Cl **33** *SC* **33** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 95

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"Class" and "class" are used inconsistently.
We are capitalizing Type, it would make sense to do the same with Class.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all occurrences of 'class' to 'Class'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **99** *SC* *P* **1** *L* **24** # 167

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Front Matter*

(to minimize comments, all related front matter stuff is here)
Page 1 line 24: Need to fill in purpose of amendment from PAR,
Page 1 line 25: status as "Task Force Review".
Page 2, abstract and keywords.
Page 3, line 36, this is 802.3bt-20XX
Page 4 line 27, this is 802.3bt-20XX
Page 4 line 28, include a brief summary of the changes, generally aligned with the PAR.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **6** *L* **15** # 266

Jones, Chad — Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

missing comment editor credit

SuggestedRemedy

add: David Abramson, IEEE P802.3bt DTE Power Via MDI over 4-Pair Task Force Comment Editor

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Awww, Thanks man.

EZ

Cl **30** *SC* **30.1** *P* **30** *L* **1** # 168

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

No need to have all of clause 30 here. It appears only 30.9, 30.10, 30.12.2.1 and 30.12.3.1 relate to PoE, and only 30.12.2.1 and 30.12.3.1 are the only sections modified. For clarity, include 30.9 & 30.10, but really only the modified sections will be needed for WG ballot - 30.12.2.1 and 30.12.3.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 30.1 through start of 30.9 (delete P30 L3 - 163 L 2)
Delete 30.11 through 30.12.2.1.5 (delete P169 L28 - 177 L50)
Delete 30.13 - 30. through end of clause 30 inclusion(delete P192 L7 - 194 L20)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4.415** *P* **97** *L* **8** # 211

Dwelley, David — Linear Technology

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

Page number is from 802.3bx D3.2

The Type 1 PD definition in Clause 1 is broken:
"1.4.415 Type 1 PD: A PD that does not provide a Class 4 signature during Physical Layer classification (see IEEE 802.3, Clause 33)."

Type 1 PSE and Type 2 definitions appear to be OK.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
"1.4.415 Type 1 PD: A PD that provides a Class 0, 1, 2 or 3 signature during Physical Layer classification (see IEEE 802.3, Clause 33)."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.1** *P* **196** *L* **1** # 169

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Previous editing instruction (P195 L 41) has clause 33.1.1 deleted - I assume this is correct. However P196 L1 and P196 L12 have edits to change the text in 33.1.1 items (c) & (d), which are now unnecessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove edits and editing instructions within 33.1.1, and show all of existing 33.1.1, including items c & d as it is in 802.3bxD3p2 (now 802.3-2015?) in strikeout.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.1** *P* **196** *L* **6** # 44

Maguire, Valerie — Siemon

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Cabling*

Missing TIA reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change,

"Type 3 operation requires ISO/IEC 11801:2002 Class D or better cabling"

to,

"Type 3 operation requires ISO/IEC 11801:2002 Class D. ANSI/TIA-568-C.2 Category 5e, or better cabling"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.3** *P* **197** *L* **39** # 163

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

External cross references 1.4.324,1.4.337, 1.4.256, 1.4.269 need to be marked as External (forest green)

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.4** *P* **198** *L* **8** # 228

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

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

Changes to the text,
"A power system consists consisting of a single PSE, link segment, and a single PD, and the link section
connecting them. "
have changed legacy requirements.

1.4.241 link section: The portion of the link from the PSE to the PD.
1.4.242 link segment: The point-to-point full-duplex medium connection between two and only two Medium Dependent Interfaces (MDIs).

We had a "link segment" that changed to "link section", which removes that requirement that a full-duplex medium be used.

SuggestedRemedy

The Task Force should discuss these implications. The preferred solution is to replace "link section" with "link segment".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change definition to:

1.4.241 link section: The portion of the link segment from the PSE to the PD.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.4** *P* **198** *L* **9** # 267

Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Types are not introduced, they just magically appear

SuggestedRemedy

add a second sentence to the paragraph: "PSEs and PDs are categorized by Type." Then capitalize Type in the next sentence: "The power system is defined by the lowest Type..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.1.4.1** *P* **199** *L* **14** # 1

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Cabling*

Missing Type 4 in:
Type 2 and Type 3 operation requires a 10 °C reduction in the maximum:

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:
Type 2 and Type 3 operation requires a 10 °C reduction in the maximum:
To:
Type 2 Type 3 and Type 4 operation requires a 10 °C reduction in the maximum:

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Type 2, Type 3, and Type 4 operation requires a 10 °C reduction in the maximum:

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.0a** *P* **200** *L* **28** # 118

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Types*

In Table 33-1a we have a column "Number of Pairs used to deliver Power".
What we really want here is to indicate if the PSE shall, may, or may not support 4P powering.
The difference is in *support* versus *used*.

SuggestedRemedy

- Replace column title by "Supports 4-pair power".
- Change content to "No, No, Allowed, Allowed, Yes, Yes"
- Remove note 4 as this clarification is then no longer needed.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.0a** *P* **200** *L* **30** # 185

Johnson, Peter Sifos Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Types*

Under the Table 33-1a heading "Number of Pairs use to deliver Power" are values "2-Pair Only", etc. Seems like these values need only be "2", "2 or 4", or "4" to be meaninful.

SuggestedRemedy

Change values to "2", "2 or 4", or "4". Furthermore, because footnote 4 uses the term "pairsets", and because pairset is now defined in Definitions, it might be even better to change column header to "Number of pairsets used to deliver power" and adjust the values to "1", "1 or 2", or "2".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 118.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2** *P* **200** *L* **34** # 201

Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

We changed "2-Event" Classification to "Multiple-Event" Classification a while ago - now "1-Event" and "Multiple-Event" don't match well. "Single-Event" fits better.

I recognize that this is changing a long-standing parameter name, but I think the additional clarity this change would bring is worth it.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "1-Event" to "Single-Event" throughout the document (first instance at p200 line 34).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.0a** *P* **200** *L* **49** # 59

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"1-Event Classification of differs between Types. Please refer to Table 33-10 items 11 and 12 for details."

SuggestedRemedy

"1-Event Classification differs between Types. Please refer to Table 33-10 items 11 and 12 for details."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 186.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.0a** *P* **200** *L* **49** # 186

Johnson, Peter — Sifos Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Footnote 3 to Table 33-1a has a typo - remove the "of" before "differs".

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the "of" before "differs" in footnote 3.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.0.a** *P* **200** *L* **49** # 56

Lukacs, Miklos — Silicon Labs

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

There is a typo in this sentence: 1-Event Classification of differs between Types.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: 1-Event Classification differs between Types.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.0a** *P* **200** *L* **50** # 189

Johnson, Peter — Sifos Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Types*

Footnote 4 should apply to ALL Type-3 PSE's that provide 4-pair powering including those in rows 3 and 4 of the table. Secondly, assuming that we are allowing for Type-3 PSE's that only power 2 pair (to Class 3/4 limit), then Section 33.2.5.6 (4-Pair ID) needs to specify 4-pair PSE's only. Finally, there is a caveat that a Type-3 or Type-4 PSE that is restricted to 1 or 2 event classification by power management will not be able to resolve if a PD is Type-2 versus Type-3 / 4.

SuggestedRemedy

Add footnote 4 to wherever "4-Pair" (or 2 pairsets) appears in the table.

Then modify 33.2.5.6 to start with "Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs that will deliver power on both pairsets shall determine...."

Change 2nd line of footnote: "Type 1 PDs and Type 2 PDs that have been clearly identified as Type 1 or Type 2 may be powered using one pairset."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 118

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.0a** *P* **200** *L* **50** # 136

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

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

"Type 1 or 2 PDs may be powered using one pairset."
Any PD may be powered over 2P, not just Type 1 or Type 2 PDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove sentence.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 118.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.1** *P* **201** *L* **10** # 60

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Reference to "The location of Alternative A and Alternative B Endpoint PSEs and Midspan PSEs are illustrated in Figure 33-4, Figure 33-5, Figure 33-6, and Figure 33-7."

SuggestedRemedy

"The location of Alternative A and Alternative B Endpoint PSEs and Midspan PSEs are illustrated in Figure 33-4, Figure 33-5, Figure 33-5a, Figure 33-5b, Figure 33-6, Figure 33-7, Figure 33-7a, and Figure 33-7b."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3** *P* **209** *L* **20** # 137

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

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

"PSEs may choose the polarity choices associated with Alternative A or Alternative B listed in Table 33-2a corresponding with their Type."

SuggestedRemedy

Statement is too weak, 'shall' missing.
"PSEs shall use permitted polarity configurations associated with Alternative A or Alternative B listed in Table 33-2a corresponding with their Type."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3** *P* **209** *L* **27** # 184

Johnson, Peter Sifos Technologies

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

"Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs may operate simultaneously on both Alternatives" reads like this is optional when it is not in many cases (Class 5 and above PSE's powering Type 3 and Type 4 PD's) as specified in Table 33-1a.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:

Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs shall operate both Alternatives simultaneously when powering at Class 5 and above and may operate both Alternatives simultaneously when powering PDs capable of receiving power on both Modes.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 138.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.3** *P* **209** *L* **27** # 138

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

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

"Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs may operate simultaneously on both Alternatives."

Conditions apply, this statement is not always true.

SuggestedRemedy

"Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs may operate simultaneously on both Alternatives, when the requirements of Section 33.2.5.6 are met."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4** *P* **209** *L* **35** # 61

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs shall provide the behavior of the state diagrams shown in Figures (TBD)."

SuggestedRemedy

"Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs shall provide the behavior of the state diagrams shown in Figures 33-9a to Figure 33-9g."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4** *P* **209** *L* **36** # 249

Dove, Daniel — Dove Networking Solut

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

TBD No longer necessary

SuggestedRemedy

Strike"(TBD)" and replace with "33-9a through 33-9g and Figure 33-10."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We need to see if Figure 33-10 will apply to Type 3/4 or will we need to create a new one…

Partial OBE by comment 61.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.1** *P* **210** *L* **5** # 202

Dwelley, David — Linear Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

We were either too aggressive or not quite aggressive enough cutting text last time:
"If a PSE performs detection using Alternative B see 33.2.5.5."

SuggestedRemedy

Either restore the original sentence from D1.1, or kill this sentence entirely and add (see 33.2.5.5) to the end of the previous sentence.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

We removed the sentence in order to not have the same requirement in two places.

Change sentence to:

"If a PSE performs detection using
Alternative B see 33.2.5.5 for more information on detection backoff requirements."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.1** *P* **210** *L* **5** # 187

Johnson, Peter — Sifos Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Partially deleted sentence regarding Alt B backoff in presence of open circuit. Was this done as maintenance? (If not, it should have been a maintanence task.) Also, moving to the new clause 33.2.5.5 seems a bit out of place since the topic is clearly about back-off behavior.

SuggestedRemedy

Either delete the sentence in 33.2.4.1 entirely or re-locate 33.2.5.5 clause back to it's prior location.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 202.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.1** *P* **210** *L* **5** # 62

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"If a PSE performs detection using Alternative B see 33.2.5.5."

SuggestedRemedy

"If a PSE performs detection using Alternative B see Section 33.2.5.5."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 202.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.1** *P* **210** *L* **5** # 247

Picard, Jean — Texas Instruments

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Sentence seems imcomplete

SuggestedRemedy

Remove parentheses around "see 33.2.5.5"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 202.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.1** *P* **210** *L* **5** # 270

Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"If a PSE performs detection using Alternative B (see 33.2.5.5)" This sentence looks lonely, and a lot of unneccesary text. Perhaps it's hard to see all this stuff without the version of the draft that doesn't show the change bars (I will request a clean version of the draft for D1.3 in addition to change bars).

SuggestedRemedy

add "(see 33.2.5.5)" to the end of the previos paragraph and delete this sentence.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 202.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.2** *P* **210** *L* **37** # 237

Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

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

In D1.0 comment 229 struckout text,
""both_alts_valid:A Type 3 or Type 4 PSE has detected a PD requesting power on both pair sets." This was not done for D1.1 or D1.2. The variable both_alts_valid was replaced by a do_detection state.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace text,
"Insert new variables both_alts_valid, PD_signature and PD_4pair_candidate as follows:"
With,
"Insert new variables PD_4pair_candidate as follows:"

Strike out text on lines 40 to 43,
"both_alts_valid
This variable is provided for Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs.
Values:False:do_detection does not yield "valid" on both pairsets.
True: do_detection yields "valid" on both pairsets."

Strike Editor's Note,
"Editor's Note: The above parameter (both_alts_valid) need to be refined by comments. These should be reviewed as connection check text is adopted."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

This should have been done already.

EZ.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.4** *P* **211** *L* **40** # 96

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

original text: "... Type 3 and Tyep 4 PSEs shall use this value...."
Typo in type

SuggestedRemedy

"Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs shall use this value."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.4** *P* **211** *L* **41** # 219

Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Fix typo "Tyep".

SuggestedRemedy

Use "Type".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 96.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.5** *P* **215** *L* **9** # 140

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

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

We need additional Autoclass signature timers (eg. Tacs Tab. 33-17a) in PSE and PD state machines to distinguish short and long first finger and for measurement time.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert editors note: "Timers to be added for Autoclass"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** SC **33.2.4.6** P **216** L **18** # 55

Lukacs, Miklos — Silicon Labs

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

This is the first place where the single and dual signature PD is mentioned, but these terms are not described.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a chapter into section 33.1. describing the PD interface variants (single and dual signature)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert pointer at first use of each "single.." and "dual.." with appropriate definition reference.

Cl **33** SC **33.2.4.6** P **216** L **29** # 141

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

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

"pd_requested_power: This variable indicates the power class requested by the PD. A Type 1 PSE that measures a Class 4 signature assigns that PD to Class 0. When a PD requests a higher class than a Type 3 or Type 4 PSE can support, the PSE shall assign the PD class 3, 4, or 6, whichever is the highest that it can support."

This exact same 'shall' statement is in 33.2.6.2, page 237, line 4-5.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "When a PD requests a higher class than a Type 3 or Type 4 PSE can support, the PSE shall assign the PD class 3, 4, or 6, whichever is the highest that it can support."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to "When a PD requests a higher class than a Type 3 or Type 4 PSE can support, the PSE assigns the PD class 3, 4, or 6, whichever is the highest that it can support."

