

IEEE P802.3bt D2.0 4PPoE Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 30 SC 30 P 24 L 1 # 286

Schindler, Fred Seen Simply, Broadco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A Management

All new TLVs need to be added to this section. This include Autoclass and Measurements. This comment is related to other comments marked COMMENT-2.

SuggestedRemedy

Add on line 4, "Editor's Note: readers are encouraged to improve the management section to incorporate new TLVs. Table 79-8 should match theses updates." This comment should not be considered satisfied until an acceptable solution is provided to address the comment made.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add this note to the "TDL"

Schindler to address and submit comment for D2.1

Cl 30 SC 30.12.2.1.14 P 35 L 4 # 490

Stover, David Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status A Management

"aLldpXdot3LocPowerType" There is no value for Type 3 or Type 4.

SuggestedRemedy

Add values for Type 3 and Type 4. I'm honestly not sure what the encoding should be for this clause. Make change to p35, L4 and p38, L50

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Yseboodt to Add an item to the TDL noting that we need to update this field.

No changes to the draft result from accepting this comment.

Cl 33 SC 33 P 43 L 33 # 171

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type TR Comment Status A Editorial

1.2.6 says: "Unless otherwise stated, numerical limits in this standard are to be taken as exact, with the number of significant digits and trailing zeros having no significance." Consequently trailing zeros (after the decimal point) should not be shown.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove trailing zeros throughout the draft. This includes: Table 33-1, Table 33-8, Table 33-9, Table 33-10, Table 33-11, Page 96 line 7, Table 33-12, Table 33-13, Table 33-14, Table 33-15, Table 33-17, Equation 33-11, Equation 33-14, Equation 33-15, Equation 33-17, Equation 33-18, Equation 33-19, Table 33-18, Table 33-21, Table 33-22, Table 33-23 Table 33-24, Table 33-25, Table 33-26, Table 33-28, Table 33-29, Table 33-30, Table 33-31, Table 33-32, Table 33-33, Equation 33-34, Equation 33-35, Equation 33-36, Equation 33-37, Equation 33-38, Equation 33A-4, Table 33B-1.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add section before 33.1.3, with title "Significant Digits" with text: Numerical values in Clause 33 do not conform to the convention in 1.2.6. The values have been defined with an accuracy of three significant digits. Leading and trailing zeroes have significance and some values have been rounded to the proper significant digits and therefore won't match exact values provided from the included equations.

Add TDL "review and update significant digits."

IEEE P802.3bt D2.0 4PPoE Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.5.11 P 75 L 11 # 503
 Stover, David Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status A PSE SD

The pd_autoclass term is never read by the state machine. Also the mr_pd_autoclass detected variable name is missing an underscore.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove
 pd_autoclass: This variable indicates whether the PD requests Autoclass during Physical Layer classification.

pd_autoclass is set to True when a class signature if '0' is detected during the TACS window, as defined in Table

33-27, otherwise it is set to False.

Values:

FALSE: The PD does not request Autoclass.

TRUE: The PD requests Autoclass.

Change

mr_pd_autoclass detected:

to

mr_pd_autoclass_detected:

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change

mr_pd_autoclass detected:

to

mr_pd_autoclass_detected:

Add to TDL: Yseboodt, pd_autoclass usage needs to be defined (in state diagram or text or both).

CI 33 SC 33.2.5.11 P 75 L 12 # 388
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type E Comment Status A Editorial

Spelling mistake
 "pd_autoclass is set to True when a class signature if '0' is detected during the TACS window, as defined in Table 33-27, otherwise it is set to False."
 "if" should be "of"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:

"pd_autoclass is set to True when a class signature of '0' is detected during the TACS window, as defined in Table 33-27, otherwise it is set to False."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 503

Comment 503 has the following response:

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change

mr_pd_autoclass detected:

to

mr_pd_autoclass_detected:

Add to TDL: Yseboodt, pd_autoclass usage needs to be defined (in state diagram or text or both).

