*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.2**　　　　　　*P* **14**　　*L* **19**　　　# 2

Jones, Chad　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

*Comment Type* **E**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

Not sure why this sentence is it's own paragraph. Works just fine after the last sentence of the previous paragraph (which is only 3 sentences covering two lines). I'd make this all one paragraph

*SuggestedRemedy*

delete the line feed after the last sentence on line 17, adding the one sentence to the previous paragraph.

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.5.6.1**　　　　*P* **17**　　*L* **42**　　　# 3

Jones, Chad　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

*Comment Type* **E**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

"When either there is no PSE or the PSE is not sourcing power…" 'Either' is superfluous.

*SuggestedRemedy*

delete 'either' making it read: "When there is no PSE or the PSE is not sourcing power…"

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.7.1.3**　　　　*P* **21**　　*L* **7**　　　# 4

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　General Motors

*Comment Type* **E**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

Row 6a is changed but it isn't included in the Editor's note.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "6a" to the list in the Editor's note before "6b".

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.7.1.3**　　　　*P* **21**　　*L* **17**　　　# 5

Wienckowski, Natalie　　　　　　General Motors

*Comment Type* **E**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

The elipses on the merged row indicating skipped rows should be left justified, not centered.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Left justify the elipses (…).
Do the same on P21L40, P21L46, P22L21, and P22L26.

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　　　　*P* **1**　　*L* **2**　　　# 6

Zimmerman,　　　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

*Comment Type* **E**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

Update front matter to 802.3dc revision d2.1, and reflecting 802.3dd as the first revision of IEEE Std 802.3-202x

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change header to be amendment to 802.3-202x, change first paragraph on page 1 as per comment, and update pages 3 through 11 to align with 802.3dc D2.1 and reflecting 802.3dd as the first amendment.

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　　　　*P* **6**　　*L* **26**　　　# 7

Zimmerman,　　　　　　　　CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

*Comment Type* **E**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

missing hyphen "Editor-in Chief"

*SuggestedRemedy*

per comment

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

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  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

*Comment ID* **7**　　　　Page 1 of 11
11/9/2021  3:24:31 PM

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.5.6**     *P* **17**     *L* **10**     # 8

Zimmerman,     CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status*   **X**

Change editing instructions to remove "(as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019)" since this is an amendment to the revision.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove references to IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019, including: "(as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019)" *with and without parens* and ", inserted by IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019," from all editing instructions.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status*   **O**

---

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104**     *P* **14**     *L* **5**     # 9

Zimmerman,     CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Cisco, CommScope,

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status*   **X**

Editor's Note (Expected to be removed by comment during Working Group Ballot)"

*SuggestedRemedy*

remove all editor's notes so marked.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status*   **O**

---

*Cl* **FM**     *SC* **FM**     *P* **1**     *L* **2**     # 10

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **ER**     *Comment Status*   **X**

The draft should be written as an amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-20xx, specifically as Amendment 2 per Mr. Law's recommendation to the WGAC.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update front matter plus headers and footers. In front matter: update abstract, replace Introduction with Introduction from P802.3/D2.1, add self description from latest draft of P802.3cs to introduction. A search on 2018 should pull up any other locations for update.

Put in amendment number on title pate, boxed note at beginnning of front matter Introduction, and on self description at end of Introduction.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status*   **O**

---

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.2**     *P* **14**     *L* **12**     # 11

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **TR**     *Comment Status*   **X**

The draft includes bad subclause and table numbers. The aggregate of these errors create a probably of technical errors as a result.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update draft using P802.3/D2.1 as the base text. This draft used as the base for this amendment should be close to IEEE Std 802.3-20xx, and it will be easier to track changes to P802.3 in future drafts for any changes that would affect this project than it is to deal with the inconsistencies.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status*   **O**

---

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.2**     *P* **14**     *L* **12**     # 12