Cl **33** SC **33.2.4.6** P **216** L **36** # 190

Johnson, Peter — Sifos Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE State Diagram*

The value descriptions, for example Class 5, do not account for Dual Signature classifications described in Table 33-16a.

SuggestedRemedy

Either update this to reflect Dual Signature classification processing or add editor's note that do_classification function must eventually take into account Dual Signature handling.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add editor's note: "DS PD classification must be taken into account here."

Cl **33** SC **33.2.4.6** P **218** L **1** # 224

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Editor's note,
"Editor's Note: "Mutual identification not complete" in above paragraph needs to be clear. Team to pay
close attention to above paragraph during reviews."

I do not understand why this note exists.

SuggestedRemedy

Briefly discuss if anyone has a concern with the reference section and remove the Editor's note if no concern remains. Otherwise add some specifics to the Editor's note.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Task force to discuss

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.6** *P* **218** *L* **7** # 20

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

In Draft D1.2 Icont-2P became Icont in the list at:
"except for ICon-2P, ILIM-2P, TLIM-2P, and PType (see Table 33–11),".

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:
"except for ICon-2P, ILIM-2P, TLIM-2P, and PType (see Table 33–11),"
to:
"except for ICon, ILIM-2P, TLIM-2P, and PType (see Table 33–11),"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.7** *P* **223** *L* **13** # 115

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE State Diagram*

Autoclass missing from state diagrams, eg: "Figure 33-9c Type 3 and Type 4 PSE delivering power state diagram" and "Figure 33-9g Type 3 and Type 4 PSE classification state diagram".

SuggestedRemedy

Insert editors note: "Autoclass to be added to state machine".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.4.7** *P* **226** *L* **1** # 129

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE State Diagram*

This is part of the Type 3 and Type 4 state diagram, and as such the states CLASS_EV1 and 1-EVENT_CLASS do not apply and can be removed.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove mentioned states and incoming and outgoing arrows.
See yseboodt_state_diagram_0915.pdf

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5** *P* **227** *L* **35** # 225

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Power*

The existing sentence,
"In any operational state, the PSE shall not apply operating power to a pairset until the PSE has successfully detected a valid signature over that pairset."
may be improved by permitting allowed specific system implementations.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with,
"In any operational state, the PSE shall not apply operating power to a pairset until the PSE has successfully detected a valid signature over that pairset. A PSE powering a single-signature PD with less than or equal to class 4 power levels may toggle between 2-pair and 4-pair power."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"In any operational state, the PSE shall not apply operating power to a pairset until the PSE has successfully detected a valid signature over that pairset, except as specified in section 33.2.7.1."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5** *P* **227** *L* **37** # 35

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Powering*

Addressing the text and the Editor Note following this text:
In any operational state, the PSE shall not apply operating power to the PI a pairset until the PSE has successfully detected a valid signature over that pairset.

Editor's Note: The above sentence needs to be addressed as it forbids turning off and on a single pairset when connected to a SS class 0-4 PD.

We need to allow turning on and off a single pairset when connected to single signature PD for all classes.

SuggestedRemedy

1. To add the following text after line 38:
Type 3 and Type 4 PSE that successfully detected valid signature over each pairset of a single signature PD, may turn off one of the pairsets and turn it on gain during POWER_UP or POWER_ON states.
2. If this comment accepted, to remove editor note in lines 38-40.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 225.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5** *P* **227** *L* **38** # 92

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Powering*

"In any operational state, the PSE shall not apply operating power to the PI a pairset until the PSE has successfully detected a valid signature over that pairset."

"Editor's Note: The above sentence needs to be addressed as it forbids turning off and on a single pairset when connected to a SS class 0-4 PD."

This has been addressed by in 33.2.7.1:
"A Type 3 or Type 4 PSE that is connected to a class 0-4 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 T pon."

SuggestedRemedy

Remove editors note.
Possibly amend the sentence:
"In any operational state, the PSE shall not apply operating power to the PI a pairset until the PSE has successfully detected a valid signature over that pairset. See 33.2.7.1 for transitions between 2-pair and 4-pair mode."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 225.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5** *P* **227** *L* **39** # 21

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Powering*

Per the Editor Note we need to allow at POWER-UP or POWER_ON state to turn OFF and back to ON a sigle pairset.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Add the following text after line 39:
Type 3 and Type 4 PSE that successfully detected valid signature over each pairset and powered up a Single Signature PD, may turn off one of the pairsets and turn it on gain during POWER_UP or POWER_ON states.
2. Remove Editor Note in lines 39-40.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 225.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5** *P* **227** *L* **39** # 261

Dove, Daniel Dove Networking Solut

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Powering*

Regarding this Editor's Note: I believe that unless its imperative to support, having a SS Type 3 or Type 4 PD precludes powering off one pairset. The relevant issue is that the PSE State Diagram does not allow a single signature process to have different power states on the different pair-sets. Adding such would substantially increase complexity. Example; What state would a Type 3 PSE with single PS Control state machine, powering a single-signature PD be in if it removed power on one pairset while keeping power on the other?

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Editor's note and leave text as is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5** *P* **227** *L* **40** # 93

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Powering*

Topic: Class 0 / Type 3 removal
"Editor's Note: The above sentence needs to be addressed as it forbids turning off and on a single pairset when connected to a SS class 0-4 PD."

SuggestedRemedy

"Editor's Note: The above sentence needs to be addressed as it forbids turning off and on a single pairset when connected to a SS class 1-4 PD."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 261.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5** *P* **227** *L* **42** # 214

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Detection*

A previous comment filed indicated why changing link segment to link section changes requirements. This same concern exists for all of these changes.

SuggestedRemedy

The Task Force should discuss the implications of restoring IEEE 802.3-2012 values. When I review the specification I see link section and link segment values used interchangeably. The text in this section lines 42 and 43 are an example of this. The group should decide what is required and change all occurrences of these words to a consistent usage and technical implications.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No changes to draft.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5** *P* **228** *L* **5** # 262

Dove, Daniel — Dove Networking Solut

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R** *Connection Check*

The words "that will deliver" suggest that power WILL be delivered on both pairsets.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "that will deliver" with "capable of delivering".

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

"that will deliver" is the intent of the sentence. If a type 3/4 PSE will only deliver power over 1 pairset, it does not need to do a connection check.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5.0a** *P* **228** *L* **14** # 220

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

The section repeats a requirement. Text,
"The connection check shall be completed before classification is performed on any pairset." is not required because the same requirement is covered in line 5.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the referenced text on line 14.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5.01** *P* **228** *L* **36** # 218

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Connection Check*

The sentence,
"The connection check shall be rerun if power up fails to meet the timing requirements or anytime power is removed from both pairsets at the same time after reaching the POWER_UP state." may be improved.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the text with,
"The connection check shall be rerun if power up fails to meet the timing requirements or when power is removed from both pairsets
after reaching the POWER_UP state."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace with:

"The connection check shall be rerun before applying power if power up fails to meet the timing requirements or power is absent on both pairsets simultaneously after reaching the POWER_UP state."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5.2** *P* **229** *L* **50** # 98

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

'voltage/current' can be read as 'or', should be 'and'

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 'voltage/current' by 'voltage and current'

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change sentence to:

"An effective resistance is calculated from
two or more measurements made during the detection process."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5.4** *P* **231** *L* **33** # 45

Bennett, Ken — Sifos Technologies, In

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

The word "tolerance" is referenced in the text: "but one or both of the offset tolerances are exceeded", however it has been removed from the table.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "offset tolerances" to "offsets"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6** *P* **232** *L* **31** # 130

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Classification*

"Based on the response of the PD, the minimum power level at the output of the PSE is P Class as shown in Equation (33-3)."
This seems like an appropriate place to explain the Pclass nuance between SS and DS PDs.

SuggestedRemedy

"Based on the response of a single-signature PD, the minimum power level at the output of the PSE is P Class as shown in Equation (33-3). For dual-signature PDs P Class applies to each pairset independently."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to:

"Based on the response of the PD, the minimum power level at the output of the PSE is P Class as shown in Equation (33-3). For single-signature PDs, P Class applies to the total PD power. For Type 3/DS and Type 4/DS PDs, P Class applies to each pairset independently."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6** *P* **232** *L* **44** # 188

Johnson, Peter — Sifos Technologies

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

The paragraph concerning Autoclass seems off-topic in this exact location as it separates the Pclass equation from the associated paragraph starting on line 39.

SuggestedRemedy

Either move the Autoclass paragraph to after the Pclass equation or perhaps to after Table 33-7.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Move paragraph to after equation 33-3.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.5.6** *P* **232** *L* **44** # 9

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

marked as YD_001_PSEP2P for Reference)

Addressing the text: "(see 33.3.5.3 and Annex 33B)"

We agree last meeting that:
1. The Auto Class Annex will be named Annex C and not Annex 33B.
2. The Annex 33B was reserved for PSE PI P2P unbalanced requirements WHICH ARE NORMATIVE so they canot be combined with Annex 33A.
See related comment for fixing the incorrect implementation of Annex 33B in a comment marked as YD_002_PSEP2P.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from (see 33.3.5.3 and Annex 33B)to (see 33.3.5.3 and Annex 33C)

[See also YD_002_PSEP2P that addresses other correction need to be made due to incorrect implementation of darshan_06_0715.pdf in http://www.ieee802.org/3/bt/public/jul15/darshan_06_0715-REV008.docx.]

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change from (see 33.3.5.3 and Annex 33B) to (see 33.3.5.3 and Annex 33C)

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6** *P* **233** *L* **10** # 191

Johnson, Peter — Sifos Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

In Table 33-7, the column header "Minimum supported power levels at output of PSE (Pclass)" is not accurate. Pclass is defined in equation 33-3. Text above refers to "over-margined values..." - that is a more accurate depection of this column. Also, for Classes 4 - 7, phrases such as "30W or Ptype as defined in Table 33-11, whichever is lower" is unusual because as presented in Table 33-11, Ptype cannot be lower than 30W.

SuggestedRemedy

Change column header "Minimum PSE output power (Pclass) See NOTE 1" and modify NOTE 1 to "This is the minimum required power at the PSE PI calculated using minimum Vport_pse and maximum Rchan. Use equation 33-3 for other values of Vport_pse and Rchan. For maximum power available to PDs, see Table 33-18."

Utilize numeric values as is done for class 0-3, namely 30 Watts, 45 Watts, 60 Watts, 75 Watts, and 90 Watts.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Leave column header as is, but reference note 1.

Change Note 1 to: "This is the minimum required power at the PSE PI calculated using minimum Vport_pse and maximum Rchan. Use equation 33-3 for other values of Vport_pse and Rchan. For maximum power available to PDs, see Table 33-18."

Do not change values in column.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6** *P* **233** *L* **22** # 226

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *PSE Classification*

PSEs may indicate that they are not capable of providing more than class-4 power by ending classification after 2 or 3 events. Table 33-7 indicates 2 or 3 events but Table 33-3, omit 3 events, which is confusing.

SuggestedRemedy

Indicate that 3 events may be provided by Type-3 and Type-4 PSEs in Table 33-3 on page 214.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Class_num_events in Table 33-3 is a maximum. Table 33-7 is not the maximum, it is the number of events required for that power.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6** *P* **234** *L* **40** # 99

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Nitpick comment.
"Classes from 0 to 4", one can debate if this includes 4.

SuggestedRemedy

Revert to "0, 1, 2, 3, and 4" or use "from 0 up to and including 4".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Replace with: "from 0 up to and including 4".

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6** *P* **235** *L* **5** # 193

Johnson, Peter — Sifos Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Classification*

Present text: "When a dual-signature PD is detected, the PSE shall supply at least the requested power over a pairset per the class code detected over that pairset". This statement, as written, demands that full requested power be provided to any dual-signature PD by any PSE detecting it. Not sure about the term "class code" - is that used anywhere else?

SuggestedRemedy

Revise this to:

A Type 3 or Type 4 PSE detecting a dual-signature PD shall not power any pairset with a classification exceeding the power available on that pairset at the PSE.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 132

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6** *P* **235** *L* **5** # 132

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Classification*

"When a dual-signature PD is detected, the PSE shall supply at least the requested power over a pairset per the class code detected over that pairset."

Seems to force a PSE to delivered requested power, thereby breaking power demotion. Also mis-uses the word 'detection'.

SuggestedRemedy

"When connected to a dual-signature PD, the PSE shall treat the requested power over each pairset independently."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6** *P* **235** *L* **8** # 100

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"Editor's Note: Measurement method and PSE margin for Autoclass still need to be addressed."

SuggestedRemedy

This work is completed, editors note can be removed.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6** *P* **236** *L* **15** # 57

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"In states CLASS_EV1, CLASS_EV2, and CLASS_EV3, the PSE shall measure I Class and classify the PD based on the observed current according to Table 33-9."

This line seems to be in a slightly larger font size.

SuggestedRemedy

Match fontsize with surrounding text.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6.2** *P* **237** *L* **10** # 195

Johnson, Peter — Sifos Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Classification*

"...A Type 3 or Type 4 PSE connected to a dual-signature PD shall skip all subsequent class events and transition directly to MARK_EV_LAST if the class signature during CLASS_EV3 is 0, 1, 2, or 4."

This transition option is not currently avalable in Figure 33-9g, the classification state diagram. Only exit from CLASS_EV3 requires PD Class =4.

Also, if a PSE uses at least 3 events to resolve Type 1 Class 3 from Type 3 Class 3, then the only option is to move onto CLASS_EV4 after measuring Class 3 on the 3rd event. Is this a problem if the PSE will not support Class 5 on that pairset? (Would CLASS_EVAL just reject the power-up?)

SuggestedRemedy

Editor note indicating this deficiency in the state diagram Fig 33-9g.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add Editor's note under Fig 33-9g: "Diagram needs to be updated to reflect new exits from CLASS_EV3."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6.3** *P* **237** *L* **45** # 58

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs may choose to implement an extension ..."

SuggestedRemedy

"Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs may implement an extension ..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6.3** *P* **237** *L* **48** # 117

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

original text: ""
Annex 33B is still empty, what needs to go in there ?

