

IEEE P802.3bt D0.2 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P 16 L 13 # 14  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Definitions  
 Definition of pair-set is missing.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Insert definition of pair-set agreed in task force  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 ... "pair-set" and its definition as referring to either of the two valid 4-wire connections as listed in 33.2.3.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1 P 17 L 11 # 22  
 Rimboim, Pavlick Microsemi  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** Text Improvements  
 missing "," after 25  
 "and the PHYs defined in Clause 25 Clause 40 and Clause 55. These entities allow devices to draw"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 and the PHYs defined in Clause 25, Clause 40 and Clause 55. These entities allow  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 1.1 P 17 L 52 # 44  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Type 4  
 Type 4 is missing from c) Compatability.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 See related comment for page 20 for a potential solution. i.e. reuse the suggested text.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment # 92 for suggested remedy.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 3.1.4 P 20 L 19 # 5  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** Definitions  
 Term "per 2-pair" should be "per pair-set" as defined elsewhere, in note 1  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "2-pair" with "pair-set" in note 1  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4 P 20 L 26 # 24  
 Rimboim, Pavlick Microsemi  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Channel  
 "All four twisted pairs, connected from PSE PI to PD PI are required for Type 3 operation."  
 this ststaement is not true, for instance, you can have type 3 2P only, type 3 that uses the new MPS but uses only 30W 2P, with all the charecteristics meeting the 2P and type 3 requirements.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Type 3 system can use two twisted pair or 4 twisted pair  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 This text needs to be changed, but it should be stated that operation above class 4 power levels requires 4 twisted pairs. See comment #132 for suggested remedy.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.2 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 1.4 P 20 L 26 # 55  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
**Comment Type TR Comment Status D Channel**  
 Explanatory text missing on +Icable and -Icable.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 replace "... operation." with "... operation--two pair-sets each having one carrying (+Icable) and one carrying (-Icable), from the perspective of the PI.  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Suggested text is not clear.  
 Suggested Fix:  
 replace "... operation." with "... operation--two pair-sets each having one twisted pair carrying (+Icable) and one twisted pair carrying (-Icable), from the perspective of the PI.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P 20 L 35 # 15  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting  
**Comment Type TR Comment Status D Channel**  
 Title change makes section generic, yet the text doesn't apply to types 1 & 4  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change section title to read "Type 2 and Type 3 Cabling requirements"  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Type 4 needs to be added to this section.  
 Change title to read "Type 2, Type 3, and Type 4 Cabling requirements".  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.1 P 20 L 46 # 6  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting  
**Comment Type ER Comment Status D Channel**  
 TIA TR42.7 is updating TSB-184 to TSB-184A. Reference is or will be obsolete. (likely something similar has to happen for ISO)  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Update reference to TSB-184A in anticipation or, add editors note to remind about updating.  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.3 P 21 L 24 # 7  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting  
**Comment Type ER Comment Status D Text Improvements**  
 NOTE is more properly an "Editors Note" - the text is not suitable for the final standard.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Make "NOTE" "Editor's note" (to be removed prior to publication).  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See Comment # 64 for suggested remedy.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.2 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.3 P 21 L 24 # 64  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Unbalance

The following text is not accurate:  
 "NOTE - The pair-to-pair resistance unbalance values are preliminary working numbers used for.."

We need the channel pair to pair resistance unbalance.  
 The channel is the cabling and connectors per TIA definition for a Channel or alternatively the P2P resistance unbalance from the face of the first equipment to the face of the end equipment or equivalent term but it cannot be cable+cordage only.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:  
 NOTE - The channel pair-to-pair resistance unbalance values are preliminary working numbers used for characterizing cabling while awaiting input from ISO/IEC SC25 (developing the second edition of ISO/IEC TR 29125) and TIA TR42 (developing a revision of TIA TSB-184). These groups have works in progress that are expected to include channel pair-to-pair resistance unbalance specifications suitable for reference.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EDITOR'S NOTE - The channel pair-to-pair resistance unbalance values are preliminary working numbers used for characterizing cabling while awaiting input from ISO/IEC SC25 (developing the second edition of ISO/IEC TR 29125) and TIA TR42 (developing a revision of TIA TSB-184). These groups have works in progress that are expected to include channel pair-to-pair resistance unbalance specifications suitable for reference.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.1.4.2 P 21 L 5 # 95  
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D Text Improvements

Long list of Types is awkward.

