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

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/various

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

Confusion with numbering of PICS, subclauses, and tables may result now that the revision is open for ballot, but not yet a the point where .3dd is written against it.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to front page: "Editor's Note (to be removed prior to SA ballot) - This draft is written as an amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 (as amended by, among other things, IEEE Std 802.3cg-2019). The frontmatter and numbering of tables, equations, figures, subclauses, and PICS items reflects that. These are expected to be adjusted prior to the final stage of working group ballot for IEEE P802.3dd, when the appropriate sections of the draft of 802.3dc are sufficiently stable."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **6**   *L* **26**   # 8

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

The chair and editor-in-chief are the same person. No need to duplicate the name.

SuggestedRemedy

Merge to one person with two titles.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **13**   *L* **46**   # 9

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

IEEE P802.3bj and IEEE P802.3bk are no longer running.

I think there is no need to list all the other amendment projects that are runnning today.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the parenthesized text.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
802.3bj and 802.3bk are listed as examples of projects that ran together.

Cl **104**   *SC* **104.2**   *P* **14**   *L* **16**   # 10

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

This paragraph contains four consecutive sentences which deal with two concepts. It would be more readable if it is split to two paragraphs, one for V_PSE and one for V_PD.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a paragraph break after the second sentence.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **104**   *SC* **104.5.3.3**   *P* **14**   *L* **35**   # 16

Graber, Steffen   Pepperl+Fuchs SE

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

The text states, that the PD is requesting/net requesting full operating voltage (see also line 34). I would expect, that not only the operating voltage is requested/not requested, but also the power associated to the respective power class, as voltage on its own will not be sufficient to power up the device.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "full operating voltage" to "full operating voltage and power".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

TFTD

The Clause 104 state diagram thresholds for operation work on the voltage presented. Current is not the control parameter.

Cl **104**   *SC* **104.5.3.3**   *P* **14**   *L* **35**   # 11

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

"or is not otherwise requesting full operating voltage" - does not make sense logically (if I understand the intent correctly).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "or is otherwise not requesting full operating voltage".

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 **14**
Li **35**

Page 1 of 4
8/30/2021 9:29:56 AM

Cl **104**　　*SC* **104.5.3.6**　　　　　*P* **15**　　　*L* **31**　　　# ☐17

Graber, Steffen　　　　　　　Pepperl+Fuchs SE

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

Arc between states "DO_DETECTION" and "DO_CLASSIFICATION" is not reaching "DO_CLASSIFICATION" state. Line is going into branch "A" symbol, but should start at bottom of branch "A" symbol.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **104**　　*SC* **104.5.6.1**　　　　　*P* **17**　　　*L* **42**　　　# ☐18

Graber, Steffen　　　　　　　Pepperl+Fuchs SE

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

Text "When either there is no PSE or the PSE is not sourcing power, the PD presents voltage on the (unpowered) pair." states that a PD (always) presents a voltage on the unpowered pair. Nevertheless this may be the case or not (e.g. if the internal capacitors are discharged or if there is a reverse polarity protection, which besides a few µA or even less prevents reverse power).

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to: "When either there is no PSE or the PSE is not sourcing power, the PD might present a voltage on the (unpowered) pair.".

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **104**　　*SC* **104.5.6.1**　　　　　*P* **17**　　　*L* **44**　　　# ☐1

Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/various

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

PICS PD10 needs to change to reflect the changed requirement

SuggestedRemedy

Add PICS table, including 104.9.4.3 Powered Device (PD) and PICS item PD10 to the draft Change Value/Comment of PICS PD10 from "At a delay of T_OFF max after disconnection from the PSE, a PD shall not source greater than 410 uJ out o fits PI until V_PD drops below V_Sleep_PD max" to "the voltage across a 5 kohm resistor connected across the PD PI shall not exceed V_PUP as defined in Table 104–8, at a delay of T_OFF max (see Table 104-4) after the removal of PSE power from the PD PI."