SuggestedRemedy

Add editors note on text to be integrated into Annex 33B:
"Annex 33B needs information on:
- Explanation of the measurement method
- Guideline for what PDs need to do for reliable measurement
- Explain combination of L1 and LLDP Autoclass
- Simplified margin calculation"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change 33B to 33C.

Create/Add to Appendix 33C:

""Annex 33C needs information on:
- Explanation of the measurement method
- Guideline for what PDs need to do for reliable measurement
- Explain combination of L1 and LLDP Autoclass
- Simplified margin calculation"

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6.2** *P* **238** *L* **41** # 240

Picard, Jean — Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Classification*

The PSE TLCF spec needs to readjusted to align with the PD proposed changes on TACS and TLCF_PD.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the TLCF range from 85-100 ms to 88-105 ms.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See comments 53, 52, 54, 238, 239

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6.3** *P* **238** *L* **42** # 53

Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Classification*

Table 33-10
The long first class Event timing for the PSE can be easily set to a tighter range with no impact on PSE complexity, since the accuracy of PSE clock already allows it. This is helpful for the PD timings which can be relaxed, since this is the more restrictive timing requirement for the PD.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Table 33-10 item 12 TLCF to 87.5 Min
Leave 100 as Max

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Obe by 240.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.6.3** *P* **239** *L* **19** # 135

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Autoclass*

An improved calculation for Autoclass margin is described in yseboodt_1_0915.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

See changes in yseboodt_1_0915.pdf

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

adopt changes in yseboodt_1_0915.pdf except for items 1 and 2 of Table 33-10A

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **239** *L* **25** # 227

Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Power*

Legacy text,
"PSE behavior conforms to the state diagrams in Figure 33-9,Figure 33-9 continued, and Figure 33-10.
When the PSE provides power to the PI, it shall conform with Table 33-11."
that states a requirement has been stricken from the spec.

SuggestedRemedy

Restore the text with the following TBD or replace with reference to the appropriate state diagrams.
"PSE behavior conforms to the state diagrams in Figure 33-9,Figure 33-9 continued, Figure TBD, and Figure 33-10. When the PSE provides power to the PI, it shall conform with Table 33-11."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Bring back:

"When the PSE provides power to the PI, it shall conform with Table 33-11."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **240** *L* **21** # 22

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Power*

Table 33-11 item 1a, Vport_PSE_diff (PSE Vdiff).
Background:
We have shown that PSE Vdiff max for a single port is 0.2mV maximum calculated at worst case and the spec were set to 2mV.
After additional research on multi-port systems we have found that the PSE Vdiff may reach to 6-8mV due to cross regulation effect of ports using shared power leads.
Two solutions were analyzed:
a) To specify PSE Vdiff=2mV as is today for a single port and let system designer to figure out how to make sure that in multiport operation the spec will still be met.
This solution was rejected by few system vendors.
b) To specify PSE Vdiff=10mV while keeping system Vdiff=60mV as it was before which move some burden on PD to use 50mV maximum when diodes are used in the PD, instead of 58mV as it is today.
This solution looks better.
-It will keep the same maximum pair current.
-It will not affect PSE MPS solutions.
-It will add tolerable burden on PD by making sure that diode Vdiff is 50mV max and not 58mV.
- The total system E2EP2P_Iunb stays the same

SuggestedRemedy

1. To change Table 33-11 item 1a from 2mV to 10mV.
2. To update all relevant PSE PI and PD PI numbers that will be affected by this change.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

1. To change Table 33-11 item 1a from 2mV to 10mV.

All other unbalance numbers will be reviewed in future.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **240** *L* **34** # 207

Dwelley, David — Linear Technology

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Parameter isn't completely clear for the 2-pair case:
"Continuous output current capability in POWER_ON state over both pairsets"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
"Continuous output current capability in POWER_ON state over all powered pairsets"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 46.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **240** *L* **34** # 46

Bennett, Ken — Sifos Technologies, In

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Table 33-11 item 4, parameter column, states: "Continuous output current capability in POWER_ON state over both pairsets". In the info section, 33.2.7.4, it is referenced as the "total" current and has the information about the pairsets.

The parameter description would be clearer and simpler if it was referred to as the "Continuous total current" instead of using "over both pairsets".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
"Continuous total output current capability in POWER_ON state."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **240** *L* **35** # 94

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Bulk comment.
Table 33-11.

1,2,3,4 as PSE Type is not consistent, All is better.

SuggestedRemedy

change 1,2,3,4 to All in:
- page 240, item 4
- page 241, item 5
- page 242, item 13
- page 243, item 20, 22, 23, 24

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

change 1,2,3,4 to All in:
- page 240, item 4
- page 241, item 5
- page 242, item 13
- page 243, item 22, 23, 24

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **240** *L* **39** # 47

Bennett, Ken — Sifos Technologies, In

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Item 4a in table 33-11 shows "E2ERunb" which doesn't match "E2EP2PRunb" used elsewhere. The suggested remedy makes them the same.

(Alternatively, given that it's defined, the symbol "E2EP2PRunb" could be simplified.)

SuggestedRemedy

Change entries in item 4a, table 33-11, from:
"E2ERunb" to "E2EP2PRunb"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 210

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **240** *L* **39** # 13

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

1.To update TBDs for Icont-2P_unb min in Table 33-11 item 4a for classes 5 and 7.
2. To update class 8 value from 0.931A to 0.926A due to the change of Pclass PD from 71.3W to 71W.
See details on page 2 of darshan_04_0915.pdf.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace TBDs in Table 33-11 item 4a, Icon-2P_unb minimum value column:
Class 5: Replace TBD with 0.536A
Class 7: Replace TBD with 0.778A
Class 8: Change from 0.931A to 0.926A

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **240** *L* **42** # 3

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Power*

Table 33-11 item 4a, additional information.
1. It is 33.2.7.4.1 and not 33.2.7.4a
2. The additional information do not cover all the information needed for item 4a. It is 33.2.7.4 and 33.2.7.4.1

SuggestedRemedy

Table 33-11 item 4a, additional information.
Replace See 33.2.7.4a with: See 33.2.7.4 and 33.2.7.4.1

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **240** *L* **44** # 206

Dwelley, David — Linear Technology

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Table 33-11, item 4a: The Icon-2p-unb label makes less sense than before because of the change made in the D1.1 comment cycle that changed Icon-2p to Icon. The -unb suffix made sense when there was a standalone Icon-2p parameter but not now.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Icon-2p-unb to Icon-2p throughout: I count 6 locations on pages 240, 245, 246, and 276, and two more with _unb on pages 198 and 245.

Also change the existing Icon-2p to Icon on p245 line 23 to be consistent.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

OBE by comment 4.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **241** *L* **17** # 152

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Pres: Yair7*

Table 33-11, Item 7, Icut-2P.

Icut-2p is the range in which the PSE may optionally cut power. The lowerbound was defined by Icon in 802.3-2012.
The correct lowerbound now would be Icon-2P-unb. The calculation in D1.2 also results in Icon-2P-unb values.

Issues:
- Rather than a calculation, we can refer to Icon-2P-unb
- In its current form it is defined per Type, which results in Icut-2P being smaller than Icon-2P-unb for Class 5 and 7
- It is too high in 2P mode

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the 'min' value of Icut-2p for Type 3 and Type 4 by 'Icon-2P-unb'.
Add editors note below Table 33-11 "Icut-2P min should be equal to the relevant section of the lowerbound template which is currently TBD. "

Note: somewhat less brokener, needs further work (does not work for dual-signature, have not fixed 2P mode)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

This parameter should be fixed, but the min values you suggest are not correct. For example, if the PSE uses active current balancing, it could use the lower values.

Task Force to Discuss

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **241** *L* **20** # 18

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair7*

Table 33-11 item 7.
We need to update Kicut3 and Kicut4 to include the constants for class 5 and 7 otherwise they will create errors resulted with Icont-2P_unb doesnt equal to Icut_min.
See details in Darshan_07_0915.pdf.

SuggestedRemedy

See details in Darshan_07_0915.pdf for updating Table 33-11 item 7.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Accept changes for item 7, Table 33-11 shown in Darshan_07_0915_Rev004.pdf on page 1.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **241** *L* **34** # 14

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair6*

1. To update TBDs for ILIM-2P min in Table 33-11 item 9 classes 5 and 7.
See derivation in darshan_06_0915.pdf.

SuggestedRemedy

Table 33-11 item 9, ILIM-2P minimum value column:
Class 5: Replace TBD in ILIM-2P min with 0.551A
Class 7: Replace TBD in ILIM-2P min with 0.829A

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **241** *L* **38** # 242

Picard, Jean Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *PSE Power*

there is too much margin for ILIM-2P

Table 33-11

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce ILIM-2P class 6 to a value slightly below 0.7A

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

What is the reason behind this? Yair do you agree?

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **241** *L* **38** # 17

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair6*

To update ILIM-2P min in Table 33-11 item 9 classes 6 and 8.
It reduces currents by about 15% due margins reduction that can be left to designer decision.
Reason for update:
In order to reduce currents, we utilized the fact that Ppeak_PD is lower now and we dont force Icut_max/Icon-2P_unb= about 1.15 as in 802.3at.
See derivation in darshan_06_0915.pdf.

SuggestedRemedy

Table 33-11 item 9, ILIM-2P minimum value column:
Class 6: Change from 0.817A to 0.691A.
Class 8: Change from 1.162A to 0.990A.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **241** *L* **43** # 241

Picard, Jean — Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *PSE Power*

there is too much margin for ILIM-2P

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce ILIM-2P class 8 to a value slightly below 1A

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

What is the reason behind this? Yair do you agree?

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **242** *L* **32** # 109

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Table 33-11, Item 17, Ihold
In Additional information: "Applies to highest current pair."

SuggestedRemedy

Replace (twice) by "Applies to pair with the highest current."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **242** *L* **32** # 110

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Table 33-11, Item 17b, Ihold
Parameter is called "DC MPS current when total sum of both pairs with the same polarity is measured, connected to a single-signature PD"

'total' adds no value to this lengthy description.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace by "DC MPS current when sum of both pairs with the same polarity is measured, connected to a single-signature PD"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **243** *L* **28** # 111

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Note 3 to Table 33-11 says:
"3 Item 17b applies to PSEs that implement MPS detection by measuring sum of the pairset currents of the same polarity."

'pairsets of the same polarity' does not make sense. This should be 'pairs'.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace by "3 Item 17b applies to PSEs that implement MPS detection by measuring the sum of the pair currents of the same polarity."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **243** *L* **45** # 10

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

The following text contains error:
"1. Icont-2P and Ipeak-2P need to be addressed for Extended power..."
It is Icont-2P_unb and not Icont-2P.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
"1. Icont-2P_unb and Ipeak-2P need to be addressed for Extended power..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is only an editor's note, but…

Change to:
"1. Icon-2P_unb and Ipeak-2P need to be addressed for Extended power…"

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **243** *L* **45** # 5

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

Editor Notes on Page 243 lines 44-47 and page 244 lines 1-21 to change per page 5 of darshan_04_0915.pdf due to addressing the issues in D1.1 and D1.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Editor Notes on Page 243 lines 44-47 and page 244 lines 1-21 to change per page 5 per darshan_04_0915.pdf.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 42

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **243** *L* **45** # 204

Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"Icont" appears several places in the draft in Editor's notes and in 33A-9. It appears to be a typo - 33-11 defines the parameter as "Icon".

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Icont" with "Icon" throughout: I count 8 instances, on pages 243, 244, and 334.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7** *P* **243** *L* **45** # 42

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

There are list of editor notes on page 243-244 that need to be updated per the progress made in D1.1 and the possible acceptance of comments in D1.2.
See the proposed updates for Editor Notes in page 243-244 in darshan_04_0915.pdf page 5.

SuggestedRemedy

In case updates proposed by darshan_04_0915.pdf pages 1-4 will be accepted, to update Editor's Notes in page 243-244 per darshan_04_0915.pdf page 5.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete all blue and red text (all of note 1) on page 5 of

darshan_04_0915.pdf.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.1** *P* **244** *L* **43** # 264

Dove, Daniel Dove Networking Solut

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *PSE Power*

If we are going to allow this, we need to address the stability issues and potential interoperability problems that may occur if a PSE suddenly removes power from one pair-set, and also how to deal with applying power to that pairset without creating stability problems.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the added text on lines 43 and 44.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Do you know of any stability or interoperability problems that may occur.

There are many systems that already do this…

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4** *P* **245** *L* **18** # 153

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

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

"PSEs shall meet I Con as specified in Table 33-11. Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs when connected to a single-signature PD shall meet I Con-2P as specified in Table 33-11 item 4a."

Problems:
- Does not address dual signature
- I Con-2P no longer exists

SuggestedRemedy

"PSEs connected to a single-signature PD shall meet Icon and Icon-2P_unb as specified in Table 33-11.
PSEs connected to a dual-signature PD shall meet Icon on each pairset as specified in Table 33-11."

(Note: this works, because Pclass is defined to be independent for dual-signature PDs.)
(Note: we need to specify that Icon, in the context of dual-signature, refers to the pairset current (what used to be Icon-2P), see other comment).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"PSEs connected to a single-signature PD shall meet Icon and Icon-2P_unb as specified in Table 33-11.
PSEs connected to a dual-signature PD shall meet Icon-TBD on each pairset as specified in Table 33-11."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4** *P* **245** *L* **19** # 2

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Icon*

"single-signature PD shall meet ICon-2P as specified in Table 33-11 item 4a."

Typo: It is Icont-2P_unb and not Icont-2P

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
single-signature PD shall meet ICon-2P-UNB as specified in Table 33-11 item 4a.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 153

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4** *P* **245** *L* **19** # 200

Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Icon*

Hierarchy of "shalls" is not as clear as it could be:
"PSEs shall meet ICon as specified in Table 33–11. Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs when connected to a single signature PD shall meet ICon-2P as specified in Table 33-11 item 4a."

SuggestedRemedy

Add an "also":
"PSEs shall meet ICon as specified in Table 33–11. Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs when connected to a single signature PD shall also meet ICon-2P as specified in Table 33-11 item 4a."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 153

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4** *P* **245** *L* **21** # 154

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

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

"I Con is the total current of both pairs with the same polarity that a PSE has to support. I Con-2P_unb is the maximum current the PSE is required to support over one of the pairs of same polarity under E2EP2PRunb condition in the POWER_ON state."