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status*   **X**

P802.3/D2.1 has "Class Power Requirements" numbered 104.3.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update subclause number.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status*   **O**

---

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.5.3**     *P* **14**     *L* **23**     # 13

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status*   **X**

P802.3/D2.1 has "PD state diagram" numbered 104.5.4.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update subclause number.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status*   **O**

---

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general     *Comment ID* **13**     Page 2 of 11
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected     RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn     11/9/2021  3:24:31 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.5.3.3**     *P* **14**     *L* **25**     # 14

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status* **X**

P802.3/D2.1 has "Variables" numbered 104.5.4.3

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update subclause number.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.5.3.6**     *P* **15**     *L* **1**     # 15

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status* **X**

P802.3/D2.1 has "State diagram" numbered 104.5.4.6.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update subclause number.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.5.4**     *P* **16**     *L* **1**     # 16

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status* **X**

P802.3/D2.1 has "PD signature" numbered 104.5.5.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update subclause number.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.5.4**     *P* **16**     *L* **7**     # 17

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status* **X**

The editing instruction and Table number do not agree.  P802.3/D2.1 has "Valid PD detection signature characteristics, measured at PD PI" numbered Table 104-9.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update editing instruction and Table number.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.5.6**     *P* **17**     *L* **1**     # 18

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status* **X**

P802.3/D2.1 has "PD power" numbered 104.5.4.7.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update subclause number.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.5.6**     *P* **17**     *L* **10**     # 19

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status* **X**

Editing instruction should be updated for being an amendment to 802.3-20xx.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change Table 104-11 items 6b, 15, as follows, (unchanged rows not shown):

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.5.6**     *P* **17**     *L* **14**     # 20

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status* **X**

P802.3/D2.1 has "PD power supply limits" numbered Table 104-11.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update table number.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**     *SC* **104.5.6.1**     *P* **17**     *L* **33**     # 21

Grow, Robert     RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*   **E**     *Comment Status* **X**

P802.3/D2.1 has "PD discharge" numbered 104.5.7.1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update subclause number., also change editing instruction number at line 39.

*Proposed Response*     *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general     *Comment ID* **21**     Page 3 of 11
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected    RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn     11/9/2021  3:24:31 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.5.6.3**    *P* **18**    *L* **1**    # 22

Grow, Robert    RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*  **E**    *Comment Status*  **X**

P802.3/D2.1 has "Input current" numbered 104.5.7.3.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update subclause number., also change editing instruction number at line 7.

*Proposed Response*    *Response Status*  **O**

---

*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.7.1.1**    *P* **19**    *L* **11**    # 23

Grow, Robert    RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*  **E**    *Comment Status*  **X**

Editing instruction should be updated for being an amendment to 802.3-20xx.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace Figure 104-10 to remove tCHRG and VCHRG as follows:

*Proposed Response*    *Response Status*  **O**

---

*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.7.1.2**    *P* **19**    *L* **35**    # 24

Grow, Robert    RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*  **E**    *Comment Status*  **X**

Editing instruction should be updated for being an amendment to 802.3-20xx.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace Figure 104-11 to remove tCHRG and VCHRG as follows:

*Proposed Response*    *Response Status*  **O**

---

*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.7.1.3**    *P* **20**    *L* **7**    # 25

Grow, Robert    RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*  **E**    *Comment Status*  **X**

Editing instruction should be updated for being an amendment to 802.3-20xx.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace Figure 104-12 to remove tCHRG and VCHRG as follows:

*Proposed Response*    *Response Status*  **O**

---

*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.7.1.3**    *P* **21**    *L* **7**    # 26

Grow, Robert    RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*  **E**    *Comment Status*  **X**

Editing instruction should be updated for being an amendment to 802.3-20xx. Additionally P802.3/D2.1 has "SCCP electrical requirements" numbered Table 104-12.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change Table 104-12 as follows, editing rows 6b, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, and 18, and removing rows 20 and 21, unchanged rows not shown:. Also change table number to 104.12 at line 11 and page 22, line 1.