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **104**　　*SC* **104.5.6.3**　　　　　*P* **18**　　　*L* **9**　　　# ☐3

Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/various

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

PICS PD16 needs to change to reflect the new requirement

SuggestedRemedy

Add PICS table, including 104.9.4.3 Powered Device (PD) and PICS PD16 to the draft and change the Feature text to "Input current while in DISCONNECT state" (showing strikeout as in the change on page 18)

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **104**　　*SC* **104.6.2**　　　　　*P* **18**　　　*L* **36**　　　# ☐4

Zimmerman, George　　　　　　CME Consulting/various

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

PICS item for Type E is missing (wasn't added by 802.3cg)

SuggestedRemedy

Add PICS table, including 104.9.4.4 Fault Tolerance to draft, with: Feature "Type E PD fault tolerance", Subclause 104.6.2, Value/Comment "The PI shall meet the fault tolerance requirements as specified in 146.8.5 and 146.8.6"

Proposed Response　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **104**　　*SC* **104.7.1.3**　　　　　*P* **22**　　　*L* **10**　　　# ☐12

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　Cisco

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

The change seems to be from 31 to 39, but the digit "9" is not underlined.

SuggestedRemedy

Underline "9".

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 **22**
Li **10**

Page 2 of 4
8/30/2021 9:29:56 AM

Cl **104** *SC* **104.7.2** *P* **22** *L* **33** # 5

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/various

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

 PICS item needs to be added for the new requirement.

SuggestedRemedy

 Add PICS table, and new PICS item SCCP21a (after SCCP21) to draft, Feature: "Unsupported SCCP commant", Subclause: 104.7.2, Description: "Any unsupported command shall return all 1s in the data and CRC8 fields", Status: "SCCP:M", Value: "Yes[] N/A[]"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Text of description to be adjusted per comment 13 resolution

---

Cl **104** *SC* **104.7.2** *P* **22** *L* **43** # 13

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

 "shall" should a requirement from a device (probably the PD, since the PSE is the initiator), not from the command.

 I assume the PD should return all-ones as a response to an unsupported command.

SuggestedRemedy

 Change to "The PD shall return all 1s in the data and CRC8 fields for any unsupported command".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 (note - do before comment 5)

Cl **104** *SC* **104.7.2.6** *P* **23** *L* **8** # 14

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

 Slide 4 of https://www.ieee802.org/3/dd/public/Stewart_3dd_01a_04272021.pdf says change the +/- 20 mV tolerance to +20 mV. In the draft it is -20 mV.

 It would be preferable to state the tolerance as "0 to +20 mV" instead.

SuggestedRemedy

 Change - to +.
 Consider changing to "0 to +20 mV".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **104** *SC* **104.7.2.6** *P* **24** *L* **1** # 19

Graber, Steffen   Pepperl+Fuchs SE

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

 Page is empty.

SuggestedRemedy

 Remove empty page.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.8.5** *P* **25** *L* **15** # 6

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/various

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

 PICS needs to be added to reflect new requirement, this PICS needs to reflect clause 104 is an option]

SuggestedRemedy

 Insert Clause 146 PICS table to draft, (146.11) with 146.11.3 Major capabilities/options, inserting new option at the end, "*PPSE", MDI encompases a Clause 104 PSE, 146.8.5, 146.8.6 ; Status=O, Support, "Yes[] No[]". Insert 146.11.4.5 MDI specifications to draft, and PICS item MDI4 to draft, changing status to M:!PPSE

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **146** *SC* **146.8.6** *P* **25** *L* **30** # 7

Zimmerman, George   CME Consulting/various

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

 PICS needs to be added to reflect new requirement, this PICS needs to reflect clause 104 is an option]

SuggestedRemedy

 Insert Clause 146 PICS table to draft, (146.11) with 146.11.3 Major capabilities/options, inserting new option at the end, "*PPSE", MDI encompases a Clause 104 PSE, 146.8.5, 146.8.6; Status=O, Support, "Yes[] No[]". Insert 146.11.4.5 MDI specifications to draft, and PICS item MDI5 to draft, changing status to M:!PPSE

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Pa* **25**   Page 3 of 4
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed Z/withdrawn   *Li* **30**   8/30/2021 9:29:56 AM
SORT ORDER: Page, Line

Cl **146**   *SC* **146.8.6**   *P* **25**   *L* **33**   #   15

Ran, Adee   Cisco

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

The limitation to 2000 mA is unclear. The requirement is stated as "application of short circuits of any wire to the other wire of the same pair or ground potential" and short circuits can draw any current. What or who is limiting the source current?

Does it mean that the fault tolerance requirement is not application of "short circuits" but instead application of a current source of up to 2000 mA as a load?

SuggestedRemedy

This should be phrased differently but I'm not sure what to suggest.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
TFTD.
Insert " where applicable due to applied voltage." after "2000 mA".

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 **25**
Li **33**

Page 4 of 4
8/30/2021 9:29:56 AM