SuggestedRemedy

"Operation for all Types requires...". This text may move to an informative annex but the remedy should still work.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.2 P 22 L 19 # 81  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 10G

In 33.2.2 Midspan PSE types, the text for 10G need to be included.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following text after line 19:  
 10GBASE-T Midspan PSE:  
 A Midspan PSE that results in a link that can support 10BASE-T, 100BASE-TX, 1000BASE-T and 10GBASE-T operation (see Figure TBD).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #17 for suggested remedy.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.2 P 22 L 9 # 17  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 10G

There are now several types of midspan PSE (the exact number depends on how you want to classify types, and isn't important - additionally the word "type" is defined and overused, so best to avoid)  
 We have added a 10GBASE-T midspan, which topologically, a 10GBASE-T Midspan PSE looks just like a 1000BASE-T midspan.  
 We have also added 4-pair powering (Type 3 and type 4?) midspans - whether these are Type 3 & Type 4 is

SuggestedRemedy

Change "two types" to "several variations", insert the following after 1000BASE-T Midspan PSE description:  
 "10GBASE-T Midspan PSE:  
 A Midspan PSE that results in a link that can support 10BASE-T, 100BASE-TX, 1000BASE-T and 10GBASE-T operation (see Figure 33-4)."  
 Modify title of Figure 33-4 to read "1000BASE-T or 10GBASE-T Midspan PSE location overview"

Then add the following Sentence:"Additionally, 1000BASE-T and 10GBASE-T Midspan PSEs" may be capable of 4-pair power (see Figure 33-5).

See contribution for figure 33-5 showing 4-pair PSE similar to Figure 33-4.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.2 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.2 P 24 L 46 # 58  
 Feldman, Shahar Microsemi  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 10G  
 "Figure 33-2 - 1000BASE-T Endpoint PSE location Overview" Missing 10GBASE-T reference  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 after the text "...1000BASE-T" add "/10GBASE-T"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.2 P 26 L 53 # 82  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 10G  
 Missing drawing for:  
 - 10/BASE-T/100BASE-TX Alternative A and Alternative B Midspan PSE  
 - 1000BASE-T/10GBaseT Alternative A and Alternative B Midspan PSE  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add Missing drawing for:  
 - 10/BASE-T/100BASE-TX Alternative A and Alternative B Midspan PSE  
 - 1000BASE-T/10GBaseT Alternative A and Alternative B Midspan PSE  
 See attached "darshan\_D0.2\_Midspan drawings" file.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.1 P 28 L 21 # 83  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 4-Pair Power  
 The Backoff time Tdbo algorithm is not required for 4P systems.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add the following text after line 25:  
 A Type 3 or Type 4 PSE that is delivering power over Alternative A and Alternative B pairs is not required to meet backoff algorithm.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Suggested fix:  
 "A Type 3 or Type 4 PSE that is delivering power over Alternative A and Alternative B is not required to meet backoff algorithm."  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P 31 L 29 # 9  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D PSE State Diagram  
 pse\_dll\_capable interacts with allowable variations in Table 33-3 - needs a reference here and more description.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Insert after See 33.6, "for a description of Data Link Layer functionality and Table 33-3 for the allowed permutations of this variable with PSE Type and class\_num\_events."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.2 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 1st Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.4 P 34 L 28 # 1  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE State Diagram

tinrush\_timer, per table 33-11 is the timer to monitor the "per pair-set" inrush event. Although I can't find another tinrush, because it is mentioned prominently that it is a per pair-set inrush, it should be mentioned here.

SuggestedRemedy

add "per pair-set" before "inrush event".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change definition to "A timer used to monitor the duration of the inrush event on a single pair-set".

EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.5 P 34 L 34 # 100  
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D PSE State Diagram

time1\_timer should apply to all Mark events except the last one (whichever that is)

SuggestedRemedy

change text to "A timer used to limit mark event times for all but the last mark event during Multiple Event classification..."

Also fix Table 33-10 on page 48: row 6 Parameter: "Mark event timing (except last Mark event)"; row 8 Parameter: "Last Mark event timing"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 2.4.5 P 34 L 8 # 38  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PSE State Diagram

The name TLCF\_TIMER is not correct in some locations. One version needs to be selected.

