C.4 are:

1. It is describing the current during startup (inrush) only and not short circuit condition. Short circuit condition is well defined by figure 33-14.
2. It include the equations need to describe the behaviour in order to make it normative.
3. It fixes some of inaccuracies found between t=0 to t=2msec.

*SuggestedRemedy*

1. Replace figure 33C.4 with the attached updates.
2. Move 33C.4 to the normative text to be located in 33.2.9.6.
3. Scan the draft and delete the text refering 33C.4 in other locations that is not inrush or startup state/mode.
4. In locations that figure 33C.4 were used to describe short circuit behaviour, replace it with figure 33-14.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Reviewed, to be worked on offline before next comment session.

frs: Figure 33-14 captures the allowance provided by 33C.4 and corrects errors made in 33C.4.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P50 L51 # 221  
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
We reference informative figures from the Annex. In addition, these figures contain errors.

Remove reference to Annex figures.

SuggestedRemedy

IS:  
f) During startup, for PI voltages between 0 V and 10 V, the max IInrush requirement is as specified in Table 33-9, item 6. See Figure 33C.4, Figure 33C.6, and Figure 33C.23.

SHOULD BE:  
f) During startup, for PI voltages between 0 V and 10 V, the max IInrush requirement is as specified in Table 33-9, item 6.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
frs: This is related to 39, 225.  
Using normative references to informative diagrams is confusing.

This needs to be resolved with the other reference comments.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.6 P51 L8 # 315  
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
Lines 8-15 do not provide any additional information.  
ICUT is a range of values and has a min and max as shown in item 8 table 33-9

SuggestedRemedy  
Remove lines 8-15

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
frs: The acceptance of this depends on how related comments are processed. See 420, 320, 326, 324.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.7 P51 L10 # 513  
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Any reason why this equation isn't numbered.

SuggestedRemedy  
See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
frs: This is related to 315.  
Assume the commentor would like a number for this equation.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.7 P51 L6 # 222  
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
We reference informative figures from the Annex. In addition, these figures contain errors.

Remove reference to Annex figures.

SuggestedRemedy

IS:  
If IPort in Table 33-9 exceeds ICUT for longer than Tovld, the PSE may remove power from the PI. See Figure 33C.6.

SHOULD BE:  
If IPort in Table 33-9 exceeds ICUT for longer than Tovld, the PSE may remove power from the PI.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
frs:  
SHOULD BE:  
If IPort in Table 33-9 exceeds ICUT for longer than Tovld, the PSE may remove power from the PI. See Figure 33-14.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.8 P51 L 20 # 329  
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
Normative text should reference normative figures.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify figure 33-14 to convey what minium current the PSE shall provide and to show what maximum current a PD may demand.

On figure 33-14:

- Replace the PD boundary label 400/350xcable with lpeak that is given by equation 33-1.
- Replace the PD boundary labeled lcable with ICUT which is Pclass/VPSE.
- Label the region from 0 to the PD boundary ILIM from time 0 to 10 ms as "short circuit range."
- Label the region from 0 to the PD boundary lpeak from time 10 ms to Tovldmin as "overload range."
- Label the region from 0 to the PD boundary ICUT from time Tovldmin to end-of-the-scale as "normal operating range."
- Label the region between the PD and PSE boundary as PSE may remove PI power.
- Scan for other use of 33C.6 and replace these with a reference to Figure 33-24.

Proposed Response Response Status W

frs: Adjust text.  
Modify figure 33-14 to convey what minium current the PSE shall provide and to show what maximum current a PD may demand.

On figure 33-14:

- Replace the PD boundary label 400/350xcable with lpeak that is given by equation 33-1.
- Replace the PD boundary labeled lcable with ICUT which is Pclass/VPSE.
- Label the region from 400/350xcable to the PD boundary ILIM from time 0 to 10 ms as "short circuit range."
- Label the region from ICUT to 400/350xcable from time 0 ms to Tovldmin as "overload range."
- Label the region from 0 to the PD boundary ICUT from time 0 to end-of-the-scale as "normal operating range."
- Label the region between the PD and PSE boundary as PSE may remove PI power.

- Scan for other use of 33C.6 and replace these with a reference to Figure 33-14.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P51 L 24 # 422  
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status X  
The intent of Type 1 and Type 2 operation is not properly described.

SuggestedRemedy

The original text was corrupted when the comment editor, edited the wrong box.

=> Make this box read only.

Proposed Response Response Status W

frs: Discussed with commmentor to arrive at a minimal acceptable change.

TEXT SHOULD BE:

A PSE may remove power from the PI if the PI current exceeds the "PD upperbound template" in Figure 33-14. Power shall be removed from the PI of a PSE before the PI current exceeds the "PSE upperbound template" in Figure 33-14.

NOTE-The PSE, and not the PD, is responsible for limiting current during transients lasting less than 10 ms. The PD is responsible for limiting current for transients lasting more than 10 ms.

Cl 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P51 L 28 # 98  
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
It is true that the PSE and not the PD, is responsible for limiting the current during transient lasting less then 10msec however it is important to add text to clarify that this transient is caused by PSE dv/dt.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text from :  
"NOTE - The PSE, and not the PD, is responsible for limiting current during transient lasting less then 10msec"

With  
"NOTE - The PSE, and not the PD, is responsible for limiting current during PSE voltage transients lasting less then 10msec."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
frs: See 319.  
The commentor did not complete their input, The solution matches the original text.

Explaing why ILIM is required for a normally functioning would aid readers in the understanding of ILIM's purpose.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P51 L 28 # 319  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D

There is no shall statement in this section that says that the PSE shall limit the current for a duration of TLIM.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the note with:  
 The PSE shall limit the current to ILIM for a duration of TLIM to account for transients at the PI.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 frs: Related to 319, this solution addresses both. Adjust text.

Replace the note with:  
 The PSE shall limit the current to ILIM for a duration of up to TLIM in order to account for transients at the PI.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P51 L 33 # 53  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

In equations 33-2 and 33-3 there are no units for the times t.

SuggestedRemedy

change 10x10<sup>-6</sup> to 10 us, 8.2x10<sup>-3</sup> to 8.2 ms and 10x10<sup>-3</sup> to 10 ms

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 frs:

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P51 L 33 # 525  
 Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Provide units for the requirements in 33-2, and 33-3, on page 52.

SuggestedRemedy

Both formula require units of seconds.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P51 L 42 # 57  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Draft D3.0:

The PSE is sourcing power not the PI.

SuggestedRemedy

Change PI to PSE.  
 Same update needed in page 52 line 45.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 frs: A PSE PI provides the power.

I do not see a problem with either term.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P51 L 43 # 198  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The units for the constant, K, are noted as mJ. This is not dimensionally valid (I<sup>2</sup>\*t != J).

Furthermore, the selection of 0.025 as the I2t constant is based on the 802.3af power level, which is obviously exceeded by 802.3at. That makes 0.025 inappropriate for defining the PSE upperbound template in Figure 33-14.

But wait, it gets worse. There is a long segment at 1.75A, which corresponds to an I2t constant of 0.205, much greater than 0.025.

SuggestedRemedy

Use an I2t of 0.205, as this is more inclusive and further improves design margin. Update the PSE upperbound template accordingly.

If interested, ask commenter for excel graphs overlaying old template and new template.

Proposed Response Response Status W

frs: This needs to be discussed.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P52 L1 # 441  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Figure 33-14  
 Suggest modification to make it clearer  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 See attached graph  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 frs: I do not see attachments.  
 I suspect this matches directions in 329.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P52 L1 # 423  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Figure 33-14 is unclear and contains errors. Redraw.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Anoop to supply figure.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 frs: We eagerly await Anoop's solution.  
 See 441.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P52 L15 # 257  
 Frosch, Richard Phihong USA  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Is Ilim a minimum or maximum in figure 33-14?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 TBD  
 According to table 33-9 minimum would be the same as 400/350\*Icable which makes Ilim equal to the 1imit from 10ms to Tovldmin which means the graph is wrong.  
 Maximum makes no sense because maximum is defined by figure 33-14.  
 Ilim was put somewhere in between the min and max but its not defined properly.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 frs: Using legacy language,  
 ICUT\_MAX = ILIM\_MIN.  
 In this draft,  
 ICUT\_MAX <= ILIM < PSE upperbound template

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P52 L28 # 81  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 Figure 33-14  
 Draft D3.0:  
 Figure 33-14 defines also TLIM in addition to Tovld  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change Tovld min to Tovld min/TLIM min  
 Change Tovld max to Tovld max/TLIM max  
 Add text to 33.2.9.9: PSE may remove power at any time between the PD upper bound template and the PSE upper bound template  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 frs: This is related to 329, and 441. The solution to these probably covers what is required here.  
 Changing a time value to a constant on a time scale does not make sense.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P52 L 30 # 93  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

1. The title of the drawing 3-14 is not reflecting the full intent of it.
2. Equation 33-2 and 33-3 do not reflect the fact that the requirements are applicable only when Vport is within operating range.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change title of figure 33-14 from;  
 "Figur 33-14 - PI Operating current templates"

to

"Figur 33-14 - PI Operating current and timing templates at Static Output Voltage, Vport operating range"

2. Add in equation 33-2 and 33-3 " and  $V_{port\_min} \leq V_{port} \leq V_{port\_max}$ " for each part of the equations.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

frs: This diagram is valid for static and dynamic PSE voltages.

PSEs only supplies ILIM when the port voltage changes.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P52 L 34 # 40  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The PD curve is for operation when Vport is static. During the ad-hocs this was clear, and is the reason for the note (P51, line 28) relating to the PSE being responsible for the first 10ms.

This needs to be made clear in this section, and the accompanying figure 33-14 so as to not make it appear that the PD requires an internal current limit.

SuggestedRemedy

The PD upperbound template, IPDUT, is defined by the following segments, when the PSE output output voltage remains constant:

ALso, change the PD limit-line title to "PD upperbound template for static PSE output voltage."

Proposed Response Response Status O

frs: See 93. This diagram is valid for static and dynamic PSE voltages.

The note on page 51 line 28 is in the same section as Figure 33-14.

Would moving this note to just below figure 33-14 meet the commentor's needs?

Most PDs do not require a current limiter. PDs with a large input capacitance may be required to limit current. This was discussed during the ad hoc and in the task force.

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P52 L 52 # 68  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Delete the text "See figure 33C.4 and Figure 33C.6" they are not relevant in this clause after creating figure 33-14.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the text "See figure 33C.4 and Figure 33C.6"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

frs:

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.9.9 P52 L 52 # 132  
 Johnson, Peter Sifos Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Reference to Figure 33C.4 creates the implication that Tlim(MIN)= 50 msec and Tlim(MAX)= 75 msec and that Ilim has the range 400 to 450 mA.  
 Reference to Figure 33C.6 is valid for Type 1 or Type 2 inrush, but no longer appear valid for Ilim or Tlim specification.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Either remove the references or modify the figures to cover new Ilim/Tlim behaviors as well as Type 2 PSE behavior.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Comment Type empty, set to E as default  
 frs: see 68.

CI 33 SC 33.3 P57 L 6 # 232  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez  
 "33" is a clause. "33.3" is a subclause.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "clause" with "subclause."

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.3.1 P57 L 41 # 74  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 25W 4 pair  
 Draft D3.0:  
 The note in line 41 precludes the ability to reduce power loss over the cable and increase overall system efficiency.  
 Rational:  
 Using a Type 2 PD that requires a total of 24W (example) on a 2P can also take a total of 24W over all 4 pairs with simple PD implementation.  
 In this case this PD can work on 2P PSE or on 2x2P PSEs with the same PD behaviour which is transparent to the user.

In addition let's assume that in this case both pairs are coming from the same box and the same power supply. This is a classical case in which by using all pairs we effectively reduce the channel power loss and allows interoperable and reliable operation.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change from:

"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."

to:  
 "NOTE-PDs that implement only Mode A or Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard. PDs that simultaneously may receive power from both Mode A and Mode B is out of scope of the standard"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The comment demonstrates a concern over the case where there is a PD that can work as either 24W 2 pair or 24W 4 pair (2x 2 pair, total of 24W). The existing text does not specifically preclude either solution because the PD does not REQUIRE power from both pairs, it can work on either pair set (Mode A or B). There is no problem to be fixed. A PD built as suggested would represent a superset of the required functionality.



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.1 P57 L41 # 78  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 25W 4 pair

Draft D3.0

The standard allow using for each pair up to Icable.

This Note prevents using all 4 pairs in a way that the total current will be Icable.

The end result if using a total of Icable for all 4 pairs would be less power on the cables, less power consumption on PSE resulting with higher then 80% system efficiency.

If Icable meet the specification of 2P then I<Icable certainly meets the same specification so preventing feeding the current all over the 4 pairs doesnt make sense.

This is implementation that is inline with the global effort for reducing power loss and in my opinion we are not authorized to preclude implementations that meet the numbers and state machines of this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Option 1:

Delete:

"PDs that simultaneously require power from both Mode A and Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard."

Option 2:

Change to: "PDs that simultaneously recive power from both Mode A and Mode B are out of scope of the standard."

Option 3:

Change to:"PDs that simultaneously recive power from both Mode A and Mode B are specifically required to meet the requirements of this standard for each Mode A and Mode B independently."

Option 4:

"PDs that simultaneously receive power from both Mode A and Mode B and the sources of Mode A and Mode B are comming from different system segments are specifically not allowed by this standard."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This note does not prevent using all 4 pairs in the manner proposed. It merely states that the PD must not REQUIRE on both mode A and mode B.

Commentary only: Other sections of the standard may preclude these implementations, and interoperability is dubious at best.

CI 33 SC 33.3.1 P57 L42 # 229  
 Sanita', Gianluca Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E Comment Status D 2 x 25W

This comment tries to address all the PoE system that are not covered by the Power budget delivered over two pairs especially after that this budget has been reduced down to 30W at the PSE side.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:

PDs that simultaneously require power from both Mode A and Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard

With:

PDs that simultaneously require power from both Mode A and Mode B are out of scope of this standard

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Note: comment type field empty, set to E as a default.

The Note starts with "PDs that implement only Mode A or Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard." That means the PD must obtain full functionality on either and only one pair set because PSEs are specified that operate on only one Mode at a time, and either Mode is allowed. Thus a 2 x 25W device that REQUIRES MODE A and Mode B is not compatible with the standard based on interoperability. There are solutions like this today that are recognized to be non-compliant. Labelling a noncompliant solution as out of the scope is dangerous.

CI 33 SC 33.3.2 P57 L52 # 340  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D Classification

Add the following text

SuggestedRemedy

The data link layer LLDP-POE can be optionally implemented for dynamic power negotiation when connected to Type 1 PSE which supports LLDP-POE.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There does not appear to be a downside since it is redundant to Clause 33.3.5 (P63, L13) "A type 1 PD may implement any of the class signatures in 33.3.5 and 33.7." This also supported in 33.7.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.2 P58 L6 # 231  
 Sanita', Gianluca Nokia Siemens Network

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD Underpowered

This comment tries to address all the Type-2 PDs that are not allowed to power up with only max Type-1 PD power budget.

SuggestedRemedy

Change  
 A Type 2 PD that does not successfully observe a 2-Event Physical Layer classification or Data Link Layer classification must conform to Type 1 PD power restrictions.

With  
 A Type 2 PD that does not successfully observe a 2-Event Physical Layer classification or Data Link Layer classification must conform to Type 1 PD power restrictions if defining a "underpower operational mode" is applicable to the PD specific appliance; otherwise the PD will power off."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 We agree with the intent of the comment, but believe that the spirit is all ready encompassed with the existing text. A PD may intentionally present a bad MPS signature, effectively requesting that it be disconnected. This power level is consistent with Type 1 operation. It should be pointed out that a type 2 PD is required to provide a user notification if underpowered within the same paragraph (P58, L7) . It may be possible to do this within the spirit of the comment.

CI 33 SC 33.3.2 P58 L7 # 246  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD Underpowered

While the goal of providing the user with notification that the PD is underpowered is admirable, requiring such notification to be "local" and "external" is unnecessarily restrictive and vague.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the words "local" and "external."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The objective is to let the person plugging a PD in, or troubleshooting a non-working PD to determine if the problem is due to a power type mismatch. This is necessary in a standard that is inherently creating incompatibilities. "Local" and "external" are neither vague or restrictive.

The comment's basis may not be clear and it may need to be clarified and entered at a later date.

CI 33 SC 33.3.2.4 P33 L3 # 414  
 Zimmerman, George Solarflare Communicat

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PSE State Machine

state diagrams specify the "externally observable" behavior? the information in the diagrams goes beyond "externally observable" (internal counters, state variables, etc.), and it's not clear what this qualifier is intended to mean - it is not commonly used in other areas of 802.3. The qualifier appears to either require that the state variables need to be explicitly observable or that only the externally observable parts of the diagrams are required by the standard (unlikely).

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the qualifier "externally observable" (or all of line 3 - line 5 may be sufficient) and/or add text to explain what is meant to be included or excluded by it.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete P33 L3

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.2.9 P48 L46 # 131  
 Johnson, Peter Sifos Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D PD Ilim Tlim

Table 33-9 Items 10 (Ilim) and 11 (Tlim) combined with 33.2.9.9 and Figure 33-14 provide an ambiguous picture of Ilim and Tlim. Issues:

33-9 Item 10 specifies Ilim(MIN) for Type 1 (400mA) and Type 2 PSE's (602 - 686mA depending on Vport). For Ilim(MAX), reference is made to figure 33-14. Figure 33-14 does not clearly show an Ilim(MAX) value - just the PSE upperbound template. Paragraph 33.2.9.9 (PD Upperbound Template) then refers back to Table 33-9 for Ilim.