*Proposed Response*    *Response Status*  **O**

---

*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.7.2.6**    *P* **22**    *L* **51**    # 27

Grow, Robert    RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*  **E**    *Comment Status*  **X**

Editing instruction should be updated for being an amendment to 802.3-20xx. Additionally P802.3/D2.1 has "SCVOLT_INFO register table" numbered Table 104-14.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change Table 104-14, Description for b[7:0] as shown:. Also change table number to 104.14 page 23, line 1.

*Proposed Response*    *Response Status*  **O**

---

*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.9.4.1**    *P* **25**    *L* **4**    # 28

Grow, Robert    RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*  **E**    *Comment Status*  **X**

P802.3/D2.1 has "Powered Device (PD)" numbered 104.9.4.3.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update subclause number.

*Proposed Response*    *Response Status*  **O**

---

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  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

*Comment ID* **28**

Page 4 of 11
11/9/2021  3:24:31 PM

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.9.4.1**　　　　*P* **25**　　*L* **6**　　　# 29

Grow, Robert　　　　　　　　　RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*　**E**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

Editing instruction should be updated for being an amendment to 802.3-20xx.

*SuggestedRemedy*

PD 11 and PD 17.

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.9.4.1**　　　　*P* **25**　　*L* **10**　　　# 30

Grow, Robert　　　　　　　　　RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*　**E**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

P802.3/D2.1, where "PD Discharge" is numbered PD11, Subclause is 104.5.7.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update base text to that of P802.3/D2.1.

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.9.4.1**　　　　*P* **25**　　*L* **20**　　　# 31

Grow, Robert　　　　　　　　　RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*　**E**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

P802.3/D2.1 has this PICS numbered PD17

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update base text to that of P802.3/D2.1.

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.9.4.4**　　　　*P* **25**　　*L* **25**　　　# 32

Grow, Robert　　　　　　　　　RMG Consulting

*Comment Type*　**TR**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

This PICS item already exists in P802.3/D2.1.  This version includes  differences from COMEL2 in the revision draft

*SuggestedRemedy*

Either delete subclause and its contents; or turn into a Change edit to the next revision.

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.5.3.6**　　　　*P* **15**　　*L* **41**　　　# 33

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

*Comment Type*　**TR**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

Which arc is taken if wakeup=0 and sccp_reset_pulse = 1 and Vpd > Vsig_disable

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add Vpd <= Vsig_disable to transition A criteria from PD_SLEEP

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.5.4.3**　　　　*P* **15**　　*L* **30**　　　# 34

Slavick, Jeff　　　　　　　　　Broadcom

*Comment Type*　**TR**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

definition of sscp_reset_pulse states during detection this variable takes on true/false values.  Now you're using it in PD_SLEEP as well

*SuggestedRemedy*

remove "during detection," from both TRUE and FALSE desciprtions for sscp_reset_pulse

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **FM**　　*SC* **FM**　　　　*P* **11**　　*L* **1**　　　# 35

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　Cisco

*Comment Type*　**E**　　　*Comment Status* **X**

802.3cu is repeated twice. Amendment 12 is 802.3cv.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change cu to cv

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status* **O**

---

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  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

*Comment ID* **35**

Page 5 of 11
11/9/2021  3:24:31 PM

*Cl* **FM**    *SC* **FM**                    *P* **13**        *L* **44**        # 36

Ran, Adee                                    Cisco

*Comment Type*    **E**        *Comment Status*  **X**

"editing instructions have been written to minimize the probability of changes being lost at publication from other IEEE 802.3 amendment projects running in parallel (e.g., IEEE P802.3bj and IEEE P802.3bk)"

bj and bk were completed a long time ago, and were relatively unrelated to each other. This text is probably copied from a draft of 802.3bm that ran in parallel to both. It as not a relevant example ("e.g.") of parallel projects.