Only applies to single-signature.
Replace E2EP2PRunb by defined terminology.

SuggestedRemedy

"When connected to single-signature PDs, I Con is the total current of both pairs with the same polarity that a PSE has to support. I Con-2P_unb is the maximum current the PSE is required to support over one of the pairs of same polarity under maximum current unbalance conditions, as specified in 33.2.7.4.1, in the POWER_ON state.

When connected to a dual-signature PD, I Con-TBD is the current of a pairset that a PSE has to support."

Note: by removing -2P, things fit better for single-signature, but now we have to shoehorn things for dual-signature.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

"When connected to single-signature PDs, I Con is the total current of both pairs with the same polarity that a PSE has to support. I Con-2P_unb is the minimum current the PSE is required to support over any pair of the same polarity under maximum current unbalance conditions, as specified in 33.2.7.4.1, in the POWER_ON state.

When connected to a dual-signature PD, I Con-TBD is the minimum current of a pairset that a PSE has to support."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4** *P* **245** *L* **22** # 198

Dwelley, David — Linear Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Icon*

The E2EP2PRunb section of this sentence is awkward, and E2EP2PRunb is used before it is defined:

"ICon-2P_unb is the maximum current the PSE is required to support over one of the pairs of same polarity under E2EP2PRunb condition in the POWER_ON state."

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with:

"ICon-2P_unb is the maximum current the PSE is required to support over any pair in the POWER_ON state when unbalance effects are included."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 154

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4** *P* **245** *L* **22** # 49

Bennett, Ken — Sifos Technologies, In

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Icon*

The statement:
"ICon-2P_unb is the maximum current the PSE is required to support..."
should say:
"ICon-2P_unb is the minimum current the PSE is required to support..."

SuggestedRemedy

Change the word "maximum" to "minimum".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 154

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4** *P* **245** *L* **23** # 4

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Icon*

"In addition to ICon-2P and ICon-2P-UNB as specified in Table 33–11, the..."

Typo: It is Icont and not Icont-2P

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:
"In addition to ICon-2P and ICon-2P-UNB as specified in Table 33–11, the..."
To:
"In addition to ICon and ICon-2P-UNB as specified in Table 33–11, the..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 154

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4** *P* **245** *L* **40** # 155

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

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

"K is the ratio between I Peak-2P due to system end to end pair-to-pair current unbalance effect..."
"K=0 for two pair systems (Type 1 and Type 2 systems). The value of K which is based on curve fit and is dimensionless, for a Type 3 and Type 4 system that operates as 4-pair system is given by Equation (33-4a)."

Main issue: K=0 also for dual-signature PDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword & fix:
Replace
"K=0 for two pair systems (Type 1 and Type 2 systems). The value of K which is based on curve fit and is dimensionless, for a Type 3 and Type 4 system that operates as 4-pair system is given by Equation (33-4a)."
By
"The value of K is based on a curve fit and is dimensionless. For Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs, operating in 4-pair mode and connected to single-signature PDs, the value of K is given by Equation 33-4a. In all other cases the value of K is 0."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Yair to give presentation in Oct.

Replace text with:

"The value of KIpeak is based on a curve fit and is dimensionless. For Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs, operating in 4-pair mode and connected to single-signature PDs, the value of KIpeak is given by Equation 33-4a. For all other cases the value of KIpeak is 0. DS PDs TBD."

Change K to Kipeak in equation 33-4a.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4** *P* **245** *L* **49** # 33

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair 4*

Equation 33-4a (the equation that describes K) need to be updated per class 5 and 7 and not just class 6 and 8 as it is now.
It is in line with all updates made for PSE/PD P2P_Runb for better accuracy due to the fact that unbalance parameters are changed as function of current.

SuggestedRemedy

Implement the changes proposed in page 4 of darshan_04_09.pdf

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Note: We changed K to Kipeak in another comment.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4.1** *P* **246** *L* **14** # 113

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Icon*

"I con-2P-unb maximum is specified for total channel common mode pair resistance from 0.1 to 12.5."

There is no I con-2P-unb maximum. Possible to use Rch rather than constant.

SuggestedRemedy

"I con-2P-unb is specified for total channel common mode pair resistance from 0.1 to Rch."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4.1** *P* **246** *L* **15** # 32

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

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

See related comment YD_002_PSEP2P.
"For channels with common mode pair resistance lower than 0.1 .., see guidelines in Annex 33A."

The relevant material in Annex 33A (from 33A.6 to 33A.10) is NORMATIVE and it was originally named Annex 33B. see seperate comment on Annex 33B ((MARKED FOR REFERENCE AS YD_002_PSEP2P) that was not implement correctly per the approved documents from July 2015)
Therfore:
1. the word guidelines not to be used.
2. Replace reference from Annex 33A to Annex 33B.

SuggestedRemedy

replace:
For channels with common mode pair resistance lower than 0.1 .., see guidelines in Annex 33A."

With:
For channels with common mode pair resistance lower than 0.1 .., see Annex 33B."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4.1** *P* **246** *L* **21** # 16

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

To update equation 33-4b to include classes 5 and 7.
See details in page 1 of darshan_04_0915.pdf.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Implement updates per page 1 of darshan_04_0915.pdf.
2. Remove Editor Note in page 246 line 37

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Add note below equation 33-4b:

"Editor's Note: Numbers to be updated for DS PDs."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.4.2** *P* **246** *L* **41** # 40

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

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

"See Annex 33A"

The relevant material in Annex 33A (from 33A.6 to 33A.10) is NORMATIVE and it was originally named Annex 33B. see seperate comment on Annex 33B ((MARKED FOR REFERENCE AS YD_002_PSEP2P) that was not implement correctly per the approved documents from July 2015)
Therfore:
Aafter implementing YD_002_PSEP2P, change from Annex 33A to Annex 33B.

SuggestedRemedy

replace:
See Annex 33A.

With:
See Annex 33B.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.5** *P* **246** *L* **49** # 157

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Inrush*

"POWER_UP mode occurs on each pairset between the PSE's transition to the POWER_UP state on that pairset and either the expiration of T Inrush-2P or the conclusion of PD inrush currents on that pairset (see 33.3.7.3)."

For Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs, the conclusion of the PD inrush current is not cause to transition to POWER_ON.

SuggestedRemedy

"POWER_UP mode occurs on each pairset between the PSE's transition to the POWER_UP state on that pairset and either the expiration of T Inrush-2P or, for Type 1 and Type 2 PSEs that make use of legacy powerup, the conclusion of PD inrush currents on that pairset (see 33.3.7.3)."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.5** *P* **247** *L* **14** # 26

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *PSE Inrush*

Addressing the text:
For Type 1 PSE, measurement of minimum IInrush-2P requirement to be taken after 1 ms to allow startup transients. A Type 2 PSE that uses 1-Event Physical Layer classification, and requires the 1ms settling time, shall power up a class 4 PD as if it used 2Multiple-Event Physical Layer classification.
---
1. Measuring after 1msec to account for transients is true for:
a) all PSE Types and not just Type 1.
b) Not clear how the rest of the text addressing classification is related to the inrush requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the first sentence from:
For Type 1 PSE, measurement of minimum IInrush-2P requirement to be taken after 1 ms to allow startup transients.
To:
Measurement of minimum IInrush-2P requirement to be taken after 1 ms to allow startup transients.
2. Delete:
A Type 2 PSE that uses 1-Event Physical Layer classification, and requires the 1ms settling time, shall power up a class 4 PD as if it used 2Multiple-Event Physical Layer classification. OR explain why we need it. As it is worded and combined with the first sentence, it is not clear the intent and the need.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.6** *P* **248** *L* **18** # 23

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Power*

Refering to the text:
The ICUT-2P threshold may equal the IPeak-2P value determined by Equation (33-4).

When we changed Ppeak_PD/Pclass_PD ratio from 1.11 to 1.05 to reduce maximum ipeak current, it caused Ipeak-2P to be close to Icont-2P_unb which required tighter accuracy for setting Icut-2P threshold.
As a result, for allowing design flexibility and cost effective solutions we can allow Icut-2P threshold to be equal or higher that Ipeak-2P due to the fact that removing power due to crossing Icut-2P is not mandatory.
As a result we need to explicitly clarify and allow the following:
a) The ICUT-2P threshold may equal or greater (not just equal) the IPeak-2P value determined by Equation (33-4).
b) ICUT-2P threshold must be below ILIM_MIN (as usual).
c) The value of Icut_2P_max shall not exceed 1.15*Icon-2P_unb
d) Any combinations of the above will not cause violating PSE maximum power allowed.

SuggestedRemedy

To change:
The ICUT-2P threshold may equal the IPeak-2P value determined by Equation (33-4).
To:
The ICUT-2P threshold may be greater than or equal to the IPeak-2P value determined by Equation (33-4). The Icut-2P threshold needs to be below ILIM_MIN as described by Figure 33-14.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.6** *P* **248** *L* **26** # 221

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *PSE Power*

The existing text,
" When connected to a single signature PD, a Type 3 or Type 4 PSE should (TBD) remove power from both pairsets before the current exceeds the "PSE upperbound template" on either pairset."
provides unnecessary guidance. The prior sentence,
"Power shall be removed from a pairset of a PSE before the pairset current exceeds the "PSE upperbound template" in Figure 33-14."
provides requirement. On pages 239 to 240,
"Power may be removed from both pairsets any time power is removed from one pairset. Editor's Note: All other instances of the above statement to be removed from draft. If commentators find any please comment against them." The first sentence called out in this comment is fits the concern expressed in the Editor's note.

The requirement in this section prevents one or both of the pairsets from crossing the PSE upperbound template. Concerns about delays in turning off one pairset then a second pairset may not warranted because the device connected to the PSE is no longer considered a PD. Having the ability to control pairsets individually permits system providers to build systems capable of removing power from a fault while still providing power on a nonfaulting pairset.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the sentence,
" When connected to a single signature PD, a Type 3 or Type 4 PSE should (TBD) remove power from both pairsets before the current exceeds the "PSE upperbound template" on either pairset."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Fred to resubmit next meeting.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.7** *P* **248** *L* **26** # 36

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *PSE Power*

Referring to the text:
When connected to a single signature PD, a Type 3 or Type 4 PSE should (TBD) remove power from both pairsets before the current exceeds the "PSE upperbound template" on either pairset.

The above text meant to protect single signature classes 6 and up PDs from having all the current flowing over one pairset when the other pairset is about to cross the upperbound template of figure 33-14.
The TBD need to be replaced with text that reflects it.

SuggestedRemedy

Alternative 1:
Change from:
When connected to a single signature PD, a Type 3 or Type 4 PSE should (TBD) remove power from both pairsets before the current exceeds the "PSE upperbound template" on either pairset.

To:
When connected to above class 5 single signature PD, a Type 3 or Type 4 PSE should should remove power from both pairsets before the current exceeds the "PSE upperbound template" on either pairset.

Alternative 2:
Remove the above text ("When connected to a single signature PD, a Type 3 or Type 4 PSE should (TBD) remove power from both pairsets before the current exceeds the "PSE upperbound template" on either pairset.")

Due to tha fact that the text in lines 24-26 covers already what we want and shown here below for reference :
"A PSE may remove power from the PI if the PI current meets or exceeds the "PSE lowerbound template" in Figure 33-14. Power shall be removed from the a pairset PI of a PSE before the pairset PI current exceeds the "PSE upperbound template" in Figure 33-14."

So if the current over a pairset is about to cross the upperbound and as a result power was disconnected from that pair, the other pair will be overloaded and disconnected as well due its own protections.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Yair to resubmit for next meeting.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.7** *P* **248** *L* **27** # 127

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *PSE Power*

"When connected to a single signature PD, a Type 3 or Type 4 PSE should (TBD) remove power from both pairsets before the current exceeds the "PSE upperbound template" on either pairset."

TF to discuss if we can lose the TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove TBD.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Lennart will resubmit for next meeting.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.7** *P* **248** *L* **33** # 25

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Power*

After line 33 which is the end of:
"The maximum value of ILIM-2P is the PSE upperbound template described by Equation (33–6) and Figure 33–14."

We need to mention that ILIM-2P minimum in Table 33-11 item 9 include the effects of end to end pair to pair current/resistance unbalance.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Add after the above text:
ILIM-2P minumum value in Table 33-11 item 9 for class 5 and above includes E2EP2PRunb effect.
2. Remove note #5 at the Editor Note section in page 244 line 13.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.7** *P* **248** *L* **43** # 208

Dwelley, David — Linear Technology

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

-2pmin and -2pmax suffices are missing a space/underscore in several locations. In each case (example here is Ilim-2pmin) it looks like a new parameter is being defined where that is not the intent

SuggestedRemedy

Change to -2p min or -2p_min (or max as appropriate), whichever the style guide likes better.

I count 11 mins, 2 maxs on pages 248-250 and 275

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

I believe a space is needed before the min or max.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.7** *P* **249** *L* **1** # 159

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Lennart2*

This Figure 33-14 now works on a per pairset basis, rather than a PI basis.
This has the effect to double all the constants in the Figure when the PSE operates in 4P mode.
The issue is with the 1.75A constant in the upperbound template.

In 802.3-2012 this was chosen as 100W / 57V = 1.75A.
IEC 60950 lists a maximum Isc for Class 2 power sources as 150W / Vmax = 150W / 57V = 2.63A or 1.3A per pairset.

TF to discuss if we need to change 1.75A to 1.3A.

Note:
- Adopting 1.3A limit introduces a margin challenge for Class 7-8 PSEs
- Discussion with IEC experts still ongoing to see how to interpret this specification

SuggestedRemedy

See presentation yseboodt_2_0915.pdf on Figure 33-14 for replacement figures.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 158

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.7** *P* **249** *L* **1** # 160

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Lennart2*

Figure 33-14.
In contrast to 802.3-2012, the parameter Ilim(min) went from being Type dependent to being Class dependent.
The reason is that we do not want Type 3/4 PSEs that are restricted to low power, to have to support comparatively
enormous currents up to Tlim(min) in the lowerbound template.

Fig 33-14 also uses Ilim(min) in the upperbound template, for t > Tcut(max).
The side effect is that that upperbound limit is no longer Type-constant, but moves with Class.