33-9 Item 11 specifies Tlim(MIN) for Type 1 and Type 2 PSE's (50msec). For Tlim(MAX), reference is made to Figure 33-14. Again, Figure 33-14 makes no mention of Tlim. It makes an inference however that a PD may draw up to Ilim current from a PSE for up to 10msec - this might suggest Tlim(MIN) is 10 msec, not 50msec in Table 33-9. Paragraph 33.2.9.9 (then refers back to Table 33-9 for Tlim.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify Figure 33-14 to more clearly indicate the range for Ilim(MAX) (e.g. PSE upperbound template ?)

Modify Figure 33-14 to describe the range for Tlim better. If Tlim(MIN) is in fact less than 50 msec, modify Table 33-9, Item 11 to reflect this.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Comment Type empty, set to E as default

Edit Table 33-9 as follows:

Item	Symbol	Min	Max	PSE type	Additional Information
10	Ilim	0.4	0.45	1	Same
				2, Type 1 PD	
				2, Type 2 PD	
	Icable*	See	400/350	Info	
11	Tlim	50	75	1	Same
				2, Type 1 PD	
				2, Type 2 PD	
		0	10		

See also comment 317 dependency on Tlim

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P58 L45 # 103  
 Vladan, Ionel Marius ON Semiconductor

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

Definition of TRUE and FALSE values for the variable pd\_dll\_capable are with a small mistake. They should be referring to PD instead of PSE.

SuggestedRemedy

Change definition for FALSE and TRUE in :  
 FALSE : The PD does not implement Data Link Layer classification  
 TRUE : The PD does implement Data Link Layer Classification

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.3 P58 L45 # 216  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

Erronous reference to PSE. Should reference PD.

SuggestedRemedy

IS:  
 pd\_dll\_capable  
 This variable indicates whether the PD implements Data Link Layer classification. See 33.6.  
 Values: FALSE: The PSE does not implement Data Link Layer classification.  
 TRUE: The PSE does implement Data Link Layer classification.

SHOULD BE:

IS:  
 pd\_dll\_capable  
 This variable indicates whether the PD implements Data Link Layer classification. See 33.6.  
 Values: FALSE: The PD does not implement Data Link Layer classification.  
 TRUE: The PD does implement Data Link Layer classification.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.  
 See comment 103.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P60 L15 # 92  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD State Diagram  
 Draft D3.0.

The PD state diagram is NOT supplying a "PD TEST ERROR" to specify the behaviour in fault conditions.

*SuggestedRemedy*

add "PD TEST ERROR" states to the PD state diagram.  
 See attached drawing for reference.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 File not readable

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P60 L15 # 84  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD State Machine  
 Draft D3.0.

The PD state diagram is NOT supplying a "Test Mode" as we did in the PSE state diagram. Test mode allows by passing all PD functions that prevent it from powering. In this way we can test PDs in the field if when connected to PSE something is not working and we want to isolate the problems. We can add a cautionary note as we did in 33.6.1.1.4 for the PD as well with the relevant text.

*SuggestedRemedy*

add "PD TEST MODE" state to the PD state diagram.  
 See attached drawing for reference.

Add the following text "Test Mode may be used only for PD tests purposes and not as part of PD normal operation"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 PD functions do not prevent it from powering, this is controlled by the PSE. A failed PD that does not power from a PSE cannot be reliably bypassed.

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P60 L2 # 330  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status A PD State Diagram  
 If Vport < Vreset\_th is true then you are in detection.

*SuggestedRemedy*

This term should be ANDed with a term that ensures the system is within a mark state.

See a related comment on state NOT\_REQUESTING\_POWER.

Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changes documented in landry\_fig33-17\_v01.pdf

CI 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P60 L5 # 306  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D PD State Diagram  
 Not sure what is achieved by the state "NOT\_REQUESTING\_POWER". Seems like the condition that takes you into this state leads you out of the state as well

*SuggestedRemedy*

Editor please explain and double check the purpose of this state

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 1) No proposed Remedy  
 2) This state appears to differentiate an unpowered pd into two classes, those that want (required) power from those that do.

Since a PD may change its desire for power over time, "NOT\_REQUESTING\_POWER" provides a separate state. This state was present -2005, Figure 33-12

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.4 P61 L12 # 247  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD State Machine

This paragraph states that, "a PD shall present a valid detection signature ... while it is in a state where it will accept power via the PI, but is not powered via the PI."

For example, DO\_CLASS\_EVENT1 in the state diagram explicitly shows that the PD will accept power, but is not powered (indicated by the power\_received\*mdi\_power\_required exit condition). DO\_CLASS\_EVENT1 also, however, explicitly shows the PD presenting an invalid detection signature (present\_det\_sig <= FALSE). This seems to conflict with the text.

A similar argument can be constructed for the very next paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Since the state diagram appears to capture the intended behavior, REPLACE the first three paragraphs of 33.3.4 with the following:

When a PD presents a valid or non-valid detection signature, it shall present the detection signature at the PI between Positive VPort and Negative VPort of PD Mode A and PD Mode B. When a PD becomes powered via the PI, it shall present a non-valid detection signature on the set of pairs from which it is not drawing power.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The proposed text loses some meaning, the following text addresses the concern.  
 REPLACE the first three paragraphs of 33.3.4 with the following:

A PD shall present a valid detection signature while it is in a state where it will accept power via the PI, but is not powered via the PI per Figure 33-17. A Type 2 PD shall present a non-valid detection signature when in the mark state per Figure 33-17.

A PD shall present a non-valid detection signature at the PI while it is in a state where it will not accept power via the PI per Figure 33-17.

When a PD presents a valid or non-valid detection signature, it shall present the detection signature at the PI between Positive VPort and Negative VPort of PD Mode A and PD Mode B as defined in 33.3.1. When a PD becomes powered via the PI, it shall present a non-valid detection signature on the set of pairs from which it is not drawing power.

CI 33 SC 33.3.4 P61 L22 # 233  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

More than two voltage/current measurements may be made by the PSE during the detection process. The "slope" applies to any of an infinite number of voltage/current measurements. It is therefore incorrect to specifically refer to "the two voltage/current measurements."

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "the."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.3.4 P61 L29 # 234  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The definitions for Vn and In are imprecise.

SuggestedRemedy

REPLACE:  
 "are the [voltage|current] measurements made at the PD PI"

WITH:  
 "are the first and second [voltage|current] measurements made at the PD PI, respectively"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Editor may need further direction.

CI 33 SC 33.3.4 P61 L34 # 397  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

Wasted space

SuggestedRemedy

Make tables 33-12, 33-13 full width and resize column widths to contents. Check the anchors are on page 61 at the references to them and Table 33-12 should fit on p61. Start 33.3.5 on p62.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Propose that we give the editor license to reformat Table 33-12 and 33-13 to reduce height as well as compact the text.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.5 P63 L11 # 36  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type T Comment Status R class pd

To maintain the ongoing compliance of existing type 1 PDs, the statement should be altered to specify the minimum of class 0 (default or no intentional signature).

A Type 1 PD may implement any of the class signatures in 33.3.5 and 33.7.

*SuggestedRemedy*

A minimum requirement for a type 1 PD is to present a physical layer Class 0 1-event signature. Optionally, a type 1 PD may implement any of the class signatures in 33.3.5 and 33.7.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Table 33-5 updated to include Type 1, Class 0. See comment 203.

The update of table 33-5 makes it unnecessary to change the text.

CI 33 SC 33.3.5 P63 L15 # 248  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

The classification permutation table, Table 33-5, explicitly shows that a Type 2 PD must implement both 2-Event class signature and Data Link Layer classification.

Thus, the statement that, "Type 2 PDs shall implement both ..." is redundant in the use of "shall."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Strike "shall."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.3.5 P63 L6 # 71  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

Draft D3.0:

According to the:

1. Classification base line concept and
2. Associated motions and
3. Current text in 802.3 that define that the physical layer classification information is the maximum power that the PD will ever need.

the text should explicitly note that a PD that asks more power than advertised in L1 hardware classification is specifically not compliant.

The rationale for this was to prevent interoperability issues such as when a PD that advertised through its Layer 1 classification that it needs e.g. 12.95W and through L2 requires more power than 12.95W. In this scenario when it is connected to PSE that equipped with L2 the PD will fully work and when connected to a PSE that doesn't equipped with L2 it may or will not work.

As a result we mandate PD type 2 to support both L1 and L2 classification and specify that hardware classification results are max. Power values.

*SuggestedRemedy*

- 1) Add the following text right after line 19:

"PD that asks more power by using Data Link Layer classification than advertised in its physical layer classification is not compliant to this standard".

Other equivalent wording is welcomed.

- 2) In addition add to 33.7.6.2 page 94 ,line 18 the following text.

"The "NEW\_VALUE" shall not be higher than specified in mr\_pd\_class\_detected variable.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The issues in the comment are addressed in Table 33-5 and Table 33-14.

Acceptance results in no change to text.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P63 L 33 # 249  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status R class pd

Table 33-14 is wrong in two regards.

First, the power for Class 4 is no longer correct, as the maximum current for a Type 2 PSE changed in March 2008.

Second, the Class 0, 3, and 4 powers should be restated in terms of "ICable \* VPort min."

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the powers for Class 0, 3, and 4 with "ICable \* VPort min" or "PPort max as defined in Table 33-17."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

(Note: Correction of 29.5W to Icable\*Vport performed in comment 43.)

Class 3 PD power is fixed at 12.95W regardless of cable capacity. Comment suggests to make PD power a function of I cable and Vport. This would allow a Class 3 PD to draw 25.5W, which is not the intent of the specification. Comment could be implemented if further information on port voltage and cable type was provided, but seems counter productive.

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P63 L 45 # 24  
 Feldman, Daniel Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A ez

Table 33-14  
 PD maximum power on class 4 is 29.5W. Should be 25.5W, given 600mA of I cable

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 29.5 with 25.5W.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 43

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P63 L 45 # 227  
 maggiolino, joseph broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A ez

table 33-14 class 4 29.5w

SuggestedRemedy

table 33-14 class 4 25.5w

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 43

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P63 L 45 # 258  
 Frosch, Richard Phihong USA

Comment Type T Comment Status A ez

Class 4 power in table 33-14 is wrong

SuggestedRemedy

Change 29.5W to 25.5W.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 43

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P63 L 45 # 357  
 Hopwood, Keith Phihong

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

Class 4 Power for PD can't be 29.5W with only 600mA

SuggestedRemedy

Change Value from 29.5W to 24.6W

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CommentType field empty, set to E as default

OBE 43.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P63 L45 # 104  
 Vladan, Ionel Marius ON Semiconductor

Comment Type E Comment Status A ez

Since the objective 6 has changed via a passed motion, the tabel 33-14 should be changed accordingly.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 29.5 W to 24 W in tabel 33-14.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Note, new power level is 25.5W

OBE 43

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P63 L45 # 43  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type TR Comment Status A ez

Table 33-14

Icable went to 600mA from 720mA & 29.5W is no longer correct for Class 4.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest that the limit be changed to: Icable \* Vportmin (see table 33-17)

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change class 4 from 29.5W to:

Icable \* Vportmin (see 33.1.4 and table 33-17)

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P63 L45 # 428  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status A ez

Table 33-14 PD Power Classification

Class 4 still references 29.5W

Change to 25.5W or Icable \* Vport

SuggestedRemedy

Change 29.5W to 25.5W

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 43

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.1 P63 L46 # 442  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status R ez

Table 33-14

Power corresponding to class 4 has not been updated

SuggestedRemedy

Change 29.5W to 25.5W

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

See 43



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P64 L14 # 154  
 Jetzt, John Avaya  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A ez  
 Fix typos.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 1. Title of 33.3.5.2: PD 2-Event . . .  
 2. First sentence: PDs implementing a 2-Event . . .  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P64 L14 # 235  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A ez  
 Title of subsection is "IPD 2-Event class signature"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "IPD" with "PD."  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See 154

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P64 L14 # 58  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A ez  
 Draft D3.0:  
 Typo. Should be PD and not IPD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete I  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See 154

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P64 L14 # 453  
 Jones, Chad Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A ez  
 Typo in heading:  
 "33.3.5.2 IPD 2-Event class signature" - stray I in front of PD.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to: "33.3.5.2 PD 2-Event class signature"  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See 154

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P64 L20 # 454  
 Jones, Chad Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A ez  
 "The Figure 33-17 state diagram specifies the externally observable behavior of the PD."  
 This is a completely superfluous sentence that is already stated in the state diagram section of the document.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Strike the sentence.  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P64 L 34 # 200  
 Tziony, Noam Microsemi

Comment Type T Comment Status R class pd

Table 33-16  
 Item 2: Mark event voltage (VMark) 10V max

In order to simplify the PD front-end, Mark event maximum should be the same as the Detection voltage maximum.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to:  
 Mark event voltage (VMark) 10.1V max

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

The challenging part of the PD front-end design is to land a threshold between 10 and 14.5V. Moving the Mark range to 10.1V actually makes the PD design slightly more difficult.

A secondary design requirement of the PD front-end is to maintain Mark characteristics throughout the Mark range of 7-10V. Extending this range to 10.1V actually makes the PD design slightly more difficult.

The signature range extending to 10.1V was intended to insure the PD maintains signature beyond the highest possible PSE probing voltage of 10V. (This could be argued not necessary.)

If a change were to be made to align these limits, it would make more sense to lower the PD signature range from 10.1V to 10.0V

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P64 L 36 # 210  
 Tziony, Noam Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

Table 33-16  
 Item 3:  
 Mark event current (IMark) is 2mA max

We allow Imark\_lim to be 5mA minimum.  
 So Imark can be up to <5mA.  
 It is possible to get PSE voltage down too 7V with Imark up to 5mA.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Table 33-16 Item 3:  
 Mark event current (IMark) 4mA maximum

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P64 L 36 # 207  
 Tziony, Noam Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status R class pd

Table 33-16  
 Item 3:  
 Mark event current (IMark) is 0.25mA min  
 This minimum value is not require. A zero value is OK too.  
 Rational:  
 Until PD gets to Vmark\_th, the current is 40mA which discharge the port.  
 When PD detects Vmark\_th, current can be zero.  
 The requirement of 0.25mA limits implementations.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:  
 Mark event current (IMark) 0mA min

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Limiting PD behavior often eases PSE design and vise versa.

The requirement for the PD to draw 0.25mA minimum reduces design requirements for the PSE. PSEs are typically designed with one-sided drivers that can assert voltage onto the port, but are unable to discharge the port. By mandating a minimum load current, the PSE can be designed without needing to implement a discharge circuit. Additionally, PSE stability requiriements are eased when there is a limited range of load currents.

It can be aruged that the 0.25mA requirement limits PD implementations, however practically speaking, PDs will draw some current in order to maintain state memory. PDs are also required to present an invalid signature which can be implemented by shorting the port with a ~10Kohm resistor thereby meeting both minimum current draw and invalid signature requirments.

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P64 L 38 # 201  
 Tziony, Noam Microsemi

Comment Type T Comment Status R class pd

Table 33-16  
 Item 4: Mark event threshold (VMark\_th) 10V min

In order to simplify the PD front-end, Mark event threshold minimum should be the same as the Detection voltage maximum.

SuggestedRemedy

Mark event threshold (VMark\_th) 10.1V min

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

See 200

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P64 L 41 # 202  
 Tziony, Noam Microsemi

Comment Type T Comment Status A ez

Table 33-16  
 Item 6: Classification reset voltage (VReset), Additional Information: "See 33.3.5.2.1"

Subsection 33.3.5.2.1 don't talk about VReset at all.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:  
 Additional Information: "See 33.3.5.2.2"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.2.1 P64 L47 # 208  
 Tziony, Noam Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A class pd

At Table 33-16, item 4 (VMark\_th), additional information "See 33.3.5.2.1".

I've looked at subsection 33.3.5.2.1 and I didn't find any explanations regarding VMark\_th

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the following text to 33.3.5.2.1:  
 "Vmark\_th is the operating range of the Mark event to be detected by the PD.  
 The mark event voltage as specified in Table 33-16 item 2 is actually the PSE mark event range after worst case cable voltage loss as measured at the PD PI.  
 Once the PD detects Vmark\_th, it may reduce its current from Iclass to Imark.  
 When PD gets to Mark event voltage range, the PD shall consume Imark"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert text at the end of 33.3.5.2.1:

"Vmark\_th is the PI voltage threshold at which the PD implementing 2-event classification transitions into and out of the DO\_CLASS\_EVENT1 or DO\_CLASS\_EVENT2 states as shown in Figure 33-17."

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.2.1 P64 L47 # 250  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status A ez

The VMark range overlaps with the detect range.

Thus, the statement, "when the voltage at the PI is in the range of VMark, a PD implementing 2-Event class signature shall return a non-valid detection signature ..." is imprecise. It should only present this mark event signature in certain states of the state diagram.

*SuggestedRemedy*

FROM:  
 When the voltage at the PI is in the range of VMark, a PD implementing 2-Event class signature shall return a non-valid detection signature as defined in Table 33-13.

