Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 2

Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Copyright year is 2019 in multiple places in the draft. I assume this amendment will be published in 2020 so you don't need "202x".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 2020 everywhere, in both text and templates.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 1

Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Document title in PDF metadata is "IEEE P802.3xx name of Task Force", this shows up as the document name in PDF readers.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to correct TF name and draft number.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **1** *L* **1** # 36

Yseboodt, Lennart Signify

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

Many of the editing instructions deviate from the required format.

These are:

The editing instructions contained in this amendment define how to merge the material contained
therein into the existing base standard and its amendments to form the comprehensive standard.

The editing instructions are shown in bold italic. Four editing instructions are used: change, delete, insert,
and replace. Change is used to make corrections in existing text or tables. The editing instruction specifies
the location of the change and describes what is being changed by using strikethrough (to remove old mate-
rial) and underscore (to add new material). Delete removes existing material. Insert adds new material with-
out disturbing the existing material. Deletions and insertions may require renumbering. If so, renumbering
instructions are given in the editing instruction. Replace is used to make changes in figures or equations by
removing the existing figure or equation and replacing it with a new one. Editing instructions, change mark-
ings, and this NOTE will not be carried over into future editions because the changes will be incorporated
into the base standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Check all editing instructions and make sure they start with any of
- Insert
- Change
- Delete
- Replace

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Editor given lisence to change all editing instructions inline with IEEE standards.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Pa **1**
Li **1**

Page 1 of 11
1/15/2020 12:17:30 PM

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **7**   *L* **4**   # 37

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

"The following individuals were officers and members of the IEEE 802.3 Working Group at the beginning of the IEEE P802.3xx Working Group ballot."

SuggestedRemedy

Change P802.3xx to P802.3cv.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 1

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **11**   *L* **10**   # 3

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Order of unpublished amendments may change. The number should be added when they are published.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "Amendment X--" for all unpublished amendments.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **11**   *L* **27**   # 4

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

802.3ck is not listed in the amendment list. Not knowing whether cv will be published before ck, it may be wise to have these projects refer to each other.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a paragraph for 802.3ck based on D1.0:

IEEE Std 802.3ck™-20xx
This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and adds Clause 161 through Clause 163,
Annex 120F, Annex 120G, and Annex 162A through Annex 162D. This amendment includes Physical
Layer specifications and management parameters for 100 Gb/s, 200 Gb/s, and 400 Gb/s electrical interfaces based on 100 Gb/s signaling

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **13**   *L*   # 5

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

In all amendment documents there is an internal title page following the table of contents that lists the meaning of editing instructions (per style manual 18.2). See page 20 of 802.3bt-2018.

This page is missing here.

SuggestedRemedy

Add internal title page based on the one in 802.3bt.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **33**   *SC* **33.6.3.4**   *P* **17**   *L* **36**   # 7

Ran, Adee   Intel

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

In the definition of PSEAllocatedPowerValue, "Integer that indicates the PSE allocated power value in the PSE." should not be deleted (based on previous definitions).

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the strikethough from this sentence.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **33**   *SC* **33.6.3.4**   *P* **18**   *L* **4**   # 6

Ran, Adee   Intel

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

The sentence "The new max power value that the PSE expects the PD to draw. " is deleted here - but it should be retained.

The second sentence "Actual power numbers are... where X is the decimal value of PSE_NEW_VALUE" should be deleted, as in the previous paragraphs.

Similarly in the next paragraph - "The new max power value that the PD wants to draw" should be retained, and the next sentence should be deleted.

SuggestedRemedy

Format these 2 paragraphs per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Pa* **18**   Page 2 of 11
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *Li* **4**   1/15/2020 12:17:30 PM
SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Cl **33**   *SC* **33.6.3.4**   *P* **18**   *L* **4**   # 49

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify
Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**

There is a mistake in the changes to PSE_NEW_VALUE, the wrong sentence is removed.
// means crossed out \\
__ means underline __

SuggestedRemedy

Line 3 through 7 needs to become:

PSE_NEW_VALUE:

The new max__imum__ power value that the PSE expects the PD to draw. // Actual power numbers are
    represented using an integer value that is encoded according to Equation (79-2), where X is the
    decimal value of PSE_NEW_VALUE. \\
    __ Power numbers are represented using an integer value in units of 0.1 W. __

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

OBE by 6

Cl **33**   *SC* **33.6.3.4**   *P* **18**   *L* **11**   # 50

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify
Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**

There is a mistake in the changes to PD_NEW_VALUE, the wrong sentence is removed.
// means crossed out \\
__ means underline __

SuggestedRemedy

PD_NEW_VALUE:
    The new max__imum__ power value that the PD wants to draw. // Actual power numbers are represented
    using an integer value that is encoded according to Equation (79-1), where X is the decimal value
    of PD_NEW_VALUE. \\
    __ Power numbers are represented using an integer value in units of 0.1 W. __

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

OBE by 9

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **3**   # 38

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Editing instrustion: "Change the last paragraph of 79.3.2 as follows:"

This paragraph is modified by 802.3bt.

SuggestedRemedy

Change editing instruction to "Change the last paragraph of 79.3.2, as modified by IEEE Std 802.3bt, as follows:"

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

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **6**   # 8

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

The paragraph that is shown here as deleted does not exist in the base document - it was added in 802.3bt. IT should be noted to help readers understand what's going on.

SuggestedRemedy

In the editorial instruction, change "79.3.2" to "79.3.2 (As amended by 802.3bt-2018)".

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

OBE by 38

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **16**   # 9

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

There are 3 instances of "Figure 79-3" that are not cross-references. I assume they refer to the figure that was added in 802.3bt. If it is not modified by this amendment, the references should be in external Xref format (forest green).

SuggestedRemedy

Format these 3 instances as External Xref (forest green).

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Pa* **19**   Page 3 of 11
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *Li* **16**   1/15/2020 12:17:30 PM
SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **23**   # **39**

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

   1. The note on page 19, line 23 is not formatted as a note, and is also not underlined (it is new text).
   2. There is no editing instruction to insert a new Table.
   3. The Table number is not right, I suspect it needs to be 79-1a.
   4. The paragraph on lines 43-47 is new and needs to be underlined.
   5. The note does not end with a period.

SuggestedRemedy

   Resolutions are obvious per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **23**   # **11**

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

   The paragraph starting with "Note: some implications"…

   1. is new, so should be underlined.
   2. is a note, so per the style manual (16.1) should start with "NOTE—" (using em dash).
   3. should be terminated by a period

   The paragraph below the table is also new and should be underlined. It also looks like a NOTE.

SuggestedRemedy

   Change per comment. There may be a paragraph style for NOTE in FrameMaker.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

   PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

   OBE by 39

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **26**   # **40**

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

   There is no reference to Table 79-2 (==>79-1a).

SuggestedRemedy

   Add the following sentence at the end of the note on line 27:
   "Table 79-1a lists the recommended Power via MDI TLV formats for each permutation of power entity Types."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **29**   # **10**

Ran, Adee   Intel

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

   This table is labeled 79-2, but the base document already has "Table 79–2—IEEE 802.3 auto-negotiation support/status".

SuggestedRemedy

   Re-label this table as 79-2a (a future revision project will renumber all tables sequentially).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

   PROPOSED REJECT.

   Lennart claims in his comment that this should be Table 79-1. Someone check to make sure he is right…

   TFTD

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **31**   # **41**

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

   In Table 79-2 (soon to be 79-1a), we list "Type 1-2" and "Type 3-4".
   This use of the "-" symbol violates the style guide.

SuggestedRemedy

   Change to "Type 1, Type 2" and "Type 3, Type 4".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Pa* **19**   Page 4 of 11
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *Li* **31**   1/15/2020 12:17:30 PM
SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.3.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **43**   # 12

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

According to the style manual (10.2.2): "The word can is used for statements of possibility and capability, whether material, physical, or causal (can equals is able to)"; and "The word may is used to indicate a course of action permissible within the limits of the standard (may equals is permitted to)"

This paragraph describes two permissible ways of of determining the partner type, so it should use "may".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "can" to "may", twice.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Which way did you guys mean these sentences? Are you telling them how to do it and giving them 2 options (may would be appropriate) or are you just pointing out a capability (can would be appropriate)?