In recent projects this text was used to point to other projects running in parallel to the specific projects.

However, to save work in copying this text between projects, it does not need to be specific or give any examples.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete "(e.g., IEEE P802.3bj and IEEE P802.3bk)".

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**

---

*Cl* **104**        *SC* **104**                    *P* **14**        *L* **9**        # 37

Ran, Adee                                    Cisco

*Comment Type*    **E**        *Comment Status*  **X**

In the base standard 104.2 is "Link segment". The subclause labeled "Class power requirements" is 104.3.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to 104.3 in editorial instructions and subclause title.

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**

---

*Cl* **104**        *SC* **104.2**                    *P* **14**        *L* **17**        # 38

Ran, Adee                                    Cisco

*Comment Type*    **E**        *Comment Status*  **X**

Paragraph break is at the wrong place in the middle of the definition of VPD.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move "VPD is the voltage at the PD PI." to the beginning of the second paragraph.

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**

---

*Cl* **104**        *SC* **104.5.3.6**                    *P* **15**        *L* **27**        # 39

Ran, Adee                                    Cisco

*Comment Type*    **E**        *Comment Status*  **X**

It looks as if sscp_reset_pulse is a conditio of arrow A.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move the sscp_reset_pulse label near the transition it belongs to.

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**

---

*Cl* **104**        *SC* **104.5.3.6**                    *P* **15**        *L* **41**        # 40

Ran, Adee                                    Cisco

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

The conditions of transitioning from PD_SLEEP are not mutually exclusive. For example, it is posible that (VPD>Vsig_disable), (!wakeup), and sccp_reset_pulse are all true, and It is unclear what transition should occur in that case.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Maybe add "*(VPD<=Vsig_disable)"  to the condition leading to A.

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**

---

*Cl* **104**        *SC* **104.5.4**                    *P* **16**        *L* **15**        # 41

Ran, Adee                                    Cisco

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

It is unclear what "Vsig_disable max" means, especially now that Vsig_disable limits depend on class.

*SuggestedRemedy*

If Isignature_limit conditions are class dependent, break it into two rows and specify the conditions for each row separately.

Otherwise write the condition with a specific voltage.

Alternatively add a table footnote to explain what Vsig_disable max means.

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**

---

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  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

*Comment ID* **41**        Page 6 of 11
11/9/2021  3:24:31 PM

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.5.6.1**　　　　*P* **17**　　　*L* **56**　　　# 42

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

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

"the voltage(...) shall not exceed (...)  at a delay of TOFF max (see Table 104-4) after the removal of PSE power"

"at a delay of TOFF max (see Table 104-4) after the removal of PSE power" is ambiguous - is it only at that specific point in time? Or starting from that point and on? Or until that point?

I assume the intent is "from that point and on".

Also, the first statement describes a situation when there is no power from the PSE, but the "shall" statment as written is not limited to these times.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the last sentence to:

In order to constrain this current, the voltage across a 5 k<Ohm> resistor connected across the PD PI shall not exceed VPUP (see Table 104–8) when the PD is not drawing power from its PI, except possibly within TOFF max (see Table 104-4) from the removal of PSE power from the PD PI.

Change the corresponding PICS item in 104.9.4.1 accordingly.

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status*　**O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.6.1**　　　　*P* **18**　　　*L* **23**　　　# 43

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

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

"Compliance with requirements of 104.8 may require greater isolation" - 104.8 has no requirements in its body, but has 7 subclauses. It is unclear what requirements are referred to, and what "greater isolation" means.

The added sentence is too general to be helpful for readers.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Point to the specific subclause(s) and describe the additional isolation requirements (e.g. 2 MΩ at 500 V as mentioned in zimmerman_3dd_01a_06152021).

Alternatively, delete the added sentence.