The PD must draw IMark when voltage at the PI is in the range of VMark.

TO:

When the PD is presenting a mark event signature as shown in the state diagram of Figure 33-17, the PD shall draw IMark as defined in Table 33-16 and present a non-valid detection signature as defined in Table 33-13.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.2.2 P65 L2 # 251  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D sd

This subsection describing the pse\_power\_type reset behavior is out of place, not to mention incorrect in its description of how the state diagram resets the pse\_power\_type value.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the 33.3.5.2.2 subsection title, and the first paragraph describing pse\_power\_type state variable. The second paragraph can remain as an appendage to 33.3.5.2.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Change first sentence to:

A PD implementing 2-Event class signature resets its pse\_power\_type state variable to 1 when the voltage at the PI is less than or equal to Vreset\_th as defined in Table 33-16.

The PD shall draw 0.25 mA minimum until the PD transitions from a DO\_MARK\_EVENT state to the NOT\_MDI\_POWERED state.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.5.2.2 P65 L3 # 209  
 Tziony, Noam Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D sd

At Table 33-16, item 5 (VReset\_th), additional information "See 33.3.5.2.2".

I've looked at subsection 33.3.5.2.2 and I didn't find any explanations regarding VReset\_th

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following text 33.3.5.2.2

"Vreset\_th is the operating range of the Reset to be detected by the PD.  
 Once the PD detects Vreset\_th, it will behave as specified in pd-reset Variable definition."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert the following at the start of 33.3.5.2.2.:

"VReset\_th is the PI voltage threshold at which the PD implementing 2-event classification transitions from the DO\_MARK\_EVENTx to the NOT\_MDI\_POWERED state as shown in Figure 33-17."

CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L15 # 25  
 Feldman, Daniel Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Table 33-17

Table 33-17  
 Vport min is set to be 41V. Should be 42.5V based on 600mA Icable

SuggestedRemedy

change the number to 42.5V

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment 65

CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L15 # 325  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Table 33-17

Table 33-17 Item 1 and 3  
 The minimum values for type 2 PD is fixed at 41V and 39.7V. These need to be expressed in terms of Icable

SuggestedRemedy

Define:  
 Vport min = 50 - RchxIcable/2  
 Voverload min = 50 - RchxIcablex200/350

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comments 421, 65

CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L15 # 65  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D Table 33-17

Type 2 PD input voltage need to be updated according to Icable=600mA  
 New value is 50V-12.5OHM\*0.6A=42.5V  
 or 50V-Icable\*Rch\*0.5

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 41 with:  
 Option 1: 42.5  
 Option 2: 50V-Icable\*Rch\*0.5

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Table 33-17, Item 1, PSE type 2, change minimum entry to:

Vport\_min(PSE) - (Icable \* Rch/2)

Add note to Additional information:  
 "See Table 33-1"

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L15 # 226  
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Table 33-17

With the lower system operating current of 600mA (vs 720mA), voltage at PD due to cable drop is now higher. It is now 42.5V (vs 41V).

IS:  
Vpd = Vpse - Vcable = 50V - Icable \* 12.5ohms  
= 50V - 0.6A \* 12.5ohms = 42.5V  
WAS:  
Vpd = Vpse - Vcable = 50V - Icable \* 12.5ohms  
= 50V - 0.72A \* 12.5ohms = 41V

SuggestedRemedy

Table 33-17, Item 1, Input Voltage

WAS: 41V (for Type 2 PD)

SHOULD BE: 42.5V (for type 2 PD)

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See Comment 65

CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L16 # 44  
Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Table 33-17

With Icable changing, the PD port volatges have changed from the present values.

SuggestedRemedy

Item 1: Type 2 Vport min = 50 - (.6\*12.5) = 42.5V

Item 3: Input V during Overload Voverload = 50 - (.6 \* 400/350 \* 12.5) = 41.4V

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comments 65, 421

CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L22 # 421  
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D Table 33-17

With the reduction of Icable from .720 to .600 A, input voltages for PD are affected.

Table 33-17, Item 3, Input voltage range during overload  
Is 39.7V  
Should be 50V - (400/350 \* 600mA \*12.5ohms) = 41.4V

SuggestedRemedy

Table 33-17, Item 3, Input voltage range during overload

IS:  
39.7V minimum  
SHOULD BE:  
41.4V minimum

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Table 33-17, Item 3, PSE type 2, change minimum entry to:

Vport\_min(PSE) - (Icable \* Rch/2 \* 400/350)

Add note to Additional information:  
"See Table 33-1"

CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L22 # 56  
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status D Table 33-17

Type 2 PD input voltage during overload need to be updated according to  
Iport=600mA\*0.4/0.35  
New value is 50V-Rch\*0.5\*Icable\*0.4/0.35=41.4V

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 39.7 with:  
Option 1: 41.4  
Option 2: 50V-Rch\*Icable\*0.2/0.35

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Comment Type blank, set to E as default.

See comment 421

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L 23 # 119  
 Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Table 33-17

Table 33-17  
 The tables should contain only numbers and not the formulae required to calculate them. The content of each cell will be the result of the respective formula, and will be automatically updated if something changes (e.g. I cable). Then the formulae can be added for reference in the text or in an annex.

SuggestedRemedy

Separate into 2 rows the PD types, and substitute 12.95W and 24.6W in place of the expression of Pport max.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Apparently the tool does not contain embedded formula. The consensus of commenters requested the formula in the table, even though it is harder on the reader.

See added note comment 451

CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L 23 # 451  
 Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Table 33-17, item 4.  
 Adding the variable I cable has made our life easier by only having to change the number in one spot but it has made the document harder to read. I got here from a reference on page 58, line 3 which says: "The maximum power a PD may expect to draw from a PSE is PPort max as defined in Table 33-17." I go to T33-17 and I find Pport = I cable \* Vportmin. But where do I find I cable?

SuggestedRemedy

Add: "Also, Table 33-1" under "See 33.3.7.2" in additional information for Item 4 Table 33-17.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L 28 # 85  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Draft D3.0:

Item 6:

1. We should define a minimum number only. The max. should not be defined due to the fact that it is implementation issue.
  - 1.1 5msec as minimum number is suggested. I would like to get more inputs from PD system vendors.
2. In most cases there is inherent delay in the application so forcing a number is not critical in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 0 to 5msec.  
 Delete value for maximum.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Is burdensome to force a PD to have a minimum inrush period. The maximum limitation is to assure compatibility with a PSE.

CI 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L 28 # 252  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD Tdelay

The Tdelay from the end of inrush to the engagement of Type 2 high power mode should be guaranteed to be longer than the time the PSE is in inrush mode.

The PSE may be in inrush for up to 75ms, and the PD has no knowledge of when the PSE transitions into full power mode.

Therefore, the PD must remain in inrush for at least 75ms.

SuggestedRemedy

Tdelay is 75ms min

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment 45

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L37 # 316  
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
Table 33-17 Item 7 Class 4 peak operating power  
The variable Vport\_static\_min has not been defined anywhere

SuggestedRemedy  
Table 33-17 defines 2 variables Vport and Voverload.  
Voverload defines the voltage when the PD is drawing peak power. Vport is the port voltage when the PD is drawing Pport.  
Recommend replacing:  
Pport\_max / Vport\_static\_min x Vport\_min with  
Pport\_max / Vport\_min x Voverload\_min

Pport\_max/Vport\_min x 400/350 gives the peak current that the PD can draw.

It needs to be noted that Vport is the instantenous value for the PSE while it is the DC value for the PD. This needs to be specified in section 33.3.7.1  
Recommend adding a comment in this section:  
Vport is the port voltage when the PD is drawing Pclass\_pd  
Define Pclass\_pd in Table 33-14

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See Comment 86

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L37 # 424  
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
Table 33-17, Item 7, Peak Operating power, Class 4

Maximum value has formula:  
 $(400/350) \times (Pport\ max / Vport\_static\ min) \times (Vport\ min)$

Vport\_static isn't a defined parameter.

SuggestedRemedy  
Correct formula as desired.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 86

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L37 # 86  
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
Draft D3.0:

Our objective for determine Ppeak was that  $Ppeak=Pport\_max*0.4/0.35$ .  
The current text specifies  $Ppeak = (0.4/0.35)*(Pport\_max/Vport\_static\_min)*Vport\_min$ .  
Analyzing the above equation shows the following:  
A) Pport\_max is a constant number determined by item 4 which is  $25.5W=0.6A*42.5V$  which is OK.  
B) Vport\_static\_min is not defined, hence it is not clear what it is?  
C) Vport\_min=42.5V (for Icable =600mA)

I don't see the benefit of using such equation that actually don't supply additional information.  
It is simpler to define  $Ppeak=(0.4/0.35)*Pport\_max$

SuggestedRemedy  
Replace:  
" $(0.4/0.35)*(Pport\_max/Vport\_static\_min)*Vport\_min$ ."

With " $Ppeak=(0.4/0.35)*Pport\_max$ "

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Table 33-17, item 7, Peak operating power class 4 replace formula with  
 $Ppeak=(0.4/0.35)*Pport\_max$

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L37 # 120  
Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics

Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
Table 33-17  
The parameter Vport\_static is not defined. Vport is the static input voltage. Transient input voltage is Vtran\_lo.

SuggestedRemedy  
Change the expression of peak operating power:  
 $(400/350) \times (Pport\_max/Vport\_min) \times Vtran\_min$

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 86



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L37 # 121  
 Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Ppeak

Table 33-17  
 It is very difficult for a reader to find out the right number for Ppeak. As suggested for Pport the tables should contain only numbers and not the formulae required to calculate them. The formula can be moved into the text for reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the content of the cell Ppeak max with the result of the formula.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The majority of commenters favor the formula approach even though it is harder on the reader.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L38 # 253  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Vport\_static

VPort\_static is undefined.

SuggestedRemedy

Define it, or perhaps replace with the properly intended variable, or fix entire expression.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 86

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L38 # 259  
 Frosch, Richard Pihong USA

Comment Type T Comment Status D Vport\_static

Vport\_static is undefined. I can not find any other reference in draft 3.0 to it.

SuggestedRemedy

Vport ad hoc team needs to define

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment 86

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7 P66 L38 # 452  
 Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D Vport\_static

Table 33-17 Item 7

Vport\_staticmin is undefined. I searched the doc and only find this one instance of the variable.

SuggestedRemedy

I think this is the min value of Table 33-9, Item 1.

Add: "Also, Table 33-9, Item 1" across from Vport\_staticmin in the additional information column for Table 33-17, Item 7.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment 86

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.2 P67 L32 # 37  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type T Comment Status D Pport

While PD peak operating power (Table 33-17 item 7) has provision for different classes, it seems like the input average power (same table item 4) does not. However we know that the PSE has an Icut limit based on the class (Table 33-9 item 8 page 48). Omission of this in the PD section seems to be an oversight.

SuggestedRemedy

The input average power should be Pclassmax with Additional information "per Table 33-14" (Section 33.3.5.1, page 63, line 35).

Table 33-14 limits should be titled "Maximum average power drawn by PD" to clarify - note that this is stated in the same section line 26:

A Type 1 PD shall return a Class 0 to 3 signature in accordance with the maximum power draw as specified by Table 33-14.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change Table 33-14 header from "Maximum power available to PD" to "Maximum average power drawn by PD."

Change class 4 power entry in table 33-14 to "Icable \* Vportmin"

Change Table 33-17 Item 4 maximum to "Pclassmax" with added note See Table 33-14.

Change 33.3.7.2 paragraph

"The maximum value of PPort is obtained as described in 33.2.8 and 33.7."  
 to: "The maximum value of PPort is obtained as described in 33.2.8, Table 33-14, and 33.7."

Interrelated to comment 86

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.3 P68 L7 # 45  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PD Inrush period

The inrush requirement for sec a type 2 PD have an intentional startup delay of 75ms - even when starting from a type 2 PSE. This causes an unnecessary burden on the type 2 PD due to control of both the minimum and maximum startup times driving cost and complexity up.

"Type 2 PDs with pse\_power\_type state variable set to 2 prior to power-on shall behave like a Type 1 PD for at least Tinrush max."

From .af: 33.3.5.3 Input inrush current  
 Input inrush current at startup will be limited by the PSE if CPort < 180uF, as specified in Table 33.5. If CPort >180uF, input inrush current shall be limited by the PD so that IInrush max is satisfied.

This seems to cover up an "oops" in .af since the PD was required to have an inrush less than 0.4A anyway.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text to read:

"Type 2 PDs shall limit their inrush current to linrush.

A type 1 PD shall have internal inrush current limiting below IInrush max, if CPort > 180 uF. Type 1 internal inrush limiting is not required if CPort < 180 uF, because PSE inrush limiting will provide the necessary limiting."

The inrush limit is in-place to avoid having the type 2 PSE provide a scaled-up inrush limiting, resulting in higher limiting device stress and therefore cost. Type 2 PDs are all ready required to have more sophisticated control due to 2-event classification, and virtually all integrated PD front-end solutions have some form of inrush limiting. Requiring the type 2 PD to limit its own inrush will have no cost impact to the market.

Given that the PSE will always know that it is powering a type 2 PD, it may safely skip the inrush period, or curtail its length. The PSE will still be protected from a non-compliant PD by clause 33.2.9.1 - just as it would be for a shorted cable while powering a PD. The PSE must handle this case and there is no additional cost to the PSE.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the text to read:

"Type 2 PDs shall limit their inrush current to linrush or below.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

A type 1 PD shall have internal inrush current limiting below  $I_{inrush\ max}$ , if  $C_{Port} > 180\ \mu F$ . Type 1 internal inrush limiting is not required if  $C_{Port} < 180\ \mu F$ , because PSE inrush limiting will provide the necessary limiting."

Change Table 33-9 item 6:

Break into three rows:

MIN	MAX	PSE	Additional info
0.4	0.45	1	See33.2.9.6
0.4	0.45	2, type 1 PD	See33.2.9.6
		l <sub>lim</sub> 2, type 2 PD	See33.2.9.6

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.4 P68 L16 # 307  
Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status A Pport typo  
peak current shall not exceed Pport max

SuggestedRemedy

Replace  
peak current shall not exceed Pport max  
with  
peak power shall not exceed Pport max

Response Response Status C  
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 417

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.4 P68 L16 # 217  
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status R Pport typo  
Paragraph on Peak Operating Current incorrectly uses term current when it should use pwoer and peak when it should use average.

SuggestedRemedy

IS:

At any static voltage at the PI, and any PD operating condition, the peak current shall not exceed PPort max for more than 50 ms maximum and 5% duty cycle maximum. Peak operating power shall not exceed PPeak max.

SHOULD BE:

At any static voltage at the PI, and any PD operating condition, the peak power shall not exceed PPort max for more than 50 ms maximum and 5% duty cycle maximum. Average operating power shall not exceed PPort.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

See commetrn 417

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.4 P68 L16 # 61  
Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status A Pport typo  
Draft D3.0:

we change peak current to peak power

SuggestedRemedy

Change peak current to peak power

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 417

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.4 P68 L 16 # 54  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A Pport typo

This subclause starts:  
 At any static voltage at the PI, and any PD operating condition, the peak current shall not exceed PPort max for more than 50 ms maximum and 5% duty cycle maximum.  
 It doesn't make sense to say that the peak current shall not exceed a power.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:  
 At any static voltage at the PI, and any PD operating condition, the peak current shall not cause PPort max to be exceeded for more than 50 ms maximum and 5% duty cycle maximum.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 417

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.4 P68 L 16 # 417  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status A Pport typo

This comment is resubmitted and my previous comment shall be withdrawn.

Paragraph on Peak Operating Current incorrectly uses term current when it should use power.

SuggestedRemedy

IS:  
 At any static voltage at the PI, and any PD operating condition, the peak current shall not exceed PPort max for more than 50 ms maximum and 5% duty cycle maximum.

SHOULD BE:  
 At any static voltage at the PI, and any PD operating condition, the peak power shall not exceed PPort max for more than 50 ms maximum and 5% duty cycle maximum.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.5 P69 L 1 # 444  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Figure 33-18

Figure 33-18  
 The current during overload has been defined as  $(400/350) \times (Pport\ max/Vport)$

This is wrong for class 1 and class 2

SuggestedRemedy

Change the value to  $(Ppeak/Voverload)$

Need to define somewhere that  $Ppeak = (Pclass/Vport) \times (400/350)$  for the class power negotiated over layer 2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the value to  $(Ppeak/Voverload)$

Add sentence to 33.3.7.4

"Note: A Type 2 PD may negotiate its Pport to less than Pclassmax via Link Layer Classification. Ppeak is reduced through Port changes affecting Pportmax."

See comments 86 & 37

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.5 P69 L35 # 317  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Dynamic PD V

The transient behavior described here is applicable only for type 2 PDs.

SuggestedRemedy

First Sentence:

.....the PSE is responsible for limiting the transient current drawn by the PD for up to TLIM min.

If previous comment to change TLIM to 50ms for type 1 PSE and 10ms to type 2 PSE is resolved then changing 10ms to TLIM min will fix this issue.