See comment #94 against D1.1:
"Comment is rejected because this is not necessary behavior and is a feature rather than a requirement. This allows PSEs to use a single current limit and not dynamically change it."

SuggestedRemedy

Solution is to have this section of the upperbound template defined by another parameter.
This could be any of: something new, Ilim(max), Icut(max), ...

I am suggesting Icut(max) in the presentation.

See presentation yseboodt_2_0915.pdf on Figure 33-14 for replacement figures.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 158

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.7** *P* **249** *L* **1** # 161

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Lennart2*

Figure 33-14 still has a TBD. It is there because this is a very tricky to define value with our current set of parameters.

SuggestedRemedy

The lowerbound TBD is Icon - 'the current in the other pairset'.
It is probably helpful for the reader to also show the effect of unbalance in this Figure.

See presentation yseboodt_2_0915.pdf on Figure 33-14 for replacement figures.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 158

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.7.** *P* **249** *L* **15** # 24

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair2*

Figure 33-14.
We need to capture Type 1 and Type 2 requirements and Type 3 and Type 4 requirements.
See proposed solution in darshan_02_0915.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

To implement darshan_02_0915.pdf.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 158.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.7** *P* **249** *L* **28** # 158

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Lennart2*

In Figure 33-14, x axis, there is a marked time with value of 8.2ms.
Followed by a marked time with value T_LIM-2P(min).
For Type 4, T_LIM-2P(min)=6ms, which is less than 8.2ms.

SuggestedRemedy

See presentation yseboodt_2_0915.pdf on Figure 33-14 for replacement figures.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Adopt yseboodt_2_0915_v110.pdf as baseline text with the exception of section 33.2.7.4.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.7** *P* **249** *L* **43** # 37

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Lennart2*

In Equation 33-7 there is a TBD that can be replaced with parametric values.
This part adresses the lowerbound template for the time point t>=Tcut-2P min.
The value of this it has to be the value of 2P current without the effect of unbalance and up to Icont-2P_unb which is the maximum possible DC current over the pair including E2EP2PRunb effect.
In other words:
For Type 3 and 4 classes 5-8: The value is 0.5*Pclass/Vport_PSE to Icon-2P_unb.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Replace the entire row of the TBD in equation 33-7 to two separate rows:
Row #3: 0.5*Pclass/Vport_PSE-2P to Icon-2P_unb for t>=Tcut-2Pmin and for classes 5-8 operating over four pairs.
Row #4: 0.5*Pclass/Vport_PSE-2P for t>=Tcut-2Pmin and for classes 0-4 operating over two pairs.
2. Add after line 3 page 50:
Icon-2P_unb is specified in Table 33-11.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 158

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.11** *P* **250** *L* **45** # 205

Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Missing capitalization: "intra-pair..."

This typo also appears in the contents (p22 line 19) but I suspect it will fix itself.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Intra-pair..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.11** *P* **250** *L* **45** # 63

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"33.2.7.11 intra-pair current unbalance"
Capitalization.

SuggestedRemedy

"33.2.7.11 Intra-pair current unbalance"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 205

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.7.11a** *P* **251** *L* **13** # 27

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PSE Power*

The text:
Type 4 PSEs shall not source more power than PType max as specified in Table 33-11 calculated with any sliding window with a width of 1 (TBD) second.

For design flexibility we can allow 1sec window to 5sec which is much less than 60sec and get rid of the TBD

SuggestedRemedy

Replace TBD with 1 to 5 seconds.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change text to:

"Type 4 PSEs shall not source more power than PType max as specified in Table 33-11 calculated with any sliding window with a width of up to 4 seconds.

Editor's note: Lennart to check IEC62368, part 3"

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.8** *P* **251** *L* **47** # 11

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

We already agreed in last meeting that Annex B is a normative annex and is used for PSE PI P2Punb requirements.

Annex C was agreed to be used for Autoclass.
(See also YD_002_PSE_P2P that addresses other correction need to be made due to incorrect implementation of darshan_06_0715.pdf in http://www.ieee802.org/3/bt/public/jul15/darshan_06_0715-REV008.docx.)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "See Annex 33B for more information on how..."
To "See Annex 33C for more information on how..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.9.1.1** *P* **254** *L* **21** # 222

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

The following text is no longer required and should be removed,

SuggestedRemedy

Remove,
"Editor's Note: Yair to review AC MPS for 4-pair."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 64

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.9.1.1** *P* **254** *L* **21** # 64

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

original text: "Editors Note: Yair to review AC MPS for 4-pair."
In July meeting we decided not supporting AC-MPS for Type 3/4.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Editors note.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.2.9.1.2** *P* **254** *L* **27** # 142

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

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

The construction "the sum of I port-2P of both pairsets of the same polarity" is used 6 times in 33.2.9.1.2
'pairsets of the same polarity' does not make sense. This should be 'pairs'.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace by "the sum of I port-2P of both pairs of the same polarity" (6x)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **255** *L* **19** # 101

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"Type 1 and Type 2 PDs shall be capable of accepting power on either of two pairsets and may accept power on both pairsets. Type 3 and Type 4 PDs shall be capable of accepting power on either pairset and shall be capable of accepting power on both pairsets. The two conductor sets are named Mode A and Mode B."

'The two conductor sets' have not been called out at this point (due to changes in the previous text).

SuggestedRemedy

Replace by: "There are two conductor sets, named Mode A and Mode B, corresponding with the two pairsets."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 172

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **255** *L* **19** # 172

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"The two conductor sets are named Mode A and Mode B."

we now call these "pairsets" - in fact, the two sentences immediately preceding this one use the term pairsets. Switching back to conductor sets is confusing and makes the reader think there is a difference where I think there should be none.

SuggestedRemedy

replace "conductor sets" with "pairsets" or clarify what is meant by the different term.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **255** *L* **43** # 38

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

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

It is important to emphasis that PDs that are not implemented to be insensitive to polarity, are specifically not allowed by this standard.
(We used this concept already in lines 47-48).

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following text after line 43 in page 255:
PDs that are not implemented to be insensitive to power supply polarity are specifically not allowed by this standard.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 119.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **255** *L* **47** # 119

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"NOTE--PDs that implement only Mode A or Mode B are specifically not allowed by this standard."

SuggestedRemedy

Append to note: "PDs that are not implemented to be insensitive to polarity, are specifically not allowed by this standard."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Append to note: "PDs that are not insensitive to polarity, are specifically not allowed by this standard."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **255** *L* **51** # 271

Jones, Chad Cisco

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *57V*

Still looking for the proper wording for the understood implied specification: "The PD shall withstand any voltage from 0 V to 57 V at the PI indefinitely without permanent damage."

SuggestedRemedy

Type 1 and Type 2 PDs shall withstand any voltage from 0V to 57V at the PI indefinitely without permanent damage.

Type 3 and Type 4 PDs shall withstand any voltage or combination of voltages from 0V to 57V across any polarity combination of the Mode A pairset, the Mode B pairset, and both Mode A and Mode B pairsets (defined in Table 33-13) indefinitely without permanent damage.

These tests shall be run with the two conductors of each tested pair at the same voltage potential.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Task Force to discuss.

This language would cause problems for the "half active bridge" implementation that is commonly used.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.1** *P* **255** *L* **51** # 229

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *57V*

New PD Types will need to accept up to 57V on each pair set. Fix text,
"The PD shall withstand any voltage from 0 V to 57 V at the PI indefinitely without permanent damage."

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the Draft text with,

Solution-1:
Type 1 and Type 2 PDs shall withstand any voltage from 0 V to 57 V at the powered pairset indefinitely without permanent damage. Type 3 and Type 4 PDs shall withstand any voltage from 0 V to 57 V on both pair sets indefinitely without permanent damage.

Solution-2:
Type 1 and Type 2 PDs shall withstand any voltage from 0 V to 57 V at the powered pairset indefinitely without permanent damage. Type 3 and Type 4 PDs shall withstand any voltage from 0 V to 57 V on both pair sets or between pairsets indefinitely without permanent damage.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No changes to the draft.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.2** *P* **256** *L* **7** # 102

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

MPS column uses different wording than matching PSE table 33-1a (page 200).

SuggestedRemedy

Change column header "Maintain Power Signature" to "Low MPS support"
Change values to "No, No, 5xYes".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.2** *P* **256** *L* **17** # 176

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

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

Table 33-13a is entitled "Permissible PD Types" as such, it should list the types, 1 row per type. There are two entries for "Type 3/SS", differentiated by their class, not their type. They differ in the physical layer class events and whether data link layer classification is required. These differences should just be noted in a single row since the PDs are of the same type, or, are they really a different type? (the first is preferable, since a PD really shouldn't change it's type, but might under some circumstances operate say as class 3, and others as class 4)

SuggestedRemedy

Either: a) Define Type 3/SS Class 1-3 and Type 3/SS Class 4-6 as separate types (i.e., rename them e.g., Type 3a/SS and Type 3b/SS) or, preferably
b) merge the two rows showing the 2 class ranges under physical layer class and data link layer class.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Combine rows. Show "Multiple-Event" and "Mandatory" as the the physical layer and DLL class requirements.

Add Note to DLL cell which references text: "Type 3/SS Class 1-3 PDs are not required to implement DLL classification."

Add editor's note: Classification section to be updated to move all Type 3 and Type 4 PSEs to multiple-event.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.2** *P* **256** *L* **36** # 178

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

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

There are two major informative distinctions in the table, which are puzzling, but left out of the discussion. Without pointing these out, the reader is likely to think it a typographical error.
1) Class 6 is not permitted for any Type 4 PDs
2) Class 0 is not permitted for any PDs other than Type 1.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert: "Class 0 is not permitted for any PDs other than Type 1." on line 36, after the end of the sentence (same paragraph as Type 1 PDs).
Insert: "Class 6 is not permitted for Type 4 PDs." as a new paragraph after line 52.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert: "Class 0 is only permitted for Type 1 PDs." on line 36, after the end of the sentence (same paragraph as Type 1 PDs).
Insert: "Type 4/SS PDs only advertise class 7 and 8. Type 4/DS PDs only advertise class 5." as a new paragraph after line 52.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.2** *P* **256** *L* **51** # 164

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

missing space "atleast"

SuggestedRemedy

replace "atleast" with "at least"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 65.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.2** *P* **256** *L* **51** # 65

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"Type 3/DS and Type 4/DS PDs implement a minimum of Multiple-Event Physical Layer classification and Data Link Layer Classification (see 33.6). Type 3/DS PDs advertise a class signature of 1, 2, 3 or 4 on each pairset, while Type 4/DS PDs advertise a class signature of 5 on atleast one pairset."

Space missing 'atleast'.

SuggestedRemedy

Add space.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Space need in "atleast". Also add "," after "3" in "1, 2, 3 or 4".

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.2** *P* **257** *L* **1** # 170

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Most all of Section 33.3.2 appears to be informative - summarizing requirements and allowed type/classification/LLDP requirements where the normative requiremetns are elsewhere (if they aren't then the section is missing the 'shall' statements and any PICs). However, at the end of the section there are two requirements (PD5 (underpowered PDs) and PD6 (25.4.5 compliance) which seem misplaced.
These make the informative nature of the new text unclear (hence why this isn't a maintenance request), and the informative text needs to be separated from the normative text

SuggestedRemedy

Add (informative) to the title of the section.
(note the two normative requirements are moved elsewhere)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Do not add informative

Add editor's note: Need to move two normative requirements from section 33.3.2"

at end of section.

Cl **33** SC **33.3.2** P **257** L **6** # 177

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

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

"Type 2, Type 3 and Type 4 PDs shall meet the requirements of 25.4.5 in the presence of (Iunb / 2)." , but the requirement of 25.4.5 specifically only applies to Type 2 devices.
"A receiver in a Type 2 Endpoint PSE or Type 2 PD (see Clause 33) shall meet the requirements of 25.4.7. A transmitter in a Type 2 Endpoint PSE or Type 2 PD delivering or accepting more than 13.0W average power shall meet either the Open Circuit Inductance (OCL) requirement in 9.1.7 of TP-PMD, or meet the requirements of 25.4.5.1."
Additionally, the requirement here requires ALL TYpe 2, 3 and 4 PDs whether or not they include 100BASE-TX, to meet the clause 25 requirement, which would make magnetics more expensive if, in the future, 100BASE-TX support were dropped.
I believe the purpose of the requirement here is to add Iunb to the clause 25 test, so, which might benefit from some descriptive text as to the purpose.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert after "PDs", "implementing 100BASE-TX (Clause 25) PHYs"
Add a note after line 6 stating: "NOTE - For PDs implementing both Clause 25 and Clause 33, this adds the unbalance current to the requirements in Clause 25."
Add Clause 25 to the 802.3bt amendment, and modify 25.4.5 to say "Type 2 or greater Endpoint PSE or Type 2 or greater PD" (2 places).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** SC **33.3.3.3** P **259** L **6** # 67

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

In variable "pse_power_level"
"The PSE is delivering the PD's requested power..."

The variable indicates how much power the PSE has allocated by showing a number of class events (in combination with the shown class signature).
The word 'delivering' is not correct.

SuggestedRemedy

Change (4x) 'is delivering' into 'has allocated'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** SC **33.3.3.3** P **259** L **6** # 66

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *PD State Diagram*

In variable "pse_dll_power_level"
"The PSE is delivering class x ..."

The variable indicates how much power the PSE has allocated by showing a number of class events (in combination with the shown class signature) or via DLL.
The word 'delivering' is not correct.

SuggestedRemedy

Change (4x) 'is delivering' into 'has allocated'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** SC **33.3.3.5** P **260** L **14** # 120

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PD State Diagram*

original text: ""
"Figure 33-16 PD state diagram" does not yet include Autoclass partial finger support.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert editors note: "PD state diagram needs to be updated for Autoclass."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.4** *P* **261** *L* **50** # 121

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Detection*

"A Type 2 PD presents a non-valid detection signature when in a mark event state per Figure 33-16."
Applies to any PD which supports Multiple event classification.
Shall missing?

SuggestedRemedy

"A Type2, Type 3, or Type 4 PD shall present a non-valid detection signature when in a mark event state per Figure 33-16."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No changes to draft.

