Late Comments

Chad Jones

May 2018

Number 1

Cl **145** *SC* **145.2.5.4** *P* **130** *L* **39** # r04-65

Lukacs, Miklos

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *PSE SD*

--THIS COMMENT WAS SUBMITTED AFTER THE COMMENT PERIOD ENDED, IT WILL BE CONSIDERED IF NO ONE IN THE COMMENT RESOLUTION GROUP OBJECTS.--
dll_4pid is a state machine variable and it exist with the same name in both the PSE and PD variable definitions. This variable is not used anywhere else in the PSE section.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete variable and its description from page 13

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TFTD

Number 2

Cl **145** *SC* **145.2.5** *P* **158** *L* **17** # r04-66

Lukacs, Miklos

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

--THIS COMMENT WAS SUBMITTED AFTER THE COMMENT PERIOD ENDED, IT WILL BE CONSIDERED IF NO ONE IN THE COMMENT RESOLUTION GROUP OBJECTS.--
In Figure 145-16 "start tinrush_timer_sec" is missing from POWER_UP_SEC

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 145-16 add "start tinrush_timer_sec" to POWER_UP_SEC

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 28

TFTD

Number 3

Cl **145** *SC* **145.3.4** *P* **201** *L* **50** # r04-67

Yseboodt, Lennart

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

--THIS COMMENT WAS SUBMITTED AFTER THE COMMENT PERIOD ENDED, IT WILL BE CONSIDERED IF NO ONE IN THE COMMENT RESOLUTION GROUP OBJECTS.--
"A single-signature PD that is powered over only one pairset shall present a non-valid detection signature on the
unpowered pairset. A dual-signature PD that is powered over only one pairset shall present a valid detection
signature on the unpowered pairset."

Does not unambiguously handle 3-pair.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
"A single-signature PD that is powered per any valid 2-pair configuration, as defined in Table 145-20, shall present a non-valid detection signature on the unpowered pairset.
A dual-signature PD that is powered per any valid 2-pair configuration, as defined in Table 145-20, shall present a valid detection signature on the unpowered pairset."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

TFTD

Number 4

- 145.2.5.6 page 143 line 37
- Comment: The definition of "invalid" is ambiguous in regard to the open circuit condition. Is this an open circuit on both pairsets or either pairset? "Invalid" was spawned from "open_circ" in the remedy to comment 108 against D1.7. In the process, the qualifier "on both pairsets" was removed from the definition of open circuit.
- Proposed Resolution: Change: "Neither a single-signature nor a dual-signature configuration has been found. This includes an open circuit condition." To: "Neither a single-signature nor a dual-signature configuration has been found. This includes an open circuit condition on either pairset."

Number 5

Where : **145.2.4 PSE PI 145.2.4 PSE PI line 52**

Which to add comments:

Table 145–4—Permitted Pinout Alternatives per Type

PSE Type	Alternative A (MDI-X)	Alternative A (MDI)	Alternative B(X)	Alternative B(S)
Type 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Type 4	Yes	No	No	Yes

Suggested remedy?

Table 145–4—Permitted Pinout Alternatives per Type

PSE Type	Alternative A (MDI-X)	Alternative A (MDI)	Alternative B(X)	Alternative B(S)
Type 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Type 4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

- Why?
- 1.Simple reason is Type4 PSE PI should be same with Type2&Type3.