Second Sentence:

Type 2 PDs whose instantaneous maximum power draw exceeds Pport max and/or have Cport > 180uF, may require high currents during transient conditions. Such PDs shall operate below the "PD upperbound template," defined in 33.2.9.9 and Figure 13-14. For type 2 PD behavior prior to 10ms and compliance model during a transient event, see 33F.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Note: Requires changes to PSE Tlim covered by another comment not available to me, see remedy

".....the PSE is responsible for limiting the transient current drawn by the PD for up to TLIM min. "

Add sentence after the "For PD behavior prior to 10 ms and compliance models, see Figure 33F.1." (See comment 87 for changes):

"PDs shall operate below the PD Upperbound Template, defined in 33.2.9.9 and Figure 13-14 outside of the conditions defined in Figure (moved 33F.1 to this location) as required by their Type (1 or 2)."

See comment 131 deals also with PSE Tlim.

See also comment 87, 99, 100.

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.5 P69 L36 # 99  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Dynamic PD V

We need to clarify that the transient condition is generated by the PSE.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text from "transient conditions..."

To "transient conditions generated by the PSE..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.5 P69 L41 # 87  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Dynamic PD V

Draft D3.0:

Figure 33G.1. is in the informative section and yet the text discuss about compliance model.

SuggestedRemedy

Option 1 (Preferred): Move figure 33G.1. to the normative section.

Option 2: Delete "compliance models" and replace with "test models"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Move figure 33F.1 to t0 ~line 40, P69. Relabel figure #.

Change:

For PD behavior prior to 10 ms and compliance models, see Figure 33F.1.

To:

For Type 2 PD behavior prior to 10 ms see Figure 33#. Additional detail is provided in annex F.

See also comment 317 for type 2 reference

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.6 P69 L44 # 318  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D PI Capacitance

There are multiple issues here  
 1) Replace Rch with Rch/2  
 2) This section assumes that the PSE is current limiting for 50ms  
 3) Does not provide the ramp rate for the PI voltage transition from Vport min to Vport max

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest removing this section since there are no shall statements in this section. This section does not add any value. The PSE and PD behavior during transients and short circuit conditions have been clearly defined.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Remove 33.3.7.6

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.6 P69 L48 # 46  
 Patoka, Martin Texas Instruments

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This is primarily a carry-over from .af where the PSE will limit current. However, transient response is now covered by 33.3.7.5.

From .af:

"While there is no max capacitance, the PD max input capacitance (CPort in Table 33-12) and the PD input circuitry shall be designed in such a way that when a PD is connected to a PSE through a series resistance of up to 20 Ohms and the PSE voltage is changed from 44V to 57V, the peak current IPort will be as specified in Table 33-12, item 4, for a maximum duration of 50ms. Input capacitance of 180uF or less requires no special input considerations."

SuggestedRemedy

- 1) Drop 33.3.7.6 or:
- 2) Change 33.3.7.6 to read:

"... PD is connected to a PSE through a series resistance of RCh and the PSE voltage is changed from VPort min to VPort max as defined in Table 33-9, Pport may be exceeded for no more than 50 ms. Input capacitance of 180 uF or less requires no special input considerations."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See Comment 318

CI 33 SC 33.3.7.9 P70 L21 # 62  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D informative note

Draft D3.0:

The word "informative" is redundant.  
 The whole 33D etc. is informative.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "informative" and scan the text for multiple locations

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The normative vs. informative distinction might not be clear to many readers.

CI 33 SC 33.3.8 P70 L40 # 432  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D MPS

Comment reference \*\*HB-06\*\*

In conjunction with comment reference \*\*HB-05\*\* - related changes to the PD.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a 3rd bullet item:

If PD\_low\_power state has been negotiated then the PD may draw a current equal or above the minimum input current (IPort\_MPSP min) as specified in Table 33-18 instead of item a) above.

Change "A PD that does not maintain the MPS components in a) and b) above" to "A PD that does not maintain the MPS components in a) and b) or b) and c) above"

Change "shall remove both components a) and b) of the MPS" to "shall remove both components a), b) and c) of the MPS"

Also change Table 33-18

Add a line:

Input current (low power) IPort\_MPSP min mA 2 See 33.3.8

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8.1 P70 L48 # 63  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MPS  
 Draft D3.0:  
 The title "input current" is no longer match the text.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "Input Current" with "PD Maintain Power Signature"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 OBE See 236. Heading is being removed. Redundant to 100

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8.1 P70 L48 # 100  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MPS  
 The title "Input Current" is no longer relevant.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change title to "PD Maintaing power Signature"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 OBE See 236. Heading is being removed.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8.1 P70 L48 # 236  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D MPS  
 This subsection (33.3.8.1) need not be separated from 33.3.8.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete the 33.3.8.1 subsection title, folding Table 33-18 and the remaining NOTE into 33.3.8.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8.1 P70 L50 # 308  
 Vetteth, Anoop Cisco  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D MPS  
 Rch is wrong  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change Rch to Rch/2  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.4.1.8.2 P80 L41 # 144  
 John Abbott Corning Incorporated  
 Comment Type T Comment Status X  
 The equation on line 41 for {NEXTconn}dB should (a) indicate log10 as on page 74 (section 33.4.3, Impedance Balance) and (b) technically one cannot take the SQRT of an argument with UNITS; f = frequency [MHz]/1 [MHz]  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Substitute "log10" for "log" here and elsewhere for consistency.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

Cl 33 SC 33.4.2 P73 L37 # 398  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 802.3 isn't a test standard or a test-equipment standard; we are just defining what we mean by parameters by showing a recipe to measure them. It's up to the test equipment vendor and user to decide what tolerances are needed; 1%, 0.1% or whatever. Test equipment tolerancing evolves gradually over time. A spec with tolerances gets us into a silly game of double bluff: If the result is within 1% is it a pass or a fail? Do I have to cover myself by correcting for the possible uncertainty in my customers 1% equipment? And so on.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 As numbers are precise unless otherwise stated, remove the '+/- 1%' in all the test circuits  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.4.4 P74 L 40 # 536  
Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

The IEEE specification is not consistent with its common mode noise measurement requirements. Clause 33 specifies a range of 1 MHz to 100 MHz for a PSE. Other clauses (ex/ 14.3.1.2.5 10BASE-T) have no concept of measurement BW.

Testing during clause 33 development ensured data integrity with the constraints imposed. Reducing the BW of existing clause common mode measurements will not reduce the compliance of legacy systems. Requiring a PSE to meet common mode noise requirements below 1 MHz places an unnecessary cost burden on the system.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify other clauses or place a statement in clause 33 that allows the Ethernet MDI to use the clause 33 common mode requirements whether PoE power is present or not for all PoE supported data rates.

Suggested text for clause 33.4.4 add to the bottom of the existing text:

[The magnitude of the common-mode AC output voltage measured according to Figure 33-21 and Figure 33-22 at the transmit PI while transmitting data and with power applied, Ecm\_out, shall not exceed 50 mV peak when operating at 10 Mb/s, and 50 mV peak-to-peak when operating at 100 Mb/s or greater. The magnitude of the common-mode AC voltage shall not exceed 50 mV peak-to-peak measured at all other PIs. The frequency of the measurement shall be from 1 MHz to 100 MHz.]

The common-mode output voltage requirements of this clause may be applied for the MAU defined in Clause 14 and the PHYs defined in Clause 25 and Clause 40, while transmitting data whether power is applied or not.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
reviewed

Cl 33 SC 33.4.4 P74 L 42 # 532  
Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The second last sentence contradicts prior text within the same section.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "not exceed 50 mV peak-to-peak" with "be."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.4.4 P77 L 19 # 228  
Albert Vareljian Altera Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

In Figure 33-23--Pair to pair output noise voltage test: the first test terminal pertaining to the entity "PI A" is designated as "A". The second test terminal pertaining to the entity "PI B" and used in conjunction with the first terminal to perform pair-to-pair noise measurement is designated with the same name as the first terminal i.e. "A". This is ambiguous.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider assigning the terminal pertaining to the entity "PI B" a different name, e.g. "B" or "A'" etc.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "A" on p77 l19 to "B"

Cl 33 SC 33.4.8 P78 L 3 # 4  
Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status X cable

Include a reference to cabling specifications defined by TIA.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise text as follows:

"The cabling specifications for 100 W balanced cabling are described in ISO/IEC 11801-2002 and ANSI/TIA-568-C.0."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
reviewed

Cl 33 SC 33.4.8 P78 L 37 # 5  
Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status X cable

Include a reference to cabling specifications defined by TIA.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise text as follows:

"ISO/IEC IEC 11801 defines in 5.6.1 and ANSI/TIA-568-C.0 defines in 4.2 two types of Equipment..."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
reviewed



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.4.8 P79 L27 # 399  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 Does the Midspan PSE in Fig 33-25 power the cord to its left, its right, or both? Does the connection really extend from one end of it to the other?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Be clearer  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

CI 33 SC 33.4.8 P79 L31 # 400  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Midspan insertion configuration  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Midspan PSE insertion configuration  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 There is such a thing in 802.3 as just a Midspan. We are showing the location of the Midspan and not the more specific Midspan PSE.

CI 33 SC 33.4.8 P79 L44 # 6  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company  
 Comment Type E Comment Status X cable  
 Include a reference to cabling specifications defined by TIA.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise text as follows:  
 "...to more than specified 100 m as defined in ISO/IEC 11801 and ANSI/TIA-568-C.0."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

CI 33 SC 33.4.8 P79 L47 # 7  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company  
 Comment Type E Comment Status X cable  
 Include a reference to cabling specifications defined by TIA.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise text as follows:  
 "...to more than specified 100 m as defined in ISO/IEC 11801 and ANSI/TIA-568-C.0."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

CI 33 SC 33.4.8.1 P80 L16 # 88  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 Draft D3.0:  
 Item 3, the 1000BT Midspan can be also divided to items 1 and 2.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Option 1:  
 Split item 3 to:  
 3) 1000BT Connector or telecom outlet Midspan PSE  
 4) 1000BT work area or equipment cable Midspan PSE  
 Option 2: Delete lines 15-19 due to the fact that it is already explained in 33.4.8 page 91 lines 41-54 and 33.4.8.1  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.4.8.1 P80 L9 # 8  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company  
 Comment Type E Comment Status X cable  
 Include a reference to connector test specifications defined by TIA.  
 Commenter's note: '568-C.2 is pending publication. ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2 is the published (soon to be obsolete) reference.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise text as follows:  
 "These parameters should be measured using the test procedures of ISO ISO 11801:2002 or ANSI/TIA-568-C.2 for connecting hardware."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W reviewed

CI 33 SC 33.4.8.1.1 P80 L26 # 143  
 John Abbott Corning Incorporated  
 Comment Type T Comment Status X  
 The equation on line 26 for {NEXTconn}dB should (a) indicate log10 as on page 74 (section 33.4.3, Impedance Balance) and (b) technically one cannot take the log10 of an argument with UNITS; f = frequency [MHz]/1 [MHz]  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Substitute "log10" for "log" here and elsewhere for consistency.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W reviewed

CI 33 SC 33.4.8.1.4 P81 L13 # 9  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company  
 Comment Type E Comment Status X cable  
 Include a reference to patch cord specifications defined by TIA.  
 Commenter's note: '568-C.2 is pending publication. ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2 is the published (soon to be obsolete) reference.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise text as follows:  
 "...as specified in ISO/IEC 11801:2002 or ANSI/TIA-568-C.2 for insertion loss, NEXT, and return loss for the transmit and receive pairs.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W reviewed

CI 33 SC 33.4.8.2 P81 L18 # 55  
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 This clause starts:  
 When an Alternative A Midspan is connected to a 100BASE-TX PHY, the Midspan transfer function gain shall be greater than ...  
 What is a "midspan"?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to:  
 When an Alternative A Midspan PSE is connected to a 100BASE-TX PHY, the Midspan transfer function gain shall be greater than ...  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.4.8.2 P81 L23 # 64  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Draft D3.0  
 There is some confusion in the text regarding DC bias current and lumb in page 81 line 29. The dc bias current is the net result of DC bias current caused by the data, lbias1 and the DC bias current caused by lumb, lbias2=lumb/2 so DC bias current=lbias1+lbias2. According to draft 3 and 802.3 requirements the max DC bias is 8mA+ 0.5 X 0.03 X 600mA = 17mA .  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 1. Change line 29 from:  
 "Additionally, the requirements will be met with a DC bias current between 0 mA and lumb mA (see Table 33-9)."  
 To:  
 "Additionally, the requirements will be met with a DC bias current between 0 mA and (8+0.5\*lumb)mA (see Table 33-9 for lumb)."  
 2. Add figure 33-24-1 after line 36 to complete information.  
 Editor to use the right text to make this drawing part of compliance test as described in lines 32-36.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 frs: This should be discussed.  
 Figure 33-24 exists and could be pointed to from section 33.4.8.2.  
 See 534

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.4.8.2 P81 L23 # 269  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status X  
 Draft D3.0.  
 Draft D3.0.  
 1. Equation 33-14 needs to be updated with the results of worst case analysis.  
 2. The previous equation was approximation of the TF function done for filling up the TBD prior moving the draft to the working group as explained at the meeting. Attached is logarithmic accurate regression for the TF for the 100KHz to 1MHz band.  
 3. Some text modifications were made to simplify the test setup.  
 4. The definition for I<sub>bias</sub> which is required for the compliance test were corrected to match Table 33-9 definitions (I<sub>bias</sub> vs. I<sub>unb</sub>)  
 5. A drawing was added to clarify the test setup. See attached file.  
 6. See attached word file that summarize the changes.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace 4.8.2 with the new text attached in the file "33.4.8.2 Updates for Draft D3.0"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

CI 33 SC 33.4.8.2 P81 L23 # 91  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 Draft D3.0

Update equation 33-14 to include the results of sensitivity analysis for having the worst case conditions covered.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Updated equation to be delivered by the Midspan adhoc at the meeting

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 see 269, same comment

CI 33 SC 33.5.5 P82 L29 # 10  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status X cable  
 Include a reference to channel DC resistance unbalance specifications defined by TIA.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise text as follows:  
 "The resistance unbalance shall be as specified in IEC 11801 Edition 2, Clause 6.4.8 or ANSI/TIA-568-C.2, clause 5.1.2 (reference: 3 percent)."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

CI 33 SC 33.5.8 P83 L9 # 101  
 Cobb, Terry Commscope

Comment Type T Comment Status D cable  
 Last sentence "Specific requirements". The standard does define temperature derating.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete "Specific requirements and" then start the sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.6 P83 L25 # 401  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Wasted space

SuggestedRemedy  
 Start 33.6 here

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.6 P84 L1 # 402  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** RENUMBER

I believe that management register specifications are always in Clause 22 or Clause 45 (see 73.8 for an example).

SuggestedRemedy  
Move the bulk of this subclause to Clause 22 or Clause 45 as appropriate

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED REJECT.

This is inline with what 802.3af (802.3-2005 Clause 33) has.

Cl 33 SC 33.6 P84 L1 # 382  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** RENUMBER

Every clause that has one, has its environmental subclause last before the PICS

SuggestedRemedy  
Move the remainder of this subclause to before 33.5

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Balloter is asking to make 33.5 33.8 and slide up 33.6 - 33.8 by one to align with other clauses that have environmental recommendations.

Need to check all cross-references as well

Cl 33 SC 33.6 P84 L3 # 149  
Koper, Ezra Microsemi

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

MII registers 11 & 12 are PSE related therefore the PD should not mentioned here in lines 3 and 6.

SuggestedRemedy  
PD should be omitted from lines 3 and 6.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The balloter is correct that there is no PD registers and PD can be omitted assuming the group does not want to do any PD management.

Cl 33 SC 33.6 P84 L3 # 148  
Koper, Ezra Microsemi

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

The text here is not clear.  
for example: the relationship between MII/MDIO and PSE control is not clear.  
The text in lines 3-7 should be replaced with the text from 802.3af which explains better that this management option is applicable whenever PSE is instantiated in the same physical package as a PHY.

To make this subclause more clearer, the drawing bellow should be added

SuggestedRemedy  
1. Replace the current text in lines 3-7 with the following text and drawing:

"Management of the PSE is optional. If the PSE is instantiated in the same physical package as a PHY and a Clause 22.2.4 MII or Clause 45.2 MDIO is physically implemented, then the management access shall use the PSE register definitions shown in 33.6.1. Where no physical embodiment of the MII or MDIO management is supported, equivalent management capability shall be provided"

2. Insert Figure "33-25-1 for subclause 33.6" after line 7.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The suggested diagram does not help add any clarity, rather adds confusion. However, the balloter is pointing out that if management is implemented, access to these registers may be provided by the MII or MDIO interfaces. This does not preclude other interface mechanisms to these registers. Text to that effect can be added.