Already in section 33.3.5.2.1

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.4** *P* **262** *L* **6** # 48

Bennett, Ken Sifos Technologies, In

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *LLDP*

"LLDP variable PD 4P-ID" should be "LLDPDU variable.." or "TLV variable..".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "LLDP" to "TLV".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.4** *P* **262** *L* **13** # 68

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R** *PD Detection*

"two voltage/current" can be read as 'or'

SuggestedRemedy

change to "two voltage and current"

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Could be filed as a maintenance request.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.4** *P* **262** *L* **33** # 69

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"PD input connector" is not consistent with rest of document

SuggestedRemedy

change to "PD PI"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.4** *P* **263** *L* **1** # 70

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"PD input connector" is not consistent with rest of document

SuggestedRemedy

change to "PD PI"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5** *P* **263** *L* **43** # 165

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"The PD is classified based on power. The Physical Layer classification of the PD is the maximum power that the PD draws across all input voltages and operational modes."

The first statement is meaningless and needs clarification. The second sentence says all that needs to be said.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "The PD is classified based on power."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5** *P* **264** *L* **1** # 143

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

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

"A PD shall meet at least one of the allowable classification permutations listed in Table 33-8."
Wrong Table reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: "A PD shall meet at least one of the allowed classification configurations listed in Table 33-15a."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5** *P* **264** *L* **3** # 103

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"The allowed PD classification configurations are shown in Table 33-15a."
This line is redundant to line 1.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove sentence.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

NonEasy

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5** *P* **264** *L* **36** # 181

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

(Note 1 to Table 33-15a)
"Any PD that is limited to class 0-3 power levels may omit DLL support."
and P264 L43
"Type 2, Type 3 and Type 4 PDs shall implement both Multiple-Event class signature (see 33.3.5.2) and Data Link Layer classification (see 33.6)."

Are in conflict. L43 would be read that any Type 3 Class 1-3 PD would have to implement DLL (which is also in conflict with table 33-13a's PD summary, which also says that Type 1-3 Type 3 PDs only have to do 1-Event class).

SuggestedRemedy

Change P264 L43 to read:
"Type 2, Type 3 and Type 4 PDs at class 4 or greater power levels shall implement both Multiple-Event class signature (see 33.3.5.2) and Data Link Layer classification (see 33.6)."
Add after the above sentence.
"PD's of all Types at class 3 or lower power levels are not required to implement Multiple-Event class signature (see 33.3.5.2) and Data Link Layer classification (see 33.6)."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change P264 L43 to read:
"Type 2, Type 3 and Type 4 PDs at class 4 or greater power levels shall implement both Multiple-Event Physical Layer classification (see 33.3.5.2) and Data Link Layer classification (see 33.6)."
Add after the above sentence.
"PD's of all Types not capable of drawing more than class 3 power levels may omit Data Link Layer classification (see 33.6)."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5** *P* **264** *L* **43** # 243

Picard, Jean Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

The statement about Type 3 does not align with table 33-13 for class 1-3

SuggestedRemedy

Restate the sentence to Indicate that for class 1-3 SS, LLDP is optional

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 181

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5** *P* **264** *L* **43** # 231

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

The footnote on Table 33-15a and text below the table may confuse the reader. If a PD already supports DLL them it should continue to support DLL whether is it consuming less than class-4 power or not.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace footnote 1 with,
"Any PD not capable of drawing more than class-3 power levels may omit DLL support."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 181

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.1** *P* **264** *L* **52** # 174

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

"Class 0 is the default for PDs".
Now that we have Type 3 and Type 4, which are required to present at least 1-event classification class signatures, as described all over the place and summarized in Table 33-13a, Class 0 is NOT the default for PDs. Class 0 is the default that a PSE assumes. this clause specifies the PD. Class 0 appears to be only allowed for Type 1 PDs.
This statement needs to be clarified.
Additionally, Table 33-16a appears to allow class 0 for Type 3 PDs.
Without a class sig, how is the PD a type 3?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify the sentence as either applying only to Type 1 PDs or as applying to Type 1 and Type 3/SS PDs, and editor to search and align other references to class 0 Type 3 PDs in document (some of which I have commented on elsewhere).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to: Class 0 is the default for Type 1 PDs."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.1** *P* **265** *L* **4** # 223

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

The text,
"PDs implementing a Multiple-Event class signature shall return Class 4 in accordance with the maximum power draw, PClass_PD, as specified in Table 33-18."
may confuse the reader.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the sentence with,
PDs implementing a Multiple-Event class signature shall return Class 4 in accordance with the maximum power draw, PClass_PD, as specified in Table 33-18 and the responses specified in Table 33-16a."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace the sentence with,
"PDs implementing a Multiple-Event class signature shall return class_sig_A in accordance with the maximum power draw, Pclass_PD, as specified in Table 33-18 and the responses specified in Table 33-16a."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.1** *P* **265** *L* **6** # 144

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

Topic: Class 0 / Type 3 removal
"Type 3 PDs operating with a maximum power draw corresponding to class 0-3 respond to 1-Event classification by returning a Class signature 0, 1, 2, or 3 in accordance..."

Type 3 does not have class 0.

SuggestedRemedy

"Type 3 PDs operating with a maximum power draw corresponding to class 1-3 respond to 1-Event classification by returning a Class signature 1, 2, or 3 in accordance..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.2** *P* **266** *L* **3** # 196

Johnson, Peter — Sifos Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

The terms "class_sig_A" and "class_sig_B" are just a problem waiting to happen in Table 33-16a and in the PD State Diagram (and associated variable definitions). Will get confused with classifying on Alt-A and Alt-B pairs when these really mean something else.

SuggestedRemedy

What about "search and replace" with "class_sig_A" with "class_sig_ev12" and "class_sig_B" with "class_sig_ev35" or something like this?

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No changes to the draft. Better suggestions for names are invited.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.2** *P* **266** *L* **13** # 146

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

Topic: Class 0 / Type 3 removal
Table 33-16a lists Class 0 for Type 3 / Single-signature.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove row from table.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.2** *P* **266** *L* **23** # 182

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

Table 33-16a shows no entries for dual signature class 0 PDs and text on lione 38 indicates "Dual-signature PDs shall use only class 0 to 5 power level..."

Which is it? Table 33-13a suggests DS PDs don't have class 0

SuggestedRemedy

change "class 0 to 5" to "class 1 to 5"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 147.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.2** *P* **266** *L* **26** # 197

Johnson, Peter — Sifos Technologies

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R** *PD Classification*

In Table 33-16a, since class signatures are per-pairset in a Dual Signature PD, perhaps it would be beneficial to highlight this fact.

SuggestedRemedy

Beneath Dual-Siganture under PD Type 3 and PD Type 4, add (per pairset)

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

This idea is captured in the text below the table, line 38.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.2** *P* **266** *L* **38** # 147

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

"Dual-signature PDs shall use only class 0 to 5 power level over each pairset. The class advertised over each pairset is the power requested by the PD over that pairset. Dual-signature PDs may use different classsignature per pairset. It is not recommended to use different class signatures with single load dual-signature PDs."

Remove Class 0 + Grammer improvement needed.

SuggestedRemedy

"Dual-signature PDs shall advertise a class signature of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 on each pairset. The class advertised on each pairset is the power requested by the PD on that pairset. Dual-signature PDs may advertise a different class signature on each pairset. It is not recommended to use different class signatures if the dual-signature PD powers a single electrical load."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.2** *P* **266** *L* **38** # 145

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

Topic: Class 0 / Type 3 removal
"Dual-signature PDs shall use only class 0 to 5 power level over each pairset."

SuggestedRemedy

"Dual-signature PDs shall use only class 1 to 5 power levels over each pairset."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 147.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.2** *P* **266** *L* **39** # 105

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

"Dual-signature PDs may use different class signature per pairset."
Better wording.

SuggestedRemedy

"Dual-signature PDs may use a different class signature on each pairset."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 147.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.2.1** *P* **267** *L* **15** # 239

Picard, Jean Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

The PD needs more margin for TLCF_PD to keep complexity down.

SuggestedRemedy

Increase the maximum value from 84.5 ms to 87.5 ms.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.2.1** *P* **267** *L* **15** # 52

Beia, Christian STMicroelectronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

Table 33-17
The PD long first class event spec introduces a big burden for PD timing accuracy, which can be relaxed if the PSE was able to better control the lenght of the long first class event. This should not add complexity to the PSE since its clock is typically more accurate than the PD one.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Table 33-17 item7, TLCF_PD max to 86.5
Leave 75.5 as min

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 239

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.3** *P* **267** *L* **35** # 122

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

"A PD implementing Autoclass shall not have class_sig_A of '0'."
With the removal of Class 0 for Type 3/4, this 'shall' becomes redundant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove sentence.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove "In addition," from beginning of next sentence.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.3** *P* **267** *L* **37** # 244

Picard, Jean — Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

To indicate Autoclass, same requirement as indicated in table 33-16 needs to apply.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "a PD implementing Autoclass
shall reduce its classification current at TACS (as defined in Table 33–17a), resulting in a classification
signature of ‘0’ (as shown in table 33-16 for type 3) for the remainder of CLASS_EV1."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace: "In addition, a PD implementing Autoclass shall remove its classification current at TACS (as defined in Table 33–17a), resulting in a classification signature of ‘0’ for the remainder of CLASS_EV1."

with suggested remedy.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.3** *P* **267** *L* **40** # 71

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"After power up, a PD implementing Autoclass shall draw its maximum power draw throughout..."

2x draw.

SuggestedRemedy

"After power up, a PD implementing Autoclass shall draw its highest required power throughout..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.5.3** *P* **268** *L* **5** # 238

Picard, Jean — Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

The PD needs more margin for TACS to keep complexity down.

SuggestedRemedy

Increase the maximum value from 84.5 ms to 87.5 ms.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See comment 239.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.6** *P* **268** *L* **5** # 54

Beia, Christian — STMicroelectronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Classification*

Table 33-17a
The autoclass timing, as well as TLCF_PD, introduces a big burden for PD timing accuracy, which can be relaxed if the PSE was able to better control the lenght of the first long finger.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Table 33-17 item7, TACS max to 86.5
Leave 75.5 as min

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 239.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7** *P* **268** *L* **29** # 166

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Somehow the editing instruction for Table 33-18 has gotten disassociated from the table... "Change Table 33-18 as follows:"

SuggestedRemedy

Wrestle with frame so the editing instruction stays with the table.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7** *P* **269** *L* **35** # 50

Bennett, Ken — Sifos Technologies, In

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *PD Classification*

PClass is defined as a total port power and is described in Equation 33-3 using the PD Classification PClass_PD and the channel loss.

The descriptions for dual-signature PD's use PClass_PD per pairset, and different classes are allowed per pairset.

The suggestion is one possible approach to remedy this problem.

SuggestedRemedy

Create new dual signature parameters PClassDS_alta and PClassDS_altb, where PClass_PD = PClassDS_alta + PClassDS_altb. Add text in 33.3.7.2 stating that single-signature rules shall apply to each pairset in dual signature PDs.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.1** *P* **270** *L* **1** # 106

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Power*

Table 33-18.
1,2,3,4 is not consistent, change to All (this is 8 times in table)

SuggestedRemedy

change to "All"
- Item 5, Item 8, Item 9, Item 10, Item 11 (2x), Item 12, Item 13

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7** *P* **270** *L* **13** # 246

Picard, Jean — Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Power*

Ppeak_PD is not mentioned for class 6-8

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify how the peak power requirement should be applied for class 6 and 8 and define it accordingly for class 5 and 7, as well as for class 6 and 8.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by comment 12

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7** *P* **270** *L* **24** # 12

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Power*

Table 33-18 item 7 for Type 3 and 4: The parameter name "peak operating power, class 5": It is true for all classes above class 5 and not just class 5.

SuggestedRemedy

Change parameter name in Table 33-18 item 7 for Type 3 and 4:
From:
peak operating power, class 5
To:
peak operating power, class 5 to 8.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.3** *P* **271** *L* **41** # 149

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Power*

"After T Inrush-2P min, the PD shall meet P Class_PD as specified in Table 33-18."
Disallows extended power.

SuggestedRemedy

"After T Inrush-2P min, Class 6 or Class 8 PDs shall meet Pclass at the PSE PI; all other PDs shall meet P Class_PD as specified in Table 33-18."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.3** *P* **271** *L* **41** # 29

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair1*

The objective of this comment is to restore some of the text used in IEEE802.3-2012 clause 33.3.7.3 in IEEE802.3bt clause 33.3.7.3 (same location) lines 39-41.
The reason for text changes in 802.3bt was the concern that PD vendors will consume power above type 1 power while PD is still in POWER-UP mode which will cause unsuccessful startup.
It will be shown that the new version in 802.3bt:
1.Includes incorrect description of Iinrush process ending point while in 2012 version the text describing the ending point is correct.
2.The concern was already resolved in existing text in two locations

The text in the PD spec in 802.3bt clause 33.3.7.3 page 271 lines 39-50 separated to 4 parts e.g. [Part A]:
33.3.7.3 Input inrush current
[Part A] Inrush current per pairset is drawn beginning with the application of input voltage at the pairset compliant with Vport_PD-2P requirements as defined in Table 33-18,
[Part B] and ending before TInrush-2P min per Table 33-11.
[Part C] After TInrush-2P min, the PD shall meet PClass_PD as specified in Table 33-18.

Part D] Type 2, Type 3 and Type 4 PDs with pse_power_leveltype state variable set to 2, 3 and 4 respectively prior to power-on shall behave like a Type 1 PD for at least Tdelay-2P min. Tdelay-2P for each pairset starts when VPD-2P crosses the PD power supply turn on voltage, VOn_PD. This delay is required so that the Type 2, Type3 and Type 4 PD does not enter a high power state before the PSE has had time to switch current limits on each pairset from IInrush-2P to ILIM-2P.

[Part A] is correct description of the starting point of Iinrush process in the PD.