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status*　**O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.6.2**　　　　*P* **18**　　　*L* **33**　　　# 44

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

*Comment Type*　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**X**

104.6.2 text does not match the 2018 standard. It was hard to find that it was modified by 802.3cg.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add to the editorial instruction "as amended by 802.3cg".

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status*　**O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.9.1**　　　　*P* **24**　　　*L* **4**　　　# 45

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

*Comment Type*　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**X**

No apparent changes in 104.9.1 or 104.9.2. The project name 802.3dd appears in 104.9.2.2 (apparently changing the existing text) but this will disappear when integrated into the standard.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove these subclauses and their hierarchy from the amendment.

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status*　**O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　*SC* **104.9.4.4**　　　　*P* **25**　　　*L* **31**　　　# 46

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

*Comment Type*　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**X**

The new item COMEL2 coincides with a similar item recently added in 802.3dc D2.1 (see comment #12 in https://www.ieee802.org/3/dc/comments/P8023_D2p0_comments_final_by_id.pdf).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Align the text with 802.3dc D2.1, or add an editor's note to explain any difference that may need to be resolved in the future.

*Proposed Response*　　　*Response Status*　**O**

---

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  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

*Comment ID* **46**　　　Page 7 of 11
11/9/2021  3:24:31 PM

*Cl* **146**     *SC* **146.5.4.2**          *P* **26**          *L* **19**          # 47

Ran, Adee                               Cisco

*Comment Type*  **E**      *Comment Status*  **X**

The added text creates two separate cases that the first sentence refers to; these cases should be written as a bulleted list after the first sentence (as presented in stewart_3dd_02_09072021).

Also, preferably, the part common to both cases should not be repeated, but instead be part of the first sentence.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Preferably, insert "The magnitude of the positive and negative droop is defined with respect to an initial value at 133.3 ns after the zero crossing and a final value at 800 ns after the zero crossing" before the first sentence of this subclause.

Rewrite the requirements as two bullets (for PI that is / is not encompassed within the MDI) either using the definition above or based on the current text.

*Proposed Response*          *Response Status*  **O**


*Cl* **146**     *SC* **146.5.4.2**          *P* **26**          *L* **25**          # 48

Ran, Adee                               Cisco

*Comment Type*  **E**      *Comment Status*  **X**

The sentence "For applications such as those shown in Annex 146A, implementers should consider transmitter amplitude limitations" is unclear for a reader unfamiliar with Annex 146A. That annex does not decribe the applications, it only lists guidelines for these applications.

Also, it is unclear which transmitter amplitude limitations should be considered and whether this applies only to a PI encompassed within the MDI as currently written.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "For applications such as those shown in Annex 146A" to "For intrinsically-safe applications addressed by Annex 146A"

Clarify if it's only for PI encompassed within the MDI.

Clarify what amplitude limitations should be considered.

Consider making this sentence an informative NOTE.

*Proposed Response*          *Response Status*  **O**


*Cl* **146**     *SC* **146.8.3**          *P* **26**          *L* **43**          # 49

Ran, Adee                               Cisco

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

It would benefit the readers if graphical representations of the return loss limits were provided, especially to show the difference between the two specifications.

The following Matlab/Octave code can be used to illustrate equation 146-17 (top subplot) and 146-17a (bottom subplot):

```
figure; subplot(2,1,1); f=linspace(0.1, 0.2, 100); plot(f, 20-18*log10(0.2./f), 'k'); hold on;
f=linspace(0.2, 1, 100); plot(f, 20*ones(size(f)), 'k'); f=linspace(1, 10, 100); plot(f, 20-
16.7*log10(f), 'k'); f=linspace(10, 20, 100); plot(f, 3.3-7.6*log10(f/10), 'k'); ylim([0 22]); axis
ij; grid on; xlabel('Frequency (MHz)'); ylabel('Return loss (dB)'); text(3, 15, sprintf('Meets
equation
constraints')); subplot(2,1,2); f=linspace(0.1, 0.5, 100); plot(f, 20-18*log10(0.5./f), 'k'); hold
on; f=linspace(0.5, 1, 100); plot(f, 20*ones(size(f)), 'k'); f=linspace(1, 10, 100); plot(f, 20-
16.7*log10(f), 'k'); f=linspace(10, 20, 100); plot(f, 3.3-7.6*log10(f/10), 'k'); ylim([0 22]); axis
ij; grid on; xlabel('Frequency (MHz)'); ylabel('Return loss (dB)'); text(3, 15, sprintf('Meets
equation
constraints'));
```