TFTD

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.1**   *P* **22**   *L* **15**   # 13

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **X**

"shall not apply a voltage greater than V_Off to the PI for at least T_dbo" is ambiguous - it can be understood as if it is permitted to apply a higher voltage for a shorter period.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "shall apply a voltage lower than V_off to the PI for at least T_dbo".

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

TFTD

I think the "for at least" makes it obvious how to read the sentence, what do you guys think?

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.1**   *P* **22**   *L* **16**   # 14

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

V_off and T_dbo should be formatted with subscripts.

SuggestedRemedy

Format per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.1**   *P* **22**   *L* **22**   # 15

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

All table references in this paragraph are not newly inserted, so should not be underlined (just use forest green for external references).

SuggestedRemedy

Format per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.3**   *P* **22**   *L* **27**   # 16

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

"Modify" is not a recognized editorial instruction. It should be "Change".

This appears in many other similar instructions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "modify" to "change" in all editorial instructions that include it across the draft.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 36

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Pa* **22**   Page 5 of 11
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *Li* **27**   1/15/2020 12:17:30 PM
SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.4**   *P* **22**   *L* **40**   # 17

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

"Add" is not a recognized editorial instruction. It should be "Insert".

This appears in many other similar instructions.

Also, unlike "change", text inserted using "Insert" should not be underlined.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "add" to "insert" in all editorial instructions that include it across the draft. Format the text following these instructions with underline off, as necessary.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 42

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.4**   *P* **22**   *L* **43**   # 42

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Editing instructions "Add variable xyz..." should say "Insert variable xyz at <some place>." If "Insert" is used, it isn't needed to underline text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Add variable" to "Insert variable" and remove underline for ac_measurement_completed, pd_autoclass_canceled, pse_ready_pri, pse_ready_sec.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.4**   *P* **23**   *L* **6**   # 18

Ran, Adee   Intel

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

The variable mapping is listed in Table 145-38, it is not "assigned through" the table.

Since this table just maps aLldpXdot3RemAutoclassRequest
to MirroredPDAutoclassRequest, as stated in the previous sentence, the phrase "and assigned through Table 145-38" seems to be redundant.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "and assigned through Table 145-38".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

TFTD…I know this language has been discussed previously. What was decided?

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.4**   *P* **23**   *L* **8**   # 43

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The variable is named "pd_autoclass_canceled", the descriptive sentence below uses "... whether the PD cancelled Autoclass ...".

Both spellings are correct. There are 9 instances in 802.3 of "cancelled" and zero of "canceled".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "pd_autoclass_canceled" to "pd_autoclass_cancelled".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.4**   *P* **23**   *L* **19**   # 51

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify

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

New variables pse_ready_pri and _sec mention the "primary link segment" and "secondary link segment".
There is no such thing.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "primary link segment" ==> "Primary Alternative"
Replace "secondary link segement" ==> "Secondary Alternative"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Pa* **23**   Page 6 of 11
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *Li* **19**   1/15/2020 12:17:30 PM
SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.6**   *P* **23**   *L* **36**   # 19

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The editorial instruction refers to do_cxn_chk, but the text is changing another variable do_autoclass_measure; and the existing text (from 802.3bt) is not shown.

Also, it looks like a variable is defined within the function definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Separate to two editorial instructions:

1. "Change definition of do_autoclass_measure
This function measures PAutoclass as defined in 145.2.8.2. This function returns the variable P_Autoclass."

Move the P_Autoclass variable definition from here to 145.2.5.4.

2. "Change definition of do_cxn_chk…"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.6**   *P* **23**   *L* **39**   # 44

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The new do_autoclass_measure function return a variable "P_Autoclass" on line 39, but the the state diagram uses "Pautoclass".

SuggestedRemedy

Harmonize to Pautoclass.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.6**   *P* **23**   *L* **43**   # 20

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

In 145.2.7 "connection check" is not capitlized.

SuggestedRemedy

change "Connection" to "connection".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.7**   *P* **24**   *L* **2**   # 22

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Normally figures are replaced, not modified. This one looks like a local change that is worth an exception to the rule, but it should be made clear what changes are made.