Cl 33 SC 33.6.1.1.1 P85 L4 # 383  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

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

Not 'the management entity should write to reserved bits with a value of '0'': it shouldn't be asked to write to them at all. We have fixed this in 802.3ay

SuggestedRemedy  
If material in 33.6 is relocated, duplication removed, the problem might go away naturally.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Check fix in 802.3ay

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7 P89 L1 # 384  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D RENUMBER  
 Every clause that has one, has its environmental subclause last before the PICS  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Move the Data Link Layer classification subclause to before 33.5  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Refer to comment 382

CI 33 SC 33.7 P89 L1 # 492  
 Ganga, Ilango Intel  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status A PICS  
 Missing PICS for 33.7 Data Link layer classification requirements  
 Also missing PICS for requirements in 33.8  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add PICS corresponding to 33.7 and 33.8  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE submission from Gerry Nadeau.  
 PICS being redone for entire draft

CI 33 SC 33.7 P89 L1 # 152  
 Jetzt, John Avaya  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Fallback & L2 New Feature  
 Data Link Layer classification would be enhanced by an additional, optional TLV. The purpose of this TLV would be for the PD to communicate to the PSE a fallback PD power value to which the PD could fall back, if it became necessary.  
 The Power via MDI classification TLV defined in 33.7.2 enables the PSE or PD to send a requested PD power value that is lower than the actual PD power value. In the case of the PSE, this might be done if the PSE needs the PD to cut back on power. However, the power needs of a PD may often be in discrete power steps. That is, a PD may be able to curtail certain features and still maintain reasonable limited functionality. It would be useful for the PD to be able to tell the PSE what the preferred lower PD power value would be.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Create a new subsection in 33.7. Call it: DTE Power via MDI fallback TLV.  
 The DTE Power via MDI fallback TLV is optionally used by the PD to send a preferred fallback PD power value to the PSE. This TLV is optionally used by the PSE only to acknowledge the fallback TLV from the PD. The PSE may optionally use the fallback PD power value if the PSE requests a lower PD power value in a subsequent classification TLV.  
 The format of the fallback TLV can be modeled after Figure 33-26. The major difference is that the fallback PD power value takes the place of the requested PD power value.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 A fall-back power state seems like a reasonable TLV to have for sufficated devices. Specifics of the TLV can be crafted at the meeting

CI 33 SC 33.7 P89 L11 # 388  
 Piers Dawe Avago Technology  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A LIAISON  
 TLVs? Are these Slow Protocol TLVs?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 If so, would an annex to 57 be the right place to define them (if not 802.1AB)? Anyway, a PMD-and-below clause seems the wrong place.  
 Response Response Status W  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE 504.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.7 P89 L 18 # 386  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EEE

Text says 'A device implementing Data Link Layer classification shall send power management Protocol Data Units (PDUs) and process PDUs received from the remote device at least once every 30 seconds.' Per common sense and EEE principles, a PD should be allowed to go to sleep, in which case this isn't appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Explain how this can work; does the PD retract its claim to Data Link Layer classification, temporarily? Or should the sentence be qualified with 'If not in low power mode' or similar?

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The low power state in EEE is triggered by a control policy that determines there is low utilizations. While EEE is looking at msec sleep times, the balloter points out a corner case whereby if the only packets that are schedule to go ut are the keep alive PDUs and the EEE control policy allows for extended buffer and batch, this could violate the PoE policy. Interaction between EEE and PoE needs to be considered.

Cl 33 SC 33.7 P89 L 18 # 387  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status A LIAISON

Text says 'The information supplied by the Power Via MDI TLV defined in IEEE Std 802.1ABT Annex G.3 is superseded by the DTE Power via MDI classification TLV.' So there is a 'Power Via MDI' messaging protocol and a 'DTE Power via MDI classification'? If so, their names and functions are too similar, and this draft looks like an attempt to change 802.1AB, outside of 802.1AB, and without deprecating or obsoleting whatever is currently in 802.1AB. Is 'Power Via MDI' used for anything else?

SuggestedRemedy

If this is 802.1AB work, get the things you want into their draft, not here.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 504.

Cl 33 SC 33.7 P89 L 5 # 385  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status A LIAISON

We have a mix of MDI-oriented volts and amps at the bottom of the layer diagram, and now an LLDP which is above 802.3's layer stack.

SuggestedRemedy

Do we need a layer diagram and some words explaining how these things are related?

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 504.

Add at beginning of TLV section: "This is an extension of the 802.3 subtype specified in IEEE 802.1AB-REV for PoEP."

Cl 33 SC 33.7 P89 L 8 # 493  
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PICS

Data link layer classification requirement:

"Type 2 PDs that require more than 12.95 W must support Data Link Layer classification (see 33.3.5).Data Link Layer classification is optional for all other devices."

Is this "must support" or "shall support"?

SuggestedRemedy

Change this to, "shall", if it is a requirement for Type 2 PDs more than...

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The shall may be in the classification section. Balloter has a valid point, if the requirement is in this section then change to a shall, otherwise re-word paragraphs to reference the classification section.

First step, is to check where the shall and PICS is

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7 P89 L9 # 89  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 Draft D3.0:  
 Type 1 PD that requires more power then 12.95 by using Data Link Layer Classification is specifically not compliant to the standard.  
 It can be understood from the text that we can do it.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Add the following text after line 9:  
 "Type 1 that requires more power then 12.95W by using Data Link Layer Classification is specifically not compliant to the standard."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

By definition a PD that requires power levels over 802.3-2005 is a type 2. This additional text would be redundant and confusing.

CI 33 SC 33.7.1 P89 L17 # 181  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 "A device implementing Data Link Layer classification shall send power management Protocol Data Units(PDUs) and process PDUs received from the remote device at least once every 30 seconds." contradicts 802.1 specification which allows up to 3600 sec.

I am confirming that this is a requirement and therefore a super-requirement over 802.1

SuggestedRemedy  
 Clarify language to address 802.1 compliance, and compatibility.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Check 802.1ABREV and adjust text as appropriate

CI 33 SC 33.7.1 P89 L18 # 425  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D EEE  
 The DLL classification requires PDs to respond every 30 seconds minimum. With the push for Green Power, future PoE systems will want ability to power down PHY but keep port connected to run micropower circuitry. We need to eliminate requirement for PD to respond every 30 seconds.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove requirement for PD to respond with DLL every 30 seconds. Do not remove port power if MPS is present but DLL is absent.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comment 386

CI 33 SC 33.7.2 P89 L26 # 182  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Convention & L2 New Feature  
 I believe we need to consider changing the names of some fields, and adding some to provide clarity and functionality that is essential to the spec.

SuggestedRemedy  
 These changes apply here, and in clause 30 - do global search, change

- 1) Change Requested type/source/priority to "PSE Requested type/source/priority"
- 2) Change Actual type/source/priority to "PD Actual type/source/priority"
- 3) Add "PD Minimum type/source/priority" which declares the minimum power the PD can operate with so that a PSE may reduce its power to the minimum without causing it to shut down. Add appropriate sub-clause for definition which includes the value FF = unknown.
- 4) Add "PD Current type/source/priority" which declares the current power the PD is operating with so that a PSE may compute loss through the cable by subtracting this value from its own current power distributed. Add appropriate sub-clause for definition which includes the value FF = unknown. The power variable will not be required as a measurement, and may not be extremely accurate, but rather may be defined by the state of the PD and a factory setting for that state.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There are two comments here: (a) is adding PSE/PD naming to make the names more specific, which is reasonable and (b) is adding a real time current measurement. Suggest breaking up into two items. Item (a) needs to be coordinated with other naming changes. Item (b) is a reasonable enhancement.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.2 P89 L 40 # 342  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L1 L2 Classification  
 Add the following sentence after Line 40.

SuggestedRemedy

A Type-2 PD after being powered by PSE during boot up shall send at least one LLDP-POE TLV shown in Figure 33-26 with actual type/source/priority to the connected link partner for completion of mutual identification and classification. The PSE shall not change the power applied to the Type 1 or Type 2 PD till it receives this 1st TLV from the PD.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The initialization should be covered under the classification and state machine section. Check to see if this is already covered there.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.1 P89 L 42 # 516  
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 While actual 'power type', 'power source' and 'power priority' is useful for the far end to use in determining if to accept or deny a request I can't see any value in supplying a requested 'power type', 'power source' and 'power priority'. This is status information and not something that will change as a result of the arbitration. For example if a device is a Type 1 PD it can request to change this to something else, the same is true for a PSE operating from a primary source.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove requested 'power type', 'power source' and 'power priority' from the TLV and the MIB.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

The result of a change is the result of the state of the local device not the arbitration.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.1 P90 L 21 # 433  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Fallback & L2 New Feature  
 Comment reference \*\*HB-07\*\*

It is useful to define a low power mode to allow the PD to signal that it is reducing its activity to a minimal level and will be reducing its power draw.

This uses one of the bits in the power source/type/priority word. It is then managed using the same negotiation mechanism as other power fields.

See comments \*\*HB-05\*\*, \*\*HB-06\*\*

SuggestedRemedy

Add a line in Table 33-22

2 PD low power 1 = low power mode, 0 = normal operation

Change the Reserved bit range from 3:2 to 3

Add a new subclause 33.7.2.1.x PD low power mode

For a PD, when PD low power is enabled the PD is attempting to minimize its power usage and may employ power saving features.

For a PSE this bit is always 0.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Not clear if the balloter is asking for fallback power (in which case it was covered by another comment from Jetz). If the intent is to change the power mode of the device then why not just use the arbitration mechanism? What is the use if the PSE has to reserve the high power anyway? If the intent is to report current power, refer to comment by Dove.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.1.1 P89 L 49 # 343  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 This field shall be set to 01 for a PD (see 33.3) and 00 for a PSE (see 33.2).

SuggestedRemedy

This field shall be set to 01 or 11 for a PD (see 33.3) and 00 or 10 for a PSE (see 33.2).

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Either do as commenter suggests or strike the entire line



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.1.1 P89 L49 # 155  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Need to include both Type 1 and Type 2 in the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change sentence to:  
 This field shall be set to 11 for a Type 1 PD, 01 for a Type 2 PD (see 33.3), 10 for a Type 1 PSE, and 00 for a Type 2 PSE (see 33.2).

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comment 343

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.1.1 P90 L21 # 353  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 New Feature  
 The following changes are proposed to Table 33-22 to support low power modes in the PD to conserve power

SuggestedRemedy

New Text  
 3 - reserved  
 2:0 - 2 1 0  
 1 X X = reserved  
 1 0 0 = conserve  
 0 1 1 = low  
 0 1 0 = high  
 0 0 1 = critical  
 0 0 0 = unknown (default)

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Not sure what conserve means here in terms of priority. If the PD wants to reduce its power then it can send an updated TLV. The priority seems orthogonal to this.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.1.3 P90 L22 # 156  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status D L2 New Feature

Table 33-22:  
 Provide separate value/meaning information for the power priority (bits 1 and 0) of PDs and PSEs.

SuggestedRemedy

In front of the existing text of this cell:  
 When power type = PD

Then add:  
 When power type = PSE  
 1 0  
 1 1 Reserved  
 1 0 Reserved  
 0 1 Reserved  
 0 0 unknown (default)

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The priority is independent of the power type. Not sure why adding a set of reserved values helps. Perhaps balloter can provide additional clarification.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.1.3 P90 L 43 # 150  
Koper, Ezra Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Per line #43 PSE can't set PoE port priority.

In 802.3af and RFC3621 (which is the SNMP MIB), only Type 1 PSE had the capability to set PoE port priority. In 802.3at PD should be in a position to suggest what should be its priority but not enforce it on the PSE due to the fact that the PSE should be the Master (from central power management point of view) and the PD is the slave and it is also good for backwards compatibility.

State diagram in section 33.7.6.5 (both for PSE & PD need to be changed in order to reflect the proposed change).

SuggestedRemedy

Replace lines 40-43 with the following text:

"When the power type is PSE, if PSE is interested to enforce its PoE port priority, it shall set this field to low/high/critical. PD shall always accept PSE enforced priority. If PSE would like to obtain PD priority rather than enforcing its own priority, it should set this field to 00"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The PD priority is a piece of information that the PD provides to the PSE. The PSE may or may not use this information. If it uses this information, the use is outside the scope of the standard.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.2 P90 L 47 # 158  
Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status D L2 PD Value Clarification

Clarify the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

"... shall contain the currently requested PD power value, where PD power value is defined in Table 33-23."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.2 P90 L 47 # 157  
Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status D L2 PD Value Clarification

The phrase "power value" needs to be "PD power value" twice on this line, and in the title of Table 33-23.

Also globally, and when "requested" or "actual" is included, that word should precede "PD power value"

SuggestedRemedy

Change the phrase "power value" to "PD power value" twice on this line.

Also globally: see p.17,line.54; p.20,line.15; p.91,line.14; p.91,line.25; p.91,line.33; p.92,line.9; p.92,line.14; p.92,line.30; p.92,line.36; p.92,line.48; p.93,line.48; p.93,line.49; p.94,line.40; p.95,line.7.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.2 P90 L 54 # 151  
Koper, Ezra Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Power value field should be changed so that there will be an option to mark this field as "Unknown" as it is possible in all the other fields of the TLV PDU (as power type, power source, priority). Value 0 should be used as "Unknown". This will allow for example, to change PD priority without changing previous PD power request.

SuggestedRemedy

In Table 33-23 column "Value/Meaning"

Replace :

"Power = 0.1 × (decimal value of bits) Watts.

Valid values for these bits are decimal 0 through 295."

with:

"Value 0 = Unknown.

Power=0.1 x (decimal value of bits) Watts.

Valid values for these bits are decimal 1-295"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The power value is the minimum requirement of DLL Classification. A PSE cannot allocate power based on a value of unknown.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.2 P91 L10 # 183  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 Power Convention  
 Erroneous Statement - Not measuring output of PSE

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "output of the PSE's" to "input of the PD's"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comment 134.

We had a discussion on this in the Boston interim and the agreement was to always report the PD power not PSE power.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.2 P91 L10 # 134  
 Johnson, Peter Sifos Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D L2 Power Convention

This paragraph states that the Requested Power Level in the Power Value Field is "the power at the output of the PSE's PI" and that the PSE is responsible for estimating line loss. This appears to contradict statements in 33.7.2.4 (Actual PD Power Value) and 33.7.6.2 (Variables) which always define the power field as "Maximum input average power ... to the PD...". It also contradicts 33.7.5 where it is stated that an ACK or NACK must be generated when the incoming PDU has Requested Power Value NOT EQUAL to Actual Power value.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Assuming the intent is that the LLDP power fields ALWAYS carry the power level (draw) at the PD interface, 33.7.2.2 should be modified to: "In the case of the PSE, this maximum input average power the PD will consume if such power is accepted by the PSE".

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

In the Boston meeting we agreed that the PD and PSE will always talk the PD power.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.2 P91 L11 # 336  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D Cable Loss  
 Add the following line after line 11.

SuggestedRemedy  
 The calculation of cable loss this should match the methods used for Layer 1.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The L1 method assumes worst case cable loss. The estimation of cable loss used in L2 is not addressed by the protocol and hence the standard only talks power at the PD.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.2 P91 L13 # 418  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D L2 PD Value Clarification  
 The paragraph is confusing.

Rewrite.

SuggestedRemedy  
 IS:  
 If accepted by the PSE, the requested PD power value for a PD is the new maximum input average power (see 33.3.7.2) the PD will ever draw under this power allocation. If accepted by the PD, the PD requested power value for a PSE is the new maximum input average power it wants the PD to ever draw under this power allocation.

SHOULD BE:  
 Once a PD requested power value is accepted by the PSE, this is the new maximum input average power (see 33.3.7.2) the PD will ever draw under this power allocation. If the PSE requests the PD to run under a new PD power value, the PD may accept or reject the request. If accepted by the PD, this is the new maximum input average power the PD will ever draw under this power allocation.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Subclause was incorrect. Corrected from 33.7.5 to 33.7.2.2

This paragraph could be better written. Suggestion is to avoid text that may discuss priority if there is a conflict between the PD and PSE desires as that will be handled by the state machines.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.2 P91 L 6 # 159  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type T Comment Status D L2 PD Value Clarification  
 Delete the word "requested" from the definition of PD power value.

SuggestedRemedy

"where  
 Power is the effective PD power value"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type changed to a T. Requested is appropriate as it is within the context of section 33.7.2.2. 33.7.2.4 uses the same format to define actual.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.2 P91 L 9 # 160  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status D L2 Power Convention  
 Clarify this paragraph. Eliminate the phrase "this power".

SuggestedRemedy

Change paragraph to:  
 The effective PD power is the power at the input of the PD's PI, and so does not include channel losses. In the case of a PSE, the power at the output of the PSE's PI is the sum of the effective PD power and the channel loss. The PSE is therefore responsible for estimating and including channel loss when calculating the PSE allocated port power value.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comment 134

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.4 P91 L 25 # 161  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status D L2 PD Value Clarification  
 Clarify sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

"... contain the current actual PD power value, where PD power value is defined in Table 33-23."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

A clarification may be helpful, however, the suggested clarification adds confusion. The value is the worst case power number that the PD thinks it can ever draw under the existing allocation.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.5 P91 L 39 # 146  
 Koper, Ezra Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

In order to assure that PDU ACK/NACK reply sent back by PD to PSE or PSE to PD are related, two bit (bit2-3) sequence number should be added.  
 Each time PD or PSE initiate Data Link Layer PDU to advertize its state, or send change request PDU it should increment sequence number by one. ACK/NACK reply PDU should contain same sequence number (0-3)

In addition bit 0-1 of Acknowledge field should be given a name. I suggest to call it AckType

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:

Bit	Function	Value/meaning
7:2	reserved	reserved

to:

7:4	reserved	reserved
3:2	SeqNum	Two bit sequence number
1:0	AckType	1 0

--  
 1 1 = loss of communications  
 1 0 = non-acknowledge  
 0 1 = acknowledge  
 0 0 = not part of acknowledge cycle

Before line #46 add the following:

"Each time PD or PSE initiate Data Link Layer PDU to advertize its state, or send change request PDU it should increment sequence number by one. ACK/NACK reply PDU should contain same sequence number (0-3)"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The intent of the state machines is that a request for a new vlaue cannot be sent out until a response (ACK or NACK) is received for the current requested value. Hence, a sequence number is not necessary.