[Part B] is incorrect description of the ending point of Iinrush process in the PD. The end point of inrush process depends only on PD physics and not anything else e.g. PSE Iinrush timer.
It is true that Inrush need to be ended before TInrush-2P min per Table 33-11 but it needs to be in separate sentence and not as part of the description of the end point of the Inrush process.
The end point of the inrush process can be only when Cport is get to steady state by having Cport to be charged to 99% of its final value.
The end point and the requirements for the Iinrush duration are described accurately in IEEE802.3-2012 version:
"and ending when CPort is charged to 99 % of its final value. This period should be less than TInrush min per Table 33-11."
[Part C] This part resolves the concern by requiring PD to meet PClass_PD as specified in Table 33-18 only after TInrush-2P min.
[Part D] This part also resolves the concern for Type 2 and above by waiting Tdelay before PD can consume more than Type 1 power.

Summary: The only problem with the current text of 802.3bt is the mixing between the Inrush end point process description and the requirement that the process will be ended within Tinrush minimum.

See detailed analysis in darshan_01_0915.pdf, titled: "Only PD affects PD POWERUP Tinrush max (Not the PSE Tinrush Timer).

SuggestedRemedy

1) Change lines 26-27 from:
33.3.7.3 Input inrush current
Inrush current per pairset is drawn beginning with the application of input voltage at the pairset compliant with Vport_PD-2P requirements as defined in Table 33-18, and ending before TInrush-2P min per Table 33-11.
After TInrush-2P min, the PD shall meet PClass_PD as specified in Table 33-18.

To:
Inrush current is drawn during the startup period beginning with the application of input voltage at the PI compliant with VPort_PD-2P requirements as defined in Table 33-18, and ending when CPort has reached a steady state and is charged to 99 % of its final value. This period shall be less than TInrush min per Table 33-11.
After TInrush-2P min, the PD shall meet PClass_PD as specified in Table 33-18.

(2) To consider to add the following note after line 50 that address the concerns in details and supply design guide lines.
Note: For successful startup, a PSE supplying Iinrush-2P minimum value and a PD not drawing more than Type 1 maximum DC current results in stable voltage ramping across the PD input capacitor which is important for successful POWER UP. In addition, Cport value and PD load current may be time dependent. As a result PD implementers need to ensure that for any combinations of Cport and Type 1 maximum DC current during POWERUP, the PD inrush period does not exceed 50msec and that higher PD load power is used only after Tdelay.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
1) Change lines 26-27 from:
33.3.7.3 Input inrush current
Inrush current per pairset is drawn beginning with the application of input voltage at the pairset compliant with Vport_PD-2P requirements as defined in Table 33-18, and ending before TInrush-2P min per Table 33-11.
After TInrush-2P min, the PD shall meet PClass_PD as specified in Table 33-18.

To:
Inrush current is drawn during the startup period beginning with the application of input voltage at the PI compliant with VPort_PD-2P requirements as defined in Table 33-18, and ending when CPort has reached a steady state and is charged to 99 % of its final value. This period should be less than Tinrush min per Table 33-11.
After Tinrush-2P min, the PD shall meet Pclass_PD as specified in Table 33-18.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.3** *P* **271** *L* **48** # 72

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"Type3" is missing space

SuggestedRemedy

"Type 3"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.3** *P* **272** *L* **8** # 6

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Typo in "value requirements are specified in 33.2.7.6...."
It is 33.3.7.6.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 33.2.7.6 to 33.3.7.6.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.4** *P* **273** *L* **23** # 245

Picard, Jean — Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Power*

The peak power definition for class 6 and 8 is not consistent with statement of page 272 line 20 (referring to PSE Pclass).

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify how the peak power definition should be applied for class 6 and 8.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No changes to the draft. Remedies will be welcome.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.6** *P* **275** *L* **5** # 232

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Fred1*

New PD Types need to have their current demands constrained.

SuggestedRemedy

A presentation will be provided that cover why this section exists and why new PD Types should have the same constrains placed on them. Baseline text may also be proposed.

This section is based on work done in IEEE 802.3at see

http://www.ieee802.org/3/at/public/2007/05/avetteth_0507.pdf

http://www.ieee802.org/3/at/public/2007/03/schindler_1_0307.pdf

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Adopt baseline text in slides 14-17 of schindler_1_0915.pdf.

Strike Editor's Note on page 275, line 13.
"2. A drop out specification needs to be added to this section that requires PDs to ride out PSE transients. This is in place of increasing Cport."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.6** *P* **275** *L* **16** # 179

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Pres: Fred1*

"Type 1, Type 2, and single-signature Type 3 PDs with classes 0 to 4 shall meet the requirement for Cport as defined in Table 33–18 item 9. Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 0 to 4 shall meet the requirement for Cport as defined in Table 33–18 item 9 for each pairset."

These belong as notes to Table 33-18 item 9, and not in the section called "PD behavior during transients" (yes, they relate to transients, but are not a specification of behavior"

SuggestedRemedy

Delete first 2 sentences of first paragraph of 33.3.7.6, and add them as either as Note 1 to item 9 of Table 33-18, OR, split Item 9 of Table 33-18 into 3 rows, one for Type 1, 2 and Type 3/SS PDs Class 0-4, and one for Type 3/DS PDs. (if Type 4 is to be added, it should be added in Table 33-18 and not 33.3.7.6 as well)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.6** *P* **275** *L* **16** # 203

Dwelley, David — Linear Technology

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Fred1*

New text needs improving:
"Type 1, Type 2, and single-signature Type 3 PDs with classes 0 to 4 shall meet the requirement for Cport as defined in Table 33–18 item 9. Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 0 to 4 shall meet the requirement for Cport as defined in Table 33–18 item 9 for each pairset. For class 5 and 6 single-signature PDs, if CPort_min = 10µF, transient behavior has no further requirements. For dual-signature class 5 PDs, this recommendation applies to each pairset. For class 7 and 8 single signature PDs, if CPort_min = 20µF, transient behavior has no further requirements. See 33.2.7.2 (TBD) or the transient conditions"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
"A PD shall continue to operate normally in the presence of transients at the PSE PI as defined in 33.2.7.2. A single-signature PD shall include Cport >= Cport_min as defined in Table 33–18 item 9. A dual-signature PD shall meet this requirement for each pairset. For Class 0-4 PDs, no further considerations are required to maintain operation during PSE transients.

PDs with power draw greater than Class 4 may require extra capacitance to maintain operation during PSE transients. Class 5 and 6 single-signature PDs can typically meet the requirement with CPort_min = 10µF. Class 5 dual-signature PDs should include these Cport values at each pairset. Class 7 and 8 single signature PDs can typically meet this requirement with CPort_min = 20µF."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to:
"A PD shall continue to operate without interruption in the presence of transients at the PSE PI as defined in 33.2.7.2. A single-signature PD shall include Cport as defined in Table 33–18 item 9. A dual-signature PD shall meet this requirement for each pairset.

PDs with power draw greater than Class 4 may require extra capacitance to maintain operation during PSE transients. Class 5 and 6 single-signature PDs will meet the requirement with Cport >= 10µF. Class 5 dual-signature PDs should include these Cport values at each pairset. Class 7 and 8 single signature PDs will meet this requirement with Cport >= 20µF."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.6** *P* **275** *L* **17** # 173

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Power*

"Type 1, Type 2, and single-signature Type 3 PDs with classes 0 to 4 shall meet the requirement for Cport as defined in Table 33–18 item 9. Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 0 to 4 shall meet..."

According to Table 33-13a, there are no class 0 Type 3 PDs. (the first sentence is OK because there are class 0 Type 1 PDs)

SuggestedRemedy

change "Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 0 to 4" to "Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 1 to 4"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 150.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.6** *P* **275** *L* **17** # 150

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Power*

Topic: Class 0 / Type 3 removal
"Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 0 to 4 shall..."

SuggestedRemedy

"Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 1 to 4 shall..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.6** *P* **275** *L* **18** # 180

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Pres: Fred1*

Statements excluding PDs with CPort_min values greater than certain values are confusing, and do not appear to apply to any existing requirements, since the only requirements currently in the section are for TYpe 1 and Type 2.

"For class 5 and 6 single-signature PDs, if CPort_min >10uF, transient behavior has no further requirements. For dual-signature class 5 PDs, this recommendation applies to each pairset. For class 7 and 8 single signature PDs, if CPort_min >20uF, transient behavior has no further requirements. See 33.2.7.2 (TBD) or the transient conditions"

SuggestedRemedy

move statements to an editor's note, and explicitly state the requirements that these PDs are being excluded from, including what needs to be done to make those requirements (is it the referenced 'drop out' specification?)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Task Force to discuss

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.6** *P* **275** *L* **29** # 39

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Pres: Fred1*

There is some confusion in this text (lines 28-29):
- A Type 1 PD input current shall not exceed the PD upperbound template (see Figure 33-18) after TLIM min (see Table 33-11 for a Type 1 PSE)

The text refer to Figure 33-18 which specifies Tcut_min but talks about the current not to be exceed after Tlim_min so is it Tcut_min or Tlim_min?
I believe that it should be Tcut_min both in the text and in Figure 33-18 due to the fact that It is related to Figure 33-18 that talks about not crossing Ppeak_PD which is the overload condition for 50msec.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest changing from Tlim_min to Tcut_min in line 29 to sync with Figure 33-18.
To be discussed by the group.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

this is legacy text.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.6** *P* **275** *L* **34** # 124

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Fred1*

"A Type 2 PD shall meet both of the following:
a) The PD input current spike shall not exceed 2.5 A and shall settle below the PD upperbound template (see Figure 33-18) within 4 ms. During this test, the PD PI voltage is driven from 50 V to 52.5 V at greater than 3.5 V/ms, a source impedance of 1.5 , and a source that supports a current greater than 2.5 A.\

b) The PD shall not exceed the PD upperbound template beyond T LIM min under worst-case current draw under the following conditions. The input voltage source drives V PD from V Port_PSE min to 56 V at 2250 V/s, the source impedance is R Ch (see Table 33-1), and the voltage source limits the current to MDI I LIM per Equation (33-14)."

Does not support new Types.

SuggestedRemedy

"A Type 2, Type 3 or Type 4 PD shall meet both of the following:
a) The PD input current spike shall not exceed 2.5 A **per pairset** and shall settle below the PD upperbound template (see Figure 33-18) within 4 ms. During this test, the PD PI voltage is driven from 50 V to 52.5 V at greater than 3.5 V/ms, a source impedance of 1.5 ohm **divided by the number of pairsets**, and a source that supports a current greater than 2.5 A **per pairset**.

b) The PD shall not exceed the PD upperbound template beyond T LIM min under worst-case current draw under the following conditions. The input voltage source drives V PD from V Port_PSE min to 56 V at 2250 V/s, the source impedance is R Ch ** per pairset** (see Table 33-1), and the voltage source limits the current to MDI I LIM per Equation (33-14)."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 232

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.6** *P* **275** *L* **49** # 125

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Fred1*

Equation 33-14 has the constant 5.00 in without mentioning the dimension. Is that 5mA or 5 A ?

SuggestedRemedy

Add correct dimension to this equation.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make "5.00", "5.00 mA"

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.6** *P* **275** *L* **54** # 171

Zimmerman, George — CME Consulting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Fred1*

"is the per pairset current limit at the MDI (MDI I_LIM)"
the preceding text says this is MDI I_LIM-2P.

SuggestedRemedy

Either: remove the -2P notation for MDI I_LIM-2P (preferred)
or change line 54 to read MDI I_LIM-2P

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 232

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.6** *P* **275** *L* **1622** # 7

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Fred1*

This text applies to different scenarios and for easy reading each scenario may need to start in new row.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editing from:
Type 1, Type 2, and single-signature Type 3 PDs with classes 0 to 4 shall meet the requirement for Cport as defined in Table 33.18 item 9. Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 0 to 4 shall meet the requirement for Cport as defined in Table 33.18 item 9 for each pairset. For class 5 and 6 single-signature PDs, if CPort_min >=10uf, transient behavior has no further requirements. For dual-signature class 5 PDs, this recommendation applies to each pairset. For class 7 and 8 single signature PDs, if CPort_min >=20uf, transient behavior has no further requirements. See 33.2.7.2 (TBD) or the transient conditions

To:
Type 1, Type 2, and single-signature Type 3 PDs with classes 0 to 4 shall meet the requirement for Cport as defined in Table 33.18 item 9.
Type 3 dual-signature PDs with class 0 to 4 shall meet the requirement for Cport as defined in Table 33.18 item 9 for each pairset.
For class 5 and 6 single-signature PDs, if CPort_min >=10uf, transient behavior has no further requirements.
For class 5 and 6 dual-signature PDs, if CPort_min >=10uf for each pairset, transient behavior has no further requirements.
For class 7 and 8 single signature PDs, if CPort_min >=20uf, transient behavior has no further requirements.
See 33.2.7.2 (TBD) or the transient conditions

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 203

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.10** *P* **276** *L* **37** # 248

Picard, Jean — Texas Instruments

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Power*

ICON_2P max for class 5 and 6 may be too tight to pass the test described (using only 2.5m cable) due to diode mismatch (including temperature differences). To avoid later interoperability problems in the field related to diode selection.

SuggestedRemedy

If test conditions remain the same, need to verify and confirm if ICON-2P for class 6 allows sufficient margin. If not the case, increase its value accordingly.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add editor's note below table 33-11:

"Item 4a still under investigation with respect to PD Vdiff."

Cl **33** *SC* **33.3.7.10** *P* **276** *L* **38** # 34

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *PD Power*

Referring to the text:
All Class 5 and higher PDs shall not exceed Icon-2P-unb (Table 33–11, item 4a) on either pairset when tested according to section 33.3.7.10.1.
---
1. PDs need to meet Icon-2P_unb for all classes above class 5 including for extended power mode.
2. In addition Ipeak-2P need to be met for extended power mode as well.
Meeting (1) ensures meeting (2) as regard to E2EP2PRunb effect.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change from:
All Class 5 and higher PDs shall not exceed Icon-2P-unb (Table 33–11, item 4a) on either pairset when tested according to section 33.3.7.10.1.

To:
All Class 5 and higher PDs operating in non exteded power mode or extended power mode, shall not exceed Icon-2P-unb (Table 33–11, item 4a) on either pairset when tested according to section 33.3.7.10.1.