SuggestedRemedy

Scan for TCF\_TIMER and replace with TLCF\_TIMER. ex. see line 13.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.4.7 P 38 L 1 # 104  
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE State Diagram

Typo in exit logic from state CLASS\_EV1: should be pse\_skips\_multiclass per page 32 line 3

SuggestedRemedy

change "pse\_skips\_multievent" to "pse\_skips\_multiclass" (or change page 32 line 3)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 2.6 P 43 L 32 # 40  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PSE Detection

Most requirements are specified on a pair-set bases. This text covers both a pair-set and two pair-sets in parallel. The text is not clear.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "... and RChan = RCh max or RChan = RCh max/2 for two-pair, four-pair systems respectively and ..." with "... and RChan = RCh max when powering using two-pairs, or RChan = RCh max/2 when powering using four-pair systems ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.6 P 43 L 33 # 2  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Detection

comma in place of "or" (precedent language is linked by an or

SuggestedRemedy

change "for two-pair, four-pair systems respectively" to read, "for two-pair or four-pair systems respectively".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #40 for suggested remedy.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.2 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 1st Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.6 P 44 L 15 # 32  
Lukacs, Miklos Silicon Labs

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification

This comment address Table 33-7.

The number is the brackets at Classes 5,6 and 7 should be described

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We can remove the class signatures in the brackets, that was added to the working document, but is no longer needed.

Suggested Fix:

Remove brackets and numbers inside of them.  
EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.6 P 45 L 29 # 133  
Balasubramanian, Koussalya Cisco Systems Inc,

Comment Type T Comment Status D PSE Classification

Table 33-8 - The note below the table says "A Type 3 PSE that is limited to Type 1 power levels ....." - It will be more clear to call out the power level than associate it with a Type.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest note to be changed to "A Type 3 PSE that is limited to 15.4W or less ....."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #108 for suggested remedy.  
EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.6 P 45 L 34 # 33  
Lukacs, Miklos Silicon Labs

Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification

The new classes also should be mentioned

SuggestedRemedy

change the text:  
"Valid classification results are Classes 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4, as..."  
to  
"Valid classification results are Classes from 0 to 7, as..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.6.2 P 46 L 20 # 31  
Lukacs, Miklos Silicon Labs

Comment Type E Comment Status D Text Improvements

The tile is about 2-event classification

SuggestedRemedy

change the text:  
"PSE 2-Event Physical Layer classification"  
to:  
"PSE Multiple-Event Physical Layer classification"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #30 for suggested remedy.  
EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.6.2 P 46 L 20 # 30  
Rimboim, Pavlick Microsemi

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Text Improvements

"33.2.6.2 PSE 2-Event Physical Layer classification"  
title is misleading, it is discussing multi event but the title is only 2 event

SuggestedRemedy

"33.2.6.2 PSE Multiple-Event Physical Layer classification"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.2 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.2 P 46 L 24 # 109  
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type T Comment Status D PSE Classification

1-EVENT\_CLASS and CLASS\_EV1\_LCF are missing from the list of states

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add 1-EVENT\_CLASS and CLASS\_EV1\_LCF to the list of states, and add a descriptive paragraph (copied from CLASS\_EV1) for 1-EVENT\_CLASS

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add CLASS\_EV1\_LCF to the list of states. 1-EVENT\_CLASS does not belong in the Multiple-Event section.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.2 P 46 L 34 # 27  
 Rimboim, Pavlick Microsemi

Comment Type E Comment Status D Text Improvements

"based on the observed current according to Table 33-9a."  
 cant find table 33-9a, is the "a" a typo? or am i missing some table?

*SuggestedRemedy*

"based on the observed current according to Table 33-9."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The reference should be to Table 33-TBDA1.

Suggested Fix:

"based on the observed current according to Table 33-TBDA1."  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.2 P 46 L 38 # 110  
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D Text Improvements

This section is unnecessarily verbose

*SuggestedRemedy*

Combine the MARK\_EV1-4 and CLASS\_EV3-5 sections:  
 "When a PSE is in the state MARK\_EV1, MARK\_EV2, MARK\_EV3, or MARK\_EV4, the PSE shall..."  
 "When a PSE is in the state CLASS\_EV3, CLASS\_EV4, or CLASS\_EV5, the PSE shall..."  
 If Tcle3 remains the same as Tcle2, CLASS\_EV2 can also be in the combined sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.2.6.2 P 46 L 53 # 28  
 Rimboim, Pavlick Microsemi

Comment Type E Comment Status D Text Improvements

"the observed current according to Table 33-9a."  
 same comment, cant find table 33-9a, is the "a" a typo?

*SuggestedRemedy*

"the observed current according to Table 33-9."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The reference should be to Table 33-TBDA1.