CI 33 SC 33.2.5.12 P 86 L 22 # 254
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A Pres: Darshan8

The PSE state machine part for single signature when it needs to know class code by issuing 3 finger and then doing class reset due to lake of sufficient power in which it need to generate only one finger etc.
 This is covered by the text but not in the state machine.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the missing state machine part in darshan_08_0916.pdf.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to the TDL: Yair to add class reset functionality to single-sig state machine.

IEEE P802.3bt D2.0 4PPoE Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8 P 104 L 49 # 510
 Stover, David Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status A Unbalance

Intra-pair current unbalance I_unb is specified as 3% I_Peak for Type 2, 3, and 4 PSEs. For higher Class PDs, this may preclude low-speed data implementations due to higher inductance requirements on those magnetics.

SuggestedRemedy

TFTD. Especially looking for opinions from magnetics vendors here.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Stover, Darshan, Bullock, and Yseboodt to review Iunb values (Ipeak vs. Ipeak-2p_unb, etc.)

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.1 P 105 L 32 # 293
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply, Broadco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A PSE SD

During the Whistler interim, senior IEEE officers indicated all behavior had to be captured in state diagrams and that text alone would not be correct. An example of where text alone is used in this draft, "A Type 3 or Type 4 PSE that has assigned Class 1 to 4 to a single-signature PD and is in the POWER_ON state may transition between 2-pair and 4-pair power at any time, including after the expiration of Tpon." The state diagram on page 81 does not provide this behavior. This comment is related to other comments marked COMMENT-6. If state diagram changes are required, the proposed solution encourages corrections. Not all problems found are listed in my comments as text may be found to be okay in some circumstances.

SuggestedRemedy

Confirm if this example text needs to be incorporated in the reference state diagram. If so, add the following text on line 1 of the page 81, "Editor's Note: All behavior needs to be described in the state diagrams. Readers are encouraged to incorporate text only allowances and requirements into the appropriate state diagram. For example, see behaviors only described in 33.2.8.5.1 paragraph one." This comment should not be considered satisfied until an acceptable solution is provided to address the comment made.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Yseboodt, Need to add 4/2-pair transistions to State Diagram

Cl 33 SC 33.2.8.4.1 P 108 L 40 # 513
 Stover, David Linear Technology

Comment Type TR Comment Status A Pres: Stover1

R_PSE min and R_PSE max place restrictions on the PSE behind the PI, precluding PSE implementations. The spirit of these variables is to define and provide a much-needed test for system unbalance requirements. However, the variables are redundant to (and, for some valid operating parameters, in conflict with) the existing unbalance ratios implicit to I_Con and I_Con-2P_unb.

SuggestedRemedy

See stover_01_0916.pdf

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Darshan and Stover to update unbalance requirements based on Stover's work.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8.2.1 P 148 L 37 # 47
 Bennett, Ken Sifos Technologies, In

Comment Type T Comment Status A Extended Power

This section states:

"...the PD may consume greater than PClass_PD but shall not consume greater than PClass at the PSE PI."

Problem: Equation 33-2 defines Pclass by Rchan and Pclass_PD. If a PD consumes more than Pclass_PD, it will by definition cause Pclass in equation 33-2 to be exceeded.

SuggestedRemedy

Append the following text to the end of the statement:

..., where PClass is the lesser of: a) the PSEs PClass allocation; and b) the overmargined PClass value in table 33-12."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No changes to draft.

Add to the TDL: "Bennett and Yseboodt, Add maximum of overmargined Pclass values to extended power."