2. After this text, to Add Editor Note:
Editor Note: To update Rmin/Rmax and test setups for PD PI for meeting Icont-2P_unb and Ipeak-2P when PD is using extended power mode

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Extended power is not mentioned anywhere in the standard. Also, the change does not add anything as all Class 5 and higher PDs includes those using extended power.

Cl **33** SC **33.3.7.10** P **276** L **40** # 8

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

The text:
See Annex 33A for design guide lines for meeting the above requirements.

It should be Annex 33A.5 and not Annex A.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from:
See Annex 33A for design guide lines for meeting the above requirements.
To:
See Annex 33A.5 for design guide lines for meeting the above requirements.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** SC **33.3.7.10.1** P **277** L **8** # 73

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *PD Power*

Additional info is empty for Rpair(min) and Rpair(max).

SuggestedRemedy

Put "See Annex 33A.5" in both

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** SC **33.3.8** P **278** L **18** # 74

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

"of th MPS" is misspelled

SuggestedRemedy

change to: "of the MPS"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** SC **33.3.8** P **279** L **23** # 126

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *PD MPS*

In Table 33-19a under 'Conditions' the contructs
- "If no long first class event"
- "If long first class event (T_LCF)" a
are used.

This can be replaced by using the PD variable 'short_mps' returned by the do_class_timing function.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "If no long first class event" by "short_mps = FALSE"
Replace "If long first class event (T_LCF)" by "short_mps = TRUE"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Is this reflected in state diagram.

Cl **33** SC **33.4.** P **281** L **37** # 162

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

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

Equation 33-16 ..."for a 100 Mb/s or greater PHY".
While this is the spec for MDI impedance balance for 100BASE-T and 1000BASE-T, it is not consistent with the spec for 10GBASE-T in Clause 55.8.2.2.
(it is unclear yet what the 2.5G/5G PHYs will be here)

SuggestedRemedy

Insert after line 43, (eqn 55-55 in 802.3bx d3p2)
"Bal(f) >= 48 dB (1<=f<30 MHz)
>= 44 - 19.2 log10(f/50) (30<= f < 500 MHz)
for a 10GBASE-T PHY."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.4.6** *P* **285** *L* **3** # 75

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

no space between 'for' and bracket (two times)

SuggestedRemedy

Add space. De-italicize 'for'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.4.6** *P* **285** *L* **11** # 175

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *AES*

DM noise for 10GBASE-T under 1 MHz is still to be defined.
capping it at the 1MHz level should be more than sufficient to protect the system. Further, the 100BASE-T and 1000BASE-T DM noise is only specified down to 1MHz, so to be consistent, leave the spec as written.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete editor's note.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.4.9.1.1** *P* **288** *L* **47** # 76

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *AES*

No dimension for NEXTconn parameter.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "is the Near End Crosstalk loss" with "is the Near End Crosstalk loss in dB"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

NonEasy

Cl **33** *SC* **33.4.9.1.1** *P* **289** *L* **3** # 77

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

no space between and before 'for' and bracket (two times)

SuggestedRemedy

Add space. De-italicize 'for'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

NonEasy

Cl **33** *SC* **33.4.9.1.1** *P* **289** *L* **3** # 78

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Editorial*

Straigth brackets used, inconsistent with rest of document.

SuggestedRemedy

Change straight bracket to curly brackets and add dimension after brackets (dB).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

NonEasy

Cl **33** *SC* **33.4.9.1.1** *P* **289** *L* **11** # 79

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *AES*

No dimension

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "is the Near End Crosstalk loss" with "is the Near End Crosstalk loss in dB"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

NonEasy

Cl **33** *SC* **33.4.9.1.2** *P* **289** *L* **29** # 80

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *AES*

Dimension is missing

SuggestedRemedy

Add "in dB" after insertion loss

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

NonEasy

Cl **33** *SC* **33.4.9.1.2** *P* **289** *L* **40** # 81

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *AES*

Dimension is missing

SuggestedRemedy

Add "in dB" after insertion loss

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

NonEasy

Cl **33** *SC* **33.5.1.1** *P* **293** *L* **8** # 233

Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

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

Changes in Table 33-21 are not correct and text is missing below the table.

SuggestedRemedy

On line 8 change table column one, "11.15.8" to "11.15.7".

On line 12 last table column add, "R/W".

After line 43 insert text,
33.5.1.1.x Force Power Test Mode Pairset Selection (11.7:6)
Bits 11.7:6 determine which PSE Alternative or Alternatives are enabled when Force Power Test Mode is enabled.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

change 11.15:7 on line 39 to 11.15:8.

On line 12 last table column add, "R/W".

After line 43 insert text,
33.5.1.1.x Force Power Test Mode Pairset Selection (11.7:6)
Bits 11.7:6 determine which PSE Alternative or Alternatives are enabled when Force Power Test Mode is enabled.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.3.2** *P* **299** *L* **16** # 215

Schindler, Fred — Seen Simply

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *Management*

It does not appear to be worthwhile providing class 6 and 7 if they are within 3% of eachother.

SuggestedRemedy

Have the Task Force discuss whether Class 7 PD power should be increased. Provide an Editor's note for the decision if the value changes so that participants provide corrections for the text for the next Draft.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Fred to add pointer to explanation next comment cycle.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.6.3.4** *P* **302** *L* **52** # 82

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Lower border missing in "Table 33-23 Attribute to state diagram variable cross-reference"

SuggestedRemedy

Add lower border of table

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33A** *P* **329** *L* **1** # 107

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Change bars missing in this appendix.

SuggestedRemedy

Add change bars.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33.A.4** *P* **329** *L* **27** # 83

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

Four Pair is not consistent with rest of document

SuggestedRemedy

change Four Pair to 4-pair

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **33** *SC* **33A.5** *P* **330** *L* **12** # 28

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair8*

1. The constants in Annex 33A.5 needs to be replaced with numbers.
2. In addition some of existing constants need to be slightly modified due to the changes made to D1.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to implement darshan_08_0915.pdf

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Adopt changes shown on page 2 of darshan_08_0915.pdf

Cl **33** *SC* **33A.6** *P* **330** *L* **21** # 31

Darshan, Yair Microsemi

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

Marked for reference as YD_002_PSEP2P)

In D1.1 we have approved darshan_06_0715.pdf in http://www.ieee802.org/3/bt/public/jul15/darshan_06_0715-REV008.docx.
It was requested specifically to use Annex B (and not Annex C and not Annex A) to the PSE PI material in 33.2.7.4.1 and 33.2.7.4.2 that links to a Normative Annex Named Annex B in the above link.
Currently the editor named the original Annex B as Annex 33A.6 to Annex 33A.10 which is informative Annex and the intent was that this part will be separate NORMATIVE Annex B.
In addition It is not clear that all parts of original Annex B that are now Annex 33A.6 to Annex 33A.10 are related to each other as in original Annex B and not independed parts
We need to implement the relevant comment from D1.1 and others as approved.

Summary:
PSE PI Material from the above link is Normative Annex B.
The Autoclass material is Annex C.

The following remedy is identical to adopt Annex B in the above approved document while correcting the relevant instances were Annex A, B and C are mentioned.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the following changes without editorial licensing to do otherwise:

1. In Annex 33A.6 page 330 line 21: Change title to: Annex 33B [Normative]PSE PI pair-to-pair resistance/current unbalance.
1.1 In page 330 line 27: Change table Yuval_1 to Table 33B-1.
1.2 In page 330 line 28: Change <> to Annex F.
1.3 In page 330 line 51: Change Figure number from 33A-4 to 33B-1.
1.4 In page 331 line 17: Change Table 33A-1 to Table 33B-1

2. In Annex 33A.7 page 331 line 35: Change title to: 33B.1 direct measurements of Rpse_max and Rpse_min
2.1 in page 331 line 43: Change from 33A.8 and 33A.9 to 33B.2 and 33B.3
2.1 In page 332 line 17: Change Figure number from 33A-5 to 33B-2.

3. in Annex 33A.8 page 332 line 21: Change title to: 33B.2 Effective Resistance Measurement Method by measurement of current unbalance under worst case pair-to-pair load conditions
3.1 in page 332 line 41: Change Figure number from 33A-6 to 33B-3.
3.2 in page 333 line 17: Change from 33A.9 to 33B.3

4. in Annex 33A.9 page 333 line 20: Change title to: 33B.3 Current Unbalance Measurement Method
4.1 in page 333 line 22: change Table 33A-1 TO 33B-1
4.2 in page 333 line 24: change Figure 33A-7 to 33B-4.
4.3 in page 333 line 41: change Figure 33A-7 to 33B-4.
5. in Annex 33A.10 page 334 line 9: Change title to: 33B.4 Channel resistance with less than 0.1 ohm

6: Add Annex F (informative) - Derivation of Rload_max and Rload_min.
Editor Note (to be removed prior to publication): To consider the value of adding informative Annex F to present Rload_max and Rload_min equation derivation and values.

7: in Annex 33B page 335 line 2: Change to Annex C.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make changes in suggested remedy with editorial license only to combine with other accepted comments (fixing table and figure numbers, etc.).

Note to editor: We should be using cross references for all figure and section numbers. These should not be hard coded in text.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.A.6** *P* **330** *L* **27** # 84

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

Table Yuval does not exist

SuggestedRemedy

Correct reference to table 33A-1.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 31

Cl **33** *SC* **33.A.6** *P* **330** *L* **28** # 85

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

reference is missing instead <>

SuggestedRemedy

Yair, where does this refer to ?

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 31

Cl **33** *SC* **33.A.6** *P* **330** *L* **34** # 86

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

Equation 33B-1 is wrong

SuggestedRemedy

Equation 33A-4

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 31

Cl **33** *SC* **33A.6** *P* **331** *L* **4** # 87

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

There is suspicion that the addition needs to get priority. Otherwise the units are likely to add up as "ohms + dimensionless" rather than Ohms.
Note sure due to missing description of Kpse.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace formula by
R_pair_max <= R_pair_min * (U + K_pse)

Yair, correct ?

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete lines 3-12 on page 331.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.A.6** *P* **331** *L* **12** # 88

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

Kpse is not specified

SuggestedRemedy

Yair, please specify Kpse

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 87

Cl **33** *SC* **33A.6** *P* **331** *L* **21** # 15

Darshan, Yair — Microsemi

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

Table 33A.1 in draft D1.2 (will be Table 33B-1 in D1.3 due to wrong implementation of darshan_06_0715.pdf in http://www.ieee802.org/3/bt/public/jul15/darshan_06_0715-REV008.docx.)

1. To update values per changes made in D1.1.
2. To replace TBDs with numbers
3. To add two additional columns to support extended power mode.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Update TBDs in page 331 lines 20-26 Table 33B-1 (was Table 33A-1 in D1.2).
PSE Class=5,Rload_min=0.739,Rload_max=0.1562
PSE Class=6,Rload_min=0.635.
PSE Class=7,Rload_min=0.577,Rload_max=1.094
PSE Class=8,Rload_min=0.533,Rload_max=0.979
2. Modify the table to include two additional columns for Extebded Power mode.
See updated details in page 3 of darshan_04_0915.pdf

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

1. Update TBDs in page 331 lines 20-26 Table 33B-1 (was Table 33A-1 in D1.2).
PSE Class=5,Rload_min=0.739,Rload_max=0.1562
PSE Class=6,Rload_min=0.635.
PSE Class=7,Rload_min=0.577,Rload_max=1.094
PSE Class=8,Rload_min=0.533,Rload_max=0.979

Cl **33** *SC* **33.A.7** *P* **331** *L* **41** # 89

Yseboodt, Lennart — Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

Reference to 33-B2 is wrong.

SuggestedRemedy

Change reference to figure 33A-5.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 31.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.A.10** *P* **334** *L* **9** # 90
Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Pres: Yair4*

"33A.10Channel resistance" is missing space

SuggestedRemedy

add space

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 31.

Cl **33** *SC* **33.A.10** *P* **334** *L* **13** # 91
Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *Editorial*

missing spaces around <>

SuggestedRemedy

add spaces

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

EZ

Cl **79** *SC* **79.3.2.4** *P* **341** *L* **2** # 234
Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

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

The new sentence,
"A Type 3 or Type 4 device shall set the bits in power type to TBD."

Could be implementation specific but a preferred solution is provided below, which permits legacy Types to respond to new Types with the highest power levels possible.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the referenced sentence with,
"A Type 3 or Type 4 device shall set the bits in power type to the highest Type the TLV generating device supports."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **79** *SC* **79.3.2.4.1** *P* **341** *L* **33** # 151
Yseboodt, Lennart Philips

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

"This field shall be set according to Table 79-4."
Unfortunately the 'power type' field only supports Type 1/2 PDs and PSEs.
How should a Type 3/4 device set this field ?

SuggestedRemedy

Replace by
"This field shall be set according to Table 79-4.
Type 3 or Type 4 PSEs shall set this field to the value corresponding with Type 2 PSEs.
Type 3 or Type 4 PDs shall set this field to the value corresponding with Type 2 PDs."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **79** *SC* **79.3.2.6a** *P* **342** *L* **52** # 235
Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

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

Replace the Editor's note on line 52 with the requested text.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the Editor's note on line 52 with,
"The PSE power status value field shall contain the PSE's bit-map of the PSE power pair, and PSE power class, defined in Table 79-6a and is reported for the device generating the TLV."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace the Editor's note on line 52 with,
"The PSE power status value field shall contain the PSE's bit-map of the PSE power pair and PSE power class, defined in Table 79-6a, and is reported for the device generating the TLV."

Cl **79** *SC* **79.3.2.61.1** *P* **343** *L* **32** # 216

Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

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

Clarify what a PD places in a PSE field.

SuggestedRemedy

Add after line 32,
"A TLV generated by a PD shall set the field to 00."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **79** *SC* **79.3.2.6a.2** *P* **343** *L* **36** # 217

Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

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

Clarify what a PD places in a PSE field.

SuggestedRemedy

Add after line 36,
"A TLV generated by a PD shall set the field to 0000."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **79** *SC* **79.3.2.6b** *P* **343** *L* **40** # 236

Schindler, Fred Seen Simply

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

Replace the Editor's note on line 40 with the requested text.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the Editor's note on line 40 with,
"The System setup value field shall contain the device bit-map of the Power type, PD 4P-ID, and PD PI defined in Table 79-6b and is reported for the device generating the TLV."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.