The suggested remedy assumes the figure labels are changed per another comment. If they are not, the instruction should be "Inthe the third part of Figure 145-13..." instead.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the editorial instruction:

In the resulting Figure 145-13c, change the text inside state CLASS_EV1_LCE as follows:

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.7**   *P* **24**   *L* **2**   # 21

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The editorial instruction refers to Table 145-13. In 802.3bt, there are six figures with this number (continued figure). This looks like the third one.

It would be good to have a separate label for each of the three figures, to enable better referencing by readers. (This has precedence for example in clause 36 PCS Receive state diagram, which is separated to Figure 36–7a, Figure 36–7b, and Figure 36–7c).

Another comment refers to the specific change.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest the instruction:

Change the six parts of Figure 145–13 to create separate labels Figure 145–13a through Figure 145–13f (figures with no changes other than re-labeling are not shown).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Pa **24**
Li **2**

Page 7 of 11
1/15/2020 12:17:30 PM

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.7**   *P* **25**   *L* **1**   # 45

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Figure 145-14 (Autoclass state diagram on the PSE side) has been extensively modified.
The editing instruction says "Modify Figure 145-14 as follows".

There are missing underlines in the MEASURE_ACS_DONE state.

SuggestedRemedy

Describing changes to a Figure are tricky using just underlines and strikethroughs.
When new states are added, I think it is much better to say "Replace Figure 145-14 as follows" and not have underlines/change instructions in there.
This is much easier and not ambiguous when the time comes to merge this into a new base standard.

Change editing instruction to "Replace" and remove underlines in Figure 145-14.

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

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.5.7**   *P* **25**   *L* **1**   # 23

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The change to Figure 145-14 is a major one - new state is added in addition to text changes. The figure should be replaced, not changed.

The suggested remedy describes the changes for the benefit of readers, but as this description will not affect the revision document, it may be omitted.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editorial instruction to "Replace Figure 145-14 with the following figure, which includes additional state EVAL_ACS and changes in states IDLE_ACS and MEASURE_ACS_DONE".

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

OBE by 45

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.8**   *P* **26**   *L* **42**   # 24

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

It is difficult to locate the changed paragraph based on the editorial instruction.

SuggestedRemedy

Change instruction to
"Change the text in the 3rd paragraph below equation 145-3 as follows:"

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

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.8**   *P* **27**   *L* **1**   # 25

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Equations should be replaced, not modified, as changes can't be marked.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the instruction to "Replace Equation 145-4 with the following equation:"

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

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.8**   *P* **27**   *L* **4**   # 46

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

"Modify Equation 145-4 as shown:"

The change is not visible.
Like with figures, maybe even more so, marking up changes in equations is nigh impossible.

SuggestedRemedy

Change editing instruction to "Replace Equation 145-4 as follows:"

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

OBE by 25

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Pa* **27**   Page 8 of 11
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *Li* **4**   1/15/2020 12:17:30 PM
SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.2.8.1**   *P* **27**   *L* **14**   # 52

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify
Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **X**

"The PSE shall limit class event currents to I Class_LIM and shall limit mark event currents to I Mark_LIM."

I assume this to mean the total current. That would make sense.
What about a PSE doing classification of a dual-sig PD in parallel ? It might get close to hitting 90mA total current if both pairsets are showing class signature 4.

This requirement seems not to have considered that particular case.
I'm not sure we even want to touch this.

SuggestedRemedy

IF a fix is needed, we'll need some ugly language to describe parallel classification.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

TFTD

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.3.3.3.2**   *P* **27**   *L* **40**   # 47

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

Editing instruction "add" should say "Insert".

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

OBE by 36

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.3.3.3.5**   *P* **28**   *L* **1**   # 27

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

It seems that the only change in figure 145-25 is in the text in state DO_CLASS_EVENT_AUTO.

If this is correct, it should be noted in the editorial instruction. If there are other changes, please list them in addition.

Consider replacing the figure it there are changes in anything other than text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editorial instruction to "In the resulting Figure 145-25a, change the text inside state DO_CLASS_EVENT_AUTO as follows:"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

TFTD for check…

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.3.3.3.5**   *P* **28**   *L* **1**   # 26

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

In figure 145-25, as noted in another comment, it would be good to use separate labels for the two parts.