CI 33 SC 33.7.2.5 P91 L 47 # 162  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Add reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Add:  
 (see Figure 33-27 and Figure 33-28)

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.3 P91 L 51 # 163  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"Cross-reference" is hyphenated.

SuggestedRemedy

Make change globally.  
 See p.91,line 53; p.92,line 1; p.92,line 23; p.92,line 18; p.92,line 20; p.95,line 19; p.95,line 23.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.3 P92 L 6 # 184  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Naming Convention

Table 33-25, 26  
 Changes to tables required to address earlier comment regarding TLV fields

SuggestedRemedy

Please add the variables

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comment 182 and others on naming convention first.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.3 P92 L 6 # 164  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Fix capitalization.

SuggestedRemedy

Table 33-25 and Table 33-26:  
 In the TLV column, use "power source". (Four instances)

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.4 P92 L 54 # 450  
 McCormack, Michael Texas Instruments

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 New Feature

Everyone who will do in depth power management will want to know precisely, for at least some set of device, what PD is on the link. Please add a TLV to allow the identification of the PD, it can be a manufacturer assigned code. This should also include fields that identify the average power, the maximum power, the duty cycle of the maximum power, the sleep mode power and an indication whether or not the same devices of this type could synchronize their high power states.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a new optional TLV with fields:  
 Device ID - manufacture specific device ID value  
 Maximum power draw - .1W increments  
 Average power draw - .1W increments  
 Sleep mode power - .1W increments  
 Maximum power duty cycle - ratio of bits over 255  
 Synchronization - boolean

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The enhancement to add a TLV for unique identification is reasonable.

The re-definition of Max and Avg. power is confusing as the DLL

CI 33 SC 33.7.5 P91 L 1 # 426  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D Power & L2 Power Convention  
 The PD power encoding has 3 problems.

Presently, the power is scaled for 29.5W maximum. With the recent cable derating, the power is now 25.5W.

There was also talk early on to scale this power up to 100W to enable future higher power PoE. This should be implemented.

Line 9 says that for the PD the referenced power levels are at the PD connector. Line 10 then says that for the PSE, the power levels are at the PSE connector. This will cause confusion. We should just use PD power levels.

SuggestedRemedy

Scale the power to 100W.

Use power referenced to the PD connector only.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Regarding the balloter's 3 issues:

- Adjust the 29.5W to 25.5W.
- Using the field to communicate more than 25.5W is outside the scope of the standard
- Power used is that of the PD. Refer to comment 134.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.5 P92 L41 # 439  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 Timing

This whole section seems to be at odds with 33.7.1 - devices shall send and receive every 30 seconds.

Furhermore a much more rapid response is required if this feature is to be used for any form of dynamic power management (e.g. allocating power for a video call during ring).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace the 3 paragraphs with:

An LLDPDU containing a DTE Power via MDI classification TLV shall be sent within 35 seconds of Data Link Layer classification being enabled in a PD as indicated by the variable pd\_dll\_enabled, or in a PSE as indicated by the variable pse\_dll\_enabled. See 33.2.4.4, 33.3.3.3, 33.7.6.2.

An LLDPDU containing a DTE Power via MDI classification TLV with the Acknowledge field set to either "acknowledge" or "non-acknowledge" shall be sent within 30 seconds of receipt of a valid LLDPDU containing a DTE Power via MDI classification TLV with the Requested power value field not equal to the Actual power value field. It is recomended that a PSE that can support dynamic power allocation should respond within 300 milliseconds to such a PDU in normal operation.

An LLDPDU containing a DTE Power via MDI classification TLV with the Acknowledge field set to "not part of acknowledge cycle" shall be sent within 35 seconds of receipt of a valid LLDPDU containing a DTE Power via MDI classification TLV with the Acknowledge field set to either "acknowledge" or "non-acknowledge."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The balloter is asking to speed up the response time. There was a brief discussion on this at the interim and plenary meetings. Suggest to poll the Task Force on feasibility of rapid response.

CI 33 SC 33.7.5 P92 L41 # 344  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 Timing

An LLDPDU containing a DTE Power via MDI classification TLV shall be sent within 5 minutes of Data Link Layer classification being enabled in a PD as indicated by the variable pd\_dll\_enabled, or in a PSE as indicated by the variable pse\_dll\_enabled. See 33.2.4.4, 33.3.3.3, 33.7.6.2.

*SuggestedRemedy*

An LLDPDU containing a DTE Power via MDI classification TLV shall be sent after Data Link Layer classification being enabled in a PD as indicated by the variable pd\_dll\_enabled, or in a PSE as indicated by the variable pse\_dll\_enabled. See 33.2.4.4, 33.3.3.3, 33.7.6.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer comment 439

CI 33 SC 33.7.5 P92 L48 # 337  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D L2 Timing

Add the following line after line 48

*SuggestedRemedy*

The 5 minutes has been choosen to insert a limit in the 2 X TTL timer range which can be very large, and is used to assert a loss of communication event, after the initial Layer 2 commnication is established with the link partner, as explained in Sec 33.8

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The purpose of the standard is to specify interoperability requirements. The additional text is already contained in another section. Adding here creates duplicates of the same content.

CI 33 SC 33.7.5 P92 L53 # 165  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Clarify sentence.

*SuggestedRemedy*

". . . containing a DTE Power via MDI classification TLV being received with the Acknowledge field . . . "

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.5 P92 L 54 # 440  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 Timing

It is necessary that a PD can identify whether it has been connected to a type 2 PSE as rapidly as possible when it is first connected. For example, in some applications, a PD installer may plug the PD into a socket that is far distant from the PSE and will not know whether the port is able to support a high power device until a type 2 PSE is identified. Clearly this is not a problem for L1 classification but it requires a PSE supporting L2 classification to start sending management frames as soon as possible after it has powered the PD.

Clearly this may not be possible in all circumstances - such as during a PSE reboot or if hundreds of PDs are connected simultaneously. The requirement needs to be expressed for "normal operation."

SuggestedRemedy

Add a paragraph at the end of 33.7.5

To allow some PD devices to indicate that they have been connected to a type 2 PSE as rapidly as possible, the PSE shall start sending LLDP management frames including the appropriate power type within 5 seconds of applying power to the PD in normal operation.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.5 P95 L 51 # 338  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D L2 Timing

Add the following line after line 52

SuggestedRemedy

The 5 minutes has been chosen to insert a limit in the 2 X TTL timer range which can be very large, and is used to assert a loss of communication event, after the initial Layer 2 communication is established with the link partner, as explained in Sec 33.8

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The purpose of the standard is to specify interoperability requirements. The additional text is already contained in another section. Adding here creates duplicates of the same content.

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P93 L 37 # 185  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"where X is the decimal value of locActualPowerValue." is not sufficiently detailed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "where X is the decimal value of locActualPowerValue in increments of 100mW."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P93 L 43 # 166  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Fix typo.

SuggestedRemedy

". . . system does not want to change the . . ."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P93 L 51 # 186  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"where X is the decimal value of locRequestedPowerValue." is insufficient.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "where X is the decimal value of locRequestedPowerValue in increments of 100mW."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Section reference was incorrect. Changed to 33.7.6.2 from 33.7.6.1. Additional text to clarify increments is helpful and consistent.



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P94 L 13 # 295  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D MGMT: GET-SET

Comments reference \*\*HB-01\*\* and \*\*HB-02\*\* added new variables for local and remote; actual and requested "PowerFields"

Definitions for these must be added into the variable definitions section.

SuggestedRemedy

Comment reference \*\*HB-03\*\*

Add the following definitions before "removePower"

locActualPowerFields

A concatenation of the fields that indicate the actual PD power type, source, priority and value of the local system. This variable consists of a 24 bit field: bits 23:16 correspond to the Actual power type/source/priority value defined in 33.7.2.3 bit 7 mapping to bit 23, etc.; bits 15:0 correspond to the Actual power value defined in 33.7.2.4. These are mapped to the attributes aLLDPPoEPLocActualPowerType; aLLDPPoEPLocActualPowerSource; aLLDPPoEPLocActualPowerPriority; and aLLDPPoEPLocActualPDPowerValue (30.12.1.1.6,30.12.1.1.7,30.12.1.1.8,30.12.1.1.9).

locRequestedPowerFields

A concatenation of the fields that indicate the requested PD power type, source, priority and value of the local system. This variable consists of a 24 bit field: bits 23:16 correspond to the Requested power type/source/priority value defined in 33.7.2.1 bit 7 mapping to bit 23, etc.; bits 15:0 correspond to the Requested power value defined in 33.7.2.2. These are mapped to the attributes aLLDPPoEPLocRequestedPowerType; aLLDPPoEPLocRequestedPowerSource; aLLDPPoEPLocRequestedPowerPriority; and aLLDPPoEPLocRequestedPDPowerValue (30.12.1.1.2, 30.12.1.1.3, 30.12.1.1.4, 30.12.1.1.5).

remActualPowerFields

A concatenation of the fields that indicate the actual PD power type, source, priority and value of the remote system. This variable consists of a 24 bit field: bits 23:16 correspond to the Actual power type/source/priority value defined in 33.7.2.3 bit 7 mapping to bit 23, etc.; bits 15:0 correspond to the Actual power value defined in 33.7.2.4. These are mapped to the attributes aLLDPPoEPRemActualPowerType; aLLDPPoEPRemActualPowerSource; aLLDPPoEPRemActualPowerPriority; and aLLDPPoEPRemActualPDPowerValue (30.12.2.1.6, 30.12.2.1.7, 30.12.2.1.8, 30.12.2.1.9).

remRequestedPowerFields

A concatenation of the fields that indicate the requested PD power type, source, priority and value of the remote system. This variable consists of a 24 bit field: bits 23:16

correspond to the Requested power type/source/priority value defined in 33.7.2.1 bit 7 mapping to bit 23, etc.; bits 15:0 correspond to the Requested power value defined in 33.7.2.2. These are mapped to the attributes aLLDPPoEPRemRequestedPowerType; aLLDPPoEPRemRequestedPowerSource; aLLDPPoEPRemRequestedPowerPriority; and aLLDPPoEPRemRequestedPDPowerValue (30.12.2.1.2, 30.12.2.1.3, 30.12.2.1.4, 30.12.2.1.5).

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment 276 (HB-01) which was rejected

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P94 L 24 # 187  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 Wrong Figure cited

SuggestedRemedy

Figure 33-28 - Update Reference

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Pd\_dll\_enable is an output of Figure 33-17

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P94 L 28 # 188  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 Incorrect figure cited

SuggestedRemedy

Figure 33-27 - Update Reference

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Pse\_dll\_enable is an output of Figure 33-9

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P94 L 39 # 169  
 Jetzt, John Avaya  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Use apostrophe.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "... to the local system's last change in requested ..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P95 L 19 # 170  
 Jetzt, John Avaya  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Fix typo.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "A summary of cross-references between ..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P94 L 4 # 168  
 Jetzt, John Avaya  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Fix PSE INITIAL VALUE for class 0.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 It should be 130.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.3 P95 L 41 # 345  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 Collision  
 pd\_denial\_timer  
 A timer used to limit when a PD can make a new request to change the allocated power after a request is denied. The timer is done when it reaches 1 second.  
 Change this text to the folloing in the Remedy Section  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 pd\_denial\_timer  
 A timer is used to limit when a PD can make a new request to change the allocated power after a request is denied or when a collision is detected. The variable timer in the range of 1 - 1.25 sec shall be used.

Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.2 P94 L 9 # 167  
 Jetzt, John Avaya  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Fix PD\_INITIAL\_VALUE definition.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "This value is derived from the pd\_max\_power variable of the PD state diagram ..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Refer to comment 296  
 Cl 33 SC 33.7.6.3 P95 L 42 # 171  
 Jetzt, John Avaya  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Use "PD power value" instead of "allocated power".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Use "PD power value" instead of "allocated power".  
 Also in line 45.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The change really applies to Class 4. The rest of the classes come from mr\_pd\_class, class 4 can be derived from pd\_max\_power variable

The timers have to do with requesting a new allocation not the current actual power

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.3 P95 L 43 # 296  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 Collision

If there is no difference between the pd\_denial\_timer and the pse\_denial\_timer then collisions will not resolve.

The PSE should win in any conflict.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence:

"The timer is done when it reaches 1 second"

to:

"The timer is done after a period from 1.0 to 1.25 seconds"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

The denial timer starts after the management entity reads the remote request, hence the probability of a collision re-occurring based on the timers being synchronized is low as there are other variables involved. To address the balloters concern and increase the robustness the modification is accepted.

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.3 P95 L 44 # 189  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 Collision

pd\_denial\_timer is set to the same value as pse\_denial\_timer, I believe they should be different

SuggestedRemedy

Change one or both so they are not the same value, and preferably non-integral of each other.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comments 296 and 297

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.3 P95 L 44 # 346  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 Collision

pse\_denial\_timer  
 A timer used to limit when a PSE can make a new request to change the allocated power after a request is denied or when a collision is detected. The variable timer in the range of 0.75 - 1.0 sec shall be used.

Change this text to the folloing in the Remedy Section

SuggestedRemedy

pse\_denial\_timer  
 A timer is used to limit when a PSE can make a new request to change the allocated power after a request is denied or when a collision is detected. The variable timer in the range of 0.75 - 1.0 sec shall be used.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comment 297

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.3 P95 L 47 # 297  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 Collision

If there is no difference between the pd\_denial\_timer and the pse\_denial\_timer then collisions will not resolve.

The PSE should win in any conflict.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence:

"The timer is done when it reaches 1 second"

to:

"The timer is done after a period from 0.75 to 1.0 seconds"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

The denial timer starts after the management entity reads the remote request, hence the probability of a collision re-occurring based on the timers being synchronized is low as there are other variables involved. To address the balloters concern and increase the robustness the modification is accepted.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.4 P96 L1 # 298  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D MGMT: GET-SET

With reference to comment \*\*HB-01\*\*

The request is evaluated on the basis of multiple power objects - not just the power value.

SuggestedRemedy

Change

TRUE: The requested change to the allocated power is accepted  
 FALSE: The requested change to the allocated power is not accepted

to

TRUE: The requested change to the allocated power objects is accepted  
 FALSE: The requested change to the allocated power objects is not accepted

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Refer comment 276 (HB-01) which was rejected, hence its not an object

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P100 L27 # 352  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D L2 New Feature

Add the following sentence to support the power conservation mode operations.

SuggestedRemedy

PD may send a request to the PSE with the intention to enter the power conservation mode, in which, the LLDP state machine in the PD may be non operational. It does this by sending the TLV with power priority field changed to "conserve" value as mentioned in the Table 33-22 . The PSE will respond with ACK with the minimum power value to be drawn by the PD in the requested value filed in the TLV. The PD will respond with requested power and the actual power values equal and enter the conserve mode. From then on PSE shall not treat this as loss of communication event . The PD can subsequently send an another TLV with power priority reverted back to its original value and the PSE can implement the time out behavior as described in this section.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Please refer to comment 353

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L10 # 505  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

PSE variables incorrectly labeled to PD

SuggestedRemedy

Please correct variable names to PSE

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comment 286

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L12 # 293  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D MGMT: GET-SET

Figure 33-27

The state machine needs to support changes in other power objects - not just "PowerValue."

The use of locActualPowerValue, locRequestedPowerValue, remActualPowerValue, and remRequestedPowerValue within the state machine needs to be changed to accommodate other objects.

SuggestedRemedy

Comment reference \*\*HB-01\*\*

Within Figure 33-27:

Change locActualPowerValue to locActualPowerFields (4 instances)  
 Change locRequestedPowerValue to locRequestedPowerFields (4 instances)  
 Change remActualPowerValue to remActualPowerFields (2 instances)  
 Change remRequestedPowerValue to remRequestedPowerFields (3 instances)

See comment reference \*\*HB-03\*\* for changes to add definitins for these variables.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment 276 (HB-01) which was rejected

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 16 # 506  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A STATE MACHINE  
 Looks like PSE state diagram has missing arrows  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 PSE diagram should be identical to PD with modified variable settings. Please adjust per resolutions from Ohio meeting  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE 190, 191

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 20 # 427  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Figure 33-27 PSE power control state diagram  
 Logical statement exiting RUNNING and entering REMOTE REQUEST seems in error.  
 Logical statement exiting RUNNING and entering LOCAL REQUEST seems in error.  
 Same correction seems necessary on Figure 33-28 PD power control state diagram.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 IS:  
 (pd\_denial\_timer\_not\_done + (loss\_of\_comms = FALSE) + (local\_system\_change = FALSE)) \* (remRequestedPowerValue ? remActualPowerValue)  
 SHOULD BE:  
 (pd\_denial\_timer\_done \* (loss\_of\_comms = FALSE) \* (local\_system\_change = FALSE)) \* (remRequestedPowerValue ? remActualPowerValue)  
 IS:  
 (local\_system\_change = TRUE) \* (loss\_of\_comms = FALSE) \* pd\_denial\_timer\_done  
 SHOULD BE:  
 (local\_system\_change = TRUE) \* (loss\_of\_comms = FALSE)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Refer to comment  
 Denial timer necessary for right hand branch to avoid requests going out on collision.