Suggested Fix:

"the observed current according to Table 33-TBDA1."  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.2 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 1st Task Force review comments

CI 33 SC 33.2.7.1 P 49 L 16 # 26  
 Rimboim, Pavlick Microsemi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PSE Classification  
 table 33-10  
 1st class event timing in this line is defined only for type 1 or 2  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 need to add in the additional information  
 "only applies to type 1 or type 2 PSE"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Suggested Fix:  
 "only applies to Type 1 or Type 2 PSEs"  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 2.7 P 51 L 18 # 41  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Table 33-11  
 Type-4 PSE will support the new DC MPS.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add 4 to item 17, PSE Type column.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add Type 4 to the Type 3 line in Item 17.  
 Type 4 must also be added to the Type 3 line item 18 and 19.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 33.2.7.7 P 55 L 27 # 63  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Text Improvements  
 In drawing 33-14, at the 8.2msec point, there are vertical thick black marks on the numbers etc.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove these marks.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Remove any marks in the drawing, I didn't see any.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 3.1 P 60 L 11 # 47  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Text Improvements  
 Remove extra .  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove extra .  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

CI 33 SC 3.2 P 60 L 47 # 48  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Text Improvements  
 Replace "... Type 1 Type 2, ..."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 with "... Type 1, Type 2, ..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ



IEEE P802.3bt D0.2 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 3.2 P 61 L 1 # 49  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Text Improvements  
 Improve text by, replacing "Type 3 PDs operating with a max power draw corresponding to Class 3 or less implement ..."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 with "Type 3 PDs operating up to a max power draw corresponding to Class 3 implement ..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P 65 L 5 # 112  
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PD State Diagram  
 Typo in exit arc from IDLE  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change mid\_power\_received to mdi\_power\_received  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.3.5 P 66 L 8 # 114  
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PD State Diagram  
 Variable present\_class\_sig in state MDI\_POWER\_1 doesn't exist anymore  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to present\_class\_sig\_A <= FALSE. Add variable present\_class\_sig\_B <= FALSE.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.2 P 69 L 46 # 115  
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Classification  
 State names are incorrect for PD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change CLASS\_EVx to DO\_CLASS\_EVENTx  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 3.5.2 P 70 L 26 # 53  
 Schindler, Fred Seen Simply  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Text Improvements  
 Improve the text, "... for the level defined in its pse\_power\_level state variable." be replcing it with  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 "... for the level defined in the pse\_power\_level state variable."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5.2.1 P 71 L 5 # 117  
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Classification  
 State DO\_CLASS\_EVENT\_6 is missing from the list  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add state DO\_CLASS\_EVENT\_6 to the list, or refer to all as the "DO\_CLASS\_EVENT states" or the "DO\_CLASS\_EVENT\_x states".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Accepted adding class event 6 as per comment from Yair. See comment #66.  
 EZ

IEEE P802.3bt D0.2 DTE Power via MDI over 4-Pair 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 33 SC 33.3.5 P71 L5 # 66  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Classification

The DO\_CLASS\_EVENT\_6 is missing from line 5 per the current state diagram that is required to have a defined state after maximum class events per PSE type was used.: VMark\_th is the PI voltage threshold at which the PD implementing 2Multiple-Event class signature transitions into and out of the DO\_CLASS\_EVENT1, or DO\_CLASS\_EVENT2, DO\_CLASS\_EVENT3, DO\_CLASS\_EVENT4 or DO\_CLASS\_EVENT5 states as shown in Figure 33-16.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:  
 VMark\_th is the PI voltage threshold at which the PD implementing 2Multiple-Event class signature transitions into and out of the DO\_CLASS\_EVENT1, or DO\_CLASS\_EVENT2, DO\_CLASS\_EVENT3, DO\_CLASS\_EVENT4, or DO\_CLASS\_EVENT5 or DO\_CLASS\_EVENT6 states as shown in Figure 33-16.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.3.7.6 P77 L10 # 128  
 Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics

Comment Type T Comment Status D PD Power

Type 3 and Type 4 PDs behavior during transient at PSE PI has to be described

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the sentence:  
 The current limit at the MDI (MDI ILIM) is defined by Equation (33-14)

To read:  
 the current limit per pair-set at the MDI (MDI ILIM-2p) is defined by Equation (33-14)

Then modify the Equation 33-14 using the definition MDI ILIM\_2p

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ

Cl 33 SC 33.4 P78 L49 # 62  
 Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 10G

Missing 10GBaseT.  
 Change the text:  
 The requirements of 33.4 are consistent with the requirements of the 10BASE-T MAU and the 100BASE-TX and 1000BASE-T PHYs.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text to:  
 The requirements of 33.4 are consistent with the requirements of the 10BASE-T MAU and the 100BASE-TX, and 1000BASE-T and 10GBaseT PHYs.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 EZ