Another comment refers to the specific change.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest the instruction:

Change the two parts of Figure 145–25 to create separate labels Figure 145–25a and Figure 145–13b (figures with no changes other than re-labeling are not shown).

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.3.3.3.5**   *P* **29**   *L* **1**   # 28

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

Is there any change in the second part of the figure? If not, including it will likely confuse many readers.

SuggestedRemedy

List the changes in the editorial instruction, or omit the second figure.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

TFTD for check…

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Pa* **29**   Page 9 of 11
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *Li* **1**   1/15/2020 12:17:30 PM
SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.3.3.3.5**   *P* **30**   *L* **1**   # 29

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The change to Figure 145-26 is a major one - new states are added. The figure should be replaced, not changed.

The suggested remedy describes the changes for the benefit of readers, but as this description will not affect the revision document, it may be omitted.

If there are additional changes they should also be listed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editorial instruction to "Replace Figure 145-26 with the following figure, which includes additional states CANCEL1_ACS and CANCEL2_ACS."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.3.3.3.5**   *P* **31**   *L* **1**   # 30

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

For Figure 145-27, apply changes per other comments (re-label continued figure, indicate specific text changes in editorial instruction, use "replace" instead of "change" if there are changes other that in text)

SuggestedRemedy

Implement with editorial license.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.3.6.2**   *P* **31**   *L* **50**   # 31

Ran, Adee   Intel

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

The added text is confusing. I assume it is a description of a condition and its meaning (indication) but it can be read as if there should be some external indication.

Suggested remedy is a rephrasing assuming I understood correctly. If not, please rephrase as required.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the added text to:

If a PD draws less than Class 1 power during the period bounded by T_AUTO_PD1 and T_AUTO_PD2, the PSE should determine the power allocation by the assigned Class, instead of using the Physical Layer Autoclass procedure.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

While reading this comment, I realized that "Class 1 power" is not clear. Aren't we really saying the Pclass_PD limit for class 1? Do we need to change this in the PSE section somewhere as well?

I will leave it to you all…

TFTD

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.5.3.2.5**   *P* **34**   *L* **2**   # 32

Ran, Adee   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

All text changes in Figure 145–41 should be listed in the editorial instruction.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the editorial instruction to
"In Figure 145-41, change the text in state IDLE and the text in the transition from MEASURE to AUTOCLASS as follows:"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Pa* **34**   Page 10 of 11
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *Li* **2**   1/15/2020 12:17:30 PM
SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.5.3.2.5**   *P* **35**   *L* **1**   # 33

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
   I could not identify what has changed in Figure 145–42.

   The existing text is barely readable.

SuggestedRemedy
   Please list all text changes in Figure 145–42 in the editorial instruction, or change the
   instruction to "replace" if necessary.

   Consider increasing the font size.

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

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.5.3.3.1**   *P* **36**   *L* **8**   # 48

Yseboodt, Lennart   Signify
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
   Changes to pd_initial_value are not indicated with underline/strikethrough.

SuggestedRemedy
   Fix per comment.

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

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.5.3.3.1**   *P* **36**   *L* **10**   # 34

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
   "used in the PD state diagrams; defined in Figure 145–25" - it is one state diagram in
   multiple figures, not the other way around, and the semicolon is out of place.

   Looking at the figure, there is no mention of pd_initial_value in it - the definition is only
   here, based on the variables which are defined in 145.3.3.3.2. The reference to the figure is
   unnecessary and confusing.

SuggestedRemedy
   Change to "used in the Single-signature PD state diagram (Figure 145-25a)"

   Or delete this phrase altogether.

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

   Change to "used in the Single-signature PD state diagram (Figure 145-25a)"

Cl **145**   *SC* **145.5.3.3.1**   *P* **36**   *L* **15**   # 35

Ran, Adee   Intel
Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
   The newly inserted text "* !pd_acs_cancel" should be underlined.

SuggestedRemedy
   Format per comment.

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Page, Line
Pa **36**
Li **15**
Page 11 of 11
1/15/2020 12:17:30 PM