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 20 # 535  
 Schindler, Fred Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 The L1 classification systems leaves power on under the same conditions. Power is removed when the MPS does not exist. Therefore, a powered unconnected PI will not exist.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Power removal should be made optional. This can be done by deleting the entry condition that tests loss of communication.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 23 # 341  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D L2 New Feature  
 Provide details about the state behavior in the Power Conserve mode  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add the details provided in the attachment to the State Machine in Figure 33-27 on Page 96  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Please refer to comment 353

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 26 # 287  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Figure 33-27  
 "pd\_denial\_timer\_not\_done" doesn't make sense as a condition to transition to REMOTE\_REQUEST (even pse\_denial\_timer\_not\_done doesn't make sense).  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete term "pd\_denial\_timer\_not\_done +"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 26 # 172  
 Jetzt, John Avaya  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D STATE MACHINE  
 Fix variables in four paths of Figure 33-27.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Path from RUNNING state to REMOTE REQUEST state: change pd\_denial\_timer\_not\_done to pse\_denial\_timer\_not\_done.  
 Path from RUNNING state to LOCAL REQUEST state: change pd\_denial\_timer\_done to pse\_denial\_timer\_done.  
 Path from LOCAL REQUEST state to LOCAL ACK state: change locAcknowledge to remAcknowledge.  
 Path from LOCAL REQUEST state to LOCAL NACK state: change locAcknowledge to remAcknowledge.  
 Proposed Response Response Status O  
 OBE 190, 191

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 26 # 289  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status A STATE MACHINE  
 Figure 33-27  
 "loss\_of\_comms = FALSE" doesn't make sense as an "OR" condition to transition to REMOTE\_REQUEST  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change term "(loss\_of\_comms = FALSE) +"  
 to "(loss\_of\_comms = FALSE) \*\*"  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE 190, 191

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 27 # 286  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco  
 Comment Type T Comment Status A STATE MACHINE  
 Typo.  
 pd\_denial\_timer\_done - in PSE state machine...  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to pse\_denial\_timer\_done  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE 190, 191

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 27 # 90  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 Draft D3.0:  
 The state diagram as it is in figure 33-27 and 33-28 allows the case of a Type 1 PD that requires more power than 12.95 by using Data Link Layer Classification. This case is not allowed (due to interoperability issues) and according to the state diagram it is.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add to the state diagram a state that if the PD is classified as class 0,1,2 and 3 it can reclassify itself to lower class power then advertised by the hardware classification but not to higher class power.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 By definition a Type 1 cannot exceed the power levels defined in 802.3-2005.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 33 # 291  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D STATE MACHINE  
 Figure 33-27  
 State machine is missing "collision" condition.  
 If the local system sends a request just before it receives a remote request - treat it the same as getting a "NACK"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "locAcknowledge = NACK"  
 to "(locAcknowledge = NACK) + (remRequestedPowerValue != remActualPowerValue)"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 33 # 350  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D STATE MACHINE  
 Add the following to detect the collision  
 in the Local Request state (line 30) in the NACK branch  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 locAcknowledge = NACK  
 (remRequestedPowerValue NOT= remActualPowerValue)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Refer to comment 291

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 8 # 348  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A STATE MACHINE  
 Old Text  
 pd\_dll\_enabled = FALSE  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 New text  
 pd\_dll\_enabled = FALSE  
 pse\_dll\_enabled = TRUE  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 OBE 190, 191

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P96 L 9 # 190  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A STATE MACHINE  
 Too many comments, it would take a lifetime to enter them one at a time  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 See figure attached.  
 Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Changes documented in Landry\_DLLdiags\_v02.fm

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P97 L 12 # 294  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D MGMT: GET-SET  
 Figure 33-28

The state machine needs to support changes in other power objects - not just "PowerValue."

The use of locActualPowerValue, locRequestedPowerValue, remActualPowerValue, and remRequestedPowerValue within the state machine needs to be changed to accommodate other objects.

SuggestedRemedy

Comment reference \*\*HB-02\*\*

Within Figure 33-28:

- Change locActualPowerValue to locActualPowerFields (4 instances)
- Change locRequestedPowerValue to locRequestedPowerFields (4 instances)
- Change remActualPowerValue to remActualPowerFields (2 instances)
- Change remRequestedPowerValue to remRequestedPowerFields (3 instances)

See comment reference \*\*HB-03\*\* for changes to add definitins for these variables.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment 276 (HB-01) which was rejected

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P97 L 26 # 290  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status A STATE MACHINE  
 Figure 33-28

"loss\_of\_comms = FALSE" doesn't make sense as an "OR" condition to transition to REMOTE\_REQUEST

SuggestedRemedy

Change term "(loss\_of\_comms = FALSE) +"

to "(loss\_of\_comms = FALSE) \*\*"

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE 190, 191

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P97 L 26 # 288  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status A STATE MACHINE  
 Figure 33-28

"pd\_denial\_timer\_not\_done" doesn't make sense as a condition to transition to REMOTE\_REQUEST

SuggestedRemedy

Delete term "pd\_denial\_timer\_not\_done +"

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P97 L 27 # 173  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type T Comment Status D STATE MACHINE  
 Fix variables in two paths of Figure 33-28.

SuggestedRemedy

Path from LOCAL REQUEST state to LOCAL ACK state: change locAcknowledge to remAcknowledge.

Path from LOCAL REQUEST state to LOCAL NACK state: change locAcknowledge to remAcknowledge.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 33 SC 33.7.6.5 P97 L 28 # 191  
 Dove, Daniel ProCurve Networking

Comment Type TR Comment Status A STATE MACHINE  
 Many comments on this figure, too many to enter.

SuggestedRemedy

See attached figure.

Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changes documented in Landry\_DLLdiags\_v02.fm



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

**Cl 33**    **SC 33.7.6.5**                      **P97**            **L 28**                      # **351**  
 sastry, ramesh                                      Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **D**                      **STATE MACHINE**

Add the following to detect collision in the Local Request state in the NACK branch (line 25)

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 locAcknowledge = NACK  
 (remRequestedPowerValue NOT= remActualPowerValue)

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comment 292

**Cl 33**    **SC 33.7.6.5**                      **P97**            **L 3**                      # **349**  
 sastry, ramesh                                      Cisco Systems

**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **A**                      **STATE MACHINE**

Change the text "pd\_dll\_enabled = FALSE"

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 pd\_dll\_enabled = TRUE  
 pse\_dll\_enabled = FALSE

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

OBE 190, 191

**Cl 33**    **SC 33.7.6.5**                      **P97**            **L 33**                      # **292**  
 Barrass, Hugh                                      Cisco

**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **D**                      **STATE MACHINE**

Figure 33-28

State machine is missing "collision" condition.

If the local system sends a request just before it receives a remote request - treat it the same as getting a "NACK"

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change "locAcknowledge = NACK"  
 to "(locAcknowledge = NACK) + (remRequestedPowerValue != remActualPowerValue)"

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 33**    **SC 33.7.7**                                      **P97**            **L 49**                      # **147**  
 Koper, Ezra    Microsemi

**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **D**

I would like to prevent PD from sending NACK whenever PSE send change request to inform PD that it would like to swich to backup power.  
 The reason is that the PD is not in aposition to decide if PSE is allowed to change its power source or not. The same is applicable for power priority field.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 1. Add in line 48 before "If the local..."

"PD is allowed to enter to non-acknowledge state and send NACK only when PSE send change request PDU with 'Requested PD Power Value' is bellow PD power consumption.

2. Update figure 33-28 (PD power control state diagram) to reflect this change.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

1. Changing to backup power is not something that needs to be arbitrated for.  
 2. See comment 516

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.7.7 P97 L 50 # 419  
 Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D STATE MACHINE

Introductory paragraph on DLL operation isn't clear. Rewrite.

Additions in [ ]

SuggestedRemedy

33.7.7 State change procedure across a link

IS:

If the local device is in the running state and the remote device changes to the request state, the local device observes the remote device's requested power through the aLLDPPoEPRemRequestedPDPowerValue (30.12.2.1.5) attribute in the DTE Power via MDI classification remote object class. The local device changes to an acknowledge state or a non-acknowledge state depending on acceptance of the remote device's requested change.

SHOULD BE:

[Normally both the local and remote devices are in the RUNNING state. When the remote device wants to request a new power level, ]the remote device changes to the LOCAL REQUEST state. The local device observes the remote device's REMOTE REQUEST through the aLLDPPoEPRemRequestedPDPowerValue (30.12.2.1.5) attribute in the DTE Power via MDI classification remote object class. The local device changes to an REMOTE ACK state or a REMOTE NACK state depending on acceptance or rejection of the remote device's requested change.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 33 SC 33.7.8 P98 L 29 # 498  
 Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

This section is informative

SuggestedRemedy

Please label as so in the section heading

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add informative in the figure label

CI 33 SC 33.7.8 P99 L 28 # 339  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type T Comment Status D STATE MACHINE

Add more details about the collision and recovery behavior.

SuggestedRemedy

A new Figure 33-XX is provided (attachment) which is to be added after Figure 33-29. Page 99.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Illustration would be helpful. Work on this with State Machine changes

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.8 P100 L1 # 347  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Loss of Communication

Replace the entire text in 33.8 (lines 1-25) Loss of management frame communication with the following text

SuggestedRemedy

33.8 Loss of management frame communication

The following scenarios may cause loss of communication and the expected system behavior under these circumstances are presented

1)After the PSE has identified the PD as a Type 2 PD via Physical Layer classification, PSE shall not change the applied power to the PD till it receives the 1st TLV requesting for different power value via Data Link Layer communication.

After Data Link Layer communication has been established there are three scenarios that may cause a loss of management frame communication.

2) Upon loss of management frame communication, after a successful Layer 2 classification operation , both PSE and PD shall remain operational using the last acknowledged Data Link Layer classification. If a loss of management frame communication, after successful Layer 2 classification operation, persists for more than the smaller value of the remote TTL value (see IEEE Std 802.1AB-200X, subclause 9.5.4) for the PSE/PD or 5 minutes, shall assert the aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge (30.12.1.1.10) attribute in the DTE Power via MDI classification local object class to the enumeration "loss of communications." This will allow systems for any potential fault recovery.

3) If a loss of management frame communication, after successful Layer 2 classification operation, persists for more than the smaller of (2 × remote TTL) or 5 minutes, a PSE may optionally power cycle the PD. If the loss of communication persists even after one power cycle, the PSE may optionally remove the the power to the PD. The PSE may remove power at any time per Figure 33-9.

4)PD may send a request to the PSE with the intention to enter the power conservation mode, in which, the LLDP state machine in the PD may be non operational. It does this by sending the TLV with power priority field changed to "conserve" value as mentioned in the Table 33-22 . The PSE will respond with ACK with the minimum power value to be drawn by the PD in the requested value filed in the TLV. The PD will respond with requested power and the actual power values equal and enter the conserve mode. From then on PSE shall not treat this as loss of communication event . The PD can subsequently send an another TLV with power priority reverted back to its original value and the PSE can implement the time out behavior as described in this section.

PSE will always remove power to the PD when the PD draws current below the IPort\_MPS

min value as specified in Table-33-18.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Discuss with othe Loss of Communication comments

CI 33 SC 33.8 P100 L12 # 299  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"If Data Link Layer classification fails to come up within 5 minutes after the PSE has turned on power to the PD and the PSE identified the PD as a Type 2 PD via Physical Layer classification, the PSE may remove power."

In practical terms, 5 minutes might as well be infinity. This will significantly complicate the PSE validation process.

I'm trying to see the philosophy behind this behavior. It seems that the PSE is enforcing the PD requirement to support data link layer classification if it wants higher power. Bear in mind that the standard already states that the PSE will provide (and allocate) power according to the L1 classification until the DLL classification amends that. Therefore there's no issue with protecting the PSE (as there is in the general policing function). I think it is foolhardy to try and design the PSE behavior to get deterministic response to non-compliant PDs - if any system is non-compliant then you can expect indeterminate behavior. The set of non-compliant and faulty behavior is infinite.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the entire sentence:

"If Data Link Layer classification fails to come up within 5 minutes after the PSE has turned on power to the PD and the PSE identified the PD as a Type 2 PD via Physical Layer classification, the PSE may remove power."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The objectives require mutual identification. To address the balloter's concern, change to the following in line with his other comments:

"If Data Link Layer classification fails to come up within 1.25 seconds after the PSE has turned on power to the PD and the PSE identified the PD as a Type 2 PD via Physical Layer classification, the PSE may remove power."

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.8 P100 L14 # 434  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Fallback

Comment reference \*\*HB-08\*\*

Assuming that comment reference \*\*HB-07\*\* is accepted and that the PD low power mode is defined.

The PD should be allowed to suspend its management frame communication when it is in its low power state.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a sentence after "the PSE may remove power."

If PD\_low\_power state has been negotiated then the PSE and PD shall remain operational using the last acknowledged classification state.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Depends on what we do with Fallback. Refer HB-07 and other related comments.

Cl 33 SC 33.8 P100 L17 # 436  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Loss of Communication

The loss of communication object should be asserted when loss of communication occurs. This has been defined in comment reference \*\*HB-04\*\*

The optional power removal is then defined by a further time following this.

Also, the latter half of the paragraph doesn't make sense:

"If ... for the remote system, a PSE may remove power, a PD shall aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge (30.12.1.1.10) attribute in the DTE Power via MDI classification local object class to the enumeration "loss of communications."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change:

Upon loss of management frame communication, PSEs and PDs shall remain operational using the last acknowledged classification state.

If a loss of management frame communication persists past the LLDP time to live (TTL) timeout value for the remote system (see IEEE Std 802.1AB-200X, subclause 9.5.4) plus an additional delay of 2 × TTL timeout value for the remote system, a PSE may remove power, a PD shall aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge (30.12.1.1.10) attribute in the DTE Power via MDI classification local object class to the enumeration "loss of communications."

To

Upon loss of management frame communication, PSEs and PDs shall remain operational using the last acknowledged classification state and the PSE shall set the aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge (30.12.1.1.10) attribute in the DTE Power via MDI classification local object class to the enumeration "loss of communications"

If a loss of management frame communication persists for an additional delay of 2 × TTL timeout value for the remote system after the LOSS OF COMMUNICATIONS state has been entered then the PSE may remove power from the PD.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

See HB-04

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.8 P100 L 19 # 129  
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Loss of Communication

A delay of "LLDP time to live (TTL) timeout value for the remote system (see IEEE Std 802.1AB-200X, subclause 9.5.4) plus an additional delay of 2 x TTL timeout value for the remote system" would appear to be equal to 3 x TTL timeout value for the remote system, so why not say so?

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence to read:  
 "If a loss of management frame communication persists past three times the LLDP time to live (TTL) timeout value for the remote system (see IEEE Std 802.1AB-200X, subclause 9.5.4) a PSE may remove power,..."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.8 P100 L 21 # 130  
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Loss of Communication

The statement "a PSE may remove power" contradicts the requirement stated in the preceding paragraph, which says "Upon loss of management frame communication, PSEs and PDs shall remain operational using the last acknowledged classification state."

Removing power because a low-level management protocol isn't operating as quickly as expected is a drastic step.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the statement "a PSE may remove power".

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

A clarification can be added. The intent of both statements were that upon loss of communication the device stays in the last classified state. A window is provided underwhich the communication can be restored prior to switching power off.

CI 33 SC 33.8 P100 L 21 # 153  
 Jetzt, John Avaya

Comment Type E Comment Status D Loss of Communication

Fix typo

SuggestedRemedy

". . . remove power, a PD shall set the aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge . . . "

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to other Loss of Communication Bucket

CI 33 SC 33.8 P100 L 21 # 123  
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Loss of Communication

missing words

SuggestedRemedy

The end of the sentence should read:

"...a PD shall [set the] aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge (30.12.1.1.10) attribute in the DTE Power via MDI classification local object class to the enumeration "loss of communications."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comment 435

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33 SC 33.8 P100 L 21 # 435  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Loss of Communication

The latter half of this paragraph doesn't make sense:

"If ... for the remote system, a PSE may remove power, a PD shall aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge (30.12.1.1.10) attribute in the DTE Power via MDI classification local object class to the enumeration "loss of communications."

SuggestedRemedy

Change

a PSE may remove power, a PD shall aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge (30.12.1.1.10) attribute in the DTE Power via MDI classification local object class to the enumeration "loss of communications."

To

then the PSE shall set the aLLDPPoEPLocAcknowledge (30.12.1.1.10) attribute in the DTE Power via MDI classification local object class to the enumeration "loss of communications" and may remove power from the PD.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33 SC 33.8 P100 L 25 # 429  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Loss of Communication

Figure 33-9 (the PSE state machine) doesn't seem to show that...

"The PSE may remove power at any time..."

Shouldn't this be 33.2.9.9 - that allows the PSE to remove power for overload conditions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:

The PSE may remove power at any time per Figure 33-9.

To

The PSE may remove power at any time per 33.2.9.9

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The pse\_reset variable causes the state machine in Figure 33-9 to go into the IDLE state which removes power

CI 33 SC 33.8 P100 L 26 # 354  
 sastry, ramesh Cisco Systems

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Add the following text about the Power removal due to MPS violation to add context.