(displayed in linear frequency scale as is common for return loss specifications, but can be changed to log-f if desired)

SVG file can be provided if needed.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a figure illustrating equations 146-17 and 146-17a and refer to it in the text, with editorial license.

*Proposed Response*          *Response Status*  **O**


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  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

*Comment ID* **49**          Page 8 of 11
11/9/2021  3:24:31 PM

*Cl* **146**　　　*SC* **146.8.5**　　　　　*P* **27**　　　*L* **23**　　　# 50

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

*Comment Type*　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**X**

The editorial instruction says "Change the first paragraph of 146.8.5, inserted by IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019". But 802.3cg added the entire clause 146, not this specific paragraph.

If desired, the fact that clause 146 was added by 802.3cg can be stated in a single note at the beginning of this clause, but not in the specific editorial instruction.

Similarly for the two editorial instructions in 146.8.6.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the three instances of ", inserted by IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019"

*Proposed Response*　　　　*Response Status*　**O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　　*SC* **104.5.6.1**　　　　*P* **17**　　　*L* **44**　　　# 51

Huber, Thomas　　　　　　　　　　Nokia

*Comment Type*　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**X**

Awkward grammar in "This can cause a current to flow out the PD."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "This can cause a current to flow from the PD."

*Proposed Response*　　　　*Response Status*　**O**

---

*Cl* **00**　　　*SC* **0**　　　　　　*P*　　　　*L*　　　　# 52

Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　　Independent

*Comment Type*　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**X**

The copyright_year variable is set to 202x for page 13 and Clause 146

*SuggestedRemedy*

Set the copyright_year variable to 2021 for page 13 and Clause 146

*Proposed Response*　　　　*Response Status*　**O**

---

*Cl* **104**　　　*SC* **104.6.2**　　　　　*P* **18**　　　*L* **37**　　　# 53

Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　　Independent

*Comment Type*　**E**　　　*Comment Status*　**X**

The revision of 802.3 has made changes to 104.6.2 and has added item COMEL2 in 104.9.4.4

*SuggestedRemedy*

Bring the draft into alignment with the changes made in the 802.3dc revision D2.1, particularly in 104.6.2 and 104.9.4.4.

*Proposed Response*　　　　*Response Status*　**O**

---

*Cl* **146**　　　*SC* **146.11.4.5**　　　*P* **30**　　　*L* **27**　　　# 54

Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　　Independent

*Comment Type*　**ER**　　　*Comment Status*　**X**

The status entry for Item MDI2 does not conform to the syntax set out in 21.6. :M should appear at the end of the entry and "+" is not defined as OR

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the entry to !PPSE*!PPD:M

*Proposed Response*　　　　*Response Status*　**O**

---

*Cl* **146**　　　*SC* **146.11.4.5**　　　*P* **30**　　　*L* **31**　　　# 55

Anslow, Pete　　　　　　　　　　Independent

*Comment Type*　**ER**　　　*Comment Status*　**X**

The status entry for Item MDI2a does not conform to the syntax set out in 21.6. :M should appear at the end of the entry

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the entry to (PPSE or PPD):M

*Proposed Response*　　　　*Response Status*　**O**

---

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  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

*Comment ID* **55**　　　Page 9 of 11
11/9/2021  3:24:31 PM

*Cl* **146**    *SC* **146.11.4.5**    *P* **30**    *L* **33**    # 56

Anslow, Pete                          Independent

*Comment Type*   **ER**       *Comment Status*  **X**

The status entry for Item MDI4 does not conform to the syntax set out in 21.6.
:M should appear at the end of the entry and also N/A [ ] is missing from the support column

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the status entry to !PPSE:M
Add N/A [ ] to the support entry.