IEEE P802.3bt D2.0 4PPoE Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8.2.2 P 148 L 47 # 383
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type T Comment Status A PD Power

In the section "System stability test conditions during startup and steady state operation" we find:

"When a Type 1, Type 2, single-signature Type 3, or single-signature Type 4 PD is supplied with V Port_PSE-2P min to V Port_PSE-2P max with R Ch (as defined in Table 33-1) in series, it shall operate at PPort_PD , as defined in Table 33-28, with the ripple and noise content as defined in Table 33-28, and with the DC input operating voltage range as defined by Table 33-28."

and

"When a dual-signature PD is supplied with V Port_PSE -2P min to V Port_PSE-2P max with R Ch (as defined in Table 33-1) in series, it shall operate at PPort_PD-2P , as defined in Table 33-28, with the ripple and noise content as defined in Table 33-28, and with the DC input operating voltage range as defined by Table 33-28."

All of this repeats requirements already in Table 33-28, a Table that has a shall associated with it.

Also this doesn't belong in this section anyway.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove both paragraphs from this section.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TDL: Yair to rewrite this without SHALL.

No changes to draft as a result of this AIP.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8.3 P 149 L 30 # 460
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type TR Comment Status A PD Power

"If a PD has a larger C Port or C Port-2P value, then the PD shall limit the input inrush current such that I Inrush_PD max and I Inrush_PD-2P max, as defined in Table 33-28, are met."

Very true, but also redundant to the requirement a few paragraphs above:

"PDs shall draw less than I Inrush_PD and I Inrush_PD-2P from T Inrush-2P min until T delay-2P min."

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the "If a PD has a larger..." sentence.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Add to the TDL: Darshan, Make sure removal of shall on page 149, line 30 in D2.0 does not cause issues.

IEEE P802.3bt D2.0 4PPoE Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8.4.1 P 151 L 2 # 48
 Bennett, Ken Sifos Technologies, In

Comment Type T Comment Status A Extended Power

The statement:

"...the peak power shall not exceed PClass at the PSE PI for more than TCUT-2P min, as defined in Table 33-17 and with 5% duty cycle."

Needs clarification of PClass. Three interpretations are possible: Equation 33-2, Table 33-12, or the PClass level provided by the connected PSE.

SuggestedRemedy

Append the following to the end of the statement:

", where PClass is the lesser of: a) the PSE's PClass allocation; and b) the overmargined PClass value in table 33-12."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 47

Comment 47 has the following response:
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No changes to draft.

Add to the TDL: "Bennett and Yseboodt, Add maximum of overmargined Pclass values to extended power."

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8.5 P 151 L 31 # 50
 Bennett, Ken Sifos Technologies, In

Comment Type T Comment Status A PD Power

Figures 33-37, 33-38, and 33-39 show PD upperbound templates. These are also described as operating masks, and a normative shall states the PDs must operate below these upperbound templates.

The figures are valid up to TCut-2P min for a single peak rising above the PClass_PD power level. The figures are not valid for multiple peaks that are shorter duration than TCut-2P min (see 5% duty cycle in 33.3.8.4).

SuggestedRemedy

Change the NOTE as follows and put it under each respective template (replacing the existing notes where they appear):

NOTE - Figure 33-## applies to a single peak which exceeds the PClass_PD power value.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TDL: Darshan and Bennett to present to TF figures and associated text to remove for Figures 33-37 to 33-39 and submit a new comment for D2.1.

IEEE P802.3bt D2.0 4PPoE Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8.5 P 151 L 32 # 51
 Bennett, Ken Sifos Technologies, In

Comment Type E Comment Status A PD Power

The templates show a second upperbound step after Tcut-2P min. This step is the power that a peak pulse must fall below before PSE TCut timing is reset.

After a Peak lasting TCut-2P min ends, the instantaneous power must stay below the second step for 950msecs. Peaks lasting less than TCut-2P min may exceed the second step after droppin below the PClass_PD power level.

The always-valid portion of the second step is the transition at TCut-2P-min.

SuggestedRemedy

For clarity, shorten the duration of the second step in Figures 33-37, 33-38, 33-39 to 1/4 or 1/8 of their existing length.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 50
 Comment 50 has the following response:
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TDL: Darshan and Bennett to present to TF figures and associated text to remove for Figures 33-37 to 33-39 and submit a new comment for D2.1.

Cl 33 SC 33.3.8.9 P 155 L 24 # 467
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type T Comment Status R PD Power

"When V_Port_PD-2P max is applied across the PI at either polarity specified on the conductors of either Mode A or Mode B according to Table 33-19, the voltage measured across the PI for the other Mode with a 100 kOhm load resistor connected shall not exceed V bfd max as specified in Table 33-28."

Note: legacy text!

This 'shall' only applies when precisely 57.0V is applied. In essence, the shall does not exist.

SuggestedRemedy

TFTD

"When any voltage between 0V and V_Port_PD-2P max is applied across the PI at either polarity specified..."

or

"When V_Port_PD-2P is applied across the PI at either polarity specified..."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This needs to be filed as a maintenance request.

Add to TDL: Lennart to file maintenance request.

IEEE P802.3bt D2.0 4PPoE Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC 33.6 P 177 L 40 # 239
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A Pres: Darshan11

Type 3 and Type 4 single signature state machine is not complete and contradicts DLL power management in clause 33.6.

The main issues are:

1. Figure 33-50 is not supporting Type 3 and Type 4 single-signature PDs. (need to support pse_dll_power_level and pse_dll_power_type)
2. Duplicate variables used in 33.6 and 33.3.3.7 (e.g pse_dll_power_level)

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Editor Note: clause 33.6 and 33.3.3.7 need to be in sync.

The following issues need to be addressed:

1. Figure 33-50 is not supporting Type 3 and Type 4 single-signature PDs. (need to support pse_dll_power_level and pse_dll_power_type)
2. Duplicate variables used in 33.6 and 33.3.3.7 (e.g pse_dll_power_level)."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 214

Comment 214 has the following response:
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Yair to update DLL for DS PDs for D2.1.

Cl 33 SC 33.6 P 177 L 40 # 304
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply, Broadco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A Pres: Darshan11

A DLL subject matter expert should add text covering dual-signature PDs. A state diagram may be required and a LLDP attribute map would also then be required.

SuggestedRemedy

Add on line 40, "Editor's Note: readers are encouraged to improve the DLL to incorporate dual-signature PDs." This comment should not be considered satisfied until an acceptable solution is provided to address the comment made.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 214

Comment 214 has the following response:
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Yair to update DLL for DS PDs for D2.1.

Cl 33 SC 33.6 P 177 L 40 # 214
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A Pres: Darshan11

33.6 Data Link Layer classification need to be updated in order to:

1. support dual-signature PD.
2. To fix some error regarding the sync between variable names in PD state machine and its variable list, PD DLL power state maching and its variable list and figure 33-50 mainly and maybe Figure 33-49 as well.
3. In addition clause 33.6 needs to be in sync with PD single and dual signature state machines and their variable list.

SuggestedRemedy

Adopt darshan_11_0915.pdf if ready for the meeting. If not, add the following editor note to the beginning of clause 33.6:

"Editor Note: 33.6 Data Link Layer classification need to be updated in order to:

1. support dual-signature PD.
2. To fix some error regarding the sync between variable names in PD state machine and its variable list, PD DLL power state maching and its variable list and figure 33-50 mainly and maybe Figure 33-49 as well.
3. sync 33.6 with PD single and dual signature state machines and their variable list."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Yair to update DLL for DS PDs for D2.1.

Cl 33 SC 33.6.5 P 186 L 4 # 476
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type TR Comment Status A Pres: Yseboodt1

DLL Autoclass section is missing content.

SuggestedRemedy

Adopt yseboodt_01_0916_dllautoclass.pdf

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No changes to draft

Add to TDL: Lennart to work on dll for autoclass.

IEEE P802.3bt D2.0 4PPoE Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC 33.6.5 P 186 L 4 # 316
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply, Broadco

Comment Type TR Comment Status A Pres: Yseboodt1

An autotest subject matter expert should add text covering this topic. A state diagram may be required and a LLDP attribute map would also then be required. This comment is related to other comments marked COMMENT-2.

SuggestedRemedy

Add on line 5, "Editor's Note: readers are encouraged to improve Autotest information by adding text and state diagrams as appropriate." This comment should not be considered satisfied until an acceptable solution is provided to address the comment made.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 476

Comment 476 has the following response:
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No changes to draft

Add to TDL: Lennart to work on dll for autotest.

Cl 33 SC 33.7 P 186 L 24 # 538
 Goergen, Joel Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status A Environmental

See George Zimmerman comments - needs environmental and safety section

SuggestedRemedy

See George Zimmerman comments - needs environmental and safety section

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No changes to draft.

Section 33.7 will be open for review in D2.1.

Add to TDL: George to review the Environmental section for D2.1.

Cl 33 SC 79 P 208 L 2 # 237
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A LLDP

If PSE issues only single class event due to power limitations, it can't know what is the PD physical advertised class.

At this point nobody has this information.

Now if PSE has the power budget, and PD wants for more through DLL to increase power, he can't do it since DLL do not have the physical PD class.

As a result, we need to add to TLVs information, the PD physical class requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Add in clause 79: "Editor Note: If TLVs doesnt contain information regarding the PD physical advertised class, to add it."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add this note (suggested remedy) to TDL for Darshan and Schindler.

Cl 33 SC 79 P 211 L 1 # 195
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A Pres: Darshan11

Clause 79. IEEE 802.3 Organizationally Specific Link Layer Discovery Protocol (LLDP) type, length, and value (TLV) information elements, need to be updated with more TLV information needed for the current spec and optional features to support dual-signature PDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Adopt recommendations of darshan_11_0916.pdf if available for the meeting.

If not ready, add to clause 79: "Editor Note: To verify if TLVs contain all the information required to DLL to support dual-signature DLL state machine in Figure 33-50 including optional information for future needs."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 214

Comment 214 has the following response:
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Yair to update DLL for DS PDs for D2.1.

IEEE P802.3bt D2.0 4PPoE Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 79 SC 79 P 216 L 29 # 248

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A LLDP

Comment

Table 79-6b System setup value field bit 0, value/meaning:

1 = PD requested power applies to Mode A pairset

0 = PD requested power applies to Mode B pairset

The problems are:

1.System wise we need to know WITHIN single transaction what is the PD requested power for Mode A pairset and for Mode B pairset simultaneously.

1.1It looks that this bit covers operation on 2-pairs only.

1.2Currently it says that "PD requested power applies to Mode A pairset or Mode B pairset but no information about what both pairsets requested power are.

1.34-pairs operation is not covered

SuggestedRemedy

1. Add additional bit/s to indicate dual-signature PD or Single-signature PD. Use bits 7:4 reserved bits to indicate:

-Dual-signature Type 3 (use reserved codes "1011").

-Dual-signature Type 4 (use reserved codes "1010").

-The other Type 3 and 4 PDs in bits 7:4: add the "single-signature Type x PD"

2. Split Table 79-5 to Mode A and Mode B and A+B. when Mode A and B are used, Total value is set to zero.

3. Update Figure 79-3, PD requested power value for the final number of octets .

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Darshan, Schidler, and Yseboodt to Figure out how DLL state machine uses variables (SS/DS) from physical layer class.

CI 33 SC 79.3.2.6d P 217 L 19 # 232

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A LLDP

The text says:

"Using the Autoclass field to trigger a new Autoclass measurement allows a PD to change maximum power consumption."

In addition Table 796d tries to specify some "handshake" parameters.

I believe the definitions are incomplete and may cause issues.

a)It is not clear who is initiating the request for new Autoclass measurement?

b)What is the timing sequence?

c)When to raise power?

d)When to measure?

e)Where is the final Acknowledge?

F)The flow is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Editor Note: The timing and state flow is missing for the case when triggering new Autoclass measurements.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Yseboodt, Autoclass DLL needs to be updated.

Remove "Annex 33C" from autoclass description (line 19)

CI 79 SC 79.3.7.1 P 220 L 6 # 63

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status A LLDP

"(decimal value of bits)" is meaningless here. A bit field that carries a value typically encodes that value to a binary representation unless stated otherwise. The number is not decimal or binary, the base only affects the text representation.

Also applies to the next two bit fields.

SuggestedRemedy

Either delete "(decimal value of bits)" or change it to "(encoded as unsigned binary)", in all occurrences

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Jones, Figure out what to do with "decimal value of bits" in LLDP field descriptions.

IEEE P802.3bt D2.0 4PPoE Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 79 SC 79.3.7.1 P 220 L 16 # 64

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status A LLDP

"VPort_PD-2P = (decimal value of bits) mV" is an awkward way of describing the value or meaning of this bits. Also, a voltage value is not "decimal", only the text representation has a base.

I assume the measured value is rounded down or to the nearest mV and the result is encoded.

This applies to many other occurrences of "decimal value of bits" in this amendment. I am aware of two occurrences in the base document, but this amendment adds a lot more.

SuggestedRemedy

Change this one to
 "VPort_PD-2P / 1 mV, rounded down and encoded as unsigned binary"
 or
 "VPort_PD-2P in mV units, rounded down and encoded as unsigned binary"

(or rounded up or whatever is intended)

Change other occurrences in a similar style (with appropriate units and resolution).

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Jones, Figure out what to do with "decimal value of bits" in LLDP field description equations.

Cl 79 SC 79.3.7.3 P 222 L 14 # 67

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A LLDP

"= decimal value of bits" does not add any clarity here

SuggestedRemedy

delete these words

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 63.
 Comment 63 has the following response:
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Jones, Figure out what to do with "decimal value of bits" in LLDP field descriptions.

Cl 33B SC 33B P 237 L 22 # 78

Ran, Adeo Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A Pres: Darshan7

Equation 33-14 defines R_PSE_max. The sentence is not clear.

The next paragraph seems to repeat the same idea.

SuggestedRemedy

Change
 "the relationship between PSE PI Equation (33-14) and Rload_min and Rload_max"
 to
 "the relationship between effective resistances at the PSE PI (Equation (33-14)) and Rload_min and Rload_max"

Consider merging the first sentence of the next paragraph into this one.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL: Yair to align paragraphs above and below Figure 33B-1 to remove repetition. See comment 78 in D2.0

IEEE P802.3bt D2.0 4PPoE Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 33 SC Annex 33C P 241 L 14 # 231
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status A Annex

Annex 33c objective is to supply informative data regarding the timing relationships between detection and connection check as function of CC_DET_SEQ variable options. After reviewing it, it seems to supply also information regarding if classification must be done in parallel when dual-signature PD is detected and Class_4PID_mult_events_sec is TRUE which is not necessarily correct. Staggered classification can be done regardless if it is single or dual signature PD and staggered classification can be done regardless if it is Class_4PID_mult_events_sec is TRUE or FALSE. In addition, in all drawings, PWRUP starts at the same time while in dual-signature or even single signature, PWR_UP can be done in different times.

SuggestedRemedy

Update drawing to address the following points:
 a) In dual-signature classification can be done in parallel or in staggered way. See example in figure 33C-2, 33C-5 that classification is in parallel and can be also staggered. Or add note saying "The drawing show one option to classification and POWER_ON timing. Staggered classification and POWER_ON can be done."
 b) Scan all drawing in Annex 33C and repeat the fix if required.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to TDL:
 Yair and Miklos, please work offline using Lennart's Frame version before next meeting to fix Annex 33C per comment 231 D2.0.