SuggestedRemedy

PSE will always remove power to the PD when the PD draws current below the IPort\_MPS min value as specified in Table-33-18.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This already covered in the disconnect section 33.2.11.1

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.8 P100 L3 # 430  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status D Loss of Communication

I don't see how the first scenario can be called "loss of communication" since it is a failure to start communication - you can't lose what you don't have.

Furthermore the other two scenarios are the same (in terms of what cause the loss of communication - it's the response to the loss that differs).

Additionally, the systems cannot "revert" to the last acknowledged state unless there has been some change from that state - which would only happen after an acknowledged change request. A better word would be "maintain."

Finally, the preamble and the three bullets appear to be redundant when considered with the rest of the clause. It does not define loss of communications (as required for the state machine).

SuggestedRemedy

Commenet reference \*\*HB-04\*\*

Change

There are three scenarios which may cause a loss in management frame communication:

- 1) Management frame communication not established after power-on, resulting in systems using the power values established with Physical Layer classification
- 2) Loss in management frame communication, resulting in systems reverting to last acknowledged Data Link Layer classification power value
- 3) Loss in management frame communication or communication not established after power-on, resulting in PSE optionally power cycling the PD after 2 x TTL timeout value time period

To

Loss of management frame communication (signaled by loss\_of\_comms) occurs when no management frame is received within any 2 minute period. This is equivalent to 4 missing management frames transmitted at the 30 second interval defined in 33.7.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The issue is what constitutes a loss of communication. The current scheme, conceived by an active member of .3, was designed to allow for prolonged periods where a loss of communication would not be declared so that some other process that may take a while could run. For example, a FW upgrade.

Can discuss further with Loss of Communication comments: There are several comments

on the behaviour for loss of communication. Need to decide what to do here:

- Keep as is
- Remove restriction that the power is removed
- Enhance the current scheme

Cl 33 SC 33.9 P105 L34 # 410  
 Zimmerman, George Solarflare Communicat

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Items have been renumbered in Table 33-9, Current unbalance is now Item 21, power turn on time is Item 14 - there may be more.

SuggestedRemedy

Check and fix Item number references in PICS. At least, current unbalance and power turn on time

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

This has been updated in the new PICS.

Cl 33 SC 33.9.2.3 P102 L7 # 437  
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

33.3.5 "Type 2 PDs shall implement both 2-Event class signature (see 33.3.5.2) and Data Link Layer classification (see 33.7)."

The PICS does not capture the mandatory requirements for a type 2 PD.

SuggestedRemedy

Change table to:

PDT2*	Type 2 PD	33.3.5	PD is type 2	O	Y/N
PDCL*	PD Classification	33.3.4	PD supports classification	O	Y/N
			PDT2/M		

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This was addressed in the new PICS tables, text needs to be accepted.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.9.3.2 P103 L 26 # 487  
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Add Figure 33-10 to the following:

In accordance with state diagrams shown in Figure 33-9 and Figure 33-11

*SuggestedRemedy*

In accordance with state diagrams shown in Figure 33-9, Figure 33-10, and Figure 33-11

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Captured with the updated PICS.

Cl 33 SC 33.9.3.2 P104 L 4 # 491  
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Incorrect subclause reference for PSE17 through 57. Also missing hyperlinks for subclause references for the following:

PD1-33  
 EL1-18  
 PSEEL1-14

And all the subsequence PICS till the end of Clause 33

*SuggestedRemedy*

Fix the subclause references and/or hyperlinks for all the PICS in Clause 33 starting PSE17

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Updated/new PICS tables updated all references.

Cl 33 SC 33.9.3.5 P110 L 49 # 11  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Include a reference to maximum channel length defined by TIA.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Revise text as follows:

"Installation of a Midspan PSE will not increase the length to more than 100 m as defined in ISO/IEC 11801 and ANSI/TIA-568-C.0."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The text in 33.4.8, pg. 79, line 49 makes no mention of ANSI/TIA-568-C.0.

If this document reference is added to the subclause then it should be added to the PICS.

Cl 33 SC 33.9.3.5 P111 L 29 # 12  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Include a reference to patch cord specifications defined by TIA.

Commenter's note: '568-C.2 is pending publication. ANSI/TIA/EIA-568-B.2 is the published (soon to be obsolete) reference.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Revise text as follows:

"...as specified in ISO/IEC 11801-2002 and ANSI/TIA-568-C.2 for insertion loss, NEXT, and return loss for all transmit and receive pairs"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The text in 33.4.8.1.4, pg. 81, line 14 makes no mention of ANSI/TIA-568-C.2.

If this document reference is added to the subclause then it should be added to the PICS.



IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33 SC 33.9.3.8 P112 L27 # 13  
Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Include a reference to channel DC resistance unbalance specifications defined by TIA.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise text as follows:

"As specified in IEC 11801 Edition 2 Clause 6.4.8 and ANSI/TIA-568-C.2, clause 5.1.2 (reference: 3 percent)

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED REJECT.

The text in 33.5.5, pg. 82, lines 29-30 makes no mention of ANSI/TIA-568-C.2, clause 5.1.2.

If this document reference is added to the subclause then it should be added to the PICS.

Cl 33 SC 33.9.3.9 P112 L31 # 438  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
There are no PICS items for any of the data link layer functions.

SuggestedRemedy

Task the editor to add the PICS items.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Done!

Cl 33A SC 33A P117 L1 # 237  
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
Annex 33A (informative) is not particularly informative. Given the already profuse nature of the Clause 33 Annexes, it should be excised in pursuit of clarity.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike Annex 33A.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Reviewed, considering deleting annexes but pulling important info into normative text.

Cl 33A SC 33A P117 L1 # 215  
Stanford, Clay Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Delete the Annex

The Annex contains many errors. Since it is informative, commenters aren't putting effort into making it accurate and it isn't maintained like the normative section. Readers treat it as if it were normative, and so in combination with the errors, the Annex causes confusion, not clarity.

If there is valuesable information in the Annex, it should be brought into the normative section. GET RID OF IT!

SuggestedRemedy

Get rid of Annex.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

237

Cl 33A SC 33A P117 L30 # 389  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Formatting problem: Figures should be Figure n-m not Figure n.m. It's OK in 802.3ay.

SuggestedRemedy

Apply the current template to the annexes?

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

237 (OBE?)

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33B SC 33B P120 L16 # 15  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company  
 Comment Type E Comment Status X cable  
 The TIA BAS Standard has published.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Merge 3rd and 4th sentences as re-write as follows:  
 "The ANSI/TIA/EIA-862 Building Automation Systems Cabling Standard is an example of generic cabling requirements for building automation systems used in commercial buildings for a multi-product, multi-vendor environment."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

Cl 33B SC 33B P120 L27 # 16  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company  
 Comment Type E Comment Status X cable  
 Include a reference to cabling specifications defined by TIA.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise text as follows:  
 "It is recommended that a minimum of two outlets be provided per work area as specified in the current standards in ISO/IEC and ANSI/TIA".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

Cl 33B SC 33B P120 L8 # 14  
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company  
 Comment Type E Comment Status X cable  
 Include a reference to cabling specifications defined by TIA.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise as follows:  
 "DTE power via MDI is intended to operate over a 100 W balanced cabling infrastructure as described in ISO/IEC 11801 and the ANSI/TIA-568-C families of Standards.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 reviewed

Cl 33B SC 33B P120 L9 # 20  
 Marris, Arthur Cadence  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D cable  
 Out of date information  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change  
 "Although initial implementations are expected to make use of Clause 33 to provide powered IP telephones and wireless access points"  
 to  
 "Although initial implementations have made use of Clause 33 to provide powered IP telephones and wireless access points"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 33C SC 33C P121 L1 # 243  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 Annex 33C contains almost innumerable "hardcoded" references to electrical parameters from 802.3af. It needs extensive rework to reflect the variable abstraction achieved by the P802.3at Task Force.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 There are two options:  
 1) The TF chair should charter an ad hoc to review and repair Annex 33C;  
 2) delete the informative Annex altogether.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Choose option 2

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

**Cl 33C**    **SC 33C**                    **P121**    **L1**                    # **449**  
 McCormack, Michael                    Texas Instruments  
**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The 802.3 Workign Group dropped support for test procedures, we should also.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove Annex 33C  
**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
  
 see 243

**Cl 33C**    **SC 33C.1.1**                    **P122**    **L1**                    # **238**  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW                    SILICON LABS  
**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 (1) Aesthetically, the "+/-" signs should be replaced with an actual plus-or-minus symbol.  
 (2) 15.4W as the max power should be changed to PType min.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Make the above suggested changes.  
**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
  
 243 (OBE?)

**Cl 33C**    **SC 33C.1.2**                    **P123**    **L1**                    # **239**  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW                    SILICON LABS  
**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 (1) "+/-" should be replaced with the proper symbol, and spacing should be added between numeral and units in "10Hz."  
 (2) 15.4W reference should be PType min.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Per comment.  
**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
  
 243 (OBE?)

**Cl 33C**    **SC 33C.1.3**                    **P124**    **L1**                    # **240**  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW                    SILICON LABS  
**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 15.4W reference is deprecated.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Reference PType min.  
**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
  
 243 (OBE?)

**Cl 33C**    **SC 33C.1.4**                    **P124**    **L14**                    # **241**  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW                    SILICON LABS  
**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 This test procedure should be updated to measure inrush performance against Inrush and Tinrush. TLIM in this usage is deprecated.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Replace TLIM references with Tinrush references. While at it, fix numeral-unit spacing and "+/-" symbols.  
**Proposed Response**            **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
  
 243 (OBE?)

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 33C SC 33C.1.4 P125 L 20 # 270  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Draft D3.0

The PSE is not required to support Ctest=1000uF during startup.  
 PD that use Cpd>180uF is responsible to limit Inrush current to 400mA.  
 PD that use Cpd<=180uF is current limited by the PSE during startup. In this case the worst case time to fully charge the capacitor is much less than 50msec however the PSE is required to be in Inrush current limit state for 50msec minimum.  
 Therefore Ctest is a maximum number for compliance!  
 Ctest need to be  $Ctest = I_{inrush} * TLIM / V_{port}$  for measuring  $T_{inrush}$  (used to be TLIM).  
 Compliance test equipment should use Ctest that fits the PSE parameters above.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Delete the 1000uF value from Ctest in figure 33C.3
2. Change line 33 item 3 from:  
 "The capacitive load value Ctest is chosen to emulate inrush current during a startup mode condition.  
 Ctest is chosen larger than that allowable for Cpd to ensure the PSE stays in inrush current limit for more than 75 ms or until TLIM is reached. Smaller Ctest capacitor values can be used as long as  $Ctest > ( I_{inrush} * TLIM / V_{Port} )$ .

To:  
 "The capacitive load value Ctest is chosen to emulate inrush current during a startup mode condition.

Ctest is chosen larger than that allowable for Cpd (180uF) to ensure that the PSE under test stays in inrush current limit for at least 50msec.  
 Ctest is derived from Table 33-9 items 1,6 and 7 of the PSE under test by the following equation:  $Ctest = ( I_{inrush} * TLIM / V_{Port} )$ .

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

243 (OBE?)

CI 33C SC 33C.1.5 P126 L 36 # 242  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

(1) TPMDO should be TMPDO.

(2)  $44V \leq V_{Port} \leq 57V$  should instead make reference to VPort min and VPort max. And " $\leq$ " should be replaced with real mathematical inequalities.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix as recommended above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

243 (OBE?)

CI 33D SC 33D P148 L 1 # 244  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Annex 33D contains many "hardcoded" references to electrical parameters from 802.3af. It needs rework to reflect the variable abstraction achieved by the P802.3at Task Force.

SuggestedRemedy

The TF chair should charter an ad hoc to review and repair Annex 33D.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 33E SC 33E P151 L 1 # 245  
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Annex 33E contains many "hardcoded" references to electrical parameters from 802.3af. It needs rework to reflect the variable abstraction achieved by the P802.3at Task Force.

SuggestedRemedy

The TF chair should charter an ad hoc to review and repair Annex 33E.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

Cl 33E SC 33E P151 L10 # 1  
Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status X cable

Include a reference to channel DC resistance unbalance specifications defined by TIA.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise text as follows:

"The cabling resistance unbalance parameter is specified in this standard in reference to IEC 11801 Edition 2, Clause 6.4.8 or ANSI/TIA-568-C.2, clause 5.1.2, (reference: 3 percent)."

Proposed Response Response Status W

reviewed

EDITOR NOTE: comment type empty at import, set to E as a default.

Cl 33E SC 33E P151 L15 # 411  
Zimmerman, George Solarflare Communicat

Comment Type T Comment Status D

"At the maximum current allowed, this resistance unbalance equates to a 10.5 mA difference between the two paths." It looks like this has changed in the standard, but you forgot to delete it. The spec is now 3%.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Can't delete the sentence, make it technically accurate.

Cl 33F SC 33F.1.1 P153 L28 # 390  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Test case 1, Test case 2

SuggestedRemedy

Test Case 1, Test Case 2 ?

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Editor has no idea what this comment means. Without clarification from the commenter there is no choice but to reject.

Cl 99 SC 99 P L # 468  
Geoff, Thompson Nortel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

This comment is against the assertions of the Working Group Ballot Announcement letter. The "announcement" that:

"Due to the extent of the changes to Clause 33, and its associated Annexes, contained in this amendment it has been agreed with staff that they will be presented as replacements rather than strikeout and underscore as would be normal if the changes were less extensive."

is not acceptable to me. I am at a complete loss as to any rationale why the opinion of staff (no offense, but it is not their turf) has anything to do the rationale as to whether or not the Working Group is entitled to ballot the comparison/change text vs. having to ballot the entire proposal as though it were new text, with the comparison text only available as a reference document.

SuggestedRemedy

This decision should have been made by the Working Group (in the ballot motion) or perhaps by a ruling of the Working Group Chair (in WG session, before the WG).

The decision of appropriate presentation should be made all over again by an appropriate decision of all concerned parties (editorial staff gets to be included this time) when the document is put forth for Sponsor Ballot. This means that it has to be part of the motion put before the EC.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This comment mixes two issues. Issue 1 is if the final document will be published as a set of changes against the existing Clause 33 - or as a replacement of the existing Clause 33. Issue 2 is if the Working Group is entitled to see a compare of Clause 33 in the draft against the existing Clause 33.

Issue 1 - The Task Force decided that the changes being made to Clause 33 were so extensive that it would be clearer to supply replacement text rather than a very large number of changes. This will also assist when this draft is folded back in to the base standard. This is in fact a change instruction - it just happens to be a change instruction with a large scope. A similar approach was taken in IEEE 802.3ay where Clause 43 is deleted by a single instruction rather than a red line of the entire clause. Staff was consulted to ensure that they would not object to the use of the instruction replace in this case.

Issue 2 - The Working Group is indeed entitled to see a compare of Clause 33 in the IEEE P802.3at draft against the existing Clause, and this was provided as part of the balloting package.

IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

CI 99 SC 99 P1 L 34 # 494  
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Please update the Frontmatter to match the generic FM provided to 802.3 Task Forces. Specifically, please update the expiration information.

SuggestedRemedy  
Recommended expiration reads: "This draft expires 6 months after the date of publication or when the next version is published, whichever comes first."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
CommentType empty, set to E as default

CI 99 SC 99 P1 L 35 # 272  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
The expiration date is 27th September 2008.

There is no need for the date to be so far in the future. The date should be set to the expected end of the ballot cycle for this draft - not for the whole Working Group ballot cycle.

As a result of this, there may be multiple non-expired drafts in existence at the same time. We must hope that this does not cause confusion during recirculations.

SuggestedRemedy  
For the next draft, set the expiration date so that the draft expires before the next draft is expected to be published.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
  
see 494

CI 99 SC 99 P2 L 17 # 359  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
This isn't Draft 2.1

SuggestedRemedy  
Update

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Be sure to have appropriate draft number during next comment period.

CI 99 SC 99 P2 L 17 # 273  
Barrass, Hugh Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
"New text added to Draft D2.1"

This is draft 3.0

SuggestedRemedy  
Check the front matter revision references in future...

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We will do that. Accepting the comment results in no change to current Draft.

CI 99 SC 99 P2 L 2 # 358  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Prepare abstract when?

SuggestedRemedy  
It would be good to do this in preparation for Sponsor Ballot so it can get some minimal review

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

It will be added during the preparation process as stated in the draft.

CI 99 SC 99 P3 L 27 # 360  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Two broken URLs (although they work in Acrobat reader, which is great, they can't so easily be cut and pasted)

SuggestedRemedy  
Please don't let them be split over lines; use line-feeds if necessary

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## IEEE P802.3at D3.0 PoEplus comments

---

CI 99 SC 99 P4 L27 # 361  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status X

'the individual balloting committee': yes, there is one balloting committee, not two. That's not the point.

*SuggestedRemedy*

If you mean 'the balloting committee composed of individuals', say so. Refer to 802.3 chairman who may refer it to 802 and/or to staff.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
reviewed

---

CI 99 SC 99 P5 L32 # 362  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This table is not the current one used in 802.3ay

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace with the latest which should be in the repository for all editors

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

CI 99 SC 99 P6 L1 # 363  
Piers Dawe Avago Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Waste of paper. This document insists on starting new clauses on even numbered pages, as if we were going to receive a printed copy eventually. 802.3ay doesn't.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Unless staff advise otherwise, start each clause on the next available page.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.