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**


*Cl* **146**    *SC* **146.11.4.5**    *P* **30**    *L* **35**    # 57

Anslow, Pete                          Independent

*Comment Type*   **ER**       *Comment Status*  **X**

The status entry for Item MDI5 does not conform to the syntax set out in 21.6.
:M should appear at the end of the entry and also N/A [ ] is missing from the support column

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the status entry to !PPSE:M
Add N/A [ ] to the support entry.

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**


*Cl* **FM**    *SC* **FM**    *P* **1**    *L* **27**    # 58

Marris, Arthur                        Cadence Design Systems

*Comment Type*   **E**        *Comment Status*  **X**

If 802.3dd is really going to be an amendment to 802.3-2018 you need to include 802.3ct
and 802.3cp

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add IEEE Std 802.3ct-2021 and IEEE Std 802.3cp-2021 here and on page 11 line 6

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**


*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.7.2.6**    *P* **23**    *L* **1**    # 59

Marris, Arthur                        Cadence Design Systems

*Comment Type*   **E**        *Comment Status*  **X**

Table number seems wrong

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to Table 104–14

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**


*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.7.2.6**    *P* **23**    *L* **8**    # 60

Marris, Arthur                        Cadence Design Systems

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

Having a tolerance of "0 + 20mV" seems weird

*SuggestedRemedy*

Consider adding extra text to explain why a negative tolerance is not allowed

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**


*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.2**    *P* **14**    *L* **16**    # 61

Baggett, Tim                          Microchip

*Comment Type*   **E**        *Comment Status*  **X**

The organization of the two new paragraphs in 104.2 could be improved such that the first
paragraph describes V(PSE) and the second paragraph describes V(PD).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move the following sentence from the end of paragraph 1 (Line17) to the beginning of
paragraph 2 (line 19)

VPD is the voltage at the PD PI.

Final text should read:

VPSE is the voltage at the PSE PI. VPSE is measured between any positive conductor and
any negative conductor
at the PI.

VPD is the voltage at the PD PI. VPD is measured between any positive conductor and any
negative conductor at the PI.

*Proposed Response*        *Response Status*  **O**

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  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID **61**

Page 10 of 11
11/9/2021  3:24:31 PM

*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.2**          *P* **14**       *L* **16**     # 62

Dawe, Piers               Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **X**

Content is unevenly split between the two new paragraphs

*SuggestedRemedy*

Move "VPD is the voltage at the PD PI" to the second paragraph.  Or, combine the two paragraphs.

*Proposed Response*    *Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.7.2**        *P* **22**       *L* **43**     # 63

Dawe, Piers               Nvidia

*Comment Type* **E**    *Comment Status* **X**

In "The PD shall return all 1s in the data and CRC8 fields for any unsupported command", is there a "data field" and is it what is called in e.g. 104.7.2.4, "a 16-bit ... read payload"?

*SuggestedRemedy*

For consistency, change "data" to "payload"?

*Proposed Response*    *Response Status* **O**

---

*Cl* **104**    *SC* **104.7.2**        *P* **22**       *L* **43**     # 64

Dawe, Piers               Nvidia

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

This says "The PD shall return all 1s in the data and CRC8 fields for any unsupported command".  Is all ones the correct CRC8 for a payload of all 1s?  If not, the usefulness of the CRC8 is weakened.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Should the CRC8 be whatever is the normal CRC for a payload of all 1s?

*Proposed Response*    *Response Status* **O**

---

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general    *Comment ID* **64**    Page 11 of 11
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected    RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn    11/9/2021  3